Maria del Carmen Bisi Molina<sup>1</sup> Pilar Monteiro Lopéz<sup>11</sup> Carolina Perim de Faria<sup>111</sup> Nágela Valadão Cade<sup>1</sup> Eliana Zandonade<sup>11</sup>

- <sup>1</sup> Departamento de Enfermagem. Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo (UFES). Vitória, ES, Brasil
- Departamento de Antropología Física. Faculdad de Biología. Universidad Autónoma de Madrid. Madrid, Espanha
- Programa de Pós-Graduação em Saúde Pública. Escola Nacional de Saúde Pública. Fundação Oswaldo Cruz. Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brasil
- Ⅳ Departamento de Estatística. UFES. Vitória, ES, Brasil

### **Correspondence:**

Maria del Carmen Bisi Molina UFES, Centro de Ciências da Saúde Av. Marechal Campos, 1468 – Maruípe 29040-090 Vitória, ES, Brasil E-mail: mdcarmen@npd.ufes.br

Received: 8/30/2009 Approved: 4/9/2010

Article available from: www.scielo.br/rsp

# Socioeconomic predictors of child diet quality

# ABSTRACT

**OBJECTIVE:** To develop a diet quality index and to analyze socioeconomic factors associated with low child diet quality.

**METHODS:** A cross-sectional study was performed with a representative sample of 1,282 children aged between seven and ten years, living in the city of Vitória, Southeastern Brazil, in 2007. Children were randomly selected from 26 public schools and six private schools. Data on socioeconomic characteristics and life habits of children were obtained from a structured questionnaire, sent to homes and preferably completed by mothers. A food frequency questionnaire was created from studies performed with Brazilian children and tested in a public school. An index entitled *Índice de Alimentação do Escolar* (ALES – School Child Diet Index) was designed to assess diet quality, taking in consideration the nutritional recommendations for the Brazilian population and the habit of having breakfast. The association between diet quality and socioeconomic factors was analyzed using multinomial logistic regression. Adjusted odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals were estimated for the variables that remained in the model.

**RESULTS:** According to the ALES index, approximately 41% of the children studied had low diet quality (boys= 37.7%, girls= 42.7%, p=0.179). There were no significant differences between sex, age, maternal employment status and living with the mother and diet quality. The variables that remained associated with low diet quality were low maternal level of education (OR= 3.93; 95% CI: 2.58;5.99), father not present in the household (OR= 2.03; 95% CI: 1.68;2.99) and not having lunch at the table (OR= 1.47; 95% CI: 1.12;1.93).

**CONCLUSIONS:** Low maternal level of education increased the probability of a child not consuming a good quality diet, whether due to lack of access to healthy foods and adequate information or poorer ability to discern what is healthy.

**DESCRIPTORS:** Child Nutrition. Indicators. Feeding. School Feeding. Socioeconomic Factors. Cross-Sectional Studies.

### INTRODUCTION

Different assessment methods are used to study the relationship between diet and diseases.<sup>23</sup> Indices are recommended to evaluate diet quality, because they are based on specific nutritional recommendations<sup>8,19</sup> and also enable a single measure to provide a global assessment and knowledge about characteristics.<sup>7</sup> Thus, indices allow a faster and more adequate diagnosis of the conditions that predispose the early appearance and development of chronic diseases in a certain context. In Brazil, although food intake questionnaires<sup>1</sup> have been developed and validated, no indices have been proposed to evaluate child diet quality, as already performed in other countries.<sup>19</sup>

Socioeconomic, demographic and cultural factors associated with diet quality have also been the object of studies, in addition to those related to feeding practices. Household income and maternal level of education are among the socioeconomic factors used to determine diet quality.9,22 With regard to feeding practices, studies indicate a positive association between the habit of having breakfast (first morning meal) and general health, especially in terms of preventing weight excess and child obesity,<sup>10</sup> in view of the importance of this meal in regulating food intake throughout the day.24 Although the relationship between not having breakfast and the risk of weight excess is well-known, there is evidence that this practice has decreased in Western children.<sup>20</sup> In the Spanish population, Serra et al<sup>18</sup> showed that obesity is higher in children who do not have breakfast, regardless of the caloric intake. In this study, the habit of having breakfast was incorporated into an index to evaluate child diet quality.

The present study aimed to develop an index of child diet quality and analyze the socioeconomic factors associated with poor diet quality.

## METHODS

A cross-sectional study was performed with 1,282 school children aged between seven and ten years (538 boys and 744 girls), enrolled in grades one through four of elementary education in 26 public schools and six private schools (99% coverage) during the Projeto Saúde e Nutrição de Escolares (Saúdes - School Children Nutrition and Health Project) in the city of Vitória, Southeastern Brazil, in 2007. In Vitória, approximately 20% of children enrolled in the first grade of primary education are in private schools. Two-stage cluster sampling was performed, where the school was the primary unit and the class was the secondary unit. Data were stratified according to type of school (public or private), sex (male and female) and age (seven, eight, nine and ten years). A total of 40 children per school was defined using the optimum number criterion,<sup>21</sup> which reduces costs of direct child access, compared to school access, and considers the intraclass correlation of students of the same school.

Socioeconomic data and life habits were obtained from a structured questionnaire sent to the child's home and preferably completed by the mother or possible caregivers, when the former is absent. Information about child diet was obtained from a food frequency questionnaire (FFQ) with 18 food items, based on studies performed with children<sup>14</sup> or adolescents<sup>4</sup> in Brazil. Fish consumption frequency was included into the FFQ, because this is a typical food in this region and because it is part of the recommendations for the Brazilian population.<sup>a</sup> Concomitantly with the data collection, a study of reproducibility of the FFQ was performed with a sub-sample, similar to the Projeto Saúdes in terms of child sex and age group (n=91). A moderate (kappa between 0.6 and 0.8) or very good agreement (kappa >0.8) was obtained for practically all FFQ foods. According to Willet,23 corresponding values of about 0.6 and 0.8 are considered good dietary assessment instruments. Foods that did not achieve an agreement equal to or higher than 0.6 were not included in the analysis, such as "cold cuts" and "cooked tubers". In addition, "rice" and "beef/chicken" were not included because they do not discriminate this group's regular diet.

