

**An investigation into the
prevalence and people's
experience of 'food poverty'
within Causeway Coast and
Glens catchments:
Secondary analysis of local
authority data**

A report prepared by:

Dr Sinéad Furey

Ms Leanne Fegan

Dr Amy Burns

Dr Chris McLaughlin

Dr Lynsey Hollywood

Ms Pearl Mahon

Submitted July 2016

Contents	Page
Executive Summary	2
Introduction and background	3
Research aim	6
Methodology	6
Results and discussion	7
Conclusion and recommendations	14
References	16

Acknowledgement

The authors are grateful to Causeway Coast and Glens Borough Council's Environmental Health Department, particularly Ms Pearl Mahon, for permitting access to these data.

Executive Summary

Food poverty is defined as the inability to afford or access a healthy diet and is becoming recognised as a public health emergency.

This research involved secondary analysis of a Causeway Coast and Glens (CCAG)-sponsored household questionnaire data (N=362) to determine the affordability and accessibility of food, and the social impacts of food poverty. In addition, data were analysed to understand if particular catchments reported different experiences and appetites for local authority intervention to help overcome food poverty.

Findings concluded that food poverty has reached a concerning level within the CCAG Borough, with affordability and accessibility proving important points of concern. Two in five (41%) respondents reported being unable to comfortably feed themselves and their families three meals per day all of the time, and three in ten (31%) reported being forced to make a choice between food and other essentials. More than half of the respondents (54%) reported some anxiety about whether their budget would fulfil their food needs.

An important minority (13% – 40%) cited their inability to afford social activities that their peers may take for granted. This sense of being socially excluded from both low-cost, routine to more expensive, occasional activities is worrying given how social inclusivity contributes to quality of life.

Respondents indicated support for various local authority-organised activities including quality, local food and cookery demonstrations to help overcome the negative repercussions of food poverty.

Policy makers and practitioners should consider these perspectives in devising evidence-informed and meaningfully-targeted interventions, while efforts must be ongoing to address the structural causes of food poverty for a truly sustainable solution.

Introduction and Background

The prominence of food poverty – insufficient economic access to an adequate quantity and quality of food to maintain a nutritionally satisfactory and socially acceptable diet (O'Connor et al, 2016) – is becoming recognised as a public health emergency (Taylor-Robinson et al., 2013). Cooper et al (2016) highlight how UK food prices have increased by 43.5% between 2005 and 2013. Furthermore, Griffith et al (2015) noted that food prices within the UK were found to have increased higher and persisted longer than any other OECD country. Therefore, food poverty has become a concerning issue within the UK.

Recent United Nations' data indicate that an estimated 8.4 million people reported having insufficient food in the UK in 2014, the 6th largest economy in the world (Taylor and Loopstra, 2016). Meanwhile an estimated 5.6% of people aged 15 or over in the UK reported struggling to get enough food to eat and a further 4.5% reported that, at least once, they went a full day without anything to eat. It has been concluded, based on these preliminary estimates, that the UK ranks in the bottom half of European countries (Taylor and Loopstra, 2016).

Financial access to food is particularly concerning given the cost of living while emerging from an economic recession and other macroeconomic and external factors, including Welfare Reform. The issue is further complicated by the knowledge that NI has yet to fully implement Welfare Reform. Implications of a single Universal Credit benefit, paid fortnightly or monthly, coupled with benefit sanctions and impacts of the bedroom tax for which NI housing stock is poorly prepared are yet to be factored.

Such financial access issues are further complicated with physical access issues due to the high level of car-lessness in NI, sub-optimal transport links and supermarkets' locational policies to site at edge-of-town and out-of-town locations impeding access to healthy and affordable food.

