

## Exploring the association between mental wellbeing, health-related quality of life, family affluence and food choice in adolescents

Jenny Davison<sup>a,\*</sup>, Barbara Stewart-Knox<sup>b</sup>, Paul Connolly<sup>c</sup>, Katrina Lloyd<sup>d</sup>, Laura Dunne<sup>d</sup>, Brendan Bunting<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Psychology Research Institute, Ulster University, Cromore Road, Coleraine, Northern Ireland, BT52 1SA, UK

<sup>b</sup> Division of Psychology, University of Bradford, Bradford, West Yorkshire, BD7 1DP, UK

<sup>c</sup> Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Lancaster University, FASS Building, Lancaster, LA1 4YL, UK

<sup>d</sup> Centre for Evidence and Social Innovation, Queens University Belfast, University Road, Belfast, Northern Ireland, BT7 1NN, UK

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Keywords:

Food choice  
Health-related quality of life  
Mental wellbeing  
Family affluence  
Adolescents  
Survey

### ABSTRACT

Young people choose energy-dense, nutrient-poor diets, yet understanding of potential determinants is limited. Associations between food choices, mental wellbeing, health-related quality of life (HRQoL) and family affluence were explored to identify targets for intervention to promote dietary health and wellbeing in young people. Adolescents were recruited via post-primary schools in the UK and surveyed at two time-points when aged 13–14 years and 15–16 years. The questionnaire enquired about mental wellbeing using the Short Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale, HRQoL using the KIDSCREEN-10, socio-economic status using the Family Affluence Scale and food choice by Food Frequency Questionnaire (FFQ). With missing and anomalous cases excluded, the sample comprised 1208 cases. Factor analysis on the FFQ indicated five food choice factors: 'Junk Food'; 'Meat'; 'Healthy Protein'; 'Fruit/Vegetables'; 'Bread/Dairy'. Multivariate regression analysis indicated that frequent consumption of Junk Food was associated with being male and lower mental wellbeing. Frequent Meat intake was associated with being male and with lower HRQoL. Frequent choice of Bread/Dairy foods was more common among males and associated with higher wellbeing and greater affluence. Those who consumed Fruit/Vegetables frequently were more likely to be female, have higher HRQoL, higher mental wellbeing, and greater family affluence. These direct associations endured between time points. The dietary factors were not mutually exclusive. Those who frequently chose Junk Food were less likely to choose Fruit/Vegetables. Frequent choice of Meat was associated with more frequent choice of Junk Food and Healthy Protein. Intervention to improve dietary and psychological health in young people should target males, those in less affluent households, seek to reduce consumption of 'junk' food, and increase fruit and vegetable intake.

### 1. Introduction

Adolescence is a period of rapid physiological and psychological development, when self-identity and independence is established (Schwartz, Zamboanga, Luyckx, Meca, & Ritchie, 2013; Viner et al., 2015). Adolescence is also an important but overlooked stage for the establishment of long-term health behaviour (Nelson, Story, Larson, Neumark-Sztainer, & Lytle, 2008). During adolescence young people experience changes to their home and educational environment,

develop strong peer networks, and achieve financial independence, all of which have been shown to be associated with dietary behaviour in young people (Draper, Grobler, Micklesfield, & Norris, 2015; Driessen, Cameron, Thornton, Lai, & Barnett, 2014; El Ansari, Stock, & Mikolajczyk, 2012). Food choices are established during adolescence and lay the foundations for dietary habits in adulthood (Craigie, Lake, Kelly, Adamson, & Mathers, 2011). Young people's dietary choices are influenced by intrapersonal, interpersonal, community and societal factors (Story, Neumark-Sztainer, & French, 2002). Previous research has

*Abbreviations:* DENI, Department of Education NI; FAS, Family Affluence Scale; FFQ, Food Frequency Questionnaire; HRQoL, Health-related Quality of Life; KS-10, KIDSCREEN-10; sWEMWBS, Short-form Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale; SET, Social Ecological Theory; WiSe, Wellbeing in Schools study; YPBAS, Young Persons Behaviour and Attitudes Survey.

\* Corresponding author. School of Psychology, Ulster University, Cromore Road, Coleraine, County Londonderry, Northern Ireland, BT52 1SA, UK.

E-mail address: [j.davison@ulster.ac.uk](mailto:j.davison@ulster.ac.uk) (J. Davison).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2020.105020>

Received 30 March 2020; Received in revised form 24 September 2020; Accepted 3 November 2020

Available online 7 November 2020

0195-6663/© 2020 The Authors.

Published by Elsevier Ltd.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license

(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

suggested that young people have a tendency towards consumption of 'junk' (energy dense/low nutrient) food (Davison, Share, Hennessy & Stewart-Knox, 2015; de Oliveira Figueiredo et al., 2019; Fraser, Clarke, Cade, & Edwards, 2011; Kerr et al., 2009; McKeown & Nelson, 2018; Share & Stewart-Knox, 2012; Zahra, Ford, & Jodrell, 2014), consumption of which appears to increase through adolescence (Kerr et al., 2009; Larson et al., 2008; Mosley, Banna, Lim, Failkowsky, & Novotny, 2018; Post-Skagegard et al., 2002; Schneider, Dumith, Lopes, Severo & Assincao, 2016).

Adolescent food choices tend to vary according to sex with girl's food choice deemed healthier than those of boys (Cooke & Wardle, 2005; de Oliveira Figueiredo et al., 2019; Lake, Mathers, Rugg-Gunn, & Adamson, 2006; Savage, Ball, Worsley, & Crawford, 2007). Compared to boys, girls are more likely to consume diets high in fruit and vegetables (Cooke & Wardle, 2005; Skardal, Western, Ask, & Overby, 2014), and to avoid high-fat foods and limit salt intake (Lake et al., 2006). The recent Australian National Health Survey (2018) of adolescents aged 14–18 years found that girls had a higher average daily intake of fruit compared to boys, and that boys consumed more carbonated drinks than girls (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2018). It is therefore important to understand sex differences in understanding young people's food choices.

Psychological factors that are intrinsic to the individual are also likely to determine and be determined by young people's food choices (Fitzgerald, Heary, Kelly, Nixon, & Shelvin, 2013; Story et al., 2002). Consuming a poor diet in adolescence can contribute towards poor mental wellbeing (McMartin, Kuhle, Colman, Kirk, & Veugelers, 2012; Oddy et al., 2009). Mental wellbeing encompasses hedonic (happiness, life satisfaction, and affect) and eudemonic (positive functioning, sense of purpose, and self-acceptance) factors (Clarke et al., 2011; Tennant et al., 2007). Previous research on young people has also identified links between healthy eating and better mental wellbeing (Kim, Choi, Lee, & Park, 2015; Tanaka & Hasimoto, 2019) and between unhealthy eating practices and poorer mental wellbeing (Wu, Ohinmaa, & Veugelers, 2012; Zahedi et al., 2014; Zahra et al., 2014) (not measured using the sWEMWBS). Together this implies that mental wellbeing could potentially be an important driver of food choice in young people. The short-form Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale (sWEMWBS) was developed by Tennant et al. (2007) to assess mental wellbeing in non-clinical groups. For the purpose of the sWEMWBS, wellbeing has been defined as a subjective construct that comprises positive psychological factors related to self-esteem and resilience as well as quality of life (Clarke et al., 2011). The sWEMWBS has been shown to be unidimensional in structure (Clarke et al., 2011; Hoffman, Rueda, & Lambert, 2019; Melendez-Torres et al., 2019; Ringdal et al., 2018), to be reliable (Ringdal et al., 2018; Clarke et al., 2011) and appropriate for use in both adults and young people (Clarke et al., 2011; Melendez-Torres et al., 2019). Previous studies in adult samples, report an association between fruit and vegetable consumption and better mental wellbeing (as measured by the sWEMWBS) (Blanchflower, Oswald, & Stewart-Brown, 2012; Fat, Scholes, Boniface, Mindell, & Stewart-Brown, 2017; Stranges, Samaraweera, Taggart, Kandala, & Stewart-Brown, 2014). There do not appear to be any studies that have used the sWEMWBS to assess wellbeing and diet in adolescents.

Health-related quality of life (HRQoL) is a subjective construct which evaluates the perceived health of an individual on the sub-dimensions of physical, psychological and social functioning, and wellbeing (Solans et al., 2008). Evidence for a relationship between healthier dietary practices and better HRQoL has been found using a range of measures in children and adolescents in Spain (Muros, Salvador, Zurita, Gamez & Knox, 2017), Australia (Bolton et al., 2016), Canada (Wu et al., 2012) and the UK (Boyle, Jones, & Walters, 2010). A large sample study across 12 countries (Dumuid et al., 2017), and the only previous study that appears to have assessed diet as a whole (using a FFQ), found that children aged 9–11 years who were consuming healthy food choices had greater HRQoL (assessed using KS-10). A recent systematic review (Wu

et al., 2019) identified seventeen studies that found associations between better diet quality and greater HRQoL in children and adolescents. HRQoL, therefore, could be important to consider when understanding food choice in young people.

Factors extrinsic to the individual can also impact upon food choice. Less healthy dietary habits are associated with more disadvantaged socioeconomic circumstances (Dowler, 2008). Family affluence is considered a marker of socioeconomic status (Hobza, Hamrik, Bucksch, & De Clercy, 2017). Family affluence has been linked to the development of healthy food choices in children (Ahmadi, Black, Velazquez, Chapman, & Veenstra, 2015; Elinder, Heinemans, Zeebari, & Patterson, 2014; Esteban-Gonzalo et al., 2019; Petrauskiene, Zaltauske, & Albaviciute, 2015). More frequent fruit and vegetable consumption has been associated with higher family affluence (scores) in young people aged 11–15 years in the UK (Levin, Kirby, Currie, & Inchley, 2012; Simon, Owen, O'Connell, & Brooks, 2018), Canada (Ahmadi et al., 2015; Elgar, Xie, Pfortner, White, & Pickett, 2016), Greece (Yannakoulia et al., 2016), Norway (Fismen, Smith, Torsheim, & Samdal, 2014; Skardal et al., 2014), and Iran (Pourrostami et al., 2019). Higher family affluence scores have also been associated with less frequent intake of chips/fries in young people aged 10–19 years in Belgium (Rouche et al., 2019) and in 11–15 year-olds in the UK (Levin et al., 2012). Higher scores have also been associated with less frequent sugary drink consumption in young people aged 11–15 years in the UK (Simon et al., 2018). The daily experiences encountered by young people living in more economically deprived circumstances are perceived to determine less healthy eating practices (Davison, Share, Hennessy, & Stewart-Knox, 2015). Family affluence, therefore, is a potentially important socio-environmental factor to consider in constellation with other individual factors in understanding food choice in young people.