An indicator known as Índice de Alimentação do Escolar (ALES - School Child Diet Index) was developed to evaluate diet quality, based on the frequency of consumption of 15 food items and that of having breakfast. This proposal was developed based on a similar study performed with children and adolescents in Spain,19 which was not reproduced in Brazil. A score was given to each specific frequency, according to the FFQ structure (Table 1). Scoring (positive or negative) was based on the healthy diet directives recommended by the Brazilian Ministry of Health.<sup>a</sup> For foods/food groups recommended to be eaten daily, one point was added when foods such as fruits, vegetables, beans and milk were consumed daily. In the case of consumption lower than seven times a week (two to four times a week, depending on the food/food group), one point was subtracted. In addition, one point was added for consumption of items considered to be of low nutritional quality, such as candies, soft drinks, fried foods, instant noodles, hamburgers and mayonnaise, two times a week or less; while one point was subtracted when such were consumed daily. No value was given to frequencies not shown in Table 1.

Individual frequency values were added and distributed into tertiles, thus comprising three food quality categories: < 3, poor quality; between  $3 \ge$  and < 6, average quality;  $\ge$  6, good quality.

The following variables were analyzed to study the socioeconomic factors associated with the ALES Index: socioeconomic class (A, B, C, D and E), based on the level of education of the head of family and ownership of assets;<sup>b</sup> maternal level of education (illiterate and/ or incomplete primary education, secondary education and higher education); maternal employment status (working out of home, unemployed or housewife); child ethnicity (white and non-white); child age (seven,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Ministério da Saúde. Guia alimentar para a população brasileira. Brasília, DF; 2006.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup> Associação Nacional das Empresas de Pesquisa de Mercado / Associação Brasileira dos Institutos de Pesquisa de Mercado. Critério de Classificação Socioeconômica Brasil (CCSEB). São Paulo; 1997.

eight, nine and ten years); child sex (male and female); whether the child lives with the father (yes or no) and place where meals are eaten (at the table or not).

Socioeconomic class was regrouped into three categories: A/B, C and D/E, due to the small number of families in socioeconomic classes A (n=34) and E (n=18). Interviewers were trained to identify ethnicity and thus classify children into white and non-white. Children were assessed during anthropometric tests, performed in the school environment and classified by two different evaluators. In the case of disagreement, classification was made by a third evaluator and agreement between two assessments was recorded.

Qualitative variables were shown in percentages and the chi-square test ( $\chi^2$ ) was used to test the hypothesis of homogeneity of proportions. Next, multivariate analysis was made, with the use of multinomial logistic regression procedures. The dependent variable was diet quality (ALES Index), whose condition identified as "good quality" was the reference category. Variables were included when having a 5% significance level, used for any of the response-variable categories. Data were analyzed using the SPSS statistical package, version 17.0.

Of all the 1,637 families who authorized their children to participate in this study, 336 (20.5%) were not present in its second stage (completion of questionnaire sent to homes) and 19 questionnaires were excluded in the quality control stage. Thus, data from 1,282 children were obtained and evaluated, and the outcomes of the Projeto Saúdes were assessed according to such. The present study was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the Centro de Ciências da Saúde da Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo (Process 089/06, approved on 26/10/2006). Parents authorized their children's participation by signing an informed consent form, sent to their homes before data were collected in the school.

## RESULTS

A mean value of ALES Index equal to 4.3, (SD= 3.5), minimum and maximum values of -9 and 14, were found, respectively. Table 2 shows the relationship between the socioeconomic variables studied and diet quality. Significant differences were observed between diet quality and the following variables: ethnicity, socioeconomic class, head of family, maternal level of education, whether child lives with father and whether child eats at the table (p<0.001).

It could be observed that 521 (40.6%) children consumed a diet of poor quality; 311 (24.3%), one of average quality; and 450 (35.1%), one of good quality. There were no statistically significant differences between child sex, child age, maternal employment status and whether the child lived with the mother in the same home and diet quality.

Table 3 shows the results of multinomial logistic regression. The variables that remained associated with poor diet quality were as follows: low maternal level of education (OR=3.93; 95% CI: 2.58;5.99), father absent from home (OR=2.03; 95% CI 1.68;2.99), and not eating lunch at the table (OR=1.47; 95% CI: 1.12;1.93). It should be emphasized that the mother being illiterate or not having completed primary education increases the probability of a child having a poor diet quality by approximately four times and this risk decreases with the increase in level of education.

**Table 1.** Frequency and respective score of food consumption and the habit of having breakfast in children. City of Vitória, Southeastern Brazil, 2007.

Southeastern Brazil, 2007.	
Eats fruits daily	+1
Eats raw vegetables daily	+1
Eats cooked vegetables daily	+1
Eats beans daily	+1
Drinks milk daily	+1
Eats fish at least once a week	+1
Eats candies two times a week or less	+1
Eats cookies two times a week or less	+1
Drinks soft drinks two times a week or less	+1
Does not eat hamburgers or rarely eats them	+1
Eats fried snacks two times a week or less	+1
Eats French fries, fried cassava or fried bananas one time a week or less	+1
Does not eat mayonnaise or rarely eats it	+1
Does not eat instant noodles or eats it rarely	+1
Eats breakfast daily	+1
Drinks natural juice daily	+1
Eats fruits two times a week or less	-1
Eats raw vegetables less than four times a week	-1
Eats cooked vegetables less than four times a week	-1
Eats beans less than two times a week	-1
Drinks milk less than four times a week	-1
Eats fish less than once a week	-1
Eats candies daily	-1
Eats cookies daily	-1
Drinks soft drinks daily	-1
Eats hamburgers daily	-1
Eats fried snacks daily	-1
Eats French fries, fried cassava and fried bananas daily	-1
Eats mayonnaise daily	-1
Eats instant noodles daily	-1
Does not usually have breakfast	-1

# DISCUSSION

In the present study, socioeconomic factors such as maternal level of education, father present in the home and child not eating at the table increase the risk of a child consuming a diet of poor quality. Such factors are associated with family structure and the modern urban way of life.