The affordability of food is a worrying issue for Northern Ireland (NI) consumers to the extent that nine in ten consumers are anxious about the rising cost of food (Consumer Council, 2013). Food poverty manifests itself as a short-term dilemma of

putting food on the table alongside the long-term effects of food poverty including the habitual consumption of poor nutritional quality foods to the extent that lower income consumers are compromising food and nutritional quality to satiate hunger. Recent research (Safefood, Consumer Council and Food Standards Agency in NI, 2015) constructed a food basket for two household types in NI using Consensual Budget Standards methodology and found that a nutritionally adequate shopping basket of weekly food for a two-adult and a two-child household, with one child in pre-school (aged 2–4 years) and one in primary school (aged 6–11 years) would cost £119.17; while for a pensioner living alone the weekly cost would equate to £59.13. The cost of a healthy shopping basket appears prohibitively expensive in the context of the Living Costs and Food Survey which indicates how the average Northern Ireland household spent £64 per week on food (2012-14 figures). It is important to note from this survey that Northern Ireland householders spent more than their GB counterparts on food and non-alcoholic beverages during this period while simultaneously being the UK region with the second lowest level of disposable income (£515); only the North East of England has a lower disposable income (£502) than Northern Ireland (Office for National Statistics, 2015).

Food is a vehicle to promote a sense of inclusion among people because the sharing of food at meals is a social occasion. Where food is considered unaffordable, it can contribute to householders feeling socially excluded whereby they are missing out on those opportunities their higher-income counterparts may take for granted and which local authority citizens have the right to access as amenities. Levitas et al (2007, p. 25) define social exclusion as *“a complex and multi-dimensional process involving the lack or denial of resources, rights, goods and services, and the inability to participate in the normal relationships and activities, available to the majority of people in a society, whether in economic, social, cultural or political arenas. It affects both the quality of life of individuals and the equity and cohesion of society as a whole”*.

Food poverty does not have a universally-agreed indicator therefore it is difficult to arrive at a factual figure for the extent of food poverty in NI. Research effort has been considerable in the NI context with disparate attempts to measure and quantify food poverty. For example, the Department for Social Development’s 2013/2014 Poverty

Bulletin identified 21% of the population of NI living in poverty. The Health Survey for NI (2014/15) published worrying food security figures whereby 4% of households reported that there had been at least one day when they had not eaten a substantial meal in the last fortnight due to a lack of money; and 1% stated that they had ever cut the size of a child's meal because they did not have enough money for food. This is a concerning coping strategy because typically where food budgets are constrained parents will reduce their meals to ensure their children are nourished with an appropriate-sized meal. To reduce the quantity of food they serve to their child(ren) is an indication of the extent of the food poverty experience in affected households. In 2013/14, the same survey included the finding that 7% of respondents reported that there had been at least one day in the past fortnight when they had not eaten a substantial meal due to a lack of money.

Similarly the 2013 Poverty and Social Exclusion study in NI (Tomlinson et al., 2013) reported how households lack three or more of 22 necessities covering food, clothing, housing and social activities. Within those households over 115,000 adults and children (6.4% of the population) are not properly fed by today's standards. By way of illustration, telling NI data from the EU Survey on Income and Living Conditions (food deprivation measures) (2013) concluded that 29% of people have 'sometimes' or 'often' skimped on food so that others in the household would have enough to eat; 6% of households cannot afford a meal with meat, fish or vegetarian equivalent every other day; 7% of households are unable to afford fresh fruit and vegetables every day; and 2% of households (over 14,000) cannot afford two meals a day.

In the context of such food impoverishment, Advice NI data (2014) identify how food banks had increased rapidly during the last year and the demand for their assistance had grown. Startlingly, reliance on such food aid has increased greatly in NI: in 2011-12, 254 people received food parcels compared to 17,425 individuals in 2014-15 – the equivalent of a 6,860% increase in three years.

Against this background, and amidst calls for the routine collection and analysis of data to determine the extent of food poverty in NI, the purpose of this secondary

analysis is to investigate the existence and experience of food poverty by householders in the Causeway Coast and Glens' local authority area of NI.

