International Journal of Home Science 2021; 7(1): 87-89

International Journal of Home Science

ISSN: 2395-7476
IJHS 2021; 7(1): 87-89

www.homesciencejournal.com
Received: 07-11-2020
Accepted: 09-12-2020

Dr. Jiju N Vyas
Associate Professor,
SDAU Dantiwada Gujarat, India

Dr. Neha Tiwari
Scientist, KVK, JAU Amreli
Gujarat, India

Corresponding Author:
Dr. Neha Tiwari
Scientist, KVK, JAU Amreli
Gujarat, India

An analytical study of food and nutritional values amongst urban and rural people in Ahmedabad district: A comparative evaluation

Dr. Jiju N Vyas and Dr. Neha Tiwari

Abstract
Nowadays India is undergoing an impressive economic growth accompanied by a very slow decline, almost stagnation, in malnutrition levels. In developing countries, studies on dietary patterns and their relationship with nutritional status are scarce. Over the years, some nutritional studies have been performed to explore different types of food consumed in various Indian regions, among different social samples. The aim of the present paper is to review and describe trends in food and nutrition intake patterns in the urban and rural parts of Ahmedabad. Survey was done on 300 respondents, 150 from Urban Ahmedabad and 150 from Rural Ahmedabad. Major aim of the study is to understand difference of food habits and nutritional status amongst urban and rural people.

Keywords: food habits, nutritional status, urban food habits, rural food habits

Introduction
Health and nutrition are the most important contributory factors for human development. Countries, undergoing an economic transition, such as nations emerging in the international marketing competition, have to face new challenges in the treatment of nutrition related problems. Nowadays India is passing through an impressive economic growth, accompanied by a very slow decline, almost stagnation, in malnutrition levels. Malnutrition in India is not a child specific problem but it is prevalent in every age group and its adverse effects consist of greater susceptibility to infections, increased morbidity and mortality, enhancing decreased productivity and lower quality standards along all stages of life-evolution. Adequate intake of food and regular nutrition habits are the major contributing factors for the maintenance of general health status. India's poli-geographic terrain and pluralistic cultural background, offers a high variety of alimentary differences, like cereals, pulses, vegetables, fruits, milk and milk products, including also categories of consumption, like meat and poultry, roots and tubers, fats, nuts and oils.

Cereals are the most economic source of energy, representing, therefore, the principal aliment for low income social classes. Fruits and vegetables, though occupying about 65 % of cultivatable terrain, are consumed less frequently in India's general population, even if a regular intake of these aliments is recognized as an important health promoter, reducing prevalence of cardiovascular disease and obesity significantly. Milk and dairy products from animal sources (cow's milk or buffalo's milk) are an important part of Indian diet, and India has indisputably one of world's greatest milk and milk product producers. Furthermore diets rich in milk, cheese, yogurt and similar products provide important vitamins and minerals essential for human growth and development. The beneficial health effects obtained from milk are mandatory for human body and help in prevention of chronic ailments. Constant monitoring of nutrition habits and dietary intake, involving also families and communities in informative campaigns, ensures healthy balanced diets and therefore improvement of life-quality. Such initiatives offer efficient preventive strategies against the rise of non-communicable diseases, such as diabetes, coronary diseases and overweight.

Objective
- To understand Food Habits of Urban people in the city of Ahmedabad

- To study Food Habits of Rural People in the city of Ahmedabad
- To evaluate factors determining Food Habits of Urban and Rural People
- To Study difference between urban and rural People with reference to food habits
- To evaluate difference between urban and rural people with reference to nutritional status.

Methodology

The study was conducted in urban and rural area of Ahmadabad and population of urban and rural area was selected for study. Out of which 300 sample size was selected (150 Urban and 150 Rural). Non Probability convenience Sampling method was used and exploratory, Descriptive and causal research design was used. Survey method the especially mall intercept was used in the research to collect primary data from respondent. Structured questionnaire was used to collect data. Questionnaire consist of close ended questions to be evaluated in 5- point likert scale. Food and Nutrition values determinants are highly dynamic in nature. Such determinants tend to change with reference to changes in many factors like demographic variables. This segment of the study measures the dynamism of Food and Nutrition values determinants, moderators and Food and Nutrition values itself with reference to demographic like age, Geography, income, shopping experience etc. separate list of hypothesis is developed in regard to study this dynamic nature of variables

Result and Discussion

Geography and Determinates

H_0: There is no significant difference in the average score of the various determinants (Dietary Fiber, service inference, Carbohydrates, Fats, Minerals and Micro Nutrients) with reference to Geography

H_1: There is significant difference in the average score of the various determinants (Diatery Fiber, service inference, Carbohydrates, Fats, Minerals and Micro Nutrients) with reference to Geography

Table 1: Levene's Test for Geography and Determinants

Independent Samples Test						
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Dietary Fiber	Equal variances assumed	100.573	.000	-11.254	298	.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-12.458	406.279	.000
Protin intake	Equal variances assumed	25.428	.000	-8.704	298	.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-9.194	508.885	.000
Carbohydrates	Equal variances assumed	20.142	.000	-13.425	298	.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-14.052	516.077	.000
Fats	Equal variances assumed	158.691	.000	-14.437	298	.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-15.364	499.388	.000
Minerals	Equal variances assumed	136.114	.000	-11.945	298	.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-13.336	380.978	.000
Micro Nutrients	Equal variances assumed	125.489	.000	-12.174	298	.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-13.678	362.137	.000

Average score of the Diatery Fiber, service inference, Carbohydrates, Fats, Minerals and Micro Nutrients was taken as the testing variables hence Geography was taken as the grouping variable in the two independent sample t test.

Levene's test for equality of variance was performed to check the equality of the variance and it indicate that variance are mot equal for both groups Urban Respondents and Rural respondents as the test was founded statistically significant at the 5 % level of the significant. The variance was not equally distributed across the Geography.

Independent sample T test shows the test result of the all determinants and Geography. Table indicate that there were significant difference in the mean score of the all determinant of the Urban Respondents and Rural respondents as the p value (0.0000) founded less than the significant level (0.050). It is also observed from the group statistics table that the score obtained by the Rural respondents responded was significantly higher than the score obtained by the Urban Respondents responded.

Table 2: Group Statistics for Geography

Group Statistics					
Geography		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Dietary Fiber	Urban Respondents	150	3.3015	.98079	.05701
	Rural respondents	150	4.0815	.38730	.02588
Protin intake	Urban Respondents	150	3.4358	.84577	.04916
	Rural respondents	150	4.0027	.55689	.03721
Carbohydrates	Urban Respondents	150	3.0642	.89325	.05192
	Rural respondents	150	4.0063	.63483	.04242
Fats	Urban Respondents	150	2.6872	1.15079	.06689
	Rural respondents	150	3.9473	.71039	.04747
Minerals	Urban Respondents	150	3.2378	1.16185	.06753
	Rural respondents	150	4.2054	.39681	.02651
Micro Nutrients	Urban Respondents	150	3.2649	1.02212	.05941
	Rural respondents	150	4.1241	.30563	.02042

Null hypothesis is rejected as significant differences are observed between Geography and determinates

Geography and Food and Nutrition Values

H_0: There is no significant difference in the average score of the Food and Nutrition values with reference to Geography

H_1: There is significant difference in the average score of the Food and Nutrition values with reference to Geography.

Table 3: Independent T-test for Geography and PDT

Independent Samples Test						
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Food and Nutrition values	Equal variances assumed	101.113	.000	-20.934	298	.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-23.143	410.100	.000

Food and Nutrition valueswas measured through the six items scale measured on the five point likert scale. For the two independent t test, average score of the Food and Nutrition valueswas taken as the testing variable and Geography was inserted as the testing variable.

Levene's test for equality of variance was performed to check the equality of the variance and it indicate that variance are mot equal for both groups Urban Respondents and Rural respondents as the test was founded statistically significant at the 5 % level of the significant. The variance was not equally distributed across the Geography.

Independent sample T test shows the test result of Food and Nutrition values and Geography. Table indicate that there were significant difference in the mean score of the all determinant of the Urban Respondents and Rural respondents as the p value (0.0000) founded less than the significant level (0.050). It is also observed from the group statistics table that the score obtained by the Rural respondents responded was significantly higher than the score obtained by the Urban Respondents responded. The average score of the ale was 3.1042 and average score of the Rural respondents was founded 4.1600.

Table 4: Group Statistics for Geography and PDT

Group Statistics					
Geography		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Food and Nutrition values	Urban Respondents	150	3.1042	.7120	.04140
	Rural respondents	150	4.1600	.28687	.01917

Null Hypothesis is rejected as significant differences are seen between Geography and Food and Nutritional Values.

Conclusion

From the above discussions and analysis of the data collected from various urban and rural respondents, it can be said that there is significant differences observed between urban and rural respondents with reference to various determinants of the nutritional values. Viz. Fibers, Protein, Carbohydrates, Minerals and other micro nutrients. As far as Food and Nutritional values are concerned, it can be seen that the mean score of rural respondents is more than the urban respondents. So, rural respondents' shows better nutritional and food intake than urban respondents. Same is the case with various determinants for nutrition. Rural respondents score more than urban respondents with reference to intake of Protein, Fibers, Minerals and other micro nutrients.

References

1. Haddad L. Lifting the Curse. Overcoming Persistent Under nutrition in India. IDS Bull 2009;40:1–8.
2. Balaji LN, Dustagheer A. Nutrition scenario in India–implications for clinical practice. J Indian Med Assoc 2000;98:536-8, 542.
3. Jason RA, Aitchison JC. Greater India. Earth Sci Rev 2005;72:169–88.
4. Basak RK. Botanical Survey of India. An Account of its Establishment, Development and Activities. New Delhi: Botanical Survey of India 1983.
5. Mantovani G. Exploring Borders. Understanding Culture and Psychology. London: Rootledge 2000.
6. Misra A, Rastogi K, Joshi SR. Whole grains and health: perspective for Asian Indians. J Assoc Physicians India 2009;57:155-62.
7. Aberoumand A. Preliminary assessment of nutritional value of plantbased diets in relation to human nutrients. Int J Food Sci Nutr. 2009;60(Suppl):155-62.
8. SlavinJL, Lloyd B. Health benefits of fruits and vegetables. Adv Nutr. 2012;3:506-16.
9. Van Duyn MA, Pivonka E. Overview of the health benefits of fruit and vegetable consumption for the dietetics professional: selected literature. J Am Diet Assoc 2000;100:1511-21.
10. APEDA. Agricultural and Processed Food Products Export Development Authority. New Delhi: Ministry of Commerce and Industry Government of India 2014.
11. Nagpal R, Behare PV, Kumar M, Mohania D, Yadav M, Jain S *et al.* Milk, milk products, and disease free health: an updated overview. Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr 2012;52:321-33.
12. Taylor RW, McAuley KA, Barbezat W, Strong A, Williams SM, Mann JI. APPLE Project: 2y findings of a community-based obesity prevention program in primary school age children. Am J Clin Nutr 2007;86:735-42.
13. Singh RB, Beegom R, Mehta AS, Niaz MA, De AK, Mitra RK *et al.* Social class, coronary risk factors and undernutrition, a double burden of diseases, in women during transition, in five Indian cities. Int J Cardiol 1999;69:139-47.