With regard to the variables associated with child diet quality, it could be inferred that the socioeconomic conditions of families greatly determine the diet

Table 2. Characterization of the sample studied,	according to child	diet quality (ALES	S Index). City of Vité	ria, Southeastern
Brazil, 2007.				

VariableProvePoorKorregetCoordpyaluenn%n%n%m%m%m%Ser113842.020337.713424.920137.41Male53842.0203137.713424.920137.4132.528.613031.713424.920137.4132.532.613332.713424.920137.4132.532.633.633.733.623.633.633.733.633.633.733.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.633.6<		То	Total			Diet quality (ALES Index)				
Sex         0.179           Male         538         42.0         203         37.7         134         24.9         201         37.4           female         74         58.0         318         42.7         177         23.8         249         33.5           Age (years)         0.568         7         252         19.7         103         40.9         69         27.4         80         31.7           8         359         28.0         141         39.3         82         22.8         136         37.9           9         360         28.1         142         39.5         85         23.6         133         6.9           10         311         24.3         135         43.4         75         24.1         101         32.5           Ethnicity         0.001         31.5         129         30.8         104         24.8         186         44.4           Non-white         832         66.5         376         45.2         201         24.2         250         0.601           A/B         262         23.3         68         26.0         66         25.2         128         48.8           <	Variable	10			Poor		Average		bod	p-value
Male53853842.050357.713424.920.157.4Female74458.031.842.717723.824933.5Age (years)90090000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000 </td <td></td> <td>n</td> <td>%</td> <td>n</td> <td>%</td> <td>n</td> <td>%</td> <td>n</td> <td>%</td> <td></td>		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Fendel7454.054.054.076.3.19.3.5Age (years)76.3.219.710.340.96.96.7.48.031.776.3.025.219.710.340.96.96.7.48.031.783.0.028.014.139.36.92.2.813.03.03.01.0103.1124.313.543.47.524.110.13.01.01011.124.313.512.03.0.81.024.110.13.01.010.111.124.313.512.03.0.81.024.110.13.01.010.111.124.313.512.03.0.81.024.110.13.01.010.1Non-white41.92.3.512.03.0.81.024.11.02.01.010.1Non-white12.02.3.36.82.0.16.612.212.84.81.01.010.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.110.1 <t< td=""><td>Sex</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>0.179</td></t<>	Sex									0.179
Age (vers)0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000	Male	538	42.0	203	37.7	134	24.9	201	37.4	
7       252       19.7       103       40.9       69       27.4       80       31.7         8       359       28.0       141       39.3       82       22.8       136       37.9         9       360       28.1       142       39.5       85       23.6       133       36.9         10       321       24.3       132       33.4       75       24.1       103       36.9         White       419       33.5       129       30.8       104       24.8       186       44.4         Non-white       832       66.5       376       45.2       201       24.2       255       30.6         Socioeconomic class	Female	744	58.0	318	42.7	177	23.8	249	33.5	
835928.014139.38222.813637.9936028.114239.58523.613336.91031124.313543.47524.110132.5Ethniciy83.537.645.220124.225530.6Non-white83266.537.645.220124.225530.6Socioeconomic class7564.625.212848.8C39435.112868.625.212848.8C39435.112868.615.213647.7D/E47.838.017736.310722.813932.2Father48738.017736.310722.813932.2Mother3132.613039.41442.4618.2Mother3132.613339.41442.4618.2Incomplete primary education35027.817755.46718.89225.8Complete primary education25119.611445.45823.17931.5Incomplete primary education25119.617534.017730.016436.0Mother31627.819.755.46718.89225.825.8Incomplete primary education2	Age (years)									0.568
936028.114239.58523.613336.91031124.313543.47524.110132.5Ethnicity33.512633.610424.816644.4Non-white41933.512732.620.024.846.044.4Non-white41933.51286820.024.846.046.046.0Socioecommic class75.010025.414637.146.026.016025.212848.8O // E37.014837.510025.414637.167.026.027.020.041.0O // E37.014837.510025.414637.167.037.037.041.737.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.037.0	7	252	19.7	103	40.9	69	27.4	80	31.7	
1031124.331534.47524.110132.5EthnicityV81930.512930.810424.816444.4Non-white41930.512030.810424.818644.4Non-white8060.560.662.270.848.86Socieeconomic class12623.36860.060.025.414637.1A / B6231.414837.510024.414848.8C10441.624.448.013.220.341.627.8D/E46731.014.837.510022.430.847.9Head of familyVV36.31072220.341.7Mother43133.617736.31072220.341.7Mother43133.617036.510230.810742.440.4Mother3123.614142.68826.610230.8107Incomplete primary education25.612.613.014.445.45823.17931.5Incomplete primary education25.613.614.445.45823.17931.5Incomplete primary education26.113.614.613.714.624.536.134.640.1Incomplete primary education26.113.6	8	359	28.0	141	39.3	82	22.8	136	37.9	