Research Aim

As previously stated, there is no agreed definition or indicator to measure food poverty in NI. No research study in NI to date has considered food purchasing habits with levels of deprivation and social exclusion; therefore this study sought to determine the affordability and accessibility of food and the social impacts of food poverty. In addition, data were analysed to understand if particular catchments reported different experiences and appetites for local authority intervention to help overcome food poverty.

Methodology

Causeway Coast and Glens Borough Council (formerly Coleraine Borough Council, Ballymoney Borough Council, Moyle District Council and Limavady Borough Council) conducted fieldwork via a manually disseminated householder questionnaire (N=362). The survey comprised questions relating to the experience of food poverty and included the following: attitudes to shopping, poverty, meal preparation, perceived affordability of particular social activities and level of interest in participating in food-, health- and budgetary-related seminars and events.

Causeway Coast and Glens' staff conducted a primary analysis to understand the extent of food poverty among its citizens. Ulster University conducted a deeper, secondary analysis of these data to understand if particular catchments reported different experiences and appetites for local authority intervention. Data were analysed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 22. Descriptive and comparative statistics were employed in the secondary analysis of these data to determine the affordability and accessibility of food, the social impacts of food poverty and potential solutions consumers may perceive to help overcome food poverty. Principally, data were analysed and reported at the composite Causeway Coast and Glens' level. Additionally, cross-tabulations were used to investigate if different Council catchments had statistically significant results. The respondents' postcode data (where available – n=310) were categorised into three catchment areas for analysis purposes, illustrated in Table 1:

Table 1 Catchment areas

Catchment	Catchment area
1	Dunloy, Rasharkin, Cloughmills and Ballycastle (n=81)
2	Coleraine, Limavady and Dungiven (n=188)
3	Portrush, Portstewart and Bushmills (n=41)

Results

Demographics

The research sample comprised 88% females and 12% males highlighting how provisioning the household remains a female-oriented responsibility. The majority of respondents (68%) lived in two person households or lived alone. Seven in ten (71%) reported using a private car to get to their main grocery shop; a minority relied on public transport (15%), taxis (5%), walking (4%), and family members and friends (3%) when shopping for food. Three in four respondents (74%) reported their occupation to be a homemaker, retired or unemployed.

The importance of food

The everyday task of putting food on the table is important in nourishing and sustaining family members. Respondents in the Causeway Coast and Glens area recognise food as a priority and the majority (80%) confirmed that they consider food to be important.

In developing this line of enquiry further, one in two respondents (48%) considered affordability to be a key priority when purchasing food – seconded by its nutritional value (29%). Such prioritisation of food affordability and quality is reinforced throughout Europe (Nielsen, 2012). Meanwhile, larger households (25% of those households with three or more family members) attached a tertiary priority to purchasing food that they know their children will eat.

The affordability of food

This primary focus on the affordability of food was stark since, worryingly, 41% of respondents reported being unable to comfortably feed themselves and their families three meals per day all of the time. This statistic worsens among larger households, where 45.7% reported not being able to comfortably afford to feed their families all of the time. Twenty-two respondents (6%) reported rarely or never being able to afford

three meals per day, while one in six (17%) reported missing meals because their food budget was inadequate (24.8% of larger households), and one in eight (13% of all households) reported missing a meal in the previous fortnight due to budgetary restrictions – an indictment of the severity of food poverty among this cohort.

The affordability of food was further discussed whereby three in ten (31%) reported being forced to make a choice between food and other essentials (37.1% of larger households reported the same predicament). Notably, energy bills were considered a high priority expense and ranked consistently in respondents' top three priority household expenditures: for one in five householders (22.1%) electricity/gas/coal/oil was their priority (superseded only by food/groceries as a priority expense); for one in three (34.3%) energy costs were the households' second priority bill; and for one in six (16%) it was their third priority household bill. This evidence lends further plausibility to the ongoing 'heat or eat' debate' and the inadequacy of these respondents' household incomes. Meanwhile, larger households demoted food to their second priority household bill after mortgage/rent and before electricity/gas/coal/oil.