In order to design and target public health interventions appropriately, it is important to understand determinants of food choice during adolescence. Food choices are determined by an array of interacting individual psychological and socio-environmental factors (Baudry et al., 2017; Markovina et al., 2015), the relative importance of which is likely to vary by food type (Vilaro et al., 2018). Social Ecological Theory (SET), is a systems-derived model of health behaviour developed by Stokols (1992). The theory aims to frame research that is relevant to the design and evaluation of interventions to enhance community health and wellbeing (Gregson et al., 2001). SET assumes that health and wellbeing are multifactorially determined through a 'dynamic interplay' between the individual (psychology and behaviour) and the environment/context (physical/nested structures and socio-cultural) (Stokols, 1996). Young people's food choices are driven by a complex array of interacting factors, both individual and external (Davison, Share, Hennessy, & Stewart-Knox, 2015; Davison, Share, Hennessy, Bunting et al., 2015; Story et al., 2002). SET, therefore, offers an appropriate model with which to understand dietary health behaviour (Bull, Eakin, & Reeves, 2006; Golden & Earp, 2012). This analysis will therefore consider food choices and explore associations with mental wellbeing (individual level), a measure of family affluence (environment level) and quality of life (interaction between individual and environment) in young people.

The purpose of this study therefore has been to identify the food choices of adolescents assessed at age 13–14 years and again at age 15–16 years, and then to explore their relationship with mental wellbeing, HRQoL, family affluence and sex. This study has also assessed the degree to which dietary choices at age 13–14 years (as a mediating variable) indirectly affected choices at age 15–16 years. Very few existing studies on food choice in young people appear to have assessed the whole diet, instead analysing single items (Winpenney, Penney, Corder, White, & van Sluijs, 2017). This study in contrast has assessed the diet as a whole by means of a food frequency questionnaire (FFQ). This also appears to be the first study of its kind conducted on Northern Irish adolescents. This research is also novel in that no previous studies have considered wellbeing, HRQoL and family affluence together as

determinants of food choice. Whereas the sWEMWBS assesses wellbeing as a specific, single construct focused on positive hedonic factors (Clarke et al., 2011), the KS-10 measures wellbeing as part of the more general HRQoL construct (Solans et al., 2008). Given these differences, both measures have been included in the analysis. Based on previous research, it is predicted that food choices at age 13–14 years will be associated with those at 15–16 years of age and that more healthy food choices will be associated with greater mental wellbeing, HRQoL and family affluence.

## 2. Method

### 2.1. Design and procedure

Ethical approval was obtained from the School of Education Research Ethics Committee at Queens University Belfast (reference number 100314 and 111217). Data were gathered in two waves (2016 & 2018) as part of the Wellbeing in Schools (WiSe) study, which is a longitudinal survey exploring the role of schools on the health and wellbeing of 13–16 year-old school children in Northern Ireland (NI) (UK). Data were collected from pupils in clusters (each comprising one form class) within each school. A list of all post-primary schools in NI was obtained from the Department of Education NI (DENI) website. A letter detailing the aims, objectives and procedures of the study, along with an invitation to participate, was posted to the head teacher in each of the selected schools. Of the 203 schools contacted, 94 replied with 89 agreeing to participate. At each school, one form class was randomly selected from each year group to participate. Schools that provided written consent for their school to participate were sent information sheets and consent forms for parents and pupils. While parents were provided with an opportunity of opt-out consent for their child's participation, all pupils were required to provide full written consent prior to completing the questionnaire. At time two, all 89 schools were re-contacted and re-invited to continue their school's participation in the study. Of the 89 schools, 79 schools participated again at time two (response rate of 89%). The same consent procedures described above were completed at time two.

The fieldwork at time one and time two was carried out in schools either on a study iPad or a school computer, hosted by LimeSurvey, with a researcher (JD) present to address any issues/questions arising. Data were captured from the same pupils when they were in Year 10 (2016) and Year 12 (2018). The resultant sample (participants with data available at both time points) comprised 1,237 adolescents (51% male and 49% female), aged 13–14 years at time one and aged 15–16 years at time two and attending 79 post-primary schools across Northern Ireland (UK).

### 2.2. Measures

#### 2.2.1. Family Affluence Scale (FAS)

The FAS (Boyce, Torsheim, Currie, & Zambon, 2006) has been shown to be a valid measure of socio-economic inequality in young people aged 14–17 years from across Europe (N = 10,900) (Moor et al., 2019). The FAS comprises four items: 'Do you have your own bedroom at home where you normally live?' for which responses are dichotomous (yes/no); 'Does your family own a car, van or truck?' for which responses are yes-one, yes-two or more, or no; 'During the past 12 months how many times did you travel away on holiday with your family?' for which responses are on a four-point scale -not at all, once, twice, more than twice; and 'How many computers, laptops, tablets or iPads do your family own?' for which responses are none, one, two, and three or more. Principal component analysis was used to optimise the relationship between the items and the underlying component under evaluation (family affluence). From this emergent model a component weight was obtained for each individual using SPSS v25. These were then used within the statistical analyses. This use of a linear composite of

indicators is in keeping with measurement recommendations suggested by Bollen and Lennox (1991).

#### 2.2.2. Short-form Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale (sWEMWBS)

The sWEMWBS (Tennant et al., 2007) comprises seven items and measures mental wellbeing, and accounts for both hedonic elements of positive wellbeing (e.g. I've been feeling cheerful) and eudemonic elements (e.g. I've been thinking clearly). The scale gathers responses on a five-point scale (none of the time; rarely; some of the time; often; all of the time) to: 'feeling optimistic about the future'; 'feeling useful'; 'feeling relaxed'; 'dealing with problems well'; 'thinking clearly'; 'feeling closer to other people'; 'able to make my own mind about things'. Responses to the seven items were summed to create total raw scores, these raw scores were then transformed to metric scores using the sWEMWBS conversion table provided by WARWICK (Warwick Medical School, 2020). Reliability estimates (Cronbach's Alpha) for the sWEMWBS were good at both time-1 ( $\alpha = 0.76$ ) and time-2 ( $\alpha = 0.80$ ). The seven-item sWEMWBS has been found to be highly reliable for the assessment of wellbeing in young people (Clarke et al., 2011; Hunter, Houghton, & Wood, 2015; Ringdal, Bradley, & Bjornsen, 2018) and unidimensional in structure (Clarke et al., 2011; Hoffman et al., 2019; Melendez-Torres et al., 2019; Ringdal et al., 2018). The sWEMWBS has also been shown to be valid and effective for the assessment of wellbeing in young people in Wales (N = 103,971) (Melendez-Torres et al., 2019) and in Australia (N = 829) (Hunter et al., 2015).

#### 2.2.3. KIDSCREEN-10 (KS-10)

The KS-10 (The KIDSCREEN Group Europe, 2006) is a 10-item measure of HRQoL designed for use with children aged between 8 and 18 years. Items scored on a five-point scale - not at all, slightly, moderately, very, extremely - are: 'thinking about the last week, have you': 'felt fit and well'; 'felt full of energy'; 'got on well at school'; 'been able to pay attention'. Items scored on a five-point scale - never; seldom; quite often; very often; always - are: 'felt sad'; 'felt lonely'; 'been able to do the things you want to do in free time'; 'had enough time for yourself'; 'had fun with friends'; 'parents treated you fairly'. Reliability for the KS-10 was good at time one ( $\alpha = 0.84$ ) but only moderate at time two ( $\alpha = 0.64$ ). The KS-10 has been shown to be reliable with Cronbach's alpha of 0.82 in adolescents aged 8–18 years (N = 22,830) across 13 European countries (Ravens-Seiberer et al., 2010) and  $\alpha$  0.80 in Iranian adolescents (N = 551) (Nik-Azin, Shairi, Naeinian, & Sadehpour, 2014). The KS-10 has been shown to function as a good indicator of HRQoL (Erhart et al., 2009), and has a unidimensional structure (Nik-Azin et al., 2014; Ravens-Seiberer et al., 2010). The item responses for KS-10 scale were coded so that higher values indicate better wellbeing. Scores were added together and then transformed into Rasch person parameters (PP). The PPs were transformed into values with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10 using the syntax provided on a CD accompanying the purchase of the KIDSCREEN manual (Erhart et al., 2009; Ravens-Seiberer et al., 2010; The KIDSCREEN Group Europe, 2006).

#### 2.2.4. Food frequency questionnaire (FFQ)

Dietary habits were assessed using a 17-item FFQ previously employed in the Young Persons Behaviour and Attitudes (YPBAS) Survey (Central Survey Unit, 2013). Responses were on a five-point scale: more than once a day; once a day; most days; once or twice a week; less often or never. Items related to the frequency of consumption of: sweets/chocolate/biscuits; buns/cakes/pastries; fizzy/sugary drinks; diet drinks; crisps; chips/fried potatoes; boiled/baked potatoes; fried foods (sausage eggs, bacon); meat products; meat/meat dishes; fish (not fried); beans/pulses; fruit; vegetables/salads (except potatoes); bread; rice/pasta; milk (to drink; on cereal; puddings) cheese/yoghurt. The 17-item FFQ has been found to be a reliable and valid measure for assessing dietary intake in adolescents aged 11–15 years (Inchley, Mokogwu,

Mabelis, & Currie, 2020) and adults aged 18–64 years (Weir et al., 2016).

### 2.3. Analysis

All analyses were conducted using Mplus V8.4 Muthén & Muthén. Where there were missing cases (n = 29) present on the exogenous measures, these were excluded from the analysis. One case was removed as responses appeared anomalous. Where there were missing responses, these were assigned –999 or 99. The eventual sample comprised 1208 cases.

The scoring metric for the KS-10 and the sWEMWBS on both occasions were based on a Rasch model, and hence the variables were continuous, as were the principal component scores for the FAS measure. Responses to the FFQ were scored on a Likert scale, and this was treated as an ordinal measure. Following from these measurement properties a weighted least square mean and variance estimator was used for the analysis.

Since data were obtained from respondents in 79 schools, adjusted standard errors and model fit statistics were computed to account for the non-independence of the respondents owing to clustering. The statistical calculations were consequently based on a weighted least square mean and variance adjusted (WLSMV) model. The clustering effect of pupils within school (non-independence) was taken into account using the complex modelling TYPE = COMPLEX option in Mplus. This uses a sandwich estimator to compute appropriate standard errors and a chi-square test of model fit taking into account stratification, non-independence of observations owing to cluster sampling, and/or unequal probability of selection. The model parameters were estimated using robust maximum likelihood. School therefore was entered into the analysis as a clustered variable. Sex was entered as an independent variable, coded as 1 for females and 2 for males, and assumed to have an effect at time two via time one.