Ethicity0.001White4193.351.293.081.042.4.81.864.4.4Non-white8.226.553.662.622.102.4.22.553.0.6Socieeconomic class8.22.3.36.66.62.5.41.8.64.6.7A / B2.622.3.31.683.7.12.5.41.302.5.41.6.63.7.1D/F4.673.1.61.6.72.4.81.3.02.5.41.6.63.7.1D/F4.674.6.72.4.48.0.71.3.21.0.12.5.41.6.63.7.1Heard6.674.1.62.4.48.0.71.3.21.0.12.5.41.0.13.7.1Hather4.673.0.77.73.6.31.072.22.0.34.1.71.0.1Mother3.12.5.81.1.13.2.61.0.23.0.21.0.21.0.21.0.2Grandparent3.12.5.81.1.13.2.61.0.23.0.21.0.21.0.21.0.2Incomplete primary education3.5.12.5.81.1.13.0.21.0.23.0.21.0.21.0.21.0.2Incomplete primary education3.5.63.6.13.7.43.7.53.7.43.7.53.7.43.7.53.7.4Incomplete primary education3.6.13.6.13.6.13.6.13.7.43.7.43.6.13.7.43.6.1Incomplete primary education3.6.1 <t< td=""><td>9</td><td>360</td><td>28.1</td><td>142</td><td>39.5</td><td>85</td><td>23.6</td><td>133</td><td>36.9</td><td></td></t<>	9	360	28.1	142	39.5	85	23.6	133	36.9	
White41933.512930.810424.818644.4Non-white83266.537645.220124.225530.6Socieeconomic class74.866.737.666.752.212.848.8C34435.114837.666.764.712.848.770.0D/E46746714.848.011.024.213.027.460.0Head of family33.619036.510232.813.932.2Father48738.017736.31072220.341.7Mother43133.619036.510232.813.932.2Grandparent332.61339.41442.4618.2Complete primary education3527.817.755.46718.89225.8Complete primary education25119.611445.45823.17935.1Incomplete primary education25119.611445.45823.17935.1VesMather17.15525.14924.415052.5Secondary education45635.615534.013734.840.1NoA01010.445.45823.840.140.1Mether17.15525.1	10	311	24.3	135	43.4	75	24.1	101	32.5	
Non-white83266.537645.220124.225530.6Socioeconomic class <td>Ethnicity</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.001</td>	Ethnicity									0.001
Socioeconomic class0.001A / B26223.36826.06625.212848.8C39435.114837.510025.414637.1D / E46741.62448.011324.213027.8Head of family55510022.220.341.7Father48738.017736.310722.220.341.7Mother3132.613036.510232.813932.2Grandparent3326.613139.41442.66018.2Others/undefined3125.814142.68826.610230.8Mother3125.814145.45823.17931.5Complete primary education35627.819755.46718.89225.8Complete primary education25119.611445.45823.17931.5Secondary education25119.611445.45823.17931.5VersKight education25119.614016012440.130.016430.0No40131.619849.410725.762.930.130.130.130.130.1VersKight education19.614.819.025.725.925.120.1 <td< td=""><td>White</td><td>419</td><td>33.5</td><td>129</td><td>30.8</td><td>104</td><td>24.8</td><td>186</td><td>44.4</td><td></td></td<>	White	419	33.5	129	30.8	104	24.8	186	44.4	
A / BCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCC <thc< th="">CCCCC&lt;</thc<>	Non-white	832	66.5	376	45.2	201	24.2	255	30.6	
C39435.114837.510025.414637.1D/E46741.622448.011324.213027.8Heat6ramily5510230.51072220341.7Father48733.619036.510232.813932.2Grandparent332.61339.41442.4618.2Others/undefined3312.613142.68826.610230.8Maternal level of education55.417755.46718.89225.8Complete primary education35627.819755.46718.89225.5Secondary education45635.615534.013730.016436.0Higher education21917.15525.14922.415525.7No40131.619849.410726.79623.9Kigher education40131.619849.410726.79623.9No68968.432036.820123.134840.1No86968.432036.820123.134840.1No86968.432036.820.123.134.836.1No86968.432036.820.123.134.836.1No	Socioeconomic class									0.001
D/E46741.622448.011324.213027.8Heat of family55556.001Father48738.017736.31072220341.7Mother43133.619036.510232.813932.2Grandparent332.61339.41442.4618.2Others/undefined33125.814142.68826.610230.8Maternal level of education55.117555.46718.89225.8Complete primary education35627.819755.46718.89225.8Complete primary education25119.611445.45823.17931.5Eives with the father21917.15525.14922.411552.5Kives with the father17.15525.14923.440.140.1No6063.632036.820.123.436.140.1No86963.74040.123.523.645.140.1No86963.74040.123.436.140.1No86963.74040.123.436.140.1No867.440.625.523.643.440.1No86.740.740.125.523.64	A / B	262	23.3	68	26.0	66	25.2	128	48.8	
Head of family0.001Father48738.017736.31072220341.7Mother43133.619036.510232.813932.2Grandparent332.61339.41442.4618.2Others/undefined3312.5814142.68826.610230.8Maternal level of education3562.7.819755.46718.89225.8Complete primary education25119.611445.45823.17931.5Secondary education21017.15525.14922.411552.5Higher education21917.15525.14922.411552.5Live- with the father17.15525.14923.134.840.1No40031631632036.820123.134.840.1Live- with the father17.15525.14923.134.840.1No40031.631.631.631.823.434.630.0Incomplete primary education16.631.631.631.821.431.6No30.016.431.631.631.631.731.831.431.6Vest16.832.016.731.631.631.631.631.631.631.6No <t< td=""><td>С</td><td>394</td><td>35.1</td><td>148</td><td>37.5</td><td>100</td><td>25.4</td><td>146</td><td>37.1</td><td></td></t<>	С	394	35.1	148	37.5	100	25.4	146	37.1	
Father       487       38.0       177       36.3       107       22       203       41.7         Mother       431       33.6       190       36.5       102       32.8       139       32.2         Grandparent       33       2.6       13       39.4       14       42.4       6       18.2         Others/undefined       331       2.5.8       141       42.6       88       26.6       102       30.8         Maternal level of education       356       27.8       197       55.4       67       18.8       92       25.8         Complete primary education       251       19.6       114       45.4       58       23.1       79       31.5         Econdary education       251       19.6       114       45.4       58       23.1       79       31.5         Lives with the father       219       17.1       55       25.1       49       22.4       115       52.5         Lives with the father       31.6       176       18.8       201       23.1       348       40.1         No       66       6.7       40.1       285       23.8       43.2       36.1         No <td>D / E</td> <td>467</td> <td>41.6</td> <td>224</td> <td>48.0</td> <td>113</td> <td>24.2</td> <td>130</td> <td>27.8</td> <td></td>	D / E	467	41.6	224	48.0	113	24.2	130	27.8	