Shopping practices and accessing food stores

The majority (69%) reported shopping once or twice a week but there is an important minority of respondents who shop on a more frequent basis, in agreement with Food Standards Agency in NI (2014) and BBC data (Hope, 2014) that emphasise the emergence of smaller, more frequent food shopping trips while simultaneously respecting the culture of the one main shopping trip. This is particularly true for larger households, 69% of which reported shopping twice a week or more frequently for food. A majority (75%) rely on supermarkets as their food stores of choice. One in six (16%) shop in smaller supermarkets and 8% reported shopping in local stores. Three in four (75%) reported being able to physically access food easily; 34% reported a need to shop within a local proximity due to transport restrictions, and a similar proportion (29%) reported relying on relatives, taxis, public and community transport to access food shops (notwithstanding this, 65% called for better transport access to large supermarkets). This self-reporting of shopping locally may result in dissatisfied citizens who face a double disincentive of restricted choice and higher prices from

smaller food shops that cannot hope to offer the equivalent economies of scale as their supermarket counterparts.

Accessing and affording adequate food

In investigating the frequency with which physical access to food is problematic, the research uncovered how almost half of the respondents noted how they either always, most of the time or sometimes experienced difficulty in accessing good quality nutritional food, with 47% reporting difficulty in affording nutritious food.

Perhaps the gravest manifestation of food poverty is the practice of regularly skipping or missing meals. The literature (O'Connell, 2005; Harvey, 2016) reports how parents miss meals in order to ensure sufficiency of food intake for their children. In this Causeway Coast and Glens study, 20% of the cohort reported missing meals. Furthermore, 10% of respondents were unable to afford meat, chicken or fish at least every second day and 17% could not afford a roast meat joint or equivalent once a week. These Causeway Coast and Glens food deprivation measures are comparable with the 2013 Poverty and Social Exclusion Study for NI where the food deprivation measures concluded that 29% of people have 'sometimes' or 'often' skimped on food so that others in the household would have enough to eat and 6% of households cannot afford a meal with meat, fish or vegetarian equivalent every other day. This deficit in affording and accessing three nutritious family meals per day leads to the query as to whether such householders are compromising their diet for more affordable and potentially less healthy solutions (Kirkpatrick and Tarasuk, 2008; Griffith et al, 2015; Malsen, 2013; and Harvey, 2016); certainly more than one-quarter (28%) reported eating takeaways on a weekly or more frequent basis (this statistic increases to 41.3% for larger households).

Nutritional adequacy of food

Respondents' secondary concern about their food's nutritional adequacy was a recurring theme. Almost half (46%) reported concern about the food they eat – of these, 56% were wary that their diets were not healthy; 20% worried about their poor diet quality; and 16% lamented the lack of variety. The practice of compromising quality and variety to satiate hunger is concerning and has been highlighted as a

very real phenomenon in the literature which suggests that the diets of those living in austerity may be monotonous (Burns, 2004; Friel and Conlon, 2004; Coates et al, 2006).

Concerns about affording food

Such expressions of concern and worry are testament to the fact that there are associated mental health impacts with food poverty. More than half of the respondents (54%) reported a degree of anxiety about whether their budget would fulfil their food needs (worsening to 60% among larger households). This finding suggests two things: firstly, consumers' income is insufficient to satisfy their basic needs (Cooper and Dumbleton, 2013; and Hardy, 2013); and secondly, respondents may have difficulty in budgeting effectively (Lambie-Mumford and Dowler, 2014) – certainly five in nine respondents supported the concept of their local authority organising a budgeting seminar to support this important life skill. Meanwhile one in five (22%) reported the unaffordability of having a meal or drink with their family or friends once a month.

