

## Dietary Diversity and Nutritional Status of Academic Staffs of Federal Polytechnic, Ilaro, Ogun State.

Amoda Oyefunmilayo S.<sup>1</sup>, Olajide Bolanle R.<sup>1</sup>, Sosanya Samuel K.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Nutrition and Dietetics, College of Food Science and Human Ecology, Federal University of Agriculture, P.M.B. 2240, Abeokuta, Ogun State, Nigeria.

---

**Abstract:** Dietary diversity is associated with household or individual food availability and intake of nutrients from different food groups and is an essential component of the nutritional outcome. Since there is insufficient data on dietary diversity and nutrient intake adequacy among academic staff, this study was conducted to assess the dietary diversity, nutrient intake adequacy, and nutritional status of the academic staff of Federal Polytechnic, Ilaro, Ogun State, Nigeria. The study design was a cross-sectional design. The sample consisted of 100 academic staff. A semi-structured questionnaire was used to determine the socio-economic/demographic characteristics of the respondents, such as age, gender, marital status, the highest level of education attained, religion, and income level. Nutrient intakes were estimated from 24-hour dietary recalls and analyzed using Nutri-Survey software. Dietary Diversity Score (DDS) was created and categorized per the number of food groups consumed in the 24 hours preceding the study. Dietary Diversity Score was categorized as low DDS, consumption below 6 food groups, minimum DDS (6-10 food groups), and high DDS (11-15 food groups). Nutrient adequacy ratio (NAR) of energy was computed and categorized as low intake (intake < 60%), adequate intake (60%-80%), and high intake (80%-100%). Anthropometric measurements using weight and height to determine BMI and waist circumference to determine the risk of abdominal obesity were carried out to determine nutritional status. Data were analyzed using SPSS to determine descriptive and inferential variables. Statistical significance was established at  $p < 0.05$ . Majority (58%) of the respondents were male. Prevalence of overweight and obesity among the respondents was 37% and 11%, respectively. 23% of the respondents were at high risk of abdominal obesity. A more significant proportion of the respondents (77%) had minimum DDS, and 6% had a high DDS. Also, most (65%) of the respondents had an excess nutrient intake, 21% had Adequate intake, and 14% had inadequate intake. There was no statistically significant association between the dietary diversity and nutritional status of the respondents. More respondents consumed cereals, white roots, tubers, vegetables, legumes, oil and fats, spices, and condiments than other food groups twenty-four (24) hours preceding the study. Prevalence of overweight and obesity in this study was higher than in previous studies. Therefore, Individuals should diversify their diet and eat more from other food groups and engage in enough physical activity to help reduce the rising prevalence of overweight and obesity.

**Keywords:** Dietary Diversity; Nutritional Status; Nutrient Adequacy; Academic Staff; Polytechnic.

---

Date of Submission: 10-11-2021

Date of Acceptance: 26-11-2021

---

### I. Introduction

Physiological, social, cultural, psychological, genetic, metabolic, and behavioral factors influence poor nutritional status; a chronic condition [1]. The prevalence of poor nutritional status and adult obesity increases rapidly due to environmental and behavioral changes [2]. Imbalanced energy intake with energy expenditure and sedentary lifestyles causes over nutrition, which has been shown to lead to increased absenteeism from work, reduced productivity, chronic diseases, and reduced lifespan [3]. Obese workers were twice as likely to be less active and be absent from work than non-obese normal-weight workers [4].

Consumption of various foods in the diet is essential to ensure an adequate intake of diverse nutrients. Dietary diversity is referred to as a simple count of food items or food groups used in the household or by the individual over a reference period [5]. Dietary diversity can be used as a proxy measure of the nutritional quality of the diet and for the access dimension of household food security [6]. Urbanization is associated with several unhealthy dietary changes, such as increased saturated and trans fats, sugars, salt, and processed foods [7]. These dietary changes are occurring rapidly in developing countries and earlier stages of economic and social development. As a result, the global burden of obesity and other non-communicable diseases is shifting towards the poor [8].