Mother43133.619036.510232.813932.2Grandparent332.61339.41442.4618.2Others/undefined33125.814142.68826.610230.8Maternal level of education35627.819755.46718.89225.8Complete primary education25119.611445.45823.17931.5Secondary education21917.15525.14922.411552.5Higher education21917.15525.14926.734.840.1No40131.619849.410726.79623.9Lives with the father11693.347940.128523.843236.1No866.74046.52529.12124.46616.9No866.74046.52529.12124.466No866.74046.52529.12124.466Maternal employment status5118338.718323.429637.9Inemployed/temporary job23218.510846.56025.96427.660.14Housewife19.19740.46125.432.336.760.1425.4	Head of family									0.001
Grandparent       33       2.6       13       39.4       14       42.4       6       18.2         Others/undefined       331       25.8       141       42.6       88       26.6       102       30.8         Maternal level of education       356       27.8       197       55.4       67       18.8       92       25.8         Incomplete primary education       251       19.6       114       45.4       58       23.1       79       31.5         Complete primary education       251       19.6       114       45.4       58       23.1       79       31.5         Secondary education       456       35.6       155       34.0       137       30.0       164       36.0         Lives with the father        79       31.5       52.5       30.0       164       36.0         No       401       31.6       198       49.4       107       26.7       96       23.9         Lives with the mother        1196       93.3       479       40.1       285       23.8       432       36.1         No       86       6.7       40       46.5       25       29.1       21	Father	487	38.0	177	36.3	107	22	203	41.7	
Other Maternal level of education33125.814142.68826.610230.8Maternal level of education35627.819755.46718.89225.8Incomplete primary education25119.611445.45823.17931.5Secondary education45635.615545.013730.016436.0Higher education21017.15525.14922.411552.5Lives with the father5868.432036.820123.134840.1No40131.619849.410726.79623.9Lives with the mother5545.146.525.829.121.424.4No866.74046.525.29.121.424.4Maternal employment status53.210846.525.29.121.424.4Maternal employed/temporary job23.218.510846.56025.96427.6Housewife24019.19740.46125.482.934.234.2Has lunch at the table5939.817634.611422.421943.0No76960.234.344.619725.622.929.843.0	Mother	431	33.6	190	36.5	102	32.8	139	32.2	
Maternal level of education       356       27.8       197       55.4       67       18.8       92       25.8         Complete primary education       251       19.6       114       45.4       58       23.1       79       31.5         Secondary education       456       35.6       155       34.0       137       30.0       164       36.0         Higher education       219       17.1       55       25.1       49       22.4       115       52.5         Lives with the father       171       55       25.1       49       22.4       135       52.5         Yes       869       68.4       320       36.8       201       23.1       348       40.1         No       401       31.6       198       49.4       107       26.7       96       23.9         Lives with the mother       196       93.3       479       40.1       285       23.8       432       36.1         No       86       6.7       40       46.5       25       29.1       21       24.4         Maternal employment status       196       62.4       303       38.7       183       23.4       29.6       37.9	Grandparent	33	2.6	13	39.4	14	42.4	6	18.2	
Incomplete primary education       356       27.8       197       55.4       67       18.8       92       25.8         Complete primary education       251       19.6       114       45.4       58       23.1       79       31.5         Secondary education       219       17.1       55       25.1       49       22.4       115       52.5         Lives with the father       219       17.1       55       25.1       49       22.4       115       52.5         Ves       869       68.4       320       36.8       201       23.1       348       40.1         No       401       31.6       198       49.4       107       26.7       96       23.9         Lives with the mother       401       31.6       198       49.4       107       26.7       96       23.9         Lives with the mother       1196       93.3       479       40.1       285       23.8       432       36.1         No       86       6.7       40       46.5       25       29.1       21       24.4         Maternal employment status       1196       93.3       479       40.1       28.5       23.4       34.2 </td <td>Others/undefined</td> <td>331</td> <td>25.8</td> <td>141</td> <td>42.6</td> <td>88</td> <td>26.6</td> <td>102</td> <td>30.8</td> <td></td>	Others/undefined	331	25.8	141	42.6	88	26.6	102	30.8	
Complete primary education25119.611445.45823.17931.5Secondary education45635.615534.013730.016436.0Higher education21917.15525.14922.411552.5Lives with the father5525.14922.411552.5No40131.619849.410726.79623.90.001Veswith the mother119693.347940.128523.843236.1No866.74046.52529.12124.40.066Maternal employment status30.338.718323.429637.9Unemployed/temporary job23218.510846.56025.96427.640.2Has lunch at the table9740.46125.48234.2No65939.817634.611422.421943.00.001	Maternal level of education									0.001
Secondary education45635.615534.013730.016436.0Higher education21917.15525.14922.411552.5Lives with the father5525.14922.411552.5Yes86968.432036.820123.134840.1No40131.619849.410726.79623.9Lives with the mother119693.347940.128523.843236.1No866.74046.52529.12124.40.066Maternal employment status38.718323.429637.9Unemployed/temporary job23218.510846.56025.96427.6Has lunch at the table97.440.46125.48234.2No76960234347634.611422.421943.0	Incomplete primary education	356	27.8	197	55.4	67	18.8	92	25.8	