#### 2.3.1. Identification of food choice factors

Data were obtained at two points in time (at age 13–14 years and age 15–16 years). The dimensional structure representing the food choices assessed using FFQ was determined in two steps. First, exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the 17 FFQ items at time one using a geomin (oblique) solution, using a chi-square testing of model fit. Since the variables were on a five-point Likert scale, they were treated as ordinal. Results indicated a five-factor solution. Second, all factor loadings that were statistically significant at the 0.05 level in the exploratory factor model were then included within a five-factor

solution modelled within a confirmatory framework. Confirmatory factor analysis at time two confirmed the same five factors (Table 1), with the same statistically significant factor loadings.

#### 2.3.2. Predictors of food choice factors

Three further parallel exogenous measures were introduced into the time sequence of the FFQ, i.e., at both points in time, as continuous, independent/explanatory variables. These measures were: (1) FAS; (2) sWEMWBS; and (3) KS-10. There was consistency between both time-points for scores on the KS-10 ( $P < 0.001$ ), sWEMWBS ( $P < 0.001$ ), and the FAS ( $P < 0.001$ ). The five factors for the FFQ at time two were regressed onto the same factor at time one, as were the three other parallel measures (FAS; sWEMWBS; and KS-10). These latter three measures were used as predictors of the five FFQ food choice factors. This was done by having the five food choice factors on the first occasion as mediating variables in the model, and regressed onto these three predictor measures (FAS, sWEMWBS and KS-10). Sex was also introduced as a predictor for the five FFQ food choice factors on the first occasion.

## 3. Results

Data were obtained from 1,208 young people of whom 607 were males and 601 females, aged 13–14 years at time one of survey completion (2016), and aged 15–16 years at time two (2018). At time of data collection 58.4% (n = 706) were attending a secondary school, and 41.6% (n = 502) were attending a grammar school. Of these, 69.5% (n = 840) were attending mixed sex schools, 16.6% (n = 200) an all-boys school and 13.9% (n = 168) an all-girls school. Nearly half (48%) reported that their general health was ‘very good’, 21% reported ‘excellent’ and over a quarter (26%) reported it as ‘good’. Only 4% reported their general health to be ‘fair’ and less than 1% (n = 7) ‘poor’. Over three quarters (80%) of the sample reported ‘high’ family affluence, 17% ‘average’ and 3% reported ‘low’ family affluence.

#### 3.1. Food choice factors

Standardised factor loadings (see Table 1) indicated: Factor 1 ‘Junk Food’ comprised six items – sweets/biscuits, buns/cakes, fizzy sugary drinks, diet drinks, crisps, chips/fried potatoes; Factor 2 ‘Meat’ comprised three items - fried foods (sausage/egg/bacon), meat products, meat and meat dishes; Factor 3 ‘Healthy Protein’ comprised four items - fish, beans/pulses, meat/meat dishes; Factor 4 ‘Fruit and Vegetables’ comprised two items - fruit and vegetables; Factor 5 ‘Bread/Dairy’

**Table 1**  
Standardised factor loadings for food frequency questionnaire items at time-point 1 and 2 (N = 1208).

Food Frequency Questionnaire Items	Factor 1 Junk		Factor 2 Meat		Factor 3 Healthy Protein		Factor 4 Fruit and Vegetables		Factor 5 Bread/Dairy	
	T 1	T 2	T 1	T 2	T 1	T 2	T 1	T 2	T 1	T 2
1. Sweets/chocs/biscuits	<b>0.461</b>	<b>0.462</b>					0.105	0.106		
2. Buns/cake/pastries	<b>0.470</b>	<b>0.472</b>			0.265	0.267				
3. Fizzy/sugary drinks	<b>0.707</b>	<b>0.714</b>								
4. Diet drinks	<b>0.525</b>	<b>0.528</b>								
5. Crisps	<b>0.640</b>	<b>0.645</b>								
6. Chips/fried potatoes	<b>0.438</b>	<b>0.442</b>	0.314	0.316						
7. Boiled/baked potatoes	–0.260	–0.262	0.219	0.219	0.298	0.299	0.159	0.156		
8. Fried food (sausage/bacon/egg)			<b>0.770</b>	<b>0.774</b>	<b>0.453</b>	<b>0.458</b>				
9. Meat products			<b>0.722</b>	<b>0.725</b>	<b>0.649</b>	<b>0.651</b>				
10. Meat dishes			<b>0.579</b>	<b>0.580</b>	<b>0.585</b>	<b>0.587</b>	<b>0.712</b>	<b>0.706</b>		
11. Fish (not fried)							<b>0.902</b>	<b>0.898</b>		
12. Beans/pulses									<b>0.764</b>	<b>0.789</b>
13. Fruit										
14. Vegetables/salad (not potatoes)										
15. Bread										
16. Rice/pasta			0.149	0.149	<b>0.450</b>	<b>0.451</b>	0.204	0.200		
17. Milk/cheese/yoghurt									<b>0.596</b>	<b>0.606</b>

Note. T = time. Analysis conducted in Mplus; Item loadings shown  $p < 0.001$ ; Factor loadings on unstandardised scores were equal.

comprised two items – bread and milk/yoghurt. FFQ item 7 – potatoes, had a relatively low factor loading across four of the five factors, and a negative factor loading on junk food. FFQ item 10 – Meat and Meat Dishes cross-loaded onto both the Meat factor and that for Healthy Protein. The FFQ relating to Rice/Pasta loaded onto the Health Protein factor with much lower cross-factor loadings on to both the Meat and, Fruit and Vegetables factors.

The five dietary factors were equivalent across time one and two (Table 1) and therefore were restricted at time two, before being fitted to the five-factor model. Intercepts (Factorial Invariance - VI) on the FFQ were then restricted. The five dietary factors (Junk; Meat; Healthy Protein; Fruit and Vegetables; Dairy/Bread) were the dependent/outcome variables. The observed measures relating to the five factors were treated as ordinal. The factor loadings and item thresholds were restricted to be equal across the points in time. The residual variances of the respective observed measures were correlated with the same item at a later point in time. This latter step was taken after an examination of the modification indices. Restricting the factor loadings and the thresholds to be equivalent on both occasions indicated, especially after an examination of the modification's indices, that a number of correlated residuals could be usefully introduced across the same measures on each occasion. Before the introduction of the correlated residuals the model did not provide an adequate description of data: Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = 0.90; Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) = 0.90; Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = 0.04; confidence interval (CI) = 0.3–0.4; Standardised Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) = 0.05, and the chi-square test of model fit ( $\chi^2 = 1478.83$ ,  $df = 572$ ,  $P < 0.0001$ ). With the introduction of correlated residuals, an improved model resulted. With the exception of one, all correlated residuals were statistically significant (0.05 level). The fit indices also indicated a much improved model with a reduction in the chi-Square value of 485.29 for the loss of 17 degrees of freedom (CFI = 0.95; TLI = 0.95; RMSEA = 0.03; CI = 0.2–0.3; SRMR = 0.04) and the chi-square test of model fit ( $\chi^2 = 993.54$ ,  $df = 555$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ).

In this analysis the identical food choice factor on the second occasion of measurement was regressed onto the same measure taken at time one.

### 3.2. Intercorrelations between food choice factors at time one (aged 13–14) and two (aged 15–16)

There was some intercorrelation between dietary factors (Table 2). Frequent consumption of the Junk Food factor was significantly and positively associated with consumption of the Meat factor at both time one and two and with the Healthy Protein factor at time two. The Junk Food factor was associated with less frequent consumption of the Fruit and Vegetable factor at time point one but not time two. The Meat factor was positively associated with the Healthy Protein factor at both time points. The Fruit and Vegetable factor was related to more frequent intake of the Healthy Protein food factor at both time points and with

more frequent choice of the Meat factor at time two. The Bread/Dairy factor was significantly and positively correlated with all of the other four dietary factors at both time points (Table 2).

### 3.3. Predictors of the food frequency questionnaire (FFQ) factors at time one and two

The correlations between the four exogenous measures at time one (KS-10, sWEMWBS, FAS and Sex) were all below 0.25 with the exception of the relationship between KS-10 and sWEMWBS where the correlation was  $-0.63$ . The FFQ food choice factors on occasion two were regressed onto the three predictors obtained on the second occasions (FAS, sWEMWBS and KS-10), which had been regressed onto the same measure at time one. This model provided an adequate description for the data (CFI = 0.95; TLI = 0.95; RMSEA = 0.02; CI = 0.02–0.03; SRMR = 0.07; chi-square = 1184.40,  $df = 769$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ).

There was then a direct and indirect effect from these four exogenous measures onto the five FFQ factors at both points in time. In addition, the measures for FAS, sWEMWBS, KS-10 at time two had a direct effect onto the five FFQ factors at the second point in time (see Heuristic diagram 1).

#### 3.3.1. Sex, mental wellbeing, HRQoL, and family affluence

Sex had a direct effect onto the five FFQ food choice factors at time one. Males had a statistically significant higher score than females ( $p < 0.05$ ) on F1 (Junk Food), F2 (Meat) and F5 (Bread/Dairy), and a lower score on F4 (Fruit and Vegetables). The result for F3 (Healthy Protein) did not statistically significantly differ by sex. In the model this pattern of effects carried over the five-factors on the second occasion, some two years later (see Table 3).

The children's HRQoL (KS-10) measure was moderately stable over the two-year period of the study (standardised effect = 0.50). In relation to the model, the KS-10 at time one had a statistically significant direct effect on two FFQ factors. There was a negative relationship between KS-10 and F2 (Meat), and a positive effect with F4 (Fruit and Vegetables).


The measure of mental wellbeing (sWEMWBS) had a negative relationship with the FFQ F1 (Junk Food), i.e., a higher score on the eating of junk food indicated worse mental wellbeing on average. There were also two positive associations between the measure of wellbeing and FFQ. These were with factors 4 (Fruit and Vegetables) and 5 (Bread/Dairy), thus indicating that a diet of frequent fruit, vegetables, bread and dairy product intake were associated with more positive mental wellbeing.

