# U.S. rural adults' consumption of fruits and vegetables: Who is consuming at least five servings daily?

M. Nawal Lutfiyya, PhD; <sup>1</sup> Linda Chang, PharmD, MPH; <sup>2</sup> and Martin S. Lipsky, MD, MS<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Essentia Institute of Rural Health, Division of Research, 502 East 2nd Street,

**Duluth, MN 55805** 

<sup>2</sup> Department of Community and Family Medicine, University of Illinois-Chicago College of Medicine at Rockford, 1601 Parkview Avenue, Rockford, Il 61107

Corresponding Author: M. Nawal Lutfiyya, PhD

Address: Essentia Institute of Rural Health, Division of Research, 503 East Third

Street, Duluth, MN 55805

**Voice:** 218-786-8118

E-mail: mlutfiyya@eirh.org

Key Words: rural health, fruit and vegetable consumption, adult nutrition, BRFSS

Running Title: rural adults' fruit and vegetable consumption

**Manuscript Word Count: 3670** 

**Abstract Word Count: 240** 

Tables: 5

Figures: 1

An earlier draft of this paper was presented to the annual meeting of the National Rural Health Association, 3–6 May 2011, Austin Texas

#### **Abstract**

**Objective:** Adequate fruit and vegetable consumption reduces the risk for several major causes of morbidity and mortality. We examined differences in fruit and vegetable consumption between U.S. rural and non-rural adults and identified associated characteristics.

**Methods:** Bivariate and multivariate techniques were used to analyze 2009 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance Survey (BRFSS) data. Prevalence differences were mapped by U.S. state using GIS software.

Results: Logistic regression analysis revealed that U.S. rural adults consuming at least five daily servings of fruits and vegetables were more likely to be: female; African American, Hispanic or racially other; married or living with a partner; living in a household without children; living in a household whose annual income was at least \$35,000; and getting at least moderate physical activity. They were also more likely to have: a BMI of <30; have a personal physician; have had a routine medical exam in the past 12 months; self-define their health as good to excellent and to have deferred medical care because of cost. When comparing the standardized percent differences between rural and non-rural U.S. adults by state, 37 States had smaller proportions of rural adults consuming five or more daily servings of fruits and vegetables and 11 States a higher proportion of rural adults consuming five or more daily servings of fruits and vegetables.

**Conclusions:** Findings should be helpful to those interested in developing interventions aimed at increased consumption of recommended daily servings of fruits and vegetables.

#### Introduction

Similar to U.S. Healthy People objectives (e.g., HP 2000 and HP 2010), Healthy People 2020 (HP2020) [1] also contains nutrition related objectives that include increasing the consumption of both fruits and vegetables by Americans. The HP 2020 objectives for fruit and vegetable consumption echo the 2010 Dietary Guidelines for Americans that recommend an increase in vegetable and fruit intake for all aged 2 years and older. [2]Furthermore, the newly released guidelines emphasize the importance of consuming a variety of vegetables (i.e. dark-green, red, orange vegetables) and beans and peas.[2] Increasing the consumption of fruits and vegetables is deemed an important public health issue since adequate fruit and vegetable consumption may reduce the risk for several major causes of morbidity and mortality in the U.S. including: type 2 diabetes, [3] heart disease,[4–5] stroke [6] and obesity. [3–6] In addition, research also suggests that diets rich in fruits and vegetables are associated with a lower incidence of epithelial cancers of the alimentary and respiratory tracks.[7-8]

In addition to reducing the risk of developing many chronic diseases, there is an increasing and compelling body of clinical evidence supporting the benefit of diet and physical activity in not only health maintenance and disease prevention but also for disease treatment, a process referred to as Medical Nutrition Therapy (MNT). [9] MNT is an essential component in the management of conditions such as type 2 diabetes, heart disease, hyperlipidemia, stroke and obesity. [10-12] Several widely disseminated clinical practice guidelines advise eating diets high in whole foods such as fruit, vegetables, and whole grains along with limiting animal protein and avoiding high energy low nutrient foods as an important component of disease management. There is also a growing

body of medical research demonstrating that diets rich in fruits and vegetables reduce the risk of cancer, suggesting that dietary choice can be an important cancer prevention measure. [13–15]

Another key HP2020 objective is to identify and track health inequities with the goal of eradicating disparities among segments of the population. Individuals living in rural settings are one population identified as being at risk for health disparities.[1–17] While researchers have identified fruit and vegetable intake differences by race and ethnicity, [18-20] age, [21-22] socioeconomic factors [23-24] and sex, [21, 25] there is little research about the consumption of fruits and vegetables by rural populations. Those published studies examining fruit and vegetable intake by populations living in rural areas either focused on regional or narrowly defined U.S. populations (e.g., seniors or only Hispanic and African American groups) or populations in developing countries (e.g., India) or other settings outside the U.S. (e.g., France).[26-28]

This study examined the differences in daily fruit and vegetable consumption between U.S. rural and non-rural adults and explored what characteristics were associated with rural adults consuming at least five daily servings of combined fruits and vegetables.

#### **Methods**

We examined data from the 2009 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance Survey (BRFSS), to determine if there were disparities and/or differences between rural and non-rural adults in regard to the daily consumption of at least five daily servings of combined fruits and vegetables. The study used 2009 BRFSS data, the most recent

year of data collected and available for analysis. BRFSS is a cross-sectional, random digit telephone survey that is a collaborative project of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and all U.S. states and territories. The survey measures several behavioral risk factors in the adult population aged 18 years and older. Its objective is to collect uniform, state-specific data on preventive health practices and risk behaviors linked to chronic diseases, injuries and preventable infectious diseases in the non-institutionalized adult U.S. population.

In this survey, data are collected from a random sample of adults (one per household). A more detailed description of the sampling methodology of BRFSS is available elsewhere. [29] All BRFSS data are self-reported responses to mostly forced-choice questions. No additional data are generated to corroborate or substantiate the self-reported responses. As recommended by the Center for Disease Control, all analyses were performed on weighted data. The weighting provides a stratified representation of the US adult non-institutionalized population.