Higher education21917.15525.14922.411552.50.001Lives with the father0.001Yes86968.432036.820123.134840.1No40131.619849.410726.79623.9Lives with the mother28.523.843236.1No866.74046.52529.12124.4 </td <td>Complete primary education</td> <td>251</td> <td>19.6</td> <td>114</td> <td>45.4</td> <td>58</td> <td>23.1</td> <td>79</td> <td>31.5</td> <td></td>	Complete primary education	251	19.6	114	45.4	58	23.1	79	31.5	
Lives with the father       0.001         Yes       869       68.4       320       36.8       201       23.1       348       40.1         No       401       31.6       198       49.4       107       26.7       96       23.9         Lives with the mother       1196       93.3       479       40.1       285       23.8       432       36.1         Yes       1196       93.3       479       40.1       285       23.8       432       36.1         Yes       1196       93.3       479       40.1       285       23.8       432       36.1         No       86       6.7       40       46.5       25       29.1       21       24.4         Maternal employment status       506       62.4       303       38.7       183       23.4       296       37.9         Unemployed/self-employed       782       62.4       303       38.7       183       23.4       296       37.9         Housewife       240       19.1       97       40.4       61       25.4       82       34.2         Has lunch at the table       509       39.8       176       34.6       114       <	Secondary education	456	35.6	155	34.0	137	30.0	164	36.0	
Yes86968.432036.820123.134840.1No40131.619849.410726.79623.9Lives with the mother55523.843236.1Yes119693.347940.128523.843236.1No866.74046.52529.12124.4Maternal employment status55523.429637.9Unemployed/self-employed78262.430338.718323.429637.9Housewife24019.19740.46125.48234.2Has lunch at the table50939.817634.611422.421943.0No76960.234344.619725.622929.8	Higher education	219	17.1	55	25.1	49	22.4	115	52.5	
No       401       31.6       198       49.4       107       26.7       96       23.9         Lives with the mother       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5	Lives with the father									0.001
Lives with the mother       0.066         Yes       1196       93.3       479       40.1       285       23.8       432       36.1         No       86       6.7       40       46.5       25       29.1       21       24.4         Maternal employment status       5       5       29.1       21       24.4       0.068         Employed/self-employed       782       62.4       303       38.7       183       23.4       296       37.9         Housewife       232       18.5       108       46.5       60       25.9       64       27.6         Housewife       240       19.1       97       40.4       61       25.4       82       34.2         Maternal the table       509       39.8       176       34.6       114       22.4       219       43.0         Yes       509       39.8       176       34.6       114       22.4       219       43.0	Yes	869	68.4	320	36.8	201	23.1	348	40.1	
Yes119693.347940.128523.843236.1No866.74046.52529.12124.4Maternal employment status55523.429637.9Employed/self-employed78262.430338.718323.429637.9Unemployed/temporary job23218.510846.56025.96427.6Housewife24019.19740.46125.48234.2Has lunch at the table50939.817634.611422.421943.0No76960.234344.619725.622929.8	No	401	31.6	198	49.4	107	26.7	96	23.9	
No       86       6.7       40       46.5       25       29.1       21       24.4         Maternal employment status       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5	Lives with the mother									0.066
Maternal employment status       0.068         Employed/self-employed       782       62.4       303       38.7       183       23.4       296       37.9         Unemployed/temporary job       232       18.5       108       46.5       60       25.9       64       27.6         Housewife       240       19.1       97       40.4       61       25.4       82       34.2         Has lunch at the table       509       39.8       176       34.6       114       22.4       219       43.0         Yes       509       60.2       343       44.6       197       25.6       229       29.8	Yes	1196	93.3	479	40.1	285	23.8	432	36.1	
Employed/self-employed78262.430338.718323.429637.9Unemployed/temporary job23218.510846.56025.96427.6Housewife24019.19740.46125.48234.2Has lunch at the table50939.817634.611422.421943.0No76960.234344.619725.622929.8	No	86	6.7	40	46.5	25	29.1	21	24.4	
Unemployed/temporary job23218.510846.56025.96427.6Housewife24019.19740.46125.48234.2Has lunch at the table0.001Yes50939.817634.611422.421943.0No76960.234344.619725.622929.8	Maternal employment status									0.068
Housewife24019.19740.46125.48234.2Has lunch at the table0.001Yes50939.817634.611422.421943.0No76960.234344.619725.622929.8	Employed/self-employed	782	62.4	303	38.7	183	23.4	296	37.9	
Housewife24019.19740.46125.48234.2Has lunch at the table0.001Yes50939.817634.611422.421943.0No76960.234344.619725.622929.8		232	18.5	108	46.5	60	25.9	64	27.6	
Yes50939.817634.611422.421943.0No76960.234344.619725.622929.8	Housewife	240	19.1	97	40.4	61	25.4	82	34.2	
Yes50939.817634.611422.421943.0No76960.234344.619725.622929.8										0.001
		509	39.8	176	34.6	114	22.4	219	43.0	
Total 1,282 100 521 40.6 311 24.3 450 35.1	No	769	60.2	343	44.6	197	25.6	229	29.8	
	Total	1,282	100	521	40.6	311	24.3	450	35.1	