Academic Staffs constitute a significant fraction of the Nigerian workforce [9]. Academic staff as described by [10], are sedentary workers due to their work which allows for more sitting during the day, thereby

allowing for little physical activity. The prevalence of obesity was reported at 31.7% and 16.3% using waist circumference and Body Mass Index (BMI) respectively among Nigerian adults in Rivers State [11].

Several reports have shown significant benefits in productivity if adequate nutrition is ensured [12, 13]. Hunt reported that maintaining the normal nutritional status of populations can raise national productivity levels by 20% [14]. Despite all these pieces of evidence, few nutrition studies in Nigeria have focused on adults generally and staff specifically. Aside from being adults, evaluation of the nutritional status of staff is vital as many studies have reported that academic staffs have a more significant potential to influence a student's health than any other person outside the student's home [15]. For staff to serve as positive nutrition role models, they must understand and practice a healthy lifestyle and make healthy dietary choices that will ultimately reflect their good nutritional status and health. Studies have also shown that dietary diversity is strongly associated with nutrient intake adequacy [16].

As a result of this, coupled with the paucity of data on dietary diversity and nutrient intake adequacy among academic staff, this study was conducted to assess the dietary diversity and nutritional status of the academic staff of Federal Polytechnic, Ilaro, Ogun State, Nigeria.

## **II. Material And Methods**

### **2.1 Study design**

The study was a descriptive and cross-sectional study.

### **2.2 Study Area and Study Population**

#### **2.2.1 Study Area**

The study was conducted in Federal Polytechnic, Ilaro, Ogun State. It is a higher institution of learning established by decree No 33 of July 25, 1979, and became opened to students on November 15, 1979. It is located along Oja-Odan Road, about 3km from Ilaro Township and about 60km from Idiroko, a Nigerian border town with the Republic of Benin. Ilaro town itself is an ancient town landlocked between Lagos and Abeokuta, the capital of Ogun State.

#### **2.2.2 Population of the study**

The target study population includes all the academic staff of Federal Polytechnic, Ilaro, Ogun State. At the time of the study, the institution's total population of academic staff was Three Hundred and Twelve (312).

### **2.3 Sample Size and Sampling Technique**

#### **2.3.1 Sample size**

From the total population of the study target (312), 30% of academic staff was selected following Mugenda and Mugenda [17] procedure. A sample of 10-30% of the total population is considered reliable. Thus, the sample size was calculated as follows, and respondents were drawn from the population:

$30\% \times 312 = 94$  which was approximated to 100 participants.

#### **2.3.2 Sampling Technique**

Respondents were selected using a multi-stage sampling technique. The first stage involved a random selection of three schools out of the five schools in the Polytechnic by balloting. The second stage involved the random selection of three departments each from each of the schools, while in the third stage, respondents were selected randomly based on the population of respondents in each school.

### **2.4 Inclusive and exclusion criteria (criterion)**

Only willing academic staff participated in the study, while pregnant staff and those with medical ill-health were excluded from the study. However, a total of 100 staff gave their informed consent to participate in the study after the study's objective has been explained to them.

### **2.5 Materials and Method of Data Collection**

#### **2.5.1 Materials for data collection**

The following were used in the data collection of the respondents

1. Semi-structured questionnaire
2. Bathroom scale
3. Measuring tape
4. Height meter
5. 24-hour dietary recall

#### **2.5.2 Method of Data Collection**

##### **Questionnaire**

A validated self-administered questionnaire was used to elicit relevant information on the respondents' socio-economic/demographic characteristics, such as age, gender, marital status, the highest level of education attained, religion, and income level.

