R. I. Wegmans School of Health and Nutrition

Abstract

Parents (n=356) of children participating in *Fuel for Fun*, a schoolbased culinary and physical activity intervention, completed online, tested surveys on BMI, socio-demographics and eating behaviors. A subset (n=83) completed ASA24 dietary assessment to obtain Healthy Eating Index (HEI). Participants who shopped with a grocery list "most of the time" or "almost always" were dichotomized versus those responding "sometimes/seldom/do not". Independent samples t-tests compared differences in eating behavior, HEI and BMI by grocery list use. Ordinary least squares regression models measured the association between shopping with a list and HEI or BMI controlling for covariates. Parents (mean age 38.0 ± 6.5 y) were mostly white, non-Hispanic (87%), female (87%), and highly educated. BMI was overweight/obese for 42%. Total HEI ranged from 22.0 - 77.4, mean 55.5 ± 12.4 SD; grocery list users reported higher HEI (n=62, mean 57.8±11.9 SD) relative to nonusers (n=20, mean 48.0 \pm 11.1 SD, p=0.002). No difference in mean BMI by use of grocery list was noted (p=0.10). Adjusted regression model indicated total HEI was higher among participants who consistently used a grocery list by 8.3 points (p=0.009), but use of a grocery list was not associated with BMI (p=0.11). Adopting routine use of grocery lists appears to be a feasible, low-tech, no-cost approach associated with higher dietary quality.

Objective

To examine the association between consistent use of a grocery list with baseline dietary quality and BMI among parent participants enrolled in Fuel for Fun, a year long, classroom based, culinary and physical activity intervention for 4th graders.

Figure. Parent Participation Flowchart



Using a Grocery List is Associated with Higher Diet Quality but not BMI in Parents of School-Aged Children. Elizabeth H. Ruder¹, Barbara A. Lohse¹, Diane C. Mitchell², Leslie Cunningham-Sabo³

Rochester Institute of Technology¹, The Pennsylvania State University², Colorado State University³