For our study, a single year of data for the year 2009 of non-institutionalized U.S. adults (n=405,556) were analyzed, and these data were weighted to represent 219,479,823 U.S. adults. From the 2009 dataset, 99,207 U.S. adults were identified as consuming at least 5 servings of fruits and vegetables daily and were then weighted to represent 52,259,789 U.S. adults of which 8,983,840 were identified as living in rural locales.

The Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) variable included in BRFSS was used to define place of residence as either rural or non-rural. Rural residents were defined as persons living either within an MSA that had no city center or outside an MSA. Non-rural

residents included all respondents living in a city center of an MSA, outside the city center of an MSA but inside the county containing the city center, or inside a suburban county of the MSA.

The dependent variable for this analysis was: consumption of at least 5 daily servings of fruits and vegetables. This was a calculated variable derived from survey participant responses to several questions asked by the interviewer administering the survey. In addition, a number of independent variables were included in the analysis. These were: sex, race and ethnicity, age, education, marital status, children in household, household income, body mass index (BMI), health insurance status, having a personal physician, timing of last routine medical check-up, deferment of medical care because of cost, self-defined health status, and physical activity. A number of these covariates were re-coded from their original formulation for use in this analysis. Table 1 summarizes the original survey questions and response categories with the re-coded response categories.

For all variables included in the analyses reported on here, the categories of refused or don't know or missing were re-coded as missing and not included in the data analysis. Age and number of children in the household were the only continuous variables re-coded as categorical ones. The variables education, marital status, household income, have a personal physician, timing of last routine medical check-up, and self-defined health status all had multiple categories that were collapsed into fewer categories for analysis. Race and ethnicity, BMI categories, and physical activity were all calculated variables derived from the responses to several survey questions.

Race and ethnicity was calculated from participant responses to two separate survey questions---one regarding race and the other regarding Latino/Hispanic ethnicity. Combining the responses to these two questions allowed for the derivation of the race and ethnicity variable used in theses analyses. All race/ethnicity categories were computed as mutually exclusive entities. For example all respondents coded as Caucasian chose White as their racial classification, likewise black for African American, etc. If a respondent identified themselves as Hispanic, they were classified by that ethnic category regardless of any additional racial classification.

BMI was calculated from two survey questions, the first asking the respondents height in feet and inches and the second their weight in pounds. The BMI formula for imperial measurement (BMI=weight in pounds X 703/height in inches²) was then used to calculate BMI and code the resultant number into one of three categories: BMI less than 25 (neither overweight nor obese), BMI equal to or greater than 25 - less than 30 (overweight), and BMI equal to or greater than 30 (obese).

Level of physical activity was calculated by combining other variables assessing physical activity level by: 1) whether or not a person was getting recommended levels of moderate physical activity, and 2) whether or not a person was getting recommended levels of vigorous physical activity. People who reported getting recommended levels of either moderate or vigorous physical activity were coded as getting at least recommended levels of moderate physical activity. Recommended levels of moderate physical activity were defined as: moderate-intensity activities such as brisk walking for at least 30 minutes per day, at least five days a week.

Multivariate logistic regression was performed to characterize U.S. adults consuming at least five daily servings of combined fruits and vegetables. Two models were performed – one that included only rural adults, and one including only non-rural adults. Additionally, ArcView version 10.0 (ESRI, Redlands, CA) was used to map the percent differences by State between rural and non-rural adults consuming five or more daily servings of fruits and vegetables. For this calculation and mapping effort the percent of non-rural adults consuming at least five daily servings of fruits and vegetables by state was compared to the percent of their rural counterparts in the same state. Displayed on the map are both states where the percentage of rural adults consuming five or more daily servings of fruits and vegetables was either greater than or lesser than their non-rural counterparts doing the same.

For all statistical analyses, alpha was set at p< 0.05. Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS, IBM, Chicago, IL) version 19.0 was used to complete all statistical analyses performed for this study. Human subject approval was sought and received from Essentia Health's IRB as well as the University of Illinois, College of Medicine at Rockford's IRB.

#### Results

Bivariate analysis revealed that in comparison to U.S. non-rural adults U.S. rural adults were less likely to consume five or more servings of fruits and vegetables. Table 2 also displays additional comparative data for U.S. non-rural and rural adults regardless of daily consumption of fruits and vegetables. Most notably higher proportions of rural adults when compared to non-rural ones were: Caucasian, older (>

65 years of age), heavier (BMI ≥ 30), less educated (college graduation), poorer (household income <\$35,000), married or living with a partner, and without health insurance. Further, a higher proportion of rural vs. non-rural adults: did not have children living at home, had not had a routine medical check-up in the past 12 months, and self-defined their health as fair to poor rather than good to excellent.

Table 3 displays the results of a comparative bivariate analysis of non-rural and rural U.S. adults consuming at least five servings of fruits and vegetables daily. This analysis revealed similar patterns of consumption for both non-rural and rural adults. For instance, a greater proportion of women from both populations consumed at least five servings of fruits and vegetables daily. Similarly, a greater proportion of both rural and non-rural adults who had at least moderate levels of physical activity, who were married or living with a partner, who had no children living at home, and who defined their health as good to excellent consumed at least five servings of fruits and vegetables daily. Of interest were the difference in the racial/ethnicity composition among adults consuming at least five daily servings of fruits and vegetables.

Specifically, there was a 42.4% difference between the percentage of non-Caucasian rural adults (18.8%) and non-Caucasian non-rural adults (32.7%) consuming at least five daily servings of fruits and vegetables.