Anthropometric measurements (weight, height, and waist circumference) were taken using standard procedures. The weight was taken with a bathroom weighing scale and the height with a height meter, while the waist circumference was taken with a measuring tape. These measurements were used to calculate the Body Mass

Index (BMI), the Waist circumference class and compared to standards [18]. The BMI calculated was classified as underweight (< 18.5kg/m<sup>2</sup>), normal weight (18.5-24.9kg/m<sup>2</sup>), overweight (25.0-29.9kg/m<sup>2</sup>) and obese (≥ 30kg/m<sup>2</sup>) using WHO classification [18]. The waist circumference class was also classified using the WHO classification [18]. For men, low risk of abdominal obesity (≤ 0.94), medium risk (0.94-1.02), and values >1.02 were at high risk. Women, on the other hand, were classified low risk as (≤ 0.80), medium risk (0.80-0.88), and high risk at > 0.88.

**24-hour Dietary Recall**

The 24-hour diet recall method is a dietary assessment tool that consists of a structured interview in which the subjects are asked to recall all the food and drinks consumed in the past 24 hours. The information was recorded, analyzed, and used to determine the nutrient intake adequacy and the dietary diversity score.

**2.6 Dietary Diversity Score Categorization**

Based on a 15-food group model designed by FAO [19], Dietary Diversity Score (DDS) was created and categorized per the number of food groups consumed in the 24 hours preceding the study. Dietary Diversity Score was categorized as low DDS, consumption below 6 food groups, minimum DDS (6-10 food groups), and high DDS (11-15 food groups).

According to Schaetzel [20], the Nutrient adequacy ratio (NAR) of energy is computed and categorized as low intake (intake < 60%), adequate intake (60%-80%), and high intake (80%-100%).

$$NAR = (\text{Nutrient intake} \div \text{Recommended intake}) \times 100$$

**2.7 Statistical Analysis**

Nutri Survey Software was used to convert food intake to nutrient intake. Actual nutrient intake was compared to the Recommended Dietary Allowances (RDA) [21].

Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, version 16.0) was used for data analysis. Descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, frequency, percentages) and inferential statistics (chi-square and correlation) were done.

**III. Result**

**3.1 Socio-demographic Characteristics of the respondents**

Table 2 shows that 58% males and 42% females took part in the study. Most (85%) of them were married with more than half (53%) between the age of 30-39years while 31% were between the ages of 40-49years. Most (85%) of them practiced Christianity and only 15% were Muslims. The highest level of education attained indicated that about 31% had MBA/MSC, 62% had HND/BSC while 7% PHD. Only 7% earned above N200,000 monthly while 69% earned between N100,000 – 200,000.

**Table no 1: Socio-demographic Characteristics of the respondents**

| Variables                      | Frequency | Percentage | Variables             | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------------------------------|-----------|------------|-----------------------|-----------|------------|
| <b>Age group</b>               |           |            | <b>Marital Status</b> |           |            |
| 20 – 29                        | 8         | 8.0        | Single                | 13        | 13.0       |
| 30 – 39                        | 53        | 53.0       | Married               | 85        | 85.0       |
| 40 -49                         | 31        | 31.0       | Separated/Divorced    | 2         | 2.0        |
| >50                            | 8         | 8.0        | <b>Religion</b>       |           |            |
| <b>Highest Education Level</b> |           |            | Christianity          | 85        | 85.0       |
| HND/BSC                        | 62        | 62.0       | Islam                 | 15        | 15.0       |
| MBA/MSC                        | 31        | 31.0       | <b>Income</b>         |           |            |
| PHD                            | 7         | 7.0        | 50000-99999           | 24        | 24.0       |
| <b>Gender</b>                  |           |            | 100000-200000         | 69        | 69.0       |
| Male                           | 58        | 58.0       | >200000               | 7         | 7.0        |
| Female                         | 42        | 42.0       |                       |           |            |

**3.2 Nutritional Status of Respondents**

As shown in Table 2, almost half (46%) of the respondents had normal body weight, 11% were obese, 37% were overweight and 6% were underweight. Using waist circumference classification, more than half (59%) of the respondents had low risk of abdominal obesity while 18% had moderate risk and 23% were at high risk of abdominal obesity.