Understanding food poverty experiences by catchment

As stated previously, respondents were categorised into geographical districts as follows: (1) Dunloy, Rasharkin, Cloughmills and Ballycastle (n=81); (2) Coleraine, Limavady and Dungiven (n=188); and (3) Portrush, Portstewart and Bushmills (n=41). Some interesting experiential differences were apparent when investigated by location. Table 2 refers to those respondents who reported the statement(s) to be true for reasons of unaffordability.

Table 2: Food poverty experience differentiated by location and unaffordability

Statement	Dunloy, Rasharkin, Cloughmills & Ballycastle (N=81)	Coleraine, Limavady & Dungiven (N=188)	Portrush, Portstewart & Bushmills (N=41)	Statistically significant
Cannot comfortably afford to feed themselves and their families three meals per day	32.5% (n=27)	44.8% (n=87)	37.8% (n=18)	
Some level of difficulty affording a variety of nutritionally balanced meals	50% (n=40)	45.8% (n=84)	51.3% (n=20)	
Some level of difficulty accessing a variety of nutritionally balanced meals	52.2% (n=42)	47.9% (n=89)	44.0% (n=18)	
Missed a meal because their food budget was inadequate	11.8% (n=9)	24.6% (n=45)	7.5% (n=3)	**
At least one day in the last fortnight when they did not have a substantial meal for reasons of unaffordability	15.2% (n=12)	15.6% (n=28)	7.5% (n=3)	
Could not afford to have friends/family around for a meal/drink once a month	22.4% (n=17)	23.9% (n=42)	15.4% (n=6)	

Note: **Statistically significant ($p < 0.01$); numeric in bold = most prevalent

Coleraine, Limavady and Dungiven respondents (44.8%) reported being less comfortably able to afford to feed themselves and their families three meals per day than their Portrush (37.8%) and Dunloy (32.5%) cohorts. However, at the most extreme end of the spectrum, more Dunloy respondents (2.5%) reported never being able to comfortably afford three meals per day which was higher than the self-reports from Coleraine (1.6%) and no Portrush respondents reported being unable to afford three meals per day. Conversely, more Portrush respondents (51.3%) reported some level of difficulty in affording a variety of nutritionally balanced meals compared to their Dunloy (50%) and Coleraine (45.8%) counterparts. In contrast more Dunloy respondents reported some level of difficulty in accessing a variety of nutritionally balanced meals (53.2%) compared to 48.9% for Coleraine and 44% for Portrush householders.

Significantly more Catchment 2 (24.6%) respondents reported missing a meal for reasons of their food budget being inadequate than their Catchment 1 (11.8%) and 3 (7.5%) counterparts. Approximately equal Coleraine (15.6%) and Dunloy (15.2%) respondents reported that there was at least one day in the past fortnight when they did not have a substantial meal for reasons of unaffordability, which was higher than their Portrush (7.5%) equivalents. The poor affordability of food theme extended into Coleraine householders' greater inability to have friends and family around for a meal or drink once a month (23.9% compared to 22.4% and 15.4% for Dunloy and Portrush respectively).

Food poverty and social exclusion

Such social exclusion was a further recurring theme in the research – a significant minority (between 13% and 42%) cited their inability to afford social activities and outings that their peers may take for granted (refer to Table 3).

Table 3: Percentage of respondents who reported different social activities as unaffordable

Activity	Percentage who could not afford to participate
Socialising	42
Holiday	40
Cinema/theatre	37
Meal out	34
Attend a wedding	26
Hobby	25
Special occasions	13

The consideration of certain activities as being prohibitively expensive may explain, in part, the phenomenon of the affordable indulgence – takeaways – which one in five respondents reported eating once weekly, and one in three (37%) reported eating on a monthly basis.

It is interesting to note that respondents' perceptions around the affordability, or otherwise, of various social activities differed by location (refer to Table 4). Generally, Coleraine district respondents reported greater ill-affordability of social

activities than their Dunloy and Portrush counterparts (with the exception of attending the cinema/theatre).

