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## Menu Labeling in Oregon

- Menu labeling policy passed in Multnomah County, Oregon in 2008
- Multnomah policy preempted by passage of statewide menu labeling law in 2009
- Federal menu labeling law preempted Oregon law


## Study Design and Methods

- Customer intercept survey and receipt collection at the top 10 fast food chains
- Double pre-test design with data collection in spring (wave 1) and fall 2009 (wave 2)
- Stratified, 2-stage clustered sampling design
- Establishment is primary sampling unit
- Customers are secondary sampling unit
- Strata:
- Low-income/racially diverse vs. other
- Type of food sold (burger, sandwich, taco, coffee)


## Study Design and Methods

- 50 establishments ( 25 each socio-stratum)
- 50 adult customers at each sampled establishment - Asked about purchases for up to 3 children for each adult
- Target: 2500 respondents per survey collection period
- Customers received $\$ 2$ in exchange for their register receipt and completion of a brief survey


## Analysis

- Today's presentation: burger establishments
- Comparison of mean calories consumed (with customizations) spring 2009 and fall 2009
- Overall and by burger chain
- Mean calories consumed by subgroups:
- Saw and used calorie information
- Gender, age, race
- Site socioeconomic status
- Calories important in purchase
- Snack or meal
- Diabetes, hypertension
- Analyses weighted, taking into account complex sampling design (Stata v.11)

| Study Sample - Burger Establishments | Spring 2009 <br> n (\%) | Fall 2009 <br> n (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Participants | 794 | 644 |
| Establishments |  |  |
| McDonald's (5) | $249(41 \%)$ | $210(41 \%)$ |
| Burger King (3) | $145(30 \%)$ | $130(30 \%)$ |
| Wendy's (2) | $100(8 \%)$ | $75(8 \%)$ |
| Burgerville (3) | $150(9 \%)$ | $110(9 \%)$ |
| Jack in the Box (3) | $150(12 \%)$ | $119(12 \%)$ |
| Gender |  |  |
| $\quad$ Male | $547(72 \%)$ | $442(73 \%)$ |
| Female | $247(28 \%)$ | $201(27 \%)$ |
| Age |  |  |
| <25 | $91(11 \%)$ | $71(9 \%)$ |
| $25-39$ | $256(34 \%)$ | $187(29 \%)$ |
| $40-64$ | $378(45 \%)$ | $301(51 \%)$ |
| 65+ | $60(10 \%)$ | $79(11 \%)$ |
| Race/Ethnicity |  |  |
| White (non-Hispanic) | $599(72 \%)$ | $481(71 \%)$ |
| All Other Races/Ethnicities | $185(28 \%)$ | $161(29 \%)$ |

## Calories Purchased vs. Calories Consumed

 With and Without Customizations - spring \& Fall Combined ( $\mathrm{n}=1438$ )
$\square$ Purchased (no customizations) $\square$ Purchased (w/ customizations)
$■$ Consumed (no customizations) ■ Consumed (w/ customizations)

Calories Consumed - All Burger Chains Combined Spring ( $n=794$ ) and Fall ( $n=644$ ) 2009


## All Burger Chains

$■$ Spring o9 $\square$ Fall o9

## Calories Consumed by Burger Chain Spring and Fall 2009



## Seeing and Using Calorie Information \% of Burger Customers Spring and Fall 2009



## Mean Calories Consumed Spring and Fall Combined

Saw Calorie Information


Used Calorie Information
(among those who saw calorie information)


# Mean Calories Consumed Spring and Fall Combined 

Gender

$\square$ Male $\square$ Female
*Statistically significant difference, p-value <0.05
$\square<25 \square$ 25-39 $\square 40-64 \square 65+$

## Mean Calories Consumed Spring and Fall Combined

Race/Ethnicity

$\square$ All Other $\square$ White (non-Hispanic)

## Site Socioeconomic Status



## Mean Calories Consumed Spring and Fall Combined

Snack or Meal
Calories Important

$\square$ Snack $\square$ Meal

$\square$ Not Important $\square$ Important

## Mean Calories Consumed Fall 2009

Diabetes

$\square$ No Diabetes $\square$ Diabetes

Hypertension

$\square$ No Hypertension $\square$ Hypertension

## Multivariate Model

## Dependent Variable: Calories Consumed

| Independent Variables | Coefficient | Standard Error | P-value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Constant | 1300.37 | 63.30 | 0.000 |
| Female | -196.21 | 27.94 | 0.000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Age } \\ & \quad<25 \\ & 40-64 \\ & 65+ \end{aligned}$ | 5.01 <br> -69.11 <br> -310.46 | $\begin{gathered} 57 \cdot 58 \\ 24.30 \\ 61.18 \end{gathered}$ | 0.931 <br> 0.008 <br> 0.000 |
| White race | 47.48 | 31.35 | 0.141 |
| Site High SES | 38.56 | 24.46 | 0.126 |
| Burger chain <br> Burgerville <br> McDonalds <br> Wendys <br> Burger King | $\begin{gathered} -48.69 \\ -141.61 \\ -221.18 \\ 13.40 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40.34 \\ & 36.36 \\ & 46.33 \\ & 40.11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.238 \\ 0.001 \\ 0.000 \\ 0.741 \end{gathered}$ |
| Calories important | -75.35 | 48.46 | 0.131 |

$$
\mathrm{R}^{2}=0.1084
$$

## Summary

- Overall, average calories consumed at burger establishments did not change significantly from spring 2009 to fall 2009
- Average calories for a lunchtime meal is high - nearly half of the recommended daily intake of 2000 calories for the average adult
- Females and older age customers consumed fewer calories on average
- Customers at McDonald's and Wendy's consumed fewer calories on average
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