The affluence measure (FAS) had a statistically significant negative association with F4 (Fruit and Vegetables), F5 (Bread/Dairy) and a significant, but weaker, positive association with F2 (Meat) (see Table 3). The association between affluence and meat indicated that on average the more affluent tended to eat less meat. On the other hand, greater affluence was associated with more frequent consumption of fruit, vegetables, bread and dairy products, at time two. These were

**Table 2**  
Intercorrelations (standardised) between dietary factors – times one and two (N = 1208).

	Est		SE		Est/SE		P Value	
	T1	T2	T1	T2	T1	T2	T1	T2
F1 Junk + F2 Meat	0.574	0.551	0.030	0.044	19.127	12.499	0.000**	0.000**
F1 Junk + F3 Protein	0.051	0.153	0.037	0.057	1.376	2.688	0.169	0.007**
F1 Junk + F4 Fruit/Veg	-0.171	-0.084	0.036	0.045	-4.805	-1.852	0.000**	0.064
F1 Junk + F5 Bread/Dairy	0.126	0.112	0.044	0.055	2.829	2.033	0.005**	0.042*
F2 Meat + F3 Protein	0.249	0.279	0.042	0.051	5.905	5.468	0.000**	0.000**
F2 Meat + F4 Fruit/Veg	-0.037	0.139	0.040	0.040	-0.920	3.472	0.358	0.001**
F2 Meat + F5 Bread/Dairy	0.295	0.390	0.042	0.044	6.976	8.923	0.000**	0.000**
F3 Protein + F4 Fruit/Veg	0.533	0.537	0.031	0.050	16.973	10.671	0.000**	0.000**
F3 Protein + F5 Bread/Dairy	0.405	0.427	0.036	0.051	11.253	8.325	0.000**	0.000**
F4 Fruit/Veg + F5 Bread/Dairy	0.506	0.558	0.030	0.043	16.864	13.043	0.000**	0.000**

Note. F = factor; T = time; Est = estimate; SE = standard error; Est/SE = estimate divided by standard error; \*\* $p < .001$ ; \* $p < .005$ .



F: Factor; T1: Time One; T2: Time Two

**Diagram 1.** Heuristic diagram representing the statistical analysis for the model at 2 points in time.

**Table 3**  
Associations between KS-10, sWEMWBS and FAS scores, sex and dietary patterns at time two (N = 1208).

Variables	Est	SE	Est/SE	P
<b>Factor 1 – Junk Food</b>				
Sex	0.165	0.039	4.244	0.000**
KS-10	-0.003	0.002	-1.258	0.208
sWEMWBS	-0.027	0.005	-4.976	0.000**
FAS	-0.008	0.017	-0.441	0.659
<b>Factor 2 - Meat</b>				
Sex	0.134	0.025	5.290	0.000**
KS-10	-0.003	0.001	-2.357	0.018*
sWEMWBS	0.002	0.004	0.542	0.588
FAS	-0.018	0.009	-1.941	0.052*
<b>Factor 3 – Healthy Protein</b>				
Sex	0.065	0.041	1.589	0.112
KS-10	0.001	0.002	0.637	0.524
sWEMWBS	0.005	0.006	0.900	0.368
FAS	0.026	0.018	1.417	0.156
<b>Factor 4 – Fruit and Vegetables</b>				
Sex	-0.356	0.064	-5.579	0.000**
KS-10	0.008	0.003	2.442	0.015*
sWEMWBS	0.017	0.008	2.113	0.035*
FAS	0.087	0.025	3.485	0.000**
<b>Factor 5 – Bread/Dairy</b>				
Sex	0.167	0.068	2.453	0.014**
KS-10	-0.001	0.003	-0.411	0.681
sWEMWBS	0.037	0.011	3.337	0.001**
FAS	0.077	0.024	3.278	0.001**

Note. KS-10 = KIDSCREEN-10; sWEMWBS = short-form Warwick Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale; FAS=Family Affluence Scale.  
Est = estimate; SE = standard error; Est/SE = estimate divided by standard error; \*\*p < 0.001; \*p < 0.005.

effects that remained stable over the two-year period of the study, as indicated by the indirect effect of affluence on the respective factors on the FFQ measures at time two.

3.3.2. Food factors (mediating and outcome factors)

3.3.2.1. *Junk food.* The sum of the specific indirect effect of sex on the Junk food factor at time two is the multiplicative effect of sex on Junk food factor at time one, multiplied by the effect of Junk food from time one to time two conditioned on the specific exogenous measures (sex). The test statistic for the indirect effect of sex on Junk Food at the second point in time was: estimate/standard error (est/se) = 4.05. Based on the test statistic for the direct effect (4.20) there was little added value in the effect of sex on Junk food on the second occasion i.e., implying no change in junk food consumption across the two-year period.

The respective direct and indirect effects for the remaining exogenous measures were as follows: KS-10 (-1.255; 1.301); sWEMWBS (-4.983; -2.27); and FAS (-0.443; -0.44). Values of the test statistic below ±1.96 indicate values that are not statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Where the direct and indirect effects are close this indicates that the effect of the respective exogenous measure had little impact on the food factor on the second occasion.

3.3.2.2. *Meat factor.* The indirect effect of sex in the second factor (Meat) produced a test statistic of 4.81, close to the direct effect of gender on the Meat factor on occasion one (5.26). The direct and indirect effects relating to the remaining exogenous measures were as follows: KS-10 (-2.36; -2.35); sWEMWBS (0.57; -0.43); and FAS (-1.98; -1.98).

**3.3.2.3. Healthy protein.** The effect (indirect) from factor three (Healthy Protein) at time one to time two, conditioned on the exogenous measures was not statistically significant (test statistic 1.61), as neither was the direct effect (1.62) for the effect of sex at time one. The direct and indirect effects for the remaining variables in the model were as follows: KS-10 (0.63; 0.64), sWEMWBS (0.94; 0.92); and FAS (1.42; 1.43).

**3.3.2.4. Fruit and vegetables.** The fourth factor (Fruit and Vegetables) had an indirect effect of sex on the measure on the final occasion of (−5.27). This was little changed from the direct effect of sex differences on this factor on the first occasion (−5.51). The direct and indirect t-statistics for the remaining exogenous measures were as follows: KS-10 (2.43; 2.42); sWEMWBS (2.14; 2.11); and FAS (3.49; 3.40).

**3.3.2.5. Bread and dairy.** The final factor was (Bread/Dairy) products and the indirect effect of sex on this factor of (2.35). This was little changed from the direct effect value on the first occasion (2.43). For the other exogenous measures, the test statistics were as follows: KS-10 (−0.36; −0.36); sWEMWBS (3.26; 2.69); and FAS (3.25; 2.75).

#### 4. Discussion

This analysis sought to identify food choice factors in adolescents, to explore the degree to which the frequency with which foods were consumed were associated with mental wellbeing, HRQoL, family affluence and sex, and to assess any indirect effects on dietary choices longitudinally. Dietary assessment identified five food choice factors in the young people surveyed at both time points (Junk Food; Meat; Fruit and Vegetables; Healthy Protein; Bread/Dairy). Similar dietary factors have been observed previously in Greek adolescents: junk food; red meat; fruit and veg; dairy; rice, potatoes, fish, poultry; legumes; bread (Kourlaba et al., 2009) and in Brazilian youth aged 11–17 years: junk food; healthy; traditional (de Pinho, Silveira, Botelho, & Caldeira, 2014). The finding that there were five food choice factors, however, contrasts with other previous research on Irish school children aged 13–18 years (N = 483) which implied only two factors (healthy/unhealthy) (Fitzgerald et al., 2013). That the five food choice factors were found to be similar across the two time points, agrees with previous results in children aged 5–13 years in the UK (Fremaux et al., 2011) and suggests that young peoples' food choices are consistent over time. This finding, however, contrasts with previous research which found differences in food choices over time in Hawaiian girls (9–14 years) (Mosley et al., 2018), Brazilian young people (15–18 years) (Schneider, Dumith Sde, Lopes, Severo, & Assincao, 2016) and in Swedish young people (15–18 years) (Post-Skagegard et al., 2002).

Social Ecological Theory (SET) (Stokols, 1995) postulates that health behaviour occurs within a given context and is driven by multiple factors, both individual and environmental. Consistent with SET, therefore, at the individual level, there were sex differences. Males consumed junk food, bread and dairy foods more frequently, and fruit and vegetables less frequently than females at both time points. Again, at the individual level, higher mental wellbeing was associated with less frequent intake of junk food and more frequent consumption of fruit and vegetables, bread, and dairy foods at both time points. Also at both time points, those who frequently consumed fruit and vegetables had higher HRQoL while those who consumed meat frequently had lower HRQoL. At the environmental level, greater family affluence was associated with more frequent intake of fruit and vegetables, bread, and dairy foods and less frequent intake of meat. Comparison of the direct and indirect effects indicated that once the direct effect was taken into account, there was little if any change in the effect of the independent measures upon the final five outcome measures (dietary factors), at time two. To enable comparison with previous research the results have been discussed taking each food choice factor (DV) in turn.

Previous studies have also identified frequent junk food intake

among young people (Davison, Share, Hennessy, Bunting, et al., 2015; de Pinho et al., 2014; Kourlaba et al., 2009). As many as 17% of 12–16 year-olds in the UK consume junk food daily (Zahra et al., 2014). Previous qualitative research has suggested a possible reason for this is that young people express autonomy through choice of junk food (Davison, Share, Hennessy, & Stewart-Knox, 2015; Lems, Hilverda, Broerse, & Dedding, 2019). The current analysis implied that more frequent consumption of junk food was associated with lower mental wellbeing (sWEMWBS) and being male. Other studies have also found an association between the frequency with which junk food was consumed and poorer mental health in young people aged 6–18 years in Iran (Zahedi et al., 2014), and in 12–16 year-olds in the UK (Zahra et al., 2014). Although, given that this is a survey study it is not possible to establish cause and effect from our analysis, a possible explanation for this association between wellbeing and frequent junk food intake could be that frequent consumption of junk food is detrimental to wellbeing. Alternatively, poor mental wellbeing may drive choice of junk food. Further research is required to determine the direction of association between mental wellbeing and food choice. Another explanation is that young people feel bad about eating junk food (Ilmoisili, Park, Lundeen, Yaroch & Blanck, 2020) which could be detrimental to wellbeing.

The finding that family affluence was unrelated to the junk food factor contrasts with those from other studies in adolescents, and which have found lower affluence to be associated with more frequent junk food consumption (Levin et al., 2012; Rouche et al., 2019). This also contradicts results of a Brazilian study of youth aged 11–17 years (N = 474) which showed that those from lower income families were more likely to consume junk food (de Pinho et al., 2014). One possible explanation for lack of association between family affluence and junk food consumption observed in the present study is that school-based public health initiatives implemented over the past decade, for example the health promoting schools approach (Langford et al., 2016), have been successful in reducing junk food consumption (Dudley, Cotton, & Peralta, 2015; Wang & Stewart, 2013).

HRQoL was also unrelated to the junk food factor, a finding that is difficult to compare with those of previous studies of HRQoL in adolescents, the majority of which have taken BMI and not diet as the outcome. Such studies have been consistent in finding that higher BMI was associated with lower HRQoL (Boyle et al., 2010; Buttitta, Ilescu, Rousseau, & Guerrien, 2014; Cordero & Cesani, 2019; Gouveia, Frontini, Canavaro, & Moreira, 2014; Ottova, Erhart, Rajmil, Dettenborn-Betz, & Ravens-Sieberer, 2012; Wynne, Comiskey, & McGilloway, 2016). Our result implies that lower HRQoL is not related to junk food intake.