Table 4: Respondents' perceived unaffordability of social activities by location

Social activities	Dunloy, Rasharkin, Cloughmills & Ballycastle (N=81)	Coleraine, Limavady & Dungiven (N=188)	Portrush, Portstewart & Bushmills (N=41)	Statistically significant
Cannot afford to socialise	43.4% (n=23)	49.3% (n=68)	18.2% (n=6)	**
Cannot afford to go to the cinema/theatre	48.8% (n=21)	37.4% (n=52)	11.1% (n=3)	*
Cannot afford a holiday	32.8% (n=19)	45.6% (n=68)	21.9% (n=7)	*
Cannot afford a meal out	33.3% (n=19)	40.4% (n=59)	11.4% (n=4)	**
Cannot afford to attend a wedding	21.1% (n=12)	31.0% (n=45)	7.4% (n=2)	
Cannot afford a hobby	21.7% (n=13)	24.8% (n=33)	22.2% (n=6)	
Cannot afford special occasions	7.6% (n=5)	16.7% (n=25)	3.4% (n=1)	

Note: *Statistically significant (p<0.05); **Statistically significant (p<0.01); numeric in bold = most prevalent

This sense of social exclusion and the unaffordability of social interactions ranging from low-cost and routine to more expensive and occasional activities is a worrying development given how social inclusivity is important from mental health and quality of life perspectives.

Responsiveness to interventions ideas

Faced with difficulties, worries and anxiety about affording, accessing, and enjoying healthy food, these respondents also considered what solutions would start to address their food insecurity. Respondents indicated support for benefitting from quality food sold in their local community (85%) and attending cookery demonstrations (71%); healthy eating seminars (64%) and budgeting seminars (57%) to help overcome the negative repercussions of food poverty. Less popular

were nutritional labelling workshops (40%) and allotment seminars (39%) indicating respondents' disassociation of nutritional education and growing their own food as potential solutions to increasing the affordability and accessibility of food.

Again, the degree of responsiveness differed by respondents' geographical location (refer to Table 5).

Table 5: Respondents' responsiveness to intervention ideas by location

Suggested intervention	Dunloy, Rasharkin, Cloughmills & Ballycastle (N=81)	Coleraine, Limavady & Dungiven (N=188)	Portrush, Portstewart & Bushmills (N=41)	Statistically significant
Attend a cookery demonstration	84.6% (n=55)	70.9% (n=100)	63.0% (n=17)	*
Attend a healthy eating seminar	81.1% (n=43)	59.6% (n=81)	70.0% (n=21)	
Attend a budgeting seminar	68.2% (n=30)	60.6% (n=77)	52.4% (n=11)	
Attend a nutritional labelling seminar	54.5% (n=24)	37.8% (n=42)	57.1% (n=12)	
Attend an allotment seminar	52.1% (n=25)	36.7% (n=44)	42.9% (n=9)	

Note: *Statistically significant (p<0.05); numeric in bold = most prevalent

Again it is interesting to note how respondents' receptiveness to various ideas for interventions perceived as beneficial to supporting consumers' food poverty coping strategies and general life skills differed by location. For all proffered solutions, Dunloy district respondents were most responsive. Coleraine, Limavady and Dungiven respondents registered particular support for cooking demonstrations and budgeting and healthy eating seminars; while Portrush, Portstewart and Bushmills respondents afforded particular importance to a healthy eating seminar. Catchment 2 respondents reported less interest in nutritional labelling and allotment interventions and these locational differences in expressions of interest should be considered in advance of developing and offering a bespoke suite of educational and participative events by catchment.

Conclusion and recommendations

The prevalence of food poverty has reached a concerning level within the Causeway Coast and Glens Borough, with affordability being a primary point of concern, and to a lesser extent accessibility meriting policy attention. These respondents self-reported frequent anxiety about the ability of their household budgets to stretch to meet their family needs both in terms of accessing and affording nutritious and varied diets amidst other household essentials, but also in participating in social experiences that enhance quality of life.