	Diet quality							
Variable	Po	oor	Average					
variable	Crude OR (95% Cl)	Adjusted OR (95% CI)	Crude OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR (95% Cl)				
Lives with the father								
No	2.24 (1.68;2.99)	2.03 (1.68;2.99)	1.93 (1.39;2.67)	1.85 (1.33;2.58)				
Maternal level of education								
Incomplete primary education	4.48 (2.98;6.71)	3.93 (2.58;5.99)	1.71 (1.08;2.70)	1.49 (0.93;2.39)				
Complete primary education	3.02 (1.96;4.64)	2.62 (1.68;4.08)	1.72 (1.07;2.77)	1.47 (0.09;2.39)				
Secondary education	1.98 (1.34;2.92)	1.85 (1.24;2.75)	1.96 (1.31;2.94)	1.78 (1.18;2.68)				
Has lunch at the table								
No	1.86 (1.43;2.41)	1.47 (1.12;1.93)	1.64 (1.22;2.20)	1.48 (1.09;2.01)				

 Table 3. Crude and adjusted odds ratios and confidence intervals of factors associated with child diet quality. City of Vitória,

 Southeastern Brazil, 2007.

consumed by the child, as observed in other studies.<sup>9,16</sup> In the present study, low maternal level of education increased the probability of a child having a diet of poor quality, probably because their level of education determines the ability to purchase healthier foods, in addition to access to adequate information. Moreover, mothers with more years of education are more likely to discern between what is in fact considered healthy food and what is not, in view of food companies' mass use of direct marketing of their products in all means of communication. There is evidence that the marketing of food products influences child dietary habits and choices,<sup>3</sup> which could lead to excessive weight gain.<sup>26</sup>

In addition, it has been observed that maternal level of education influences the perception that mothers have of their children's nutritional status. As a result, women with a lower level of education show a higher percentage of disagreement between their perception and the nutritional status measured,<sup>13</sup> which could be considered as another risk of obesity in children and future adults.<sup>2,11</sup> By not recognizing that their children are overweight or obese, mothers may not perform important actions to prevent excessive weight gain in preadolescence, which could result in greater problems in the short and medium terms, not only from a physical, but also psychological point of view. Probably, mothers who recognize their children's nutritional status more adequately can contribute to the maintenance of a healthy weight, even though, in certain situations, other risk factors may be present, such as genetic factors or other diseases. A study performed with mothers of children in this stage of life showed that those most concerned about their children's weight were the ones who least forced them to eat and most restricted the consumption of foods,12 among which low nutritional quality ones could be present.

On the other hand, the variables associated with family structure and way of life, such as the child living with the father in the same home and the child having a specific time and place to eat their meals, lead to lower probability of their having a low quality diet, in addition to the fact that watching television during meals changes caloric intake<sup>6</sup> and exposes children to a large amount of food marketing,<sup>17</sup> which could increase the risk of development of nutritional problems.

Although the absence of the father is a risk factor for a good quality diet, not subject to technical or political interventions, food choices also depend on how the family is structured and their values, regardless of the family make-up.<sup>5</sup> This, in its turn, reflects not only the access to healthier foods, which have a higher cost in Brazil, but also how certain traditional habits, considered to be healthier, change when exposed to other conditions, independently from income.

Thus, knowledge about child diet quality and the factors associated with it is very important to subsidize actions that promote a healthy life for both the parents/family members and the children, as the latter find themselves in a stage when they are easily influenced in a negative (television, friends, advertisements in school cafeterias) and positive way.<sup>15</sup> Childhood seems to be a stage of the life cycle when there are ideal conditions to change dietary habits and lifestyles, which, in their turn, can have repercussions on future healthier choices.

It is essential that the need of a child to have a specific time for meals, in an adequate place, be present, in addition to correct information about the diet, because eating in front of the television is probably unhealthier. Moreover, by doing this, children are more exposed to advertising at times when they could be in contact with other people, probably experiencing other practices. It should be emphasized that the length of time children are exposed to television is excessive, especially in Western societies.

One possible limitation to this study refers to the method of dietary assessment itself. If on the one hand the use of a short food frequency questionnaire has advantages over long versions, on the other hand this could lead to an underestimation of consumption of certain foods, once it is necessary to group several foods that are frequently consumed into a single item. In the case of children, this choice can be an advantage, in view of the protocol that can be followed with children, in the age group studied. In the present study, the mother or caregiver received written instructions on how to complete the FFQ, something that could reduce information bias. Nonetheless, the results of the study of reproducibility showed low agreement of two FFQ items, which were excluded from the proposed index.

Another limitation is the use of a questionnaire that only aims to provide information about the frequency of food items, not enabling food portions or food groups consumed throughout a certain period of time to be quantified. Thus, the instrument itself prevents the

### REFERENCES

- Assis MAA, Guimarães D, Calvo MCM, Barros MVG, Kupek E. Reprodutibilidade e validade de questionário de consumo alimentar para escolares. *Rev Saude Publica*. 2007;41(6):1054-7. DOI:10.1590/S0034-89102007000600022
- Baughcum AE, Chamberlin LA, Deeks CM, Powers SW, Whitaker RC. Maternal perception of overweight preschool children. *Pediatrics*. 2000;106(6):1380-6. DOI:10.1542/peds.106.6.1380
- Borzekowski DL, Robinson TN. The 30-second effect: an experiment revealing the impact of television commercials on food preferences of preschoolers. *J Am Diet Assoc*. 2001;101(1):42-6. DOI:10.1016/S0002-8223(01)00012-8
- Castro IRR, Cardoso LO, Engstrom EM, Levy RB, Monteiro CA. Vigilância de fatores de risco para doenças não transmissíveis entre adolescentes: a experiência da cidade do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil. Cad Saude Publica. 2008; 24(10):2279-88. DOI:10.1590/ S0102-311X2008001000009
- Chen JL, Kennedy C. Family functioning, parenting style, and chinese children's weight status. J Fam Nurs. 2004;10(2):262-79. DOI:10.1177/1074840704264021
- Francis LA, Birch LL. Does eating during television viewing affect preschool children's intake? *J Am Diet Assoc*. 2006;106(4):598-600. DOI:10.1016/j. jada.2006.01.008
- 7. Kant AK. Indexes of overall diet quality: a review. *J Am Diet Assoc*. 1996;96(8):785-91. DOI:10.1016/S0002-8223(96)00217-9
- Kranz S, Hartman T, Siega-Riz AM, Herring AH. A diet quality index for American preschoolers based on current dietary intake recommendations and an indicator of energy balance. *J Am Diet Assoc*. 2006;106(10):1594-604. DOI:10.1016/j. jada.2006.07.005
- 9. Kranz S, Findeis JL, Shrestha SS. Uso do Índice de Qualidade da Dieta Infantil Revisado para avaliar