Sex was an important indirect determinant of the frequency with which junk food was consumed. Being male led to more frequent choice of junk food. This is consistent with previous research (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2018; Cooke & Wardle, 2005; Lake et al., 2006; Savige et al., 2007; Skardal et al., 2014) suggesting that girls' food choices are healthier than those of boys. Little if any change occurred in the differences between the sexes in terms of the five dietary factors across a period of two years. Sex differences in the frequency with which the junk food and fruit and vegetables were consumed may be partly explained by differences in taste preferences, for example, girls have been found to like fruit and vegetables more than boys, whereas boys seem to prefer junk foods (Cooke & Wardle, 2005). Another explanation could be that boys have higher energy requirements, which drives their food preferences towards more energy-dense foods (Cooke & Wardle, 2005). Another factor could be that girls have a greater awareness of their health and as such have stronger beliefs in the importance of healthy eating (Wardle et al., 2004). Previous qualitative research in 12–18 year-old boys residing in disadvantaged neighbourhoods in the Netherlands (Lems et al., 2019) has implied that junk food consumption is an important part of adolescent boys' social identity and behaviour and to fit with friends. To deter choice of junk foods therefore, dietary health promotion will need to target males, particularly those in less affluent homes and to engage with them on matters of social identity.

Taken together, these findings emphasise the need for the creation of sex-specific health promotion interventions (Lombardo et al., 2019).

Frequent consumption of meat was directly associated with lower HRQoL at time one and indirectly at time two. More frequent meat intake was also associated with being male. Unfortunately, there do not appear to have been any previous studies that have considered adolescent HRQoL and meat intake with which to compare this result. That males consumed meat more frequently than females, however, concurs with previous research indicating that boys eat more meat than girls (Danuseviciute-Brazaite & Abromaitiens, 2018; Lombardo et al., 2019; Post-Skagegard et al., 2002; Rothgerber, 2013). A possible reason for this sex difference could be that boys seek to express masculinity through eating meat (Lems et al., 2019). This implies a need to target males in seeking to encourage less frequent meat intake. Mental wellbeing and family affluence were unrelated to the frequency with which meat was consumed.

Approximately 12–18% of young people consume a diet low in fruit and vegetables (de Oliveira Figueiredo et al., 2019; McKeown & Nelson, 2018; Zahra et al., 2014). Fruit and vegetable consumption appear consistent between different populations of young people (Davison, Share, Hennessy, Bunting, et al., 2015; Howe et al., 2016; Kourlaba et al., 2009). As predicted, frequent fruit and vegetable intake was directly associated with higher mental wellbeing (sWEMWBS), higher HRQoL (KS-10), and greater family affluence (FAS) at time one and indirectly at time two. The finding that frequent fruit and vegetable intake was associated with higher wellbeing is consistent with previous research which has found that young people who frequently eat vegetables (Tanaka & Hashimoto, 2019) and/or fruit and vegetables (Kim et al., 2015) report fewer symptoms of depression. Given this is a survey study, albeit at two points in time, it is difficult to establish whether frequent fruit and vegetable intake is a cause or effect of enhanced mental wellbeing in young people.

As indicated by previous studies of children and adolescents in Spain (Muros, Salvador Pérez, Zurita Ortega, Gámez Sánchez, & Knox, 2017), Australia (Bolton et al., 2016), Canada (Wu et al., 2012) and the UK (Boyle et al., 2010), HRQoL was an important determinant of food choices in this group of young people. Again, although it is not possible to determine the degree to which HRQoL is a cause or effect of more frequent fruit and vegetable intake, these data corroborate previous research suggesting that enhancing young people's HRQoL may be the key to promoting healthy food choices in young people (Boyle et al., 2010; Dumuid et al., 2017; Wu et al., 2019). Further, more controlled research is required to establish the direction of causation between mental HRQoL and choice of fruit and vegetables.

Greater family affluence was also directly associated with more frequent fruit and vegetable intake at time one and indirectly at time two. This agrees with previous research on young people indicating that those in higher socio-economic groups make healthier food choices (Ahmadi et al., 2015) and more frequently consume fruit and vegetables (Pourrostami et al., 2019; Skardal et al., 2014; Yannakoulia et al., 2015). This finding is also in keeping with previous research that has found an association between fruit and vegetable intake and family affluence also using the FAS (Elgar et al., 2016; Fismen et al., 2014; Levin et al., 2012; Simon et al., 2019; Yannakoulia et al., 2016). Affluence has also been found to influence the availability of healthy foods within the home, with less availability in lower affluent groups (Aggarwal, Monsivais, Cook, & Drewnowski, 2011). Availability of healthy foods may also be mediated by dietary knowledge and awareness (Wardle, Parmenter, & Waller, 2000) and their cost (Shepherd et al., 2006). This implies that intervention to promote fruit and vegetable intake should target those in less affluent circumstances.

Frequent choice of fruit and vegetables was also associated with being female. That girls consumed fruit and vegetables more often than males agrees with previous research (de Oliveira Figueiredo et al., 2019; Skardal et al., 2014) and that boys reduce fruit and vegetable intake during adolescence (Post-Skagegard et al., 2002). Previous research has

shown that regular consumption of fruit and vegetables in adolescence leads to improved physical health outcomes (Vereecken et al., 2015). This implies that intervention to encourage consumption of fruit and vegetables will need to target boys, particularly those in less affluent groups.

The healthy protein factor was unusual and does not appear to have arisen out of other studies that have characterized diet in young people and could represent an emerging trend. The healthy protein factor was unrelated to mental well-being, HRQoL, family affluence or sex suggesting that the frequency with which foods high in protein were consumed was driven by other factors.

Adolescents who eat bread and grains tend to have better overall dietary quality (Papanikolaou, Jones, & Fulgoni, 2017) and dairy foods are considered important for general health (Rangan et al., 2012; Spence, 2013). The current study found that bread/dairy factor was directly associated with higher mental wellbeing at time one and indirectly at time two. Although difficult to establish whether the frequency with which bread/dairy foods were consumed was a cause or an effect of higher mental wellbeing, this finding implies that to enhance wellbeing, young people should be encouraged to include dairy and wholegrains as part of their diet. The bread/dairy factor was also associated with greater family affluence (FAS) corroborating previous research conducted in young people in Iran (Pourrostami et al., 2019), Greece (Yannakoulia et al., 2015) and Norway (Skardal et al., 2014) and indicating more frequent bread/dairy intake among those of higher socio-economic status. The bread/dairy factor was more common among males. Together, these findings imply that intervention to increase dairy and wholegrain intake will need to target females and those in less affluent families. As Social Ecological Theory (SET) (Stokols, 1995) would imply, dietary factors derived from the FFQ varied in the individual and environmental context associated with their expression and this has implications for dietary health promotion. Frequent junk food consumption was associated with individual characteristics i.e. being male and lower mental wellbeing (sWEMWBS) implying that intervention to reduce junk food intake may need to focus on raising wellbeing among young people and to target males. Frequent intake of meat was also associated with being male but with lower HRQoL (KS-10), implying that intervention to discourage meat intake would need to focus on young people's quality of life and how it relates to the food choice environment. Although also associated with being male, the bread/dairy factor was associated with higher mental wellbeing (sWEMWBS) at the individual level and with greater affluence (FAS) at the environmental level. The fruit/vegetable food choice factor was also associated with both individual and environmental factors. Those who reported frequent intake of fruit and vegetables were more likely to be female and to have higher HRQoL (KS-10), higher wellbeing (sWEMWBS) and greater family affluence (FAS). Intervention to increase fruit and vegetable intake among young people, therefore, should seek to enhance mental wellbeing and health related quality of life and at the contextual level and target those in less affluent circumstances, particularly males.

Consistent with SET associations between the frequency with which foods were consumed were associated with interacting individual and environmental level factors. That the dietary factors were not mutually exclusive implies that the young people may make different food choices in different contexts. Frequent consumption of junk food appeared to occur along with frequent intake of meat at both time points indicating that those who frequently choose junk foods also frequently choose meat. Both the junk food and meat factors were also more common in males suggesting that dietary health promotion should target efforts at reducing both junk and meat intake together and focus upon males. Frequent intake of the meat factor was also associated with frequent consumption of the healthy protein factor at both time points, implying that some young people eat meat along with healthier sources of protein and which could suggest that young people may be open to reducing meat intake by substituting it with other sources of protein. Also of



interest, was that choice of fruit and vegetables was associated with the healthy protein factor at both time points, again indicating a broader healthy food choice tendency. Another finding was that junk food consumption was associated with less frequent fruit and vegetable choice at time point one when the respondents were younger, but not at time two when they were older. This could be because either the frequency with which junk food was consumed reduced, or fruit and vegetable intake increased over time. That the bread/dairy factor overlapped with all other patterns at both time points is unsurprising given bread is a staple food.

#### 4.1. Limitations and strengths

Although the present study represents an advance in our understanding of the association of established adolescent food choices with HRQoL, mental wellbeing, sex and family affluence, it is not without certain limitations. While the FFQ, FAS, KS-10 and sWEMWBS are valid and reliable measures of assessment for use in large-scale samples, and are appropriate for evaluating adolescents' dietary intake (Inchley et al., 2020; Weir et al., 2016), family affluence (Hobza et al., 2017), HRQoL (Ravens-Seiberer et al., 2010) and mental wellbeing (Clarke et al., 2011; Hunter et al., 2015; Ringdal et al., 2018), our findings may be subject to limitations inherent in self-reported data such as inaccurate recall and bias toward what is perceived to be socially acceptable (Rosenman, Tennekoon, & Hill, 2011). A further potential limitation relates to the FFQ employed which would be subject to inaccuracies inherent in any dietary assessment method (MacDiarmid & Blundell, 1998) and which did not assess quantity of food consumed, only how often a food was chosen. Nevertheless, FFQs are characterised by low participant burden (Winpenney et al., 2017) and are designed to give an indication of 'usual' intake (Burrows, Martin, & Collins, 2010; Subar et al., 2015). Given our research question related to food choice rather than how much was eaten this has not adversely impacted upon the ability of these results to inform our understanding of food choice in adolescents. Another potential limitation is that although reducing dietary intake data to factors, has enabled us to characterise the total diet, we have not considered the prevalence with which certain foods are chosen. People seldom eat foods in isolation and more often as meals as part of a diet, therefore, to analyse individual food items for prevalence would tell us little about how people choose and combine foods. Another strength is that in using factor analysis as opposed to PCA, on the assumption that food choices vary by context, we have been able to determine overlap between food choice factors. Meanwhile, psychometric assessment of the FFQ confirmed stability of the measure for use in longitudinal surveys across time, given the five food choice factors replicated at both time points. Future studies are required that use a selection of other suitable dietary assessment tools for this age range including, for example, 24-h recalls and App-delivered diaries (Burrows et al., 2010; Rankin, Hanekom, Wright, & MacIntyre, 2010).