The respondents were sophisticated in prioritising policy solutions to improve their experience of living in food poverty. They indicated strong support for local food sources and cooking demonstrations, and a willingness to attend budgeting and healthy eating seminars to permit them to maximise their limited resources. They clearly differentiated between those activities and amenities that would augment their ability to access and afford food while deprioritising these suggestions that they considered to be superfluous to the immediate problem being experienced.

It is important that Causeway Coast and Glens Borough Council, in arriving at potential solutions to improve the incidence and experience of food poverty, consider the views of these respondents. Any amenities and programmes arising as recommendations must be evidence-informed and targeted as meaningful interventions that are ultimately welcomed by intended beneficiaries. In-so-doing, policy makers and practitioners must be mindful of the need to similarly address the structural causes of food poverty including income, benefit and employment maximisation and responsible Welfare Reform if solutions and actions are to be truly sustainable.

References

Advice NI Social Policy Report (2013) *The Growth of Food Banks in Northern Ireland*. Available from:

http://www.adviceni.net/sites/default/files/publications/AdviceNI_Food_Banks_Policy_paper.pdf [Accessed 2 March 2016].

Burns, C. (2004) *A review of the literature describing the link between poverty, food insecurity and obesity with specific reference to Australia*. Australia: Victorian Health Promotion Foundation. Available from:

http://secondbite.org/sites/default/files/A_review_of_the_literature_describing_the_link_between_poverty_food_insecurity_and_obesity_w.pdf [Accessed 30 March 2016].

Coates, J., Frongillo, E. A., Rogers, B. L., Webb, P., Wilde, P. E., and Houser, R. (2006) Commonalities in the experience of household food insecurity across cultures: what are measures missing? *Journal of Nutrition*, 136 (5), 1438-1448.

Consumer Council. (2013) *Hard to stomach: The impact of rising food costs for Northern Ireland consumers*. Belfast: Consumer Council. Available from:

http://www.consumercouncil.org.uk/filestore/documents/Hard_to_Stomach1.pdf.

[Accessed 2 March 2016].

Cooper, N. and Dumpleton, S. (2013) *Walking the breadline: The scandal of food poverty in 21st century Britain*. London: Oxfam. Available from:

<http://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/walking-the-breadline-the-scandal-of-food-poverty-in-21st-century-britain-292978> [Accessed 2 March 2016].

Cooper, N., Purcell, S. and Jackson, R. (2014) *Below the breadline – the relentless rise of food poverty in Britain*. London: Oxfam. Available from:

<http://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/below-the-breadline-the-relentless-rise-of-food-poverty-in-britain-317730>[Accessed 2 March 2016].

Department for Social Development (2014) *NI Poverty Bulletin*. Belfast: Department for Social Development.

Food Standards Agency. (2014) *The food and you survey: Northern Ireland bulletin 1 – Eating, cooking and shopping*. Available from: <http://www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/ni-bulletin-1-food-and-you-2014.pdf> [Accessed 5 July 2016].

Friel, S. and Conlon, C. (2004) *Food poverty and policy*. Dublin; Combat Poverty Agency. Available from: http://www.combatpoverty.ie/publications/FoodPovertyAndPolicy_2004.pdf [Accessed 15 March 2016].

García-Germán, S., Bardají, I. and Garrido, A. (2010) *Analysis of food deprivation in the EU under food prices volatility and rise: Scientific paper No. 10*. ULYSSES project, EU 7th Framework Programme, Project 312182 KBBE.2012.1.4-05. Madrid: Universidad Politécnica de Madrid. Available from: http://www.fp7-ulysses.eu/publications/ULYSSES%20Scientific%20Paper%2010_Analysis%20of%20food%20deprivation%20in%20the%20EU%20under%20food%20prices%20volatility%20and%20rise.pdf [Accessed 2 March 2016].

Griffith, R., O'Connell, M. and Smith, K. (2015) *Food expenditure and nutritional quality over the great recession*. London: Institute for Fiscal Studies. Available from: <http://www.ifs.org.uk/bns/bn143.pdf> [Accessed 7 March 2016].