**Table no 2: Nutritional Status of Respondents**

| Variables                          | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| <b>BMI (Kg/m<sup>2</sup>)</b>      |           |            |
| Underweight                        | 6         | 6.0        |
| Normal weight                      | 46        | 46.0       |
| Overweight                         | 37        | 37.0       |
| Obesity                            | 11        | 11.0       |
| <b>Waist Circumference</b>         |           |            |
| Low Risk of abdominal obesity      | 59        | 59.0       |
| Moderate Risk of abdominal obesity | 18        | 18.0       |
| High Risk of abdominal obesity     | 23        | 23.0       |

### 3.3. Dietary Diversity Score and Nutrient Adequacy Ratio

As shown in Table 3, a larger proportion of the respondents (77%) had minimum DDS and 6% of the respondents had a high DDS. Also, most (65%) of the respondents had excess intake of nutrient, 21% had Adequate intake and 14% had inadequate intake.

**Table no 3: Dietary Diversity Score and Nutrient Adequacy Ratio**

| Variables                       | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| <b>Dietary Diversity Score</b>  |           |            |
| Low Dietary Diversity Score     | 17        | 17.0       |
| Minimum Dietary Diversity Score | 77        | 77.0       |
| High Dietary Diversity Score    | 6         | 6.0        |
| <b>Nutrient Adequacy Ratio</b>  |           |            |
| Inadequate Intake               | 14        | 14.0       |
| Adequate Intake                 | 21        | 21.0       |
| Excess Intake                   | 65        | 65.0       |

### 3.4 Food groups consumed and Nutrient Adequacy Ratio

Table 4 shows that there was no significant relationship between the Nutrient Intake Adequacy and consumption of foods from all the food groups.

**Table no 4 : Foods groups consumed and Nutrient Adequacy Ratio**

| Food groups                   | Inadequate intake<br>n (%) | Adequate<br>Intake<br>n (%) | Excess<br>Intake<br>n (%) | Total<br>n (%) | P-value |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|---------|
| Cereals                       | 13 (13.0%)                 | 20 (20.0%)                  | 61 (61.0%)                | 94(94.0%)      | 0.995   |
| White roots & Tubers          | 10 (10.0%)                 | 12 (12.0%)                  | 39 (39.0%)                | 61(61.0%)      | 0.671   |
| Vitamin A- Rich<br>Vegetables | 7 (7.0%)                   | 11 (11.0%)                  | 32 (32.0%)                | 50(50.0%)      | 0.969   |
| Other<br>vegetables           | 14 (14.0%)                 | 21 (21.0%)                  | 63 (63.0%)                | 98(98.0%)      | 0.577   |
| Vitamin A- rich fruits        | 3 (3.0%)                   | 3 (3.0%)                    | 4 (4.0%)                  | 10(10.0%)      | 0.171   |
| Other Fruits                  | 1 (1.0%)                   | 3 (3.0%)                    | 7 (7.0%)                  | 11 (11.0%)     | 0.799   |
| Organ Meats                   | 3 (3.0%)                   | 2 (2.0%)                    | 6 (6.0%)                  | 11 (11.0%)     | 0.405   |
| Flesh Meat                    | 5 (5.0%)                   | 11 (11.0%)                  | 31 (31.0%)                | 47(47.0%)      | 0.615   |
| Eggs & Poultry                | 7 (7.0%)                   | 4 (4.0%)                    | 23 (23.0%)                | 34(34.0%)      | 0.154   |
| Fish                          | 6 (6.0%)                   | 16 (16.0%)                  | 36 (36.0%)                | 58(58.0%)      | 0.113   |

|                                |            |            |            |              |       |
|--------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|-------|
| Legumes, Nuts and Seeds        | 8 (8.0%)   | 10 (10.0%) | 22 (22.0%) | 40(40.0%)    | 0.197 |
| Milk & Milk Products           | 6 (6.0%)   | 3 (3.0%)   | 20 (20.0%) | 29(29.0%)    | 0.164 |
| Oils & Fats                    | 14 (14.0%) | 21 (21.0%) | 63 (63.0%) | 98(98.0%)    | 0.577 |
| Sweets                         | 7 (7.0%)   | 8 (8.0%)   | 33 (33.0%) | 48(48.0%)    | 0.592 |
| Spices, Condiments & Beverages | 14 (14.0%) | 21 (21.0%) | 65(65.0%)  | 100 (100.0%) | ----- |