Despite these potential drawbacks, the current study achieved a large sample size representative and including nearly half of the post-primary schools in Northern Ireland, and the analysis has taken into account the clustered nature of these data at school level. Unlike previous research into food choice in young people this study included the sWEMWBS which measures mental wellbeing, therefore, accounting for both hedonic and eudemonic elements of positive wellbeing. Unlike many previous studies that have considered single food items (Winpenney et al., 2017) our study has taken young peoples' diet as a whole. This study is novel, therefore, in that it is one of very few that have looked at the whole diet rather than individual food items and considered how food choices are constructed. This study also serves to provide a detailed analysis of individual and contextual factors associated with food choice factors to enable comparison with other research studies.

Unlike previous research into food choice in young people (Bolton et al., 2016; Boyle et al., 2010; Share & Stewart-Knox, 2012; Dumuid et al., 2017; Muros et al., 2017; Wu et al., 2012), this study encompasses

longitudinal data (at two time points), which addresses limitations often levied at the over-use of cross-sectional surveys (Ferrer-Cascales et al., 2019) and the paucity of longitudinal data (Winpenney et al., 2017). Building on this, future research should aim to assess food choices over several time-points throughout adolescence and into early adulthood to understand trajectories in food choice across the life stage, and in particular during the transitional period to adulthood. Repeated longitudinal assessments at three time points (or more) could achieve this.

#### 4.2. Conclusion

In summary, young people with better mental wellbeing tended to make healthier food choices characterized by less frequent junk food consumption and more frequent fruit and vegetable and bread and dairy intake. Evidence from previous longitudinal research (Wu et al., 2019) and qualitative enquiry (Davison, Share, Hennessy, & Stewart-Knox, 2015), both in young people, has implied a reciprocal relationship between wellbeing and healthy eating. It may therefore be possible to encourage healthier food choices in young people by enhancing mental wellbeing and in doing so, further improve overall wellbeing. Those with better HRQoL also tended to choose meat less frequently and fruit and vegetables more frequently. This could suggest that by improving HRQoL in young people that healthier food choices may develop. There were marked sex differences in food choices such that boys were more likely than girls to choose junk food, meat and bread/dairy more frequently than girls and to choose fruit and vegetables less frequently than girls. Those in more affluent homes were more likely to make healthier food choice characterized by frequent intake of fruit and vegetables and bread and dairy foods. Together, results of the present study imply that adolescents growing up in more affluent families make better food choices, and more frequently consume fruit and vegetables, bread/dairy, and meat.

Although difficult to establish cause and effect, our findings imply that interventions aimed at improving dietary health in young people, should target males in less affluent households, seek to reduce the consumption of low nutrient (junk) foods, and promote consumption of fruit and vegetables, whilst taking mental wellbeing and HRQoL into account. A next step would be to conduct more in-depth qualitative research to probe how young people conceive the five dietary factors, the reasons behind consumption and how and why they are consumed in practice and in different contexts. Meanwhile, the present study has provided a first step in assessing food choice during adolescence and identifying determinants, both individual and contextual, which should be of use to key stakeholders in the areas of public health and nutrition interested in promoting healthy dietary habits in young people.

#### Author contributions

PC and KL were responsible for the conception of the research idea. PC, KL, LD and JD contributed to the study design and management. JD lead data collection and preparation of the project dataset. JD, BSK and BB formulated the research questions and contributed to the design of the analysis. BB undertook the analysis. JD, BSK and BB were involved in drafting the paper. All authors reviewed the manuscript and approved the final version submitted for publication.

#### Ethical statement

Re: 'Exploring the association between mental wellbeing, health-related quality of life, family affluence and food choice in adolescents'.

This study obtained ethical approval from the School of Education Research Ethics Committee, Queens University Belfast (reference numbers 100314 and 111217). Parental consent was obtained for all participants, and participants gave informed consent (assent) prior to taking part in the study.

## Declaration of competing interest

The authors have no conflict of interests to declare.

## Acknowledgments

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors. This material is based upon work conducted as part of the Wellbeing in Schools (WiSe) study which was financially supported by the Centre of Excellence for Public Health (Northern Ireland), and the Centre of Evidence and Social Innovation, at Queens University Belfast. The authors would like to acknowledge the schools and their pupils, who gave their time to participate in this research.

## References

- Aggarwal, A., Monsivais, P., Cook, A. J., & Drewnowski, A. (2011). Does diet cost mediate the relation between socioeconomic position and diet quality? *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 65(9), 1059–1066. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ejcn.2011.72>
- Ahmadi, N., Black, J. L., Velazquez, C. E., Chapman, G. E., & Veenstra, G. (2015). Associations between socio-economic status and school-day dietary intake in a sample of grade 5-8 students in Vancouver, Canada. *Public Health Nutrition*, 18(5), 764–773.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2018). *Australian health survey: First results, 2017-18*. Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics, Commonwealth of Australia. <https://iepcp.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/4364.0.55.001-national-health-survey-first-rsults-2017-18.pdf>.
- Baudry, J., Péneau, S., Allès, B., Touvier, M., Hercberg, S., Galan, P., et al. (2017). Food choice motives when purchasing on organic and conventional consumer clusters: Focus on sustainable concerns. The NutriNet-santé cohort study. *Nutrients*, 9, E88.
- Blanchflower, D. G., Oswald, A. J., & Stewart-Brown, S. (2012). Is psychological wellbeing linked to the consumption of fruit and vegetables? *Social Indicators Research*, 10.1007/s11205-012-0173-y.
- Bollen, K., & Lennox, R. (1991). Conventional wisdom on measurement: A structural equation perspective. *Psychological Bulletin*, 110(2), 305–314. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.110.2.305>
- Bolton, K. A., Jacka, F., Allender, S., Kremer, P., Gibbs, L., Waters, E., et al. (2016). The association between self-reported diet quality and health-related quality of life in rural and urban Australian adolescents. *Australian Journal of Rural Health*, 24(5), 317–325. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajr.12275>
- Boyce, W., Torsheim, T., Currie, C., & Zambon, A. (2006). The family affluence scale as a measure of national wealth: Validation of an adolescent self-report measure. *Social Indicators Research*, 78, 473–487.
- Boyle, S. E., Jones, G. L., & Walters, S. J. (2010). Physical activity, quality of life, weight status and diet in adolescents. *Quality of Life Research*, 19(7), 943–954.
- Bull, S., Eakin, E., & Reeves, M. (2006). Multi-level support for physical activity and healthy eating. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 54(5), 585–593.
- Burrows, T. L., Martin, R. J., & Collins, C. E. (2010). A systematic review of the validity of dietary assessment methods in children when compared with the method of doubly labeled water. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*, 110, 1501–1510.
- Buttitta, M., Iliescu, C., Rousseau, A., & Guerrien, A. (2014). Quality of life in overweight and obese children and adolescents: A literature review. *Quality of Life Research*, 23(4), 1117–1139. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-013-0568-5>
- Clarke, A., Friede, T., Putz, R., Ashdown, J., Martin, S., Blake, A., et al. (2011). Warwick Edinburgh mental wellbeing scale (WEMWBS): Validated for teenage school students in England and Scotland. A mixed methods assessment. *BMC Public Health*, 11(1), 487.
- Cooke, L. J., & Wardle, J. (2005). Age and gender differences in children's food preferences. *British Journal of Nutrition*, 93, 741–746.
- Cordero, M. L., & Cesani, M. F. (2019). Nutritional transition in schoolchildren from Tucumán, Argentina: A cross-sectional analysis of nutritional status and body composition. *American Journal of Human Biology*, 31, Article e23257. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajhb.23257>
- Craigie, A. M., Lake, A. A., Kelly, S. A., Adamson, A. J., & Mathers, J. C. (2011). Tracking of obesity-related behaviours from childhood to adulthood: A systematic review. *Maturitas*, 70, 266–284. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.maturitas.2011.08.005>
- Daniusevicute-Brazaitė, L., & Abromaitienė, L. (2018). Evaluation of students' dietary behaviours depending on gender. *Progress in Nutrition*, 20(1), 21–29.
- Davison, J., Share, M., Hennessy, M., Bunting, B., Markovina, J., & Stewart-Knox, B. (2015b). Correlates of food choice in unemployed young people: The role of demographic factors, self-efficacy, food involvement, food poverty and physical activity. *Food Quality and Preference*, 46, 40–47.
- Davison, J., Share, M., Hennessy, M., & Stewart-Knox, B. (2015a). Caught in a 'spiral'. Barriers to healthy eating and dietary health promotion needs from the perspective of unemployed young people and their service providers. *Appetite*, 85, 146–154.
- Dowler, E. (2008). Food and health inequalities: The challenge for sustaining just consumption. *Local Environment*, 13(8), 759–772. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13549830802478736>
- Draper, C. E., Grobler, L., Micklesfield, L. K., & Norris, S. A. (2015). Impact of social norms and social support on diet, physical activity and sedentary behaviour of adolescents: A scoping review. *Child: Care, Health and Development*, 41(5), 654–667. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cch.12241>
- Driessen, C. E., Cameron, A. J., Thornton, L. E., Lai, S. K., & Barnett, L. M. (2014). Effect of changes to the school food environment on eating behaviours and/or body weight in children: A systematic review. *Obesity Reviews*, 15, 968–982.
- Dudley, D. A., Cotton, W. G., & Peralta, L. R. (2015). Teaching approaches and strategies that promote healthy eating in primary school children: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 12(28). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12966-015-0182-8>
- Dumuid, D., Olds, T., Lewis, L. K., Martín-Fernández, J. A., Katzmarzyk, P. T., Barreira, T., et al. (2017). Health-related quality of life and lifestyle behavior clusters in school-aged children from 12 countries. *The Journal of Pediatrics*, 183, 178–183. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpeds.2016.12.048>. e2.
- El Ansari, W., Stock, C., & Mikolajczyk, R. T. (2012). Relationships between food consumption and living arrangements among university students in four European countries - a cross-sectional study. *Nutrition Journal*, 11, 28.
- Elgar, F. J., Xie, A., Pfortner, T. K., White, J., & Pickett, K. E. (2016). Relative deprivation and risk factors for obesity in Canadian adolescents. *Social Science & Medicine*, 152, 111–118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.01.039>
- Elinder, L. S., Heinemans, N., Zeebari, Z., & Patterson, E. (2014). Longitudinal changes in health behaviours and body weight among Swedish school children—associations with age, gender and parental education—the SCIP school cohort. *BMC Public Health*, 14, 640.
- Erhart, M., Ottova, V., Gaspar, T., Jericek, H., Schnohr, C., Alkalisifoglu, M., et al. (2009). Measuring mental health and wellbeing of school-children in 15 European countries using the KIDSCREEN-10 Index. *International Journal of Public Health*, 54(Suppl. 2), 160–166.
- Esteban-Gonzalo, L., Turner, A. I., Torres, S. J., Esteban-Cornejo, I., Castro-Pinero, J., et al. (2019). Diet quality and well-being in children and adolescents: The Up&Down longitudinal study. *British Journal of Nutrition*, 121, 221–231.
- Fat, L. N., Scholes, S., Boniface, S., Mindell, J., & Stewart-Brown, S. (2017). Evaluating and establishing national norms for mental wellbeing using the short warwick-edinburgh mental well-being scale (SEEMWBS): Findings from the health survey for England. *Quality of Life Research*, 26, 1129–1144.
- Ferrer-Cascales, R., Albaladejo-Blazquez, N., Ruiz-Robledo, N., Clement-Carbonell, V., Sanchez-SanSegundo, M., & Zaragoza-Marti, A. (2019). Higher adherence to the Mediterranean diet is related to more subjective happiness in adolescents: The role of health-related quality of life. *Nutrients*, 11, 698. <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu11030698>
- Fismen, A. S., Smith, O. R. F., Torsheim, T., & Samdal, O. (2014). A school based study of time trends in food habits and their relation to socio-economic status among Norwegian adolescents, 2001-2009. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 11(115). <http://www.ijbnpa.org/content/11/1/115>.
- Fitzgerald, A., Heary, C., Kelly, C., Nixon, E., & Shelvin, M. (2013). Self-efficacy for healthy eating and peer support for unhealthy eating are associated with adolescents' food intake patterns. *Appetite*, 63, 48–58.
- Fraser, L. K., Clarke, G. P., Cade, J. E., & Edwards, K. L. (2011). Fast food and obesity. A spatial analysis in a large United Kingdom population of children aged 13–15. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 42, E77–E85.
- Fremaux, A. E., Hosking, J., Metcalf, B. S., Jeffery, A. N., Voss, L. D., & Wilkin, T. J. (2011). Consistency of children's dietary choices: Annual repeat measures from 5 to 13 years. *British Journal of Nutrition*, 106(5), 725–731.
- Golden, S. D., & Earp, J. A. L. (2012). Social ecological approaches to individuals and their contexts: Twenty years of health education and behavior health promotion interventions. *Health Education & Behavior*, 39(3), 364–372.
- Gouveia, M. J., Frontini, R., Canavarro, M. C., & Moreira, H. (2014). Quality of life and psychological functioning in pediatric obesity: The role of body image dissatisfaction between girls and boys of different ages. *Quality of Life Research*, 23(9), 2629–2638. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-014-0711-y>
- Gregson, J., Foerster, S. B., Orr, R., Jones, L., Benedict, J., Clarke, B., et al. (2001). System, environmental and policy changes: Using the socio-ecological model as a framework for evaluating nutrition education and social marketing programs with low-income audiences. *Journal of Nutrition Education*, 33, S4–S15.
- Hobza, V., Hamrik, Z., Bucksch, J., & De Clercy, B. (2017). The family affluence scale as an indicator for socioeconomic status: Validation on regional income differences in the Czech republic. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 14, 1540. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph14121540>
- Hoffman, S., Rueda, H. A., & Lambert, M. C. (2019). Confirmatory factor analysis of the warwick-edinburgh mental wellbeing scale among youth in Mexico. *International Social Work*, 62, 309–315.
- Howe, A. S., Skidmore, P. M. L., Parnell, W. R., Wong, J. E., Lubransky, A. C., & Black, K. E. (2016). Cardiorespiratory fitness is positively associated with a healthy dietary pattern in New Zealand adolescents. *Public Health Nutrition*, 19, 1279–1287.
- Hunter, S. C., Houghton, S., & Wood, L. (2015). Positive mental wellbeing in Australian adolescents: Evaluating the warwick-edinburgh mental wellbeing scale. *Australian Educational and Developmental Psychologist*, 32, 93–104.
- Inchley, J., Mokogwu, D., Mabelis, J., & Currie, D. (2020). *Health behaviour in school-aged children (HBSC) 2018 survey in Scotland: National report*. MRC/CSO Social and Public Health Sciences Unit, University of Glasgow.
- Kerr, M. A., Rennie, K. L., McCaffrey, T. A., Wallace, J. M. W., Hannon-Fletcher, M. P., & Livingstone, M. B. E. (2009). Snacking patterns among adolescents: A comparison of type, frequency and portion size between Britain in 1997 and northern Ireland in 2005. *British Journal of Nutrition*, 101, 122–131.