Hardy, B. (2013) *Income instability and the response of the safety net*. Washington: American University. Available from: https://spea.indiana.edu/doc/research/finance-conference/hardy_income-instability.pdf [Accessed: 2 March 2016].

Harvey, K. (2016) When I go to bed hungry and sleep, I'm not hungry: Children's and parents' experiences of food insecurity. *Appetite*, 99 (2), 235-244.

Hope, K. (2014) *The death of the weekly supermarket shop*. Available from: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-29442383> [Accessed 30 July 2015].

Northern Ireland Executive (2015b) *Health Survey Northern Ireland 2014/15*. Available from: http://www.northernireland.gov.uk/news-dhssps-111115-health-survey-northern?WT.mc_id=rss-news [Accessed 22 February 2016].

Kirkpatrick, S. L. and Tarasuk, V. (2008) Food insecurity is associated with nutrient inadequacies among Canadian adults and adolescents. *Journal of Nutrition*, 138 (3), 604-612.

Lambie-Mumford, H. and Dowler, E. (2014) Rising use of food aid in the United Kingdom. *British Food Journal*, 116 (6), 1418-1425.

Levitas, R., Pantazis, C., Fahmy, E., Gordon, D., Lloyd, E., and Patsios, D. (2007) *The multi-dimensional analysis of social exclusion*. Bristol: International Study of Poverty and Bristol Institute for Public Affairs University of Bristol. Available from: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/media/cabinetoffice/social_exclusion_task_force/assets/research/multidimensional.pdf.

Accessed 21 July 2016.

Malsen, C., Raffle, A., Marriot, S. and Smith, N. (2013) *Food poverty: What does the evidence tell us?* Bristol: Bristol City Council. Available from: <http://bristolfoodpolicycouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/Food-Poverty-Report-July-2013-for-publication.pdf> [Accessed 2 March 2016].

O'Connor, N., Farag, K. and Baines, R. (2016) What is food poverty? A conceptual framework. *British Food Journal*, 118 (2), 429-449.

Office for National Statistics. (2015) *Family spending 2015 – A report on the living costs and food survey 2014*. London: Office for National Statistics. Available from: <http://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/personalandhouseholdfinances/incomeandwealth/compendium/familyspending/2015> [accessed 27/03/16].

Safefood, Consumer Council and Food Standards Agency in NI. (2015) *The cost of a healthy food basket: Pilot study of two household types in Northern Ireland*. Dublin: Safefood. Available from:

<http://www.safefood.eu/SafeFood/media/SafeFoodLibrary/Documents/Publications/Research%20Reports/The-Cost-of-a-Minimum-Essential-Food-Basket-in-Northern-Ireland-09062015.pdf> [Accessed 2 March 2016].

Taylor, A. and Loopstra, R. (2016) *Too poor to eat: Food insecurity in the UK*. London: Food Foundation. Available from: <http://foodfoundation.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/FoodInsecurityBriefing-May-2016-FINAL.pdf> [Accessed 6 May 2016].

Taylor-Robinson, D., Rougeaux, E., Harrison, D., Witehead, M., Barr, B. and Pearce, A. (2013) The rise of food poverty in the UK. I; 347: f7157.

Tomlinson, M., Hillyard, P. and Kelly, G. (2013) *Child poverty in Northern Ireland: Results from the poverty and social exclusion study*. Belfast: Queen's University, Belfast. Available from: [http://pure.qub.ac.uk/portal/en/publications/child-poverty-in-northern-ireland-results-from-the-poverty-and-social-exclusion-study\(1dc541d8-c219-4728-8e68-a4cdb3991874\).html](http://pure.qub.ac.uk/portal/en/publications/child-poverty-in-northern-ireland-results-from-the-poverty-and-social-exclusion-study(1dc541d8-c219-4728-8e68-a4cdb3991874).html) [Accessed 2 March 2016].