		Results										
ţ	 Parents of 4th graders in 8 participating schools (32 classrooms) received paper and electronic flyers announcing the study and a link to an online consent and survey. Parents interested in the dietary study component received a link to an online consent and were contacted by the Pennsylvania State University Diet Assessment Center. 		Table 1. Descriptive characteristics Table 2. Parent characteristics by grocery list use ¹									
Recruitmen			of parents with die baseline $(n-83)$	of parents with dietary data at baseline $(n=83)$			n	Range	Consistent	Inconsistent	p-value ²	
					n (%)				grocery list use, n=62	grocery list use, n=20		
			Gender		()							
			Female		72 (87)	T L o o l t lo o o	0.2	22.77	Me:	an (SD)	0.002	
			Race/ethnicity			Eating Index	83	22-77	57.8 (11.9)	48.0 (11.1)	0.002	
			White, non-Hispani	ic	72 (87)	Body Mass	83	16-48	219(52)	273(71)	0.097	
Data Collection			White, Hispanic	1	5 (6)	Index	05	10-40	24.9(3.2)	27.3 (7.1)	0.097	
	 The study was approved by IRBs at Colorado and Pennsylvania State Universities & the Rochester Institute of Technology. Parents completed the survey online using Qualtrics (Provo, UT) to provide sociodemographics, self-reported weight and height, current/ former SNAP, and the following target measurements: 		American Indian/A.	laskan Jultiple	6(/)	Eating	79	17-48	34.1 (7.0)	32.5 (8.3)	0.397	
			Age, years, Mean (SD))	38.0 (7)	Competence ³		1, 10	0 111 (7 10)			
			BMI categories			Fruit	83	1-8	4.8 (1.3)	4.4 (1.7)	0.301	
			Underweight		1 (1)	availability						
			Normal weight		47 (57)	Vegetable	83	2-9	6.6 (1.7)	7.1 (1.7)	0.282	
			Overweight		20(24) 15(18)	availability						
	Target Measurement	Instrument & Description	Education		15 (10)	Fruit &	83	5-18 12.0	12.0 (2.6)	13.3 (2.7)	0.057	
	Grocery List Use	How often do you shop with a grocery list? 5 response options: Do not, Seldom, Sometimes, Most of the time, Almost always. Ascertained as part of a validated 19-item survey about how individuals plan and fix food.	High school graduat	te	4 (5)	availability						
			Some college		15 (18)	¹ Participants report	ting using a	a grocery list "	"most of the time"	or "almost always" were cla	assified as	
			4-year college graduate34 (41)		consistent grocery list users, participants reported using a grocery list "sometimes", "seldom" or "do not" were classified as inconsistent grocery list users.							
			Post-graduate colleg	ge	30 (36)	² Assessed by independent sample t-tests ³ Eating competence missing for n=4 participants, all of whom were consistent grocery list users						
	11 1		Fating competent		44 (56)	Lucing competence	, millioning re					
	Healthy Eating Index	Dietary intake data for 24-hour recalls collected and analyzed using the Automated Self-Administered 24-hour (ASA24) Dietary Assessment Tool, versions 2011 & 2014. ¹	Use of grocery list ²		11 (50)			•	_		_	
	(HEI)		Most of the time		31 (38)	•Consistent use of a grocery list was associated						
			Almost always	st always 31 (38) With an increase in					HEI increase of 8.25 points,			
			Sometimes		independent of race, gender, education, SNAP							
	Eating Competence	Satter Eating Competence Inventory ² (ecSI 2.0). 16 items, 5	g Competence Inventory ² (ecSI 2.0). 16 items, 5 tions scored from 3 to 0. Possible score 0 - 48; SNAP participation		3(4)	particip	ation	, and ea	ating com	petence (Tab	ole 3).	
		response options scored from 3 to 0. Possible score 0 - 48;			1(1)	 Consistent use of a grocery list was not associated 						
		scores ≥ 32 indicate eating competence. Cronbach α 0.87.	Current SNAP parti	Current SNAP participant8 (10)Previous SNAP participant9 (11)Numericipant9 (10)		with BM	/II (p=	=0.11).				
			Previous SNAP part					·				
		Never participated i	n SNAP or n=4 participants	66 (80)								
Data Analysis			² Grocery list use missing for n	=1 participant								
	• Frequency of grocery list use was dichotomized into consistent ("most of the time/almost always") and inconsistent ("sometimes/seldom/do not").		Table 3 . Predicting HEI and BMI with a second sec		ith shopping list use: ordinary least-square regression model of							
			associations betw	veen sociou	emogra	mes, eating c	compet	ence, and	a grocery na	St use $(n=79)$		
	•HEI-2010 was calcula	EI-2010 was calculated by averaging up to 3 days of intake.		B-coefficient	r Standa	1EI rd Error 2-t	ailed P	B-coe	efficient St	BMI andard Error 2	-tailed P	
	•Descriptive character	istics were calculated and the primary predictor		0.25	2			p coc		1 <i>4 4</i>	0.110	
	Wariation in baseline characteristics by use of a grocery list was tested using		grocery list	8.25	3.	UO U	1.009	- 2	2.34	1.44	0.110	
			Female	0.61	3.	.78 ().872	-(0.22	1.78	0.900	
	• variation in Dasenne (t tosts	White/	3.27	8	.32 ().696	2	2.98	3.92	0.449	
	Soporate ordinary loa	i-itsis.	non-Hispanic									
	between grocery list 1	se and (1) dietary quality was measured by HFI	Highest degree of	0.36	1.	.55 ().816	0).15	0.73	0.835	
	and (2) BMI, after controlling for race/ethnicity, education, gender, eating competence, and SNAP participation.		Current or former	-8.41	3.	.27 0).013	2	2.07	1.54	0.184	
			SNAP participant									
			Eating competent	7.40	2.	.68 0).007	-3	3.59	1.26	0.006	
	• All allalyses were con	uucieu using SFSS (24.0, 2010; AIMONK, INTJ.	Results in bold are P< 0.05									
		Conclusions										
¹ Kirkp	atrick SI, Subar AF, Douglass D, Zimmer	Consistant	t lice of	2 aro	cerv list	TATOS	26600	iated w	ith a high	r		
2014;1 ² Lohse	00:233-40. B, Satter E, Horacek T, Gebreselassie T, G	diotomy quality but was not accorded with DNAT A least										
		Eunder	dietary quality, but was not associated with BMI. Adopting									
	This metarial is h	routine us	e ot gro	cery	lists appe	ears	to be	a teasib	le, low-tec	h,		



United StatesNational InstituteDepartment ofof Food andAgricultureAgriculture

Inis material is based upon work supported by the National Institute of Food and Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture, under award number 2012-68001-19603. Any opinions, findings, or recommendations in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the view of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.





no-cost approach associated with higher dietary quality.