- Kim, T. H., Choi, J. Y., Lee, H. H., & Park, Y. (2015). Associations between dietary pattern and depression in Korean adolescent girls. *Journal of Pediatric and Adolescent Gynecology*, 28(6), 533–537.
- Kourilaba, G., Panagiotakos, D. B., Mihos, K., Alevizos, A., Marayiannis, K., Mariolis, A., et al. (2009). Dietary patterns in relation to socioeconomic and lifestyle characteristics among Greek adolescents: A multivariate analysis. *Public Health Nutrition*, 12(9), 1366–1372.
- Lake, A. A., Mathers, J. C., Rugg-Gunn, A. J., & Adamson, A. J. (2006). Longitudinal change in food habits between adolescence (11–12 years) and adulthood (32–33 years): The ASH30 study. *Journal of Public Health*, 28(10), 6.
- Langford, R., Bonell, C., Komro, K., Murphy, S., Magnus, D., Waters, E., et al. (2016). The health promoting schools framework: Known unknowns and an agenda for future research. *Health Education & Behaviour*, 44(3), 463–475. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1090198116673800>
- Larson, N. I., Neumark-Sztainer, D. R., Story, M. T., Wall, M. M., Harnack, L. J., & Eisenberg, M. E. (2008). Fast food intake: Longitudinal trends during the transition to young adulthood and correlates of intake. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 43(1), 79–86.
- Lems, E., Hilverda, F., Broerse, J. E. W., & Dedding, C. (2019). Just stuff yourself. Identifying health-promotion strategies from the perspectives of adolescent boys from disadvantaged neighbourhoods. *Health Expectations*, 22, 1040–1049.
- Levin, K. A., Kirby, J., Currie, C., & Inchley, J. (2012). Trends in adolescent eating behaviour: A multilevel cross-sectional study of 11–15 year olds in Scotland, 2002–2010. *Journal of Public Health*, 34(4), 523–531. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pubmed/dfs021>
- Lombardo, M., Aulisa, G., Padua, E., Annino, G., Iellamo, F., Pratesi, A., et al. (2019). Gender differences in taste and food habits. *Nutrition & Food Science*, 50(1), 229–239. <https://doi.org/10.1108/NFS-04-2019-0132>
- MacDiarmid, J., & Blundell, J. (1998). Assessing dietary intake: Who. *What and Why of Underreporting Nutrition Research Reviews*, 11, 231–253.
- Markovina, M., Stewart-Knox, B. J., Rankin, A., Gibney, M., de Almeida, M. D. V., Fischer, A., et al. (2015). Food4Me study: Validity and reliability of food choice questionnaire in 9 European countries. *Food Quality and Preference*, 45, 26–32.
- McKeown, A., & Nelson, R. (2018). Independent decision making of adolescents regarding food choice. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 42, 469–477.
- McMartin, S. E., Kuhle, S., Colman, I., Kirk, S. F., & Veugelers, P. J. (2012). Diet quality and mental health in subsequent years among Canadian youth. *Public Health Nutrition*, 15(12), 2253–2258.
- Melendez-Torres, G. J., Hewitt, G., Hallingberg, B., et al. (2019). Measurement invariance properties and external construct validity of the short Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale in a large sample of secondary school students in Wales. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes*, 17, 139.
- Moor, I., Kuipers, M. A. G., Lorant, V., Pförtner, T. K., Kinnunen, J. M., Rathmann, K., et al. (2019). Inequalities in adolescent self-rated health and smoking in Europe: Comparing different indicators of socioeconomic status. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, 73, 963–970. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jech-2018-211794>
- Mosley, M. A., Banna, J. C., Lim, E., Failkowski, M. K., & Novotny, R. (2018). Dietary patterns change over two years in early adolescent girls in Hawaii. *Asia Pacific Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 27, 238–245.
- Muros, J. J., Salvador Pérez, F., Zurita Ortega, F., Gámez Sánchez, V. M., & Knox, E. (2017). The association between healthy lifestyle behaviors and health-related quality of life among adolescents. *Journal de Pediatria*, 93(4), 406–412. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpmed.2016.10.005>
- Nelson, M. C., Story, M., Larson, N. I., Neumark-Sztainer, D., & Lytle, L. A. (2008). Emerging adulthood and college-aged youth: An overlooked age for weight-related behaviour change. *Obesity*, 16, 2205–2211. <https://doi.org/10.1038/oby.2008.365>
- Nik-Azin, A., Shairi, M. R., Naeinian, M. R., & Sadeghpour, A. (2014). The health-related quality of life index KIDSCREEN-10: Confirmatory factor Analysis, convergent validity and reliability in a sample of Iranian students. *Child Indicators Research*, 7, 407–420. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-013-9216-4>
- Oddy, W. H., Robinson, M., Ambrosini, G. L., O'Sullivan, T. A., de Klerk, N. H., Beilin, L. J., et al. (2009). The association between dietary patterns and mental health in early adolescence. *Preventive Medicine*, 49(1), 39–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2009.05.009>
- de Oliveira Figueiredo, R. A., Viljakainen, J., Viljakainen, H., Roos, E., Rounge, T. B., & Weiderpass, E. (2019). Identifying eating habits in Finnish children: A cross-sectional study. *BMC Public Health*, 19, 312. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-6603-x>
- Ottova, V., Erhart, M., Rajmil, L., Dettnerborn-Betz, L., & Ravens-Sieberer, U. (2012). Overweight and its impact on the health-related quality of life in children and adolescents: Results from the European KIDSCREEN survey. *Quality of Life Research*, 21(1), 59–69. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-011-9922-7>
- Papanikolaou, Y., Jones, J. M., & Fulgoni, V. L. (2017). Several grain dietary patterns are associated with better diet quality and improved shortfall nutrient intakes in US children and adolescents: A study focusing on the 2015–2010 dietary guidelines for Americans. *Nutrition Journal*, 16, 13.
- Petrauskienė, A., Zaltauskė, V., & Albaviciute, E. (2015). Family socioeconomic status and nutrition habits of 7–8 year old children: Cross-sectional Lithuanian COSI study. *Italian Journal of Pediatrics*, 41(34).
- de Pinho, L., Silveira, M. F., Botelho, A. C. D., & Caldeira, A. P. (2014). Identification of dietary patterns of adolescents attending public schools. *Journal de Pediatria*, 90(3), 267–272.
- Post-Skagegard, M., Samuelson, G., Karlstrom, B., Mohsen, R., Berglund, L., & Bratteby, L. E. (2002). Changes in food habits in healthy Swedish adolescents during the transition from adolescence to adulthood. *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 56(6), 532–538.
- Pourrostami, K., Qorbani, M., Heshmat, R., Mohammadi-Nasrabadi, F., Djalalinia, S., Sheidaei, A., et al. (2019). Economic inequality in healthy and junk food consumption and its determinants in children and adolescents: The CASPIAN-IV study. *International Journal of Pediatrics*, 7, 9249–9263. <https://doi.org/10.22038/IJP.2018.37010.3223>
- Rangan, A., Flood, V., Denyer, G., Webb, K. L., Marks, G. B., & Gill, T. (2012). Dairy consumption and diet quality in a sample of Australian children. *Journal of the American College of Nutrition*, 31(3), 185–193.
- Rankin, D., Hanekom, S. M., Wright, H. H., & MacIntyre, U. E. (2010). Dietary assessment methodology for adolescents: A review of reproducibility and validation studies. *South African Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 23, 65–74.
- Ravens-Seiberer, U., Erhart, M., Rajmil, L., Herdman, M., Auquier, P., Bruil, J., et al. (2010). Reliability, construct and criterion validity of the KIDSCREEN-10 score: A short measure for children and adolescents' wellbeing and health-related quality of life. *Quality of Life Research*, 19, 1487–1500.
- Ringdal, R., Bradley, E., & Bjornsen, H. N. (2018). Validation of two versions of the warwick-edinburgh mental wellbeing scale among Norwegian adolescents. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 46, 718–725.
- Rosenman, R., Tennekoon, V., & Hill, L. G. (2011). Measuring bias in self-reported data. *International Journal of Behavioural and Healthcare Research*, 2(4), 320–332. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJBHR.2011.043414>
- Rothgerber, H. (2013). Real men don't eat (vegetable) quiche: Masculinity and the justification of meat consumption. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 14(4), 363–375. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030379>
- Rouche, M., de Clercq, B., Lebacqz, T., Dierckens, M., Moreau, N., Desbouys, L., et al. (2019). Socioeconomic disparities in diet cary according to the migration status among adolescents in Belgium. *Nutrients*, 11(4), 812. <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu11040812>
- Savidge, G. S., Ball, K., Worsley, A., & Crawford, D. (2007). Food intake patterns among Australian adolescents. *Asia Pacific Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 16, 738–746.
- Schneider, B. C., Dumith Sde, C., Lopes, C., Severo, M., & Assincao, M. C. (2016). How do tracking and changes in dietary pattern during adolescence relate to the amount of body fat in early childhood. *PLoS One*, 11(2), Article e0149299. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0149299>
- Schwartz, S. J., Zumboanga, B. L., Luycck, K., Meca, A., & Ritchie, R. A. (2013). Identity in emerging adulthood: Reviewing the field and looking forward. *Emerging Adulthood*, 1(2), 96–113. <https://doi.org/10.1177/216796813479781>
- Share, M., & Stewart-Knox, B. S. (2012). Determinants of dietary habits in Irish adolescents. *Food Quality & Preference*, 28, 57–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2011.12.005>
- Shepherd, J., Harden, A., Rees, R., Brunton, G., Garcia, J., Oliver, S., et al. (2006). Young people and healthy eating: A systematic review of research on barriers and facilitators. *Health Education Research*, 21(2), 239–257. <https://doi.org/10.1093/her/cyh060>
- Simon, A., Owen, C., O'Connell, R., & Brooks, F. (2018). Changing trends in young people's food behaviour and wellbeing in England in relation to family affluence between 2005 and 2014. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 21(5), 687–700. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2017.1406599>
- Skardal, M., Western, I. M., Ask, A. M. S., & Overby, N. C. (2014). Socioeconomic differences in selected dietary habits among Norwegian 13–14 year-olds: A cross-sectional study. *Food & Nutrition Research*, 58, 23590. <https://doi.org/10.3402/fnr.v58.23590>
- Solans, M., Pane, S., Estrada, M. D., Serra-Sutton, V., Berra, S., Herdman, M., et al. (2008). Health-related quality of life measurement in children and adolescents: A systematic review of generic and disease-specific instruments. *Value in Health*, 11(4), 742–764.
- Spence, L. A. (2013). Shortfall in the consumption of dairy foods in Australian children's diets: Addressing health implications and practical approaches. *Nutrition and Dietetics*, 70, 66–70.
- Stokels, D. (1992). Establishing and maintaining healthy environments: Toward a social ecology of health promotion. *American Psychologist*, 47, 6–22.
- Stokels, D. (1995). Translating Social Ecological Theory into guidelines for community health promotion. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, 10(4), 282–298.
- Story, M., Neumark-Sztainer, D., & French, S. (2002). Individual and environmental influences on adolescent eating behaviours. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*, 102(3), S40–S51.
- Stranges, S., Samaraweera, P. C., Taggart, F., Kandala, N. B., & Stewart-Brown, S. (2014). Major health-related behaviours and mental wellbeing in the general population: The health survey for England. *BMJ Open*, 4, Article e005878. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2014-005878>
- Subar, A. F., Freedman, L. S., Toozé, J. A., Kirkpatrick, S. I., Boushey, C., Neuhouser, M. L., et al. (2015). Addressing current criticism regarding the value of self-report dietary data. *Journal of Nutrition*, 145, 2639–2645.
- Tanaka, M., & Hashimoto, K. (2019). Impact of consuming green and yellow vegetables on the depressive symptoms of junior and senior high school students in Japan. *PLoS One*, 14(2), Article e0211323. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0211323>
- Tennant, R., Hillier, L., Fishwick, R., Platt, S., Joseph, S., Weich, S., et al. (2007). The warwick-edinburgh mental wellbeing scale (WEMWBS): Development and UK validation. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes*, 5, 63.
- The Kidscreen Group Europe. (2006). *The KIDSCREEN questionnaires: Quality of life questionnaires for children and adolescents handbook*. Lengerich: Pabst Science Publishers.
- Vereecken, C., Pedersen, T. P., Ojala, K., Krolner, R., Dzielska, A., Ahluwalia, N., et al. (2015). Fruit and vegetable consumption trends among adolescents from 2002 to 2010 in 33 countries. *The European Journal of Public Health*, 25(2), 16–19. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckv012>

