

Adaptation of a Modified Diet Quality Index to Quantify Healthfulness of Food-Related Toy Sets

Jacqueline R Poston, BS¹ Rachel E Watkins², Stephanie Jilcott Pitts, PhD³, Virginia C. Stage, PhD, RDN⁴, and Suzanne Lazorick, MD, MPH³

¹Brody School of Medicine, ²Department of Biology, ³Department of Public Health, ⁴Department of Nutrition Science

Introduction:

- **Pretend play** is necessary to build various skills of development, including creativity, problem-solving, cognitive, and social skills.^{1,2}
- **Food-related toy sets** are often seen in settings such as preschools and childcare facilities (**Figure 1**).
- However, the nutritional quality represented by food-related toy sets currently on the market is unknown, and it is unclear whether these toy sets support or hinder positive messaging about healthy eating among young children.
- The first step in deepening our understanding is developing a tool capable of measuring the healthfulness of the food-related toys currently on the market.
- Therefore, the **OBJECTIVES** of this study were to examine (1) the construct validity of an adapted modified Diet Quality Index (*a*DQI) as a measure of the healthfulness of food-related toy sets for young children (3–8 years) and (2) the healthfulness of food-related toy sets.
- The modified DQI is a tool used in US national studies to quantify healthfulness of a child's dietary intake by scoring food and nutrients based on alignment with dietary guidelines.³

Jacqueline Poston Brody School of Medicine East Carolina University Greenville, North Carolina 27858 postonja18@students.ecu.edu



Figure 1. Children participating in pretend play with food related toy sets⁴



Figure 2. Examples of toy sets included and analyzed in this study.¹²⁻¹⁴

Methods:

- A standardized online search was used to identify toy sets (n=50) from 10 online well-known retailers of toys.
- Products included were intended for pretend play and contained toy food sets or items intended to create a meal (≥ 2 food groups) (Figure 2).
- Once selected, toy set contents were analyzed to determine the type and quantity (number of servings or portions) of foods, beverages, and meal preparation items included. FoodData Central and MyPlate.gov informed assignment of serving size, with recommended portions being those recommended for 4-year-old children.⁵⁻¹⁰
- Independent variables included retailer, price, total number of items, number of scored items, number of food categories included, whether food preparation items were included, number of food preparation items, total number of food servings, and number and percentage of total servings of each food category.
- To evaluate the nutritional content, we utilized the modified DQI, which includes 10 food group categories with a score ranging from 0 to 45 points (higher indicating better nutrition). Eight were scored from 0 to 5 points (dairy, proteins, vegetables, fruits, 100% fruit juices, sugarsweetened beverages, other added sugars, and salty snacks); two groups were scored from 0 to 2.5 points (whole and refined grains).¹¹
- We adapted the modified DQI by renaming the "other added sugars" category to "Desserts, treats and other added sugars," and scoring it as 10 points for 0 servings, 5 for 1 serving, and 0 for \geq 2 servings; for a total possible *a*DQI score of 50.
- Two researchers independently scored each toy set; any discrepancies were resolved to determine the final score.

Results:

- There was no significant difference in aDQI scores between retailers (p=0.7982).
- Table 1 shows the characteristics of the toy sets and aDQI scores. The mean aDQI scores. The mean aDQI score was 28.7 and price \$25.46. The average percent of total servings by food group demonstrated

a high prevalence of protein (32%) and refined grains (22%), higher percent vegetables than fruits (19% versus 7%), low percent of desserts (7%), and very low percent sugar-sweetened beverages (0.94%) and whole grains (0.17%)

Table 2 shows the parameter estimates, standard errors, and p-values for variables included in the linear regression model of association with the aDQI score. Regression analyses demonstrated a positive association between aDQI score and percentage of dairy, refined grains, protein, vegetables, and fruit and inverse association with percentage of desserts, sugar-sweetened beverages, and total number of servings.

Variables Adapted Modified Diet Quality Index Score	Mean	Standard Deviation 6.1	Median 29.4	Range	Quality Index Score	in the Adapte	a woalfied l	Jiet
	28.7			15.0 - 37.5	Predictor	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	p- value
Price	\$25.46	7.77	24.99	\$10.99 - \$49.99	Percentage of dairy	0.18509	0.05249	0.00
Number of Tools	2.0	2.3	1.0	0.0 – 10.0	Percentage of refined	0.12629	0.04720	0.01
Number of items	31.2	26.4	20.5	5.0 – 122.0	arains			
Percent Diary	9.1	13.1	4.5	0.0 - 64.0	Derecetere of proteine	0.44596		0.01
Percent Whole grain	0.2	1.2	0.0	0.0 - 15.1	Percentage of proteins	0.11580	0.04454	0.01
Percent Refined grain	21.9	15.1	20.5	0.0 – 57.0	Percentage of vegetables	0.16327	0.04573	0.001
Percent Protein	32.0	23.4	29.0	0.0 - 81.0	Percentage of fruits	0.27818	0.05806	<0.00
Percent Vegetable	18.6	19.2	14.0	0.0- 98.0	Percentage of desserts	