### 3.5 Association between Dietary Diversity Score, Nutritional Status and Nutrient Adequacy Ratio

As shown in Table 5, the dietary diversity score did not significantly affect the nutritional status of the respondents. Also, there was no significant relationship between the Nutrient Adequacy Ratio (NAR) of all the participants and their Dietary Diversity Score. Out of the 37 respondents that were overweight, 26 (70.3%) of them had minimum DDS and 2 (5.4%) had high DDS and 9 (24.3%) had low DDS.

**Table no 5: Association between Dietary Diversity Score, Nutritional Status and Nutrient Adequacy Ratio**

| Variables                      | Low DDS<br>n (%) | Minimum DDS<br>n (%) | High DDS<br>n (%) | Total | P-value |
|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-------|---------|
| <b>Body Mass Index</b>         |                  |                      |                   |       | 0.592   |
| Underweight                    | 0 (0.0%)         | 5(83.3%)             | 1 (16.6%)         | 6     |         |
| Normal                         | 6 (13.0%)        | 38(82.6%)            | 2 (4.3%)          | 46    |         |
| Overweight                     | 9 (24.3%)        | 26 (70.3%)           | 2 (5.4%)          | 37    |         |
| Obese                          | 2 (18.2%)        | 8 (72.7%)            | 1 (9.1%)          | 11    |         |
| <b>Nutrient Adequacy Ratio</b> |                  |                      |                   |       | 0.498   |
| Inadequate Intake              | 1 (7.1%)         | 12(85.7%)            | 1 (7.1%)          | 14    |         |
| Adequate Intake                | 3 (14.3%)        | 18(85.7%)            | 0 (0.0%)          | 21    |         |
| Excess Intake                  | 13 (20.0%)       | 47 (72.3%)           | 5 (7.7%)          | 65    |         |

## IV. Discussion

The respondents of this study consist of more males (58%) than females (42%). The higher male to female ratio in the study is similar to the study among the staff of federal polytechnic, Ilaro, Ogun state by Adebayo et al., [22]. The educational status of the respondents showed that most are well educated with qualifications of B.Sc./HND, M.Sc./MBA, and Ph.D. The high level of education reported could also be because the study was carried out in a tertiary institution that is expected among the staff. However, the reverse was the case among public-sector workers in Angola, where there was a low education level in 34.6% of the respondents of study despite working in an institution of higher education [23].

The BMI result was higher than the result obtained from a study in Maiduguri, which reported a prevalence of 8.1%; 22.8% for obesity and overweight, but similar to findings in Lagos with (22.2% obesity and 32.7% overweight [24]. These higher values in the subject of study could be attributed to the perceived sedentary nature of their work. Certain occupations characterized by sitting for long periods predispose individuals to sedentary lifestyles, and these individuals spend most of their adult working lives less engaged in physical activity [25]. Abdominal obesity determined by waist circumference of the respondents recorded in this study was lower than a study carried out by Fadupin et al. [9] on teachers in Nigeria, which majority of the teachers (60.3%) in this study had abdominal obesity. This difference is due to a high percentage of the respondents being female compared to this study, in which most of the respondents are male.

A majority (77%) of the respondents had a minimum dietary diversity. This result is against the study by Akinlua et al. [26] among undergraduate students, which observed that most participants had a poor dietary diversity score. This minimum diversity could be associated with the employment status of our respondents. They can diversify their diet to some extent as they have a regular source of income. The mean Dietary Diversity Score (DDS) from the study was  $7.89 \pm 1.54$ . This is higher than other studies by Jayawardena et al. [27], which recorded  $6.35 \pm 1.55$  among adults, and Kiboi et al. [28], which recorded  $6.84 \pm 1.46$  among pregnant women. This difference in the mean maybe as a result of the educational levels among our respondents. This could also be due to the difference in the locations. As recorded, most of the respondents had higher education. This supports other studies indicating that educational level influences dietary diversity [28, 29]. As an individual's educational level increases, their knowledge about food choices increases, and they tend to diversify their diet.

The mean energy intake of the respondents recorded in this study shows that most (65%) of them had an excess intake. It has been stated that the group mean intake of most nutrients must exceed the reference values to achieve an acceptably low prevalence of inadequate nutrient intake [30]. This indicates that the respondents' nutrient intake is adequate, which might be the result of variation in the diet of the study population. Studies have shown that a diverse diet is a proxy for nutrient intake adequacy [16, 31, 32].

The respondents' diet of this study mainly consisted of cereals, spices, condiments and beverages, vegetables, oils and fats, other vegetables, white roots, and tubers but a poor intake of fruits and Milk products which conforms with the study of Oladoyinbo et al. [5]. There is no significant association between the food groups consumed and the nutrient adequacy of the respondents.

This study recorded no statistically significant association between dietary diversity and nutritional status, but most respondents (82.6%) had a minimum dietary diversity and a normal weight. This indicates no association between diversity in diet and nutritional status, which is in contrast with other findings suggesting that dietary diversity is associated with the nutritional status of adults [33]. This difference could be attributed to the difference in study types. The study conducted by Steyn and McHiza [33] was a systematic review, whereas the present study employed a cross-sectional study design. In other related studies, the authors did not determine an association between dietary diversity and nutritional status [34, 35].

Furthermore, there was no statistically significant association between nutrient intake adequacy and dietary diversity score, which contrasts with the study conducted by Oladoyinbo et al [5] who reported a significant association between the respondents' nutrient adequacy and dietary diversity score.

## V. Conclusion

The majority of the respondents had a minimum dietary diversity score. More respondents consumed foods from the following food groups; cereals, white roots, tubers, vegetables, legumes, oil and fats, spices, and condiments than other food groups; fruits, milk and meats, twenty-four (24) hours preceding the study. The prevalence of overweight and obesity in this study is 37% and 11%, respectively. The majority of the respondents had their estimated nutrient intake adequacy for energy above the RDA. Dietary diversity was not associated with nutritional status, and there was no association between dietary diversity and nutrient intake adequacy. The generalization of these findings is limited to this study setting because the findings need to be interpreted considering that the study setting is a higher institution of learning and may not be similar to the general society. However, Individuals should diversify their diet and engage in enough physical activity to help reduce the rising prevalence of overweight and obesity. Government and other agencies should intensify intervention efforts to educate the public on good nutrition to improve good health. Therefore, there is a need for further study in this area to determine nutrient intake adequacy for all nutrients and its association with dietary diversity and nutritional status.

## Acknowledgement

We express our sincere thanks to the school authorities in Federal Polytechnic, Ilaro and the academic staff for their cooperation and agreement to participate in the study. during the data collection for this survey.

## References

- [1]. Kelly T, Yang W, Chen C-S, Reynolds K, He J. Global burden of obesity in 2005 and projections to 2030. *Int J Obes* 2005. 2008 Sep;32(9):1431–7
- [2]. Laavanya, M., Sadeera, S., Premachandra,W. , Priyangani, T. , Dahanaka, D., et al. Factors associated with the nutritional status of adults in Batticaloa district *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications* 2017, Volume 7, 69 ISSN 2250-3153
- [3]. Haas, J. D. and Brownlie, T. Iron deficiency and reduced work capacity: a critical review of the research to determine a causal relationship. *The Journal of Nutrition*,2001; 131(2), 676S-690S.and Related Disorders. 2009;7(3):221–230
- [4]. Wolf, A. M. and Colditz, G. A. Current estimates of the economic cost of obesity in the United States. *Obesity research*, 1998; 6(2), 97-106.
- [5]. Oladoyinbo C., Ugwunna U. And Ekerette N. Dietary diversity and nutrient intake adequacy among women in Iwo local government area, Osun state Nigeria. *Afr. J. Food Agric. Nutr. Dev.* 2017; 17(4): 12641-12656.
- [6]. Steyn NP, JH. Nantel G, Labadarios D. Food variety and dietary diversity scores in children: Are they good indicators of dietary adequacy? *Public Health Nutrition*. 2006;9(5):644-650.
- [7]. Nupo S, Oguntona CRB, Onabanjo OO. Dietary diversity scores and nutritional status of women in two seasons in rural areas of Ogun State, Nigeria. *Nutrition and Food Science*. 2012;42(5):355-361.
- [8]. Popkin BM, Gordon-Larsen P. The nutrition transition: Worldwide obesity dynamics and their determinants. *International Journal of Obesity*. 2004; 28: S2-S9. American Diabetes Association. Standards of medical care in diabetes. *Diabetes Care*. 2009;32(supplement 1): S13–S61.
- [9]. Fadupin G., Adeoye A. & Ariyo, O. Lifestyle and Nutritional Status of Urban School Teachers in Ibadan, Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Nutritional Sciences* 2014; Vol. 35 No. 1
- [10]. Pobebe, R.A., Plahar, W.A. and Owusu, W.B. Association between Anthropometry and Blood Pressure among Female Teachers of Child-Bearing Age in Ghana. *Journal of Biology, Agriculture and Healthcare* 2013; 3(3), 197-208.
- [11]. Siminialayi, I. M., Emem-Chioma, P. C, and Dapper, D. V. The prevalence of obesity as indicated by BMI and waist circumference among Nigerian adults attendingfamily medicine clinics as outpatients in Rivers State. *Nigerian Journal of Medicine*, 2008; 17(3), 340-345.

- [12]. Demment, M. W., Young, M. M. and Sensenig, R. L. Providing micronutrients through food-based solutions: a key to human and national development. *The Journal of Nutrition*, 2003, 133(11), 3879S-3885S.
- [13]. Chopra, M. and Darnton-Hill. Responding to the crisis in sub-Saharan Africa: the role of nutrition. *Public Health Nutrition* 2006; 9(5), 544-550.
- [14]. Hunt, I. The potential impact of reducing global malnutrition on poverty reduction and economic development. *Asia Pacific Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 2005; 14: 10-38.
- [15]. Prelip, M., Erausquin, J. X, Slusser, W., Vecchiarelli, S., Weightman, H., Lange, L., and Neumann, C. The Role of Classroom Teachers in Nutrition and Physical Education. *Californian Journal of Health Promotion* 2006; 4(3), 116-127
- [16]. Torheim LE, Barikmo I, Parr CL, Hatloy A, Ouattara F and A Oshaug Validation of food variety as an indicator of diet quality assessed with a food frequency questionnaire for Western Mali. *Eur. J. Clin. Nutr.* 2003; 57: 1283– 1291.
- [17]. Mugenda, O.M. and Mugenda, A.G. *Research Method: Qualitative and Quantitative approaches*. Nairobi, African Centre for Technology Studies (ACTS) press 2009.
- [18]. World Health Organization. Waist circumference and Waist-Hip ratio. Report of a WHO expert consultation, Geneva, 8-11 December 2008. World Health Organization: Geneva, Switzerland 2011. [https://www.who.int/nutrition/publications/obesity/WHO\\_report\\_waistcircumference\\_and\\_waisthip\\_ratio/en/](https://www.who.int/nutrition/publications/obesity/WHO_report_waistcircumference_and_waisthip_ratio/en/)
- [19]. Kennedy G, Ballard T and M Dop Guidelines for measuring individual and household dietary diversity. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Rome 2011; 1-60.
- [20]. Schatzel T Dietary Diversity and Nutritional outcomes: Agriculture and Nutritional Global Learning and Evidence exchange (N-GLÉE) USAID and SPRING 2012. DOI: 10.18697/ajfand.80.16280.12654.
- [21]. Recommended Dietary Allowances [www.biology-pages.info/R/RDAs.html](http://www.biology-pages.info/R/RDAs.html) Accessed 26/12/2016.
- [22]. Adebayo, Y. O, Odunfa, O. M Akinsanya, O. B, and John, E. P. Risk factors of cardiovascular diseases among staff of Federal Polytechnic, Ilaro, Ogun state. *Journal of Dietitians Association of Nigeria (JDAN)* Volume 11 Number 2. December, 2020
- [23]. Capingana, D.P., Magalhães, P., Silva, A.B.T., Gonçalves, M.A.A., Baldo, M.P., Rodrigues, S.L., Simões, C.C.F., Ferreira, A.V.L. and Mill, J.G. Prevalence of Cardiovascular Risk Factors and Socioeconomic Level among Public-Sector Workers in Angola. *Bio Med Central Public Health* 2013; 13: 732. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-13-732.
- [24]. Chukwuonye, I. I., Chuku, A., John, C., Ohagwu, K. A., Imoh, M. E., Isa, S. E., Ogah, O. S. and Oviasu, E. Prevalence of Overweight and Obesity in adult Nigerians – a systematic review. *Diabetes, Metabolic Syndrome and Obesity: Targets and Therapy* 2013; 6:43-47.
- [25]. Addo, P.N.O., Nyarko, K.M., Sackey, S.O., Akweongo, P. and Sarfo, B. Prevalence of obesity and overweight and associated factors among financial institution workers in Accra Metropolis, Ghana: a cross sectional study. *BMC Research Notes* 2015; 8:599. doi:10.1186/s13104-015-1590-1.
- [26]. O.A.J. Akinlua, Dietary diversity score and nutritional status of undergraduates in south west Nigeria, *J. Obes. Weight Loss Ther.* s4 (2014).
- [27]. R. Jayawardena, N.M. Byrne, M.J. Soares, P. Katulanda, B. Yadav, A.P. Hills, High dietary diversity is associated with obesity in Sri Lankan adults: an evaluation of three dietary scores, *BMC Publ. Health* 13 (2013) 314.
- [28]. W. Kiboi, J. Kimiywe, P. Chege, Determinants of dietary diversity among pregnant women in Laikipia County, Kenya: a cross-sectional study, *BMC Nutr.* 3 (2017) 12.
- [29]. M. Das, Measures, spatial profile and determinants of dietary diversity: Evidence from India, in: SSRN Scholarly Paper, Social Science Research Network, Rochester, NY, 2014. <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract/42511823>. (Accessed 25 December 2018).
- [30]. Acham H, Oldewage-Theoren WH and AA Egal Dietary diversity, micronutrient intake and their variation among black women in informal settlements in South Africa: A cross-sectional study. *Int. J. Nutr. Metab.* 2011; 4(2): 24-39.
- [31]. Rathnayake KM, Madushani P and K Silva Use of dietary diversity score as a proxy indicator of nutrient adequacy of rural elderly people in Sri Lanka. *BMC Res Notes.* 2012; 5: 469-74.
- [32]. Ruel MT Operationalizing dietary diversity: a review of micronutrient issues and research priorities. *J. Nutr.* 2003; 133: 391 1–26.
- [33]. N.P. Steyn, Z.J. McHiza. Obesity and the nutrition transition in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.*, 1311 (2014), pp. 88-101.
- [34]. A. Wemakor, J. Laari. Association between household dietary diversity and nutritional status of children (6–36 months) in Wenchi Municipality, Brong Ahafo Region, Ghana. *Nutrire*, 43 (2018), p. 22.
- [35]. Z.N. Bukania, M. Mwangi, R.M. Karanja, R. Mutisya, Y. Kombe, L.U. Kaduka, et al. Food insecurity and not dietary diversity is a predictor of nutrition status in children within semi-arid agro-ecological zones in eastern Kenya. *J. Nutr. Metabol.* (2014).

Amoda Oyefunmilayo S, et. al. “Dietary Diversity and Nutritional Status of Academic Staffs of Federal Polytechnic, Ilaro, Ogun State.” *IOSR Journal of Nursing and Health Science (IOSR-JNHS)*, 10(06), 2021, pp. 19-25.