Table 4 displays the results of the two multivariate models. Consumption of at least 5 daily servings of fruits and vegetables was the dependent variable for both models. The first model included only rural adults and the second only non-rural ones. The logistic regression analysis revealed that rural adults whose daily consumption of fruits and vegetables included at least five servings were more likely to be: female

(OR=1.666; 95% CI 1.663, 1.669) rather than male; African American (OR=1.127; 95% CI 1.123, 1.131), Hispanic (OR=1.474; 95% CI 1.469, 1.479) or racially other (OR=1.251; 95% CI 1.246, 1.255) rather than Caucasian; married or living with a partner (OR=1.071; 95% CI 1.069, 1.073) rather than single; living in a household without children (OR=1.052; 95% CI 1.050, 1.054); living in a household whose annual income is at least \$35,000 (OR=1.111; 95% CI 1.108, 1.113) compared to an income than less than \$35,000; and getting at least moderate physical activity (OR=1.881; 95%) CI 1.878, 1.885) rather than being inactive. Rural adults consuming five or more servings of vegetables daily were also more likely to have: a BMI of <25 (OR=1.126; 95% CI 1.124, 1.129) or a BMI of 25 to <30 (OR=1.066; 95% CI 1.064, 1.068) rather than > 30; have a personal physician (OR=1.045; 95% CI 1.042, 1.047); have had a routine medical exam in the past 12 months (OR=1.224; 95% CI 1.222, 1.226); and self-define their health as good to excellent (OR=1.148; 95% CI 1.145, 1.151) rather than fair to poor. Rural adults consuming at least 5 daily servings of fruits and vegetables were also more likely to have deferred medical care because of cost.

Rural adults consuming at least 5 daily servings of fruits and vegetables were approximately 33% less likely to be younger (18-34 years or 35-64 years) than older (65 or older). They also were 35.3% to 47.3% less likely of being educated beyond high school (have less than a high school education or being a high school graduate) than being a college graduate. With only slight variations in degree or magnitude of the odds ratios these patterns were the same for non-rural adults.

Table 5 displays the percentage of rural and non-rural adults consuming 5 or more daily servings of fruits and vegetables by State. Also displayed in Table 5 are the

standardized percent differences between the proportion of rural and non-rural adults consuming 5 or more daily servings of fruits and vegetables. The proportions for rural adults ranged from a low of 13.88% in Oklahoma to a high of 28.74 % in Vermont. For non-rural adults the proportions ranged from a low of 14.44% in Oklahoma to a high of 28.27% in Maine.

The percent differences are presented in Figure 1 according to states with either smaller or larger proportions of the rural adult population consuming 5 or more daily servings of fruits and vegetables in comparison to their non-rural counterparts. When comparing the standardized percent differences between the two populations (rural and non-rural) 37 States had smaller proportions of rural adults consuming 5 or more daily servings of fruits and vegetables and 11 States a higher proportion of rural adults consuming 5 or more daily servings of fruits and vegetables. In two States (New Jersey and Rhode Island) no data on the fruit and vegetable consumption of rural adults was available.

Of the 11 states where a higher proportion of rural adults consumed at least 5 daily servings of fruits and vegetables when compared to the non-rural adult population, only one State, Hawaii, was ranked in the top 10 states for fruit and vegetable production. An additional state, Arizona, ranked in the top 20 of fruit and vegetable producing States.

#### **Discussion**

Chronic disease accounts for about 75% of the health care costs in the United Sates and several studies document the benefits of a healthy diet for weight control,

and the prevention of illnesses such as diabetes, cardiovascular disease and certain types of cancer. [3-6, 30] Consuming at least five daily servings of fruits and vegetables are considered an essential part of an overall healthy balanced diet. Our study found that regardless of residency (rural or non-rural) less than 1 in 4 U.S. adults consume five or more servings of fruits and vegetables, a result similar to previous findings [31] and a proportion that falls dramatically short of the recommended targets set by HP 2010. Our results also revealed that compared to non-rural adults, a smaller proportion of rural adults reported consuming recommended amounts of combined fruits and vegetables. The findings reported here underscore the continued need for developing targeted interventions that effectively encourage healthier dietary choices.

While it may be ironic that rural adults, who live where fruits and vegetables grow, were less likely to consume the recommended number of daily servings it is not necessarily unexpected. Although rural communities produce fruits and vegetables, they typically have fewer stores that offer a wide selection of healthy lower-cost food selections than non-rural communities. [32] The importance of community environment as a contributor for individuals adopting a healthy lifestyle, including diet, is increasingly being recognized. [33] Since approximately 20% of the US population lives in rural settings [34] improving access to healthy food for rural residents could yield significant health benefits. In addition to environmental access issues, rural residents are typically poorer than their non-rural counterparts and affordability is likely an important contributing factor to fewer rural residents consuming recommended amounts of fruits and vegetables. Our results indicate that a higher proportion of rural residents earning less than \$35,000 did not consume five servings of fruits and vegetables when

compared to their non-rural counterparts. Food costs correlate to store type and food tends to be less expensive in larger supermarkets than smaller markets or convenience stores. These higher priced food outlets may be the only local and convenient food source for some rural communities. In addition to a convenience factor, transportation costs may be a barrier to purchasing less expensive healthier food that might be available in a nearby community.

Our findings also reveal several differences in the consumption of fruits and vegetables by characteristics such as gender, age, education, race/ethnicity, physical activity and reported health status. Similar to other studies, [18-25] this study found that women and those with more education were more likely to consume the recommended number of daily servings of fruits and vegetables. Likewise rural adults over age 65 were more likely to eat at least five servings of fruits and vegetables daily. Data regarding race and ethnicity from previous studies are mixed. In some studies, Caucasians consumed more fruits and vegetables than African Americans while other studies using national data demonstrated the converse. [35-38] Our study found that Caucasians were less likely to consume five servings of fruits and vegetables and that the difference was greater for Caucasians living in rural settings, even though they tended to be better educated and have higher income levels than rural non-Caucasians. The reasons for this difference are not clear and further study to confirm this finding and to understand the reasons why may be helpful in tailoring interventions to improve dietary choices among rural residents. Those engaging in regular physical activity and with a lower BMI were also more likely to consume five servings of fruits and vegetables. While physical activity and weight does not directly affect diet choices, our

findings add to the body of knowledge that unhealthy lifestyles choices tend to coexist or cluster among individuals. [35]

Finally, of interest is the distribution of fruit and vegetable consumption by rural and non-rural adults by state. This distribution indicated that in only 11 states did a higher proportion of rural adults consume five or more daily servings of fruits and vegetables than non-rural adults. The reason for this distribution is unclear especially since of those 11 states only one, Hawaii, ranked as a top ten U.S. State for fruit and vegetable production. This finding does suggest the need for further investigation---specifically, are there differences between the rural populations in the states where adults are consuming five or more daily servings of fruits and vegetables and those states where such is not occurring? This might provide insight into the role that community environment plays in diets and for what strategies for improving diets might be best suited to a rural settings

Several potential limitations to this study should be noted. First, the survey is based on telephone derived data and may be skewed because those who could not be reached by phone could not participate in the survey. For example, persons of lower socioeconomic status may have been excluded because of poorer phone access. However, the fact that the vast majority of US residents live in households with telephones minimizes this bias. Furthermore, U.S. cell phone numbers are now included in the pool of phones contacted for the survey. In addition, study strength is the use of a large multi-state database that includes a robust sample of rural residents weighted to reflect the demographics of rural vs. non-rural US populations.

A second limitation is that the survey used close-ended questions, which limit a responder's options to fully explain response choices. However, while a different question format may have yielded different results, the survey questions were worded so that the answer choices covered a wide range of response possibilities. A third and related limitation is that the answers are self-reported, which introduces the possibility of recall bias on the part of the survey participants.

Fourthly, the question asking respondents about the number of servings of vegetables is somewhat ambiguous and may have led to an under-reporting of the number of servings of vegetables consumed. For instance no refined measure consumption was included hence eating vegetables at both lunch and dinner may in actuality constitute more than 2 servings depending upon the amount of vegetables consumed. Furthermore, the questions did not include vegetable prepared in meals such as stews or soups.

A fifth potential bias resulted from the languages of the survey – English and Spanish. Individuals who did not speak English or Spanish were excluded from this survey. Not all U.S. residents speak the two languages of this survey as a result those adults from other cultures who do not speak either English or Spanish and who have vegetable rich (e.g., Chinese) or fruit and vegetable rich (e.g., Mediterranean) diets may have been excluded and as a result the aggregated data on the consumption of fruits and vegetables may not be representative of actual consumption by all adults who are residing in the United States.

### Conclusion

In conclusion, most Americans do not eat the recommended amounts of fruits and vegetables. However, rural residents appear at greater risk for not making healthy dietary choices. In addition to rural populations---men, younger individuals and those with less education and those living in poorer income households---are at even greater risk. Successfully improving the dietary patterns of Americans will need to incorporate the environmental context in which people live and the results of this study. These findings should be helpful for public health practitioners interested in developing interventions aimed at improving the diets and health of Americans.

#### References

- 1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2011). Healthy People 2020. <a href="http://www.healthypeople.gov/2020">http://www.healthypeople.gov/2020</a> (accessed 11 April 2011).
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2011). Dietary Guidelines for
   Americans. <a href="http://www.cnpp.usda.gov/dietaryguidelines.htm">http://www.cnpp.usda.gov/dietaryguidelines.htm</a> (accessed 11 April 2011).
- 3. Troughton, J., Khunti, K., Melanie, J., and Davies, M.J. (2010). Fruit and vegetable intake and incidence of type 2 diabetes mellitus: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ*, 18;341:c4229.
- 4. Aatola, H., Koivistoinen, T., Hutri-Kähönen, N., Juonala, M., Mikkilä, V., Lehtimäki, T., et al. (2010). Lifetime fruit and vegetable consumption and arterial pulse wave velocity in adulthood: The Cardiovascular Risk in Young Finns Study. *Circulation*, 122(4):2521-2528.
- 5. Dauchet, L., Amouyel, P., Hercberg, S., and Dallongeville, J. (2006). Fruit and vegetable consumption and risk of coronary heart disease: a meta-analysis of cohort studies. *J Nutr*, 136(10): 2588-2593.
- 6. He, F.J., Nowson, C.A., and MacGregor, G.A. (2006). Fruit and vegetable consumption and stroke: meta-analysis of cohort studies. *Lancet*, 367(9507):320-326.
- 7. Dubowitz, T., Heron, M., Bird, C.E., Lurie, N., Finch, B.K., Basurto-Da´vila, R., Hale, L., and Escarce, J.J. (2008). Neighborhood socioeconomic status and fruit and vegetable intake among whites, blacks, and Mexican Americans in the United States. *Am J Clin Nutr*, 87(6):1883–91.
- 8. Fernández, E., Gallus, S., and La Vecchia, C. (2006). Nutrition and cancer risk: an overview. *J Br Menopause Soc*, 12(4):139-142.

- 9. Wood OB. Nutrition in Pharmacy Practice. Chapter 100.
- 10. Chobanian, A.V., Bakris, G.L., Black, H.R., Cushman, W.C., Green, L.A., Izzo, J.L. Jr, et al. (2003). The Seventh Report of the Joint National Committee on Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Pressure: the JNC 7 report. *JAMA*, 289(19):2560-2571.
- 11. Sacks, F.M., Svetkey, L.P., Vollmer, W.M., Appel, L.J., Bray, G.A., Harsha, D., et al. (2001). The Effects on Blood Pressure of Reduced Dietary Sodium and the Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension (DASH) Diet. *NEJM*, 344(1):3-10.
- 12. Expert Panel on Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Cholesterol in Adults. (2001). NCEP III Guideline. *JAMA*, 285(19):2486-2497.
- 13. Lee, J.E., Männistö, S., Spiegelman, D., Hunter, D.J., Bernstein, L., Van Den Brandt, P.A., et al. (2009). Intakes of fruit, vegetables, and carotenoids and renal cell cancer risk: a pooled analysis of 13 prospective studies. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev*, 18 (6):1730-9.
- 14. Büchner, F.L., Bueno-de-Mesquita, H.B., Ros, M.M., Overvad, K., Dahm, C.C., Hansen, L., et al. (2010). Variety of fruit and vegetable consumption and the risk of lung cancer in the European prospective investigation into cancer and nutrition. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev*,19(9): 2278-86.
- 15. Benetou, V., Orfanos, P., et al. (2008). Vegetables and fruits in relation to cancer risk: evidence from the Greek EPIC cohort study. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev*, 17(2):387-92.
- 16. Wallace RB, Kohatsu N. (2008). Public Health and Preventive Medicine. (15<sup>th</sup> Edition). New York: McGraw Hill Professional.

- Lovasi, G.S., Hutson, M.A., Guerra, M., Neckerman, K.M. (2009). Built
   Environments and Obesity in Disadvantaged Populations. *Epidemiol Rev*, 31:7–20.
   Campbell, M. K., Demark-Wahnefried, W., Symons, M., Kalsbeek, W.D., Dodds, J.,
   Cowan, A., Jackson, B., Motsinger, B., Hoben, K., Lashley, J., Demissie, S.,
   McClelland, J.W. (1999). Fruit and Vegetable Consumption and Prevention of Cancer:
   The Black Churches United for Better Health Project. *Am J Public Health*, 89(9):1390-1396.
- 19. Devine, C.M., Wolfe, W.S., Frongillo, E.A., and Bisogni, C.A. (1999). Life-course events and experiences: Association with fruit and vegetable consumption in 3 ethnic groups. *J Am Diet Assoc*, 99(3): 309-314.
- 20. Yeh, M., Ickes, S.B., Lowenstein, L.M., Shuval, K., Ammerman, A.S., Farris, R., and Katz, D.L. (2008). Understanding barriers and facilitators of fruit and vegetable consumption among a diverse multi-ethnic population in the USA. *Health Promotion International*, 23(1): 42-51.
- 21. Baker, A.H., and Wardle, J. (2003). Sex differences in fruit and vegetable intake in older adults. *Appetite*, 40(3):269-275.
- 22. McCabe-Sellers, B.J., Bowman, S., Stuff, J.E., Champagne, C.M., Simpson, P.M., and Bogle, M.L. (2007). Assessment of the diet quality of US adults in the Lower Mississippi Delta. *Am J Clin Nutr*, 86(3):697–706.
- 23. Eikenberry, N., and Smith, C. (2004). Healthful eating: perceptions, motivations, Barriers, and promoters in low-income Minnesota communities. *J Am Diet Assoc*, 104(7):1158-1161.

- 24. Sisson, A. (2002). Fruit and Vegetable Consumption by Low-Income Americans.

  Nutrition Noteworthy, Department of Biological Chemistry, UCLA, David Geffen School of Medicine, UC Los Angeles. <a href="http://escholarship.org/uc/item/4kc331x6">http://escholarship.org/uc/item/4kc331x6</a> (accessed 11 April 2011).
- 25. Montez, J.K., and Eschbach, K. (2008). Country of Birth and Language Are Uniquely Associated with Intakes of Fat, Fiber, and Fruits and Vegetables among Mexican-American Women in the United States. *J Am Diet Assoc*, 108(3): 473-480.
- 26. Hosler, A,S., Rajulu, D.T., Fredrick, B.L., and Ronsani, A.E. (2005). Assessing retail fruit and vegetable availability in urban and rural underserved communities. *Prev Chronic Dis*, 5(4):A123.
- 27. Sharkey, J.R., Johnson, C.M., and Dean, W.R. (2010). Food Access and Perceptions of the Community and Household Food Environment as Correlates of Fruit and Vegetable Intake among Rural Seniors. *BMC Geriatrics*, 10:32.
- 28. Kanungsukkasem, U., Ng, N., Minh, H.V., Razzaque, A., Ashraf, A., Juvekar, S., Ahmed, S.M., and Bich, T.H. (1988). Fruit and vegetable consumption in rural adults population in INDEPTH HDSS sites in Asia. Global Health Action Supplement 1. DOI: 10.3402/gha.v2i0.
- 29. Mokdad, A.H., Stroup, D.F., and Giles, W.H. (2003). Public health surveillance for behavioral risk factors in a changing environment: recommendations from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance Team. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 52, RR09.
- 30. Terry, P., Terry, J.B., and Wolk, A. (2001). Fruit and vegetable consumption in the prevention of cancer: an update. *J Intern Med*, 250(4):280-290.

- 31. Blanck, H.M., Gillespie, C., Kimmons, J.E., Seymour, J.D., Serdula, M.K. (2008). Trends in fruit and vegetable consumption among U.S. men and women, 1994–2005. *Prev Chronic Dis*, 5(2):A35.
- 32. Liese, A.D., Weis, K.E., Pluto, D., Smith, E., and Lawson, A. (2007). Food store types, availability, and cost of foods in a rural environment. *J Am Diet Assoc*,107(11):1916-1923.
- 33. Glanz, K., Sallis, J.F., Saelens, B.E., and Frank, L.D. (2005). Healthy nutrition environments: concepts and measures. *Am J Health Promot*,19(5):330-333.
- 34. Central Intelligence Agency World Factbook. 2011.

  <a href="https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/us.html">https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/us.html</a> (accessed 17 April 2011).
- 35. Deshmukh-Taskar, P., Nicklas, T.A., Yang, S.J., and Berenson, G.S. (2007). Does food group consumption vary by differences in socioeconomic, demographic, and lifestyle factors in young adults? The Bogalusa Heart Study. *J Am Diet Assoc*, 107(2):223-234.
- 36. Patterson, B.H., Harlan, L.C., Block, G., and Kahle, L. (1995). Food choices of whites, blacks, and Hispanics: Data from the 1987 National Health Interview Survey. *Nutr Cancer*, 23(2):105-119.
- 37. Gans, K.M., Burkholder, G.J., Risica, P.M., and Lasater, T.M. (2003). Baseline fatrelated dietary behaviors of white, Hispanic, and black participants in a cholesterol screening and education project in New England. *J Am Diet Assoc*,103(6):699-706. 38. Champagne, C.M., Bogle, M.L., McGee, B.B., Yadrick, K., Allen, H.R., Kramer, T.R., Simpson, P., Gossett, J., and Weber, J. (2004). Dietary intake in the lower Mississippi

delta region: Results from the Foods of our Delta Study. *J Am Diet Assoc*, 104(2):199-207.

Table 1. Original Survey Question and Response Categories with Re-Coded Response Categories 2009 BRFSS Data					
Analysis Variable	Survey Question	Original Response Categories		Re-coded Response Categories	
Fruit and Vegetable Consumption	Not counting juice, how often do you eat fruit?	Calculated variable for consumed five or more servings of fruits or vegetables per day derived from the servings	Respondents that reported they never consumed fruits and vegetables or consumed less than 5 servings per day	less than 5 servings per day	
	How often do you eat green salad?	per day variables.	Respondents that reported they consumed 5 or more servings of fruits and vegetables per day	5 or more servings of fruits and vegetables per day	
	Not counting carrots, potatoes, or salad, how many servings of vegetables do you usually eat? (Example: A serving of vegetables at both lunch and dinner would be two servings.)		Respondents who reported they didn't know the servings consumed per day, those who refused to answer, and those with missing responses	Missing	
Sex	Indicate sex of	Male		Male	
	respondent.	Female		Female	
Race and Ethnicity	Which one of these groups would you say	Race responses were combined with Hispanic variable to create the second column categories			
	best represents your	White	White, non-Hispanic	Caucasian	
	race?	Black or African American	Black non-Hispanic	African American	
		Asian	Asian non-Hispanic	Other/multiracial	
		Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander non-Hispanic		
		American Indian, Alaska Native	American Indian, Alaska Native non- Hispanic		
		Other	Other non-Hispanic		
		Multiracial but preferred race not asked	Multiracial non- Hispanic		
		Don't know/Not sure, Refused	Don't know/Not sure, Refused	Missing	
	Are you Hispanic or	Yes	Hispanic	Hispanic	
	Latino?	No	Non-Hispanic		
		Don't know/Not Sure, Refused	Don't know/Not Sure, Refused	Missing	

Table 1. Origin	nal Survey Question and Ro	esponse Categories v 2009 BRFSS Data	with Re-Coded Respons	e Categories
Analysis Variable	Survey Question	Original Resp	onse Categories	Re-coded Response Categories
Age Range	What is your age?	age in years		18-34 Years
				35-64 Years
Education	\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\			>=65 Years
Education	What is the highest grade or year of school	Never attended school or only kindergarten		<high school<="" td=""></high>
	you completed?	Grades 1 through 8 (Elementary)		
	,	Grades 9 through 11	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0
		Grade 12 or GED (Hi	<u> </u>	Completed High School
		technical school)	ears (Some college or	
		College 4 years or m	ore (College graduate)	College Graduate
		Refused, Not asked	or Missing	Missing
Marital Status	Are you: (marital status)	Married		Married or Living
		A member of an unm	arried couple	with Partner
		Divorced		Unmarried and Not
		Widowed		Living With a
		Separated		Partner
		Never married		
		Refused, Not asked or Missing		Missing
Children in			Number of children: = Number of children	
Household	than 18 years of age live in your household?	None		No Children
		Refused or Missing		Missing
Household Income	Is your annual	Less than \$10,000		< \$35,000
	household income from all sources:	Less than \$15,000 (\$10,000 to less than \$15,000)		
		Less than \$20,000 (\$15,000 to less than \$20,000)		
		Less than \$25,000 (\$20,000 to less than \$25,000)		
		Less than \$35,000 (\$25,000 to less than		
		\$35,000)		
		Less than \$50,000 (\$35,000 to less than \$50,000)		> \$35,000
		Less than \$75,000 (\$50,000 to less than \$75,000)		
		\$75,000 or more		1
		Don't know/Not sure, Refused and Not asked or Missing		Missing
BMI Categories	About how much do you weigh without shoes?	BMI calculated using weight and height variable		l les
-		= weight in pounds	BMI calculated using imperial scale:	BMI <25
			(weight X 703)/ height in inches²	

Table 1. Original Survey Question and Response Categories with Re-Coded Response Categories 2009 BRFSS Data					
Analysis Variable	Survey Question			Re-coded Response Categories	
	About how tall are you without shoes?	_/= height in feet / inches		BMI 25-<30	
				BMI >=30	
		Don't know/Not sure, Refused, Not asked or Missing	Don't know/Not sure, Refused, Not asked or Missing	Missing	
Physical Activity	Now, thinking about the moderate activities you do in a usual week, do you do moderate activities for at least 10 minutes at a time, such as brisk walking, bicycling, vacuuming, gardening, or anything else that causes some increase in breathing or heart rate?  How many days per week do you do these moderate activities for at least 10 minutes at a time?	Calculated variable for adults that have reported participating in either moderate physical activity defined as 30 or more minutes per day for 5 or more days per week, or vigorous activity for 20 or more minutes per day on 3 or more days.	Respondents who reported doing enough moderate or vigorous physical activity to meet the recommendations	Getting at least moderate physical activity	
	On days when you do moderate activities for at least 10 minutes at a time, how much total time per day do you spend doing these activities?		Respondents who reported doing insufficient moderate or vigorous physical activity to meet recommendations, or respondents that reported doing no moderate or vigorous physical activity	Inactive	
	Now, thinking about the vigorous activities you do in a usual week, do you do vigorous activities for at least 10 minutes at a time, such as running, aerobics, heavy yard work, or anything else that causes large increases in breathing or heart rate?		Respondents who reported they didn't know whether they did moderate or vigorous physical activity or didn't know how many days or didn't know how much time they did the activity, those who refused to	Missing	

Table 1. Origina		esponse Categories with Re-Coded Respons 2009 BRFSS Data	se Categories
Analysis Variable	Survey Question	Original Response Categories	Re-coded Response Categories
	How many days per week do you do these vigorous activities for at least 10 minutes at a time?  On days when you do vigorous activities for at least 10 minutes at a time, how much total time per day do you spend doing these activities?	answer, and those with missing responses	
Have Health	Do you have any kind of	Yes	Yes
Insurance	health care coverage, including health	No	No
	insurance, prepaid plans such as HMOs, or government plans such as Medicare?	Don't know/Not Sure, Refused	Missing
Have a Personal	Do you have one	Yes, only one	Yes
Physician	person you think of as	More than one	
	your personal doctor or health care provider?	No	No
	(If "No" ask "Is there more than one or is there no person who you think of as your personal doctor or health care provider?".)	Don't know/Not Sure, Refused, Not asked or Missing	Missing
Timing of Last Routine Medical	About how long has it been since you last	Within past year (anytime less than 12 months ago)	Within the Past 12 Months
Check-up	visited a doctor for a routine checkup? A routine checkup is a	Within past 2 years (1 year but less than 2 years ago)	More than 12 Months Ago
	general physical exam, not an exam for a	Within past 5 years (2 years but less than 5 years ago)	
	specific injury, illness,	5 or more years ago	_
	or condition.	Never	Missing
		Don't know/Not sure or Refused	Missing
Deferment of Medical Care Because of Cost	Was there a time in the past 12 months when	Yes	Yes
Jaie Decause of Cost	you needed to see a	No	No
	doctor but could not because of cost?	Don't know/Not sure, Refused	Missing
Self-Defined Health	Would you say that in	Excellent	Good to Excellent
Status	general your health is:	Very good	
		Good	
		Fair	Fair to Poor
		Poor	

## rural adults' fruit and vegetable consumption

Table 1. Original Survey Question and Response Categories with Re-Coded Response Categories 2009 BRFSS Data				
Analysis Variable Survey Question Original Response Categ		Original Response Categories	Re-coded Response Categories	
		Don't know/Not Sure, Refused, Not asked or Missing	Missing	
Residency by Metropolitan Status		In the center city of an MSA	Non-rural	
Geographic Locale	Code	Outside the center city of an MSA but inside the county containing the center city		
		Inside a suburban county of the MSA	]	
		In an MSA that has no center city	Rural	
		Not in an MSA		

Variables and Factors		% Rural* (weighted n=42,365,517)	% Non-rural* (weighted n=177,114,306)	
Fruit and Vegetable	<5 Servings Daily	78.8	75.6	
Consumption	At Least 5 Servings Daily	21.2	24.4	
Sex	Male	48.2	48.8	
	Female	51.8	51.2	
Race And Ethnicity	Caucasian	81.3	65.6	
	African American	6.2	10.9	
	Hispanic	6.6	15.2	
	Other	5.8	8.2	
Age Ranges	18-34 Years	28.4	30.4	
. igo i i anigoo	35-64 Years	51.8	53.0	
	>=65 Years	19.8	16.6	
Education	<high school<="" td=""><td>11.8</td><td>10.4</td></high>	11.8	10.4	
	Completed High School	63.5	52.7	
	College Graduate	24.6	36.9	
Marital Status	Married Or Living With	66.4	63.9	
mariar Glatag	Partner	00.4	00.0	
	Unmarried/Not Living With	33.6	36.1	
	A Partner	33.3	00.1	
Children In Household	No Children In Household	60.0	56.0	
	At Least 1 Child In	40.0	44.0	
	Household			
Household Income	<\$35,000	43.6	35.1	
	>=\$35,000	56.4	64.9	
BMI Categories	BMI<25	32.8	37.2	
<b>G</b>	BMI 25-<30	36.6	36.2	
	BMI >=30	30.6	26.6	
Physical Activity	Getting At Least Moderate	48.9	49.7	
	Physical Activity			
	Inactive	51.1	50.3	
Have Health Insurance	Yes	83.0	85.0	
	No	17.0	15.0	
Have A Personal	Yes	81.9	80.5	
Physician	No	18.1	19.5	
Timing Of Last Routine	Within Last 12 Months	65.8	68.2	
Medical Checkup	Longer Than 12 Months	34.2	31.8	
•	Ago			
Deferment Of Medical	Deferred Medical Care	15.5	14.7	
Care Because Of Cost	Because Of Cost			
	Did Not Defer Medical Care	84.5	85.3	
	Because Of Cost			
Self Defined Health	Good To Excellent	81.7	84.7	
Status	Fair To Poor	18.3	15.3	

Table 3. Bivariate Predictor Variables for of U.S. Rural Adults Consuming at Least 5 Fruits and Vegetables Daily by Geographic Locale (Non-rural or Rural) 2009 BRFSS (weighted n=52,259,789) % Non-rural \* Variables and Factors % Rural\* (weighted n=8,983,840) (weighted n=43,275,949) Male 38.8 Sex 39.9 Female 60.1 61.2 Race And Ethnicity Caucasian 81.3 67.3 African American 10.3 5.3 Hispanic 6.9 13.3 Other 6.6 9.1 18-34 Years 26.9 28.3 Age Ranges 35-64 Years 49.4 52.7 >=65 Years 23.7 19.0 Education <High School 8.6 8.3 Completed High School 58.2 47.0 College Graduate 33.3 44.7 Marital Status Married Or Living With 68.8 65.6 Partner Unmarried/ Not Living With 34.4 31.2 A Partner Children In Household No Children In Household 61.2 57.3 At Least 1 Child In 38.8 42.7 Household Household Income 38.6 31.4 <\$35,000 >=\$35,000 61.4 68.6 **BMI Categories** BMI<25 36.8 42.0 BMI 25-<30 35.9 35.0 BMI >=30 23.0 27.3 Physical Activity Getting At Least Moderate 60.9 61.0 Physical Activity 39.1 39.0 Inactive Have Health Insurance Yes 85.8 87.5 12.5 No 14.2 Have A Personal Yes 85.0 83.8 **Physician** No 15.0 16.2 **Timing Of Last Routine** Within Last 12 Months 70.7 73.2 Medical Checkup Longer Than 12 Months 29.3 26.8 Ago **Deferment Of Medical** Deferred Medical Care 14.3 13.4 Care Because Of Cost **Because Of Cost** Did Not Defer Medical Care 85.7 86.6 **Because Of Cost** Self Defined Health Good To Excellent 84.9 87.0 Fair To Poor Status 15.1 13.0

\*Cell percentages by row significantly different by z-test measure p< .05

		Donal A last A II	NI	
Predictor Variables and Factors		Rural Adults Adjusted Odds Ratio (95% CI)	Non-rural Adults Adjusted Odds Ratio (95% CI)	
Sex	Male	***	***	
	Female	1.666 (1.663, 1.669)	1.632 (1.631, 1.633)	
Race And Ethnicity	Caucasian	***	***	
-	African American	1.127 (1.123, 1.131)	1.056 (1.054, 1.057)	
	Hispanic	1.474 (1.469, 1.479)	1.086 (1.085, 1.087)	
	Other	1.251 (1.246, 1.255)	1.276 (1.275, 1.278)	
Age Ranges	18-34 Years	.673 (.671, .675)	.740 (.739, .741)	
	35-64 Years	.675 (.673, .676)	.769 (.768, .770)	
	>=65 Years	***	***	
Education	<high school<="" td=""><td>.527 (.525, .529)</td><td>.722 (.721, .723)</td></high>	.527 (.525, .529)	.722 (.721, .723)	
	Completed High School	.647 (.646, .648)	.707 (.707, .708)	
	College Graduate	***	***	
Marital Status	Married Or Living With Partner	1.071 (1.069, 1.073)	1.039(1.038, 1.040)	
	Unmarried /Not Living With A	***	***	
	Partner			
Children In	No Children In Household	1.052 (1.050, 1.054)	1.038 (1.037, 1.039)	
Household	At Least 1 Child In Household	***	***	
Household Income	<\$35,000	***	***	
	>=\$35,000	1.111 (1.108, 1.113)	1.044 (1.042, 1.045)	
BMI Categories	BMI<25	1.126 (1.124, 1.129)	1.201 (1.200, 1.202)	
	BMI 25-<30	1.066 (1.064, 1.068)	1.096 (1.095, 1.098)	
	BMI >=30	***	***	
Physical Activity	Getting At Least Moderate Physical Activity	1.881 (1.878, 1.885)	1.884 (1.883, 1.886)	
	Inactive	***	***	
Have Health	Yes	.962 (.959, .964)	.950 (.949, .951)	
Insurance	No	***	-***	
Have A Personal	Yes	1.045 (1.042, 1.047)	1.022 (1.020, 1.023)	
Physician	No	***	***	
Timing Of Last	Within Last 12 Months	1.224 (1.222, 1.226)	1.254 (1.253, 1.255)	
Routine Medical	Longer Than 12 Months Ago	***	***	
Checkup				
Deferment Of	Deferred Medical Care Because Of	***	***	
Medical Care	Cost			
Because Of Cost	Did Not Defer Medical Care	.897 (.895, .899)	.951 (.949, .952)	
	Because Of Cost		( - ( - ( - ( - ( - ( - ( - ( - ( - ( -	
Self Defined Health	Good To Excellent	1.148 (1.145, 1.151)	1.030 (1.029, 1.032)	
Status	Fair To Poor	**	***	
*** reference group	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			

Table 5. Percentage of Rural and Non-Rural Adults Consuming 5 or More Daily Servings of
Fruits and Vegetables
2000 RRESS Data and 2007 USDA Consus Data

State	% Rural	%Non-Rural	% Difference Between Rural and Non-Rural	National Ranking for Fruit and Vegetable
Alabama	<b>Adults</b> 17.01	Adults	Adults	Production*
Alaska	19.79	20.63 23.76	-21.27 -20.04	48
Arizona	25.39		8.90	12
Arkansas	19.01	23.13		35
California	22.90	19.74	-3.87	1
Colorado	21.84	24.28	-6.01	26
Connecticut	25.76	22.58 27.57	-3.37 -7.00	37
Delaware	23.45			46
Florida	21.64	22.75	2.96	11
Georgia	21.94	23.32	-7.77	19
Hawaii	25.79	23.58	-7.50	7
Idaho	21.55	21.40	17.05	34
Illinois	22.63	25.03	-16.19	24
Indiana	17.17	21.65	4.34	25
		20.34	-18.42	
lowa	17.82	17.96	-0.78	29
Kansas	17.24	18.48	-7.20	41
Kentucky	17.30	21.96	-26.91	14
Louisiana	14.48	17.25	-19.16	38
Maine	25.93	28.27	-9.04	33
Maryland	21.24	26.99	-27.05	32
Massachusetts	19.66	24.27	-23.47	27
Michigan	21.39	22.05	-3.06	5
Minnesota	19.53	22.70	-16.25	22
Mississippi	14.26	19.02	-33.36	28
Missouri	18.14	18.80	-3.64	23
Montana	24.35	25.88	-6.28	40
Nebraska	21.23	19.45	8.35	43
Nevada	23.19	22.48	3.03	49
New Hampshire	28.45	24.71	13.17	42
New Jersey	N/A	24.83	N/A	20
New Mexico	21.34	22.59	-5.86	15
New York	24.50	25.65	-4.69	4
North Carolina	17.34	21.04	-21.37	6
North Dakota	21.75	21.68	0.30	47
Ohio	18.26	20.94	-14.67	9
Oklahoma	13.88	14.44	-4.07	31
Oregon	23.62	25.41	-7.59	8
Pennsylvania	20.34	24.01	-18.04	3
Rhode Island	N/A	25.53	N/A	44
South Carolina	15.33	17.31	-12.88	21
South Dakota	15.71	14.29	9.04	45

Table 5. Percentage of Rural and Non-Rural Adults Consuming 5 or More Daily Servings of
Fruits and Vegetables
2009 BRESS Data and 2007 USDA Census Data

State	% Rural Adults	%Non-Rural Adults	% Difference Between Rural and Non-Rural Adults	National Ranking for Fruit and Vegetable Production*
Tennessee	19.73	23.26	-17.90	18
Texas	22.70	22.75	-0.22	10
Utah	19.10	23.25	-21.73	30
Vermont	28.74	27.81	3.26	39
Virginia	22.60	26.89	-19.00	16
Washington	22.60	24.90	-10.17	2
West Virginia	15.90	16.18	-1.81	36
Wisconsin	20.04	21.95	-9.53	13
Wyoming	23.14	21.25	8.20	50
U.S.	20.38	23.07	-13.19	

<sup>\*</sup> USDA Census 2007 Data on Number of Farms and Acreage Dedicated to Fruit and Vegetable Production by State were used to compute ranking

Figure 1. States With Either Smaller Or Larger Proportions Of The Rural Adult Population Consuming 5 Or More Daily Servings Of Fruits And Vegetables In Comparison To Non-Rural Counterparts
2009 BRFSS Data