comparison with recommendations that also consider the number of portions that should be consumed daily.

In addition, the results of the present study show the need to improve child diet quality, because, according to the ALES Index, the majority of these children consume a diet of poor or average quality, making it necessary to further promote the daily consumption of protective foods and healthy dietary habits. According to the World Health Organization (WHO),<sup>25</sup> low consumption of fruits and vegetables is one of the main factors that cause diseases worldwide.

Aiming to monitor child diet quality, the ALES Index could be used by health professionals and services, in addition to children's families, in view of the practicality and adequacy of this instrument in the Brazilian context.

a dieta alimentar de pré-escolares, seus preditores sociodemográficos e sua associação com peso corporal. *J Pediatr (Rio J)*. 2008;84(1):26-34. DOI:10.1590/S0021-75572008000100006

- Maffeis C, Provera S, Filippi L, Sidoti G, Schena S, Pinelli L, et al. Distribution of food intake as a risk factor for children obesity. *Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord*. 2002;24(1):75-80. DOI:10.1016/j.jada.2006.07.005
- Mamun AA, McDermott BM, O'Callaghan MJ, Najman JM, Williams GM. Predictors of maternal misclassifications of their offspring's weight status: a longitudinal study. *Int J Obes (London)*. 2008;32(1):48-54. DOI:10.1016/j.jada.2006.07.005
- May AL, Donohue M, Scanlon KS, Sherry B, Dalenius K, Faulkner P, Birch LL. Child-feeding strategies are associated with maternal concern about children becoming overweight, but not children's weight status. J Am Diet Assoc. 2007;107(7):1167-75. DOI:10.1016/j.jada.2006.07.005
- Molina MCB, Faria CP, Montero P, Cade NV. Correspondence between children's nutritional status and mothers' perceptions: a population-based study. *Cad Saude Publica*. 2009;25(10):2285-90. DOI:10.1590/S0102-311X2009001000018
- 14. Mondini L, Levy RB, Saldiva SRDM, Venâncio SI, Aguiar JA, Stefanini MLR. Prevalência de sobrepeso e fatores associados em crianças ingressantes no ensino fundamental em um município da região metropolitana de São Paulo, Brasil. *Cad Saude Publica*. 2007;23(8):1825-34. DOI:10.1590/S0102-311X2009001000018
- Osorio EJ, Weisstaub NG, Castillo DC. Desarrollo de conducta alimentaria en la infancia y sus alteraciones. *Rev Chil Nutr.* 2002;29(3):280-85. DOI:10.4067/ S0717-75182002000300002
- Patrick H, Nicklas TA. A review of family and social determinants of children's eating patterns and diet quality. J Am Coll Nutr. 2005;24(2):83-92.

- 17. Powell LM, Szczypka G, Chaloupka FJ. Exposure to food advertising on television among US children. Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med. 2007;161(6):553-60. DOI:10.1001/archpedi.161.6.553
- 18. Serra LM, Manno S, Ribas L, Gonzalvo B, Pérez C, Aranceta J. Desayuno y obesidad In: Serra Majem L, Aranceta J, eds. Desayuno y equilibrio alimentario. Estudio enKid. Barcelona: Masson S.A., 2000; 31-44.
- 19. Serra-Majem L, Ribas L, Ngo J, Ortega R, García A, Perez-Rodrigo C, Aranceta J. Food, youth and the Mediterranean diet in Spain. Development of KIDMED, Mediterranean Diet Quality Index in children and adolescents. Public Health Nutr. 2004;7(7):931-5. DOI:10.1079/PHN2004556
- 20. Siega-Riz AM, Popkin BM, Carson T. Trends in breakfast consumption for children in the United States from 1965 to 1991. Am J Clinical Nutrit. 1998:67(4):748S-56.

- 21 Silva NN. Amostragem probabilística. São Paulo: Edusp; 1998.
- 22. Thiele S, Mensink GBM, Beitz R. Determinants of diet quality. Public Health Nutr. 2004;7(1):29-37. DOI:10.1079/PHN2003516
- 23. Willet W. Reproducibility and validity of food frequency questionnaires. Willet W. Textbook of nutritional epidemiology. New York: Oxford University Press; 1998. p.101-47.
- 24. Woods SC, Seeley RJ, Porte Jr D, Schwartz MW. Signals that regulate food intake and energy homeostasis. Science. 1998;280(5368):1378-83.
- 25. World Health Organization. The world health report 2002: reducing risks, promoting healthy life. Geneva; 2002.
- 26. World Health Organization. Marketing food to children: the global regulatory environment. Geneva; 2004.

The present study was funded by the Fundo de Apoio à Ciência e à Tecnologia de Vitória (FACITEC – Vitória Technology and Science Support Fund/ 2006 Education Public Notice, process 8039627664/2007) and Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq - National Council for Technological and Scientific Development). Master's degree scholarship granted to CP Faria by FACITEC.

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest.