



Spatial access to food: Retiring the food desert metaphor

Michael J. Widener*

Department of Geography and Planning, University of Toronto - St. George, Toronto, Canada



A B S T R A C T

The food desert metaphor has been widely used over the past few decades as a way to identify regions as being at risk for having little or no access to healthy food. While the simplicity of the metaphor is attractive, this article argues that its usefulness to researchers interested in understanding the relationship between the geography of healthy food opportunities and dietary behaviours is limited. More nuanced approaches to incorporating geography into food access studies, like including transportation, economic factors, and time use, in addition to considering other dimensions of accessibility, are warranted.

1. Introduction

Researchers, politicians, community groups, and activists have been increasingly interested in how the built environment impacts the health of individuals in a range of geographic and social contexts. This “spatial turn” in health research [1] has resulted in many health-related disciplines explicitly considering spatial variations in the distribution of positive and negative influences and outcomes. One recent area where geographic thinking was applied was the study of spatial access to healthy food, a necessary but not sufficient component to maintaining a healthy diet.

“Food deserts,” a term reported to have arisen from the United Kingdom in the early 1990s [2], are generally reported to be regions in which access to food retailers that stock fresh, affordable, and healthy food options are lacking or nonexistent. While there is no universally agreed upon definition, early definitions included those put forward by government ministers, like the UK’s health minister Tessa Jowell in 1997, who identified food deserts as areas “where people do not have easy access to healthy, fresh foods, particularly if they are poor and have limited mobility” [3,4]. The lack of geographic access is a problem, the reasoning goes, because those without the ability to physically acquire healthy foods will be less likely to incorporate such foods into their diets, leading to the consumption of food from readily available retailers (e.g. fast food restaurants and convenience stores) that typically supply options with lower nutrient and higher energy densities [5]. This ultimately can result in a range of health issues like hypertension, diabetes, and other obesity-related comorbidities [6].

The use of the word desert is appealing, as it lends an explicit spatiality to the concept of food inaccessibility, evoking a barren landscape, devoid of food for the people within. In practice, it also

simplifies the issue of food accessibility to a binary – regions where people are in food deserts, and regions where people are not in food deserts. Early on, Cummins and Macintyre critiqued this simplification, noting that the food desert concept is a factoid – an assumption or speculation “reported and repeated so often that” it is “popularly considered true; they are simulated or imagined facts” [2]. The authors go on to discuss the social and political context that can propel a factoid into government health policy, and emphasize that, despite the term’s popularity, there is a lack of empirical evidence.

A clear example of the reliance on this simplification was found in early iterations of the US Department of Agriculture’s Food Access Research Atlas, originally called the “Food Desert Locator” [7]. This mapping tool presented the locations of census tracts they defined to be food deserts because a sufficient number of residents are considered low-income and live more than one mile away (in urban areas) from the nearest grocery store. In a press release in 2011, the then Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack is quoted as saying the mapping tool “...will help policy makers, community planners, researchers, and other professionals identify communities where public-private intervention can help make fresh, healthy, and affordable food more readily available to residents.” The tool’s purpose was to pinpoint discrete regions for spatially targeted interventions intended to improve diets of residents.

This rough approach disregarded the evidence that food shopping and urban mobility are complex. Research has shown that many people do not shop at the closest food retailer [8,9] and transportation mode can drastically change levels of spatial accessibility to supermarkets [10,11]. Later iterations of the USDA’s atlas have taken a more careful and general approach by, for example, including a census tract-level food access measure that incorporated car ownership, and also moved away from the term “food desert.” However, the USDA’s platform still

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: michael.widener@utoronto.ca.

takes an all or nothing approach, designating the people within tracts that meet specified criteria as residing in a region with low levels of spatial access to healthy food options [12].

This simplification gets to the fundamental problem with the food desert metaphor: it overemphasizes space in a multidimensional problem, where its role varies depending on a range of other factors like income, household characteristics, transportation options, and time use, to name only a few. For the low-income parent working two jobs, living within walking distance to an affordably priced supermarket may not matter because of constraints on their time and activity space. Conversely, a high-income couple where only one partner works may live a great distance from the nearest healthy food retail option, but have no issues accessing and consuming healthy food because the non-working partner has the time and resources to make the trip. The food desert concept, an inherently spatial representation of healthy food access, implicitly leads those developing targeted interventions aimed at improving the nutritional content of diets to focus on the geographic characteristics of food retail and discard the many other important factors linked to dietary behaviours.

This is not to say that the geography of food retail and spatial accessibility has no marginal effect on diets and nutrition. Much good work has been done on measuring the food retail environment by researchers in geography, planning, nutrition, and public health [13–15], and a review of the literature does find that there are inequities in spatial access to food retail in the United States, if not in other high-income nations [16]. Rather, it is important to retire the food desert metaphor and consider spatial access as one component of a more holistic accessibility framework. For example, work by Penchansky and Thomas from 1981, more than a decade before the rise of the food desert, describes overall access to health services as a function of availability (the number of opportunities), accessibility (the spatial configuration of opportunities), accommodation (how clients are accepted), affordability (the cost of the service or product), and acceptability (clients' attitudes about the characteristics of providers) [17]. While their focus was on patients' interaction with the healthcare system, their generalized framework maps nicely to access to healthy food, without overemphasizing any one component. For example:

- Availability: the quantity of retailers stocking healthy food options,
- Accessibility: the spatial configuration of food retailers with healthy food,
- Accommodation: the ability of food retailers to accept alternative payments (e.g. WIC),
- Affordability: the price of healthy food options, and
- Acceptability: the stock of culturally appropriate foods.

From this list, it is apparent that the food desert metaphor emphasizes one of the five aforementioned dimensions ([spatial] accessibility), and can only generally account for the others through simplifying characteristics about aggregated populations and retail within some region.

In the next two sections of this piece, the cartographic limitations of relying on the food desert metaphor to identify regions with little or no access to healthy food and alternative practices for measuring the geography of food retail access are briefly presented. The geography of access to food is an important topic to study, but to achieve the desired outcome of identifying populations with a need for improved dietary outcomes, the food desert concept's utility is questionable. As a tool designed to identify the geography of populations who face barriers to maintaining a healthy diet, a more comprehensive approach is needed, and a more nuanced treatment of space is required.

2. Cartographic limitations to the food desert metaphor

There are a range of challenges faced by researchers and policy makers trying to

understand and communicate the spatial distribution of any phenomena via mapping. For centuries, geographers and cartographers have struggled with the limitations of maps and sought ways to overcome them; maps are models and should be interpreted as such. In regard to food deserts, the fallacy of division [18], the modifiable areal unit problem [19], and boundary effects [20] must all be accounted for if an accurate representation of spatial access to healthy food for at risk populations is to be achieved.

More recently, advances in geographic information systems (GIS) have allowed for representations of food deserts to become less rigid. In particular, interactive maps let users shift time frames, choose different political boundaries (e.g. census blocks to census tracts), and dynamically select the criteria that determine categorization as a food desert (for example, see work by Chen and Clark [21]). While these new abilities provide increased flexibility in selecting regions as food deserts, the fundamental issue of generalizing arbitrarily defined zones remains.

In addition, it is difficult for any food desert measure to capture the importance of the dynamics of everyday life. For example, shifts in the distribution of the population as they move through their activity spaces, the opening and closing of food retail options, and broader seasonal and annual trends in availability [22–24] all contribute to a moving target when it comes to pin pointing discrete spatial units (typically only focussing on residential locations) with lower levels of access. It is important to note again that it is not necessarily a problem that food deserts are simplifications of access. However, because they are intended to serve as a means for identifying populations inside of areas where there is an increased risk for maintaining unhealthy diets, it is expected that this could be achieved somewhat reliably. Nevertheless, in multiple review articles [25,26] and a cross-sectional study [27] that have examined exactly this issue, this has not been the case. For example, Caspi et al. [26] point out that the reason for some of these inconsistent findings could be related to an overreliance on GIS-based measures that fail to account for the many non-spatial variables that explain the relationship between the food environment and diet.

3. Alternative means for measuring the spatial access to food

Where do the limitations of the food desert metaphor leave researchers interested in spatial patterns of inaccessibility to healthy food retailers? Given the increase in spatial and temporal data availability on a range of topics, from food retail locations to transit networks, and widely available and easy to use GIS software packages, it is becoming easier to incorporate some of the complexities that may be responsible for the weak relationships found when studying the links between food deserts and nutrition. A number of potential approaches, all focused on a more comprehensive accounting of exposure and access to food retail across space, are described here.

Beginning in the later 2000s, numerous academics have integrated some of the aforementioned spatial dynamics into their studies of spatial access to healthy food. In some cases, this involved the use of data collected on travel patterns [10,28–31]. With these data it was possible for researchers to map routine trips (e.g. daily commutes) as a way to provide a more complete approach to understanding what food retailers were spatially available to populations in various study areas. While these studies do provide more information about various populations' space-time paths, they are limited by the data's focus on a limited set of activity spaces (e.g. only work and home), which discounts other commonly travelled places or over emphasizes those with fulltime employment.

Similar to this work, there has been an increase in the number of food environment studies that utilize global positioning system (GPS) devices [32–34]. The ubiquity of smart phones with GPS technology has made it much easier to collect large amounts of spatial trajectory data alongside other types of potentially useful information (e.g. pictures of receipts) on-the-fly. This data collection method provides more

information about where and when people move through their activity spaces, allowing for a detailed accounting of exposure as well as activities that involve an interaction with a food retailer. These studies, however, are also limited by the fact that exposure to food retail increases when a person makes a choice to interact with a food retailer. This is a problem of endogeneity which researchers should attempt to correct for in their analyses by, for example, comparing access to food retailers for all trips that do not involve a food shopping activity. Additionally, it is less feasible to describe the level of access to healthy food retailers for entire populations, as collecting detailed GPS and food-behaviour data can be time consuming and expensive.

An alternative approach to collecting data that is explicitly spatial is to explore how people perceive their food environment [35,36]. As an example, Caspi et al. [37] measured study participants' perceived access to supermarkets by asking if a supermarket was within walking distance to their homes, and then cross referencing this with a GIS-derived distance measure to the nearest supermarket. Interestingly, this research found that those participants who reported no supermarket within walking distance to their home, but where a supermarket was in fact nearby, consumed fewer fruits and vegetables compared to those who reported the presence of the store. While asking about perceptions of the food environment may not allow researchers to directly map food retail, it does provide a useful means for capturing information about how people experience what food opportunities are around them. The perceived food environment implicitly accounts for factors like economic accessibility, cultural appropriateness, and the temporal availability of stores, though, depending on the data collection tools, it can be difficult to disentangle all of these factors.

Finally, it is worth emphasizing the importance of continuing research that examines healthy food access without a spatial component. As previously mentioned, other dimensions like time scarcity [38] and economic context [39] are important drivers of behaviours related to food shopping. Together, these studies and more geographically oriented research can complement each other so as to improve our understandings of why people buy food at certain locations, and how policy makers and public health officials can encourage healthier dietary activities.

4. Conclusions

Food deserts were intended to serve as a way to identify regions where populations were at risk of maintaining unhealthy diets due to a lack of spatial access to food retailers with nutritious options. Unfortunately, the metaphor emphasized an overly generalized conceptualization of the geography of food retail, and many studies have found food desert indicators to inconsistently relate to less desirable dietary patterns. While incorporating mobility and spatial dynamics into measures of food access comes with its own set of problems and limitations, it also provides a more accurate representation of who has access to what, allows researchers to link specific space-time patterns to diet and health, and can easily be associated with other dimensions of (non-geographic) access. These capabilities, and evidence that the usefulness of the food desert concept is questionable, should lead us to the retirement of the term, as well as to a new focus on more nuanced forms of understanding how the geography of food retail and people contribute to dietary outcomes.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. Insight Grant, File Number: 435170546. "Time, geography, and food: how time use, social-spatial context, transportation options, and personal economics affect access to food in cities".

References

- [1] D.B. Richardson, N.D. Volkow, M.P. Kwan, R.M. Kaplan, M.F. Goodchild, R.T. Croyle, Spatial turn in health research, *Science* 339 (2013) 1390–1392, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1232257>.
- [2] S. Cummins, S. Macintyre, "Food deserts" – evidence and assumption in health policy making, *Br. Med. J.* 325 (2002) 436–438, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.322.7281.279>.
- [3] S. Furey, C. Strugnell, H. McIlveen, An investigation of the potential existence of "food deserts" in rural and urban areas of Northern Ireland, *Agric. Hum. Values* 18 (2001) 447–457, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1015218502547>.
- [4] M. Hickman, "Food Deserts" Depriving Towns of Fresh Fruit and Vegetables, *Indep. Print Ltd*, 2007.
- [5] J. Boone-Heinonen, P. Gordon-Larsen, C.I. Kiefe, J.M. Shikany, C.E. Lewis, B.M. Popkin, Fast food restaurants and food stores – longitudinal associations with diet in young to middle-aged adults: the CARDIA study, *Arch. Intern. Med.* 171 (2011) 1162–1170, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/archinternmed.2011.283>.
- [6] B. Caballero, The global epidemic of obesity: an overview, *Epidemiol. Rev.* 29 (2007) 1–5, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/epirev/mxm012>.
- [7] USDA, Office of Communications, Food Desert Locator, Washington, DC, 2011 <https://www.fns.usda.gov/tags/food-desert-locator>.
- [8] S. Inagami, D.A. Cohen, B.K. Finch, S.M. Asch, You are where you shop: grocery store locations, weight, and neighborhoods, *Am. J. Prev. Med.* 31 (2006) 10–17, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2006.03.019>.
- [9] S. Cummins, E. Flint, S.A. Matthews, New neighborhood grocery store increased awareness of food access but did not alter dietary habits or obesity, *Health Aff.* 33 (2014) 283–291, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2013.0512>.
- [10] M.J. Widener, S. Farber, T. Neutens, M. Horner, Spatiotemporal accessibility to supermarkets using public transit: an interaction potential approach in Cincinnati, Ohio, *J. Transp. Geogr.* 42 (2015) 72–83.
- [11] M.J. Widener, Comparing measures of accessibility to urban supermarkets for transit and auto users, *Prof. Geogr.* 69 (2017), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00330124.2016.1237293>.
- [12] USDA: Economic Research Service, Food Access Research Atlas Documentation, <https://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/food-access-research-atlas/documentation/>, (2017), Accessed date: 5 February 2018.
- [13] E.L. Wilkins, M.A. Morris, D. Radley, C. Griffiths, Using geographic information systems to measure retail food environments: discussion of methodological considerations and a proposed reporting checklist (Geo-FERN), *Health Place* 44 (2017) 110–117, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2017.01.008>.
- [14] H. Charreire, R. Casey, P. Salze, C. Simon, B. Chaix, A. Banos, D. Badariotti, C. Weber, J.M. Oppert, Measuring the food environment using geographical information systems: a methodological review, *Public Health Nutr.* 13 (2010) 1773–1785, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1368980010000753>.
- [15] R.A. McKinnon, J. Reedy, M.A. Morrisette, L.A. Lytle, A.L. Yaroch, Measures of the food environment. A compilation of the literature, 1990–2007, *Am. J. Prev. Med.* 36 (2009), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2009.01.012>.
- [16] J. Beaulac, E. Kristjansson, S. Cummins, A systematic review of food deserts, 1966–2007, *Prev. Chronic Dis.* 6 (2009) A105.
- [17] R. Penchansky, J.W. Thomas, The concept of access: definition and relationship to consumer satisfaction, *Med. Care* 19 (1981) 127–140, <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3764310>.
- [18] S. Schwartz, The fallacy of the ecological fallacy: the potential misuse of a concept and the consequences, *Am. J. Public Health* 84 (1994) 819–824, <http://dx.doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.84.5.819>.
- [19] D.W.S. Wong, The modifiable areal unit problem (MAUP), *WorldMinds Geogr. Perspect.* 100 Probl. 2004, pp. 571–575, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-2352-1_93.
- [20] X. Chen, Take the edge off: a hybrid geographic food access measure, *Appl. Geogr.* 87 (2017) 149–159, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2017.07.013>.
- [21] X. Chen, J. Clark, Interactive three-dimensional geovisualization of space–time access to food, *Appl. Geogr.* 43 (2013) 81–86.
- [22] M.J. Widener, S.S. Metcalf, Y. Bar-Yam, Dynamic urban food environments: a temporal analysis of access to healthy foods, *Am. J. Prev. Med.* 41 (2011) 439–441.
- [23] M.J. Widener, J. Shannon, When are food deserts? Integrating time into research on food accessibility, *Health Place* 30 (2014) 1–3.
- [24] X. Chen, J. Clark, Measuring space–time access to food retailers: a case of temporal access disparity in Franklin County, Ohio, *Prof. Geogr.* 68 (2016) 175–188, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00330124.2015.1032876>.
- [25] C. Black, G. Moon, J. Baird, Dietary inequalities: what is the evidence for the effect of the neighbourhood food environment? *Health Place* 27 (2014) 229–242, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2013.09.015>.
- [26] C.E. Caspi, G. Sorensen, S.V. Subramanian, I. Kawachi, The local food environment and diet: a systematic review, *Health Place* 18 (2012) 1172–1187.
- [27] T. Pearson, J. Russell, M.J. Campbell, M.E. Barker, Do "food deserts" influence fruit and vegetable consumption? – a cross-sectional study, *Appetite* 45 (2005) 195–197, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2005.04.003>.
- [28] M.J. Widener, S. Farber, T. Neutens, M.W. Horner, Using urban commuting data to calculate a spatiotemporal accessibility measure for food environment studies, *Health Place* 21 (2013) 1–9.
- [29] Y. Kestens, A. Lebel, M. Daniel, M. Thériault, R. Pampalon, Using experienced activity spaces to measure foodscape exposure, *Health Place* 16 (2010) 1094–1103.
- [30] Y. Kestens, A. Lebel, B. Chaix, C. Clary, M. Daniel, R. Pampalon, M. Thériault, S.V. Subramanian, Association between activity space exposure to food establishments and individual risk of overweight, *PLoS One* 7 (2012) e41418.

- [31] T. Burgoine, P. Monsivais, Characterising food environment exposure at home, at work, and along commuting journeys using data on adults in the UK, *Int. J. Behav. Nutr. Phys. Act.* 10 (1) (2013).
- [32] A. Gustafson, J.W. Christian, S. Lewis, K. Moore, S. Jilcott, Food venue choice, consumer food environment, but not food venue availability within daily travel patterns are associated with dietary intake among adults, Lexington Kentucky 2011, *Nutr. J.* 12 (2013), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1475-2891-12-17>.
- [33] S.N. Zenk, A.J. Schulz, S.A. Matthews, A. Odoms-Young, J. Wilbur, L. Wegrzyn, K. Gibbs, C. Braunschweig, C. Stokes, Activity space environment and dietary and physical activity behaviors: a pilot study, *Health Place* 17 (2011) 1150–1161.
- [34] J.Y. Scully, A.V. Moudon, P.M. Hurvitz, A. Aggarwal, A. Drewnowski, GPS or travel diary: comparing spatial and temporal characteristics of visits to fast food restaurants and supermarkets, *PLoS One* 12 (2017), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0174859>.
- [35] J.F. Sallis, D.J. Slymen, T.L. Conway, L.D. Frank, B.E. Saelens, K. Cain, J.E. Chapman, Income disparities in perceived neighborhood built and social environment attributes, *Health Place* 17 (2011) 1274–1283, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2011.02.006>.
- [36] A.A. Gustafson, J. Sharkey, C.D. Samuel-Hodge, J. Jones-Smith, M.C. Folds, J. Cai, A.S. Ammerman, Perceived and objective measures of the food store environment and the association with weight and diet among low-income women in North Carolina, *Public Health Nutr.* 14 (2010) 1032–1038, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1368980011000115>.
- [37] C.E. Caspi, I. Kawachi, S.V. Subramanian, G. Adamkiewicz, G. Sorensen, The relationship between diet and perceived and objective access to supermarkets among low-income housing residents, *Soc. Sci. Med.* 75 (2012) 1254–1262.
- [38] J. Jabs, C.M. Devine, Time scarcity and food choices: an overview, *Appetite* 47 (2006) 196–204, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2006.02.014>.
- [39] T. Lallukka, M. Laaksonen, O. Rahkonen, E. Roos, E. Lahelma, Multiple socio-economic circumstances and healthy food habits, *Eur. J. Clin. Nutr.* 61 (2007) 701–710, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/sj.ejcn.1602583>.