- Vilaro, M. J., Colby, S. E., Riggsbee, K., Zhou, W., Byrd-Bredbenner, C., Olfert, M. D., et al. (2018). Food choice priorities change over time and predict dietary intake at the end of the first year of college among students in the U.S. *Nutrients*, *10*, E1296.
- Viner, R. M., Ross, D., Hardy, R., Kuh, D., Power, C., Johnson, A., et al. (2015). Life course epidemiology: Recognising the importance of adolescence. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, *69*, 719–720. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jech-2014-205300>
- Wang, D., & Stewart, D. (2013). The implementation and effectiveness of school-based nutrition promotion programmes using a health-promoting schools approach: A systematic review. *Public Health Nutrition*, *16*(6), 1082–1100. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980012003497>
- Wardle, J., Haase, A. M., Steptoe, A., Nillapun, M., Jonwutiwes, K., & Bellisle, F. (2004). Gender differences in food choice: The contribution of health beliefs and dieting. *Annals of Behavioural Medicine*, *27*(2), 107–116. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324796abm2702\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324796abm2702_5)
- Wardle, J., Parmenter, K., & Waller, J. (2000). Nutrition knowledge and food intake. *Appetite*, *34*(3), 269–275. <https://doi.org/10.1006/appe.1999.0311>
- Warwick Medical School. (2020). Collect, score, analyse and interpret WEMWBS. Retrieved from <https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/sci/med/research/platform/wemwbs/using/howto/>.
- Weir, R. R., Carson, E. L., Mulhern, M. S., Laird, E., Healy, M., & Pourshahidi, L. K. (2016). Validation of a food frequency questionnaire to determine vitamin D intakes using the method of triads. *Journal of Human Nutrition and Dietetics*, *29*, 255–261. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jhn.12328>
- Winpenny, E. M., Penney, T. L., Corder, K., White, M., & van Sluijs, E. M. F. (2017). Change in diet in the period from adolescence to early adulthood: A systematic scoping review of longitudinal studies. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, *14*(60). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12966-017-0518-7>
- Wu, X. Y., Ohinmaa, A., & Veugelers, P. J. (2012). Diet quality, physical activity, body weight and health-related quality of life among grade five students in Canada. *Public Health Nutrition*, *15*(1), 75–81.
- Wu, X. Y., Zhuang, L. H., Li, W., Guo, H. W., Zhang, J. H., Zhao, Y. K., et al. (2019). The influence of diet quality and dietary behavior on health-related quality of life in the general population of children and adolescents: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Quality of Life Research*, *28*(8), 1989–2015.
- Wynne, C., Comiskey, C., & McGilloway, S. (2016). The role of body mass index, weight change desires and depressive symptoms in the health-related quality of life of children living in urban disadvantage: Testing mediation models. *Psychology and Health*, *31*(2), 147–165. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08870446.2015.1082560>
- Yannakouli, M., Lykou, A., Kastorini, C. M., Papasaranti, E. S., Petralias, A., Veloudaki, A., et al. (2016). Socio-economic and lifestyle parameters associated with diet quality of children and adolescents using classification and regression tree analysis: The DIATROFI study. *Public Health Nutrition*, *19*(2), 339–347. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S136898001500110X>
- Zahedi, H., Kelishadi, R., Heshmat, R., Motlagh, M. E., Ranjbar, S. H., Ardalan, G., et al. (2014). Association between junk food consumption and mental health in a national sample of Iranian children and adolescents: The caspian-IV study. *Nutrition*, *30* (11–12), 1391–1397. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nut.2014.04.014>
- Zahra, J., Ford, T., & Jodrell, D. (2014). Cross-sectional survey of daily junk food consumption, irregular eating, mental and physical health and parenting style of British secondary school children. *Child: Care, Health and Development*, *40*(4), 481–491. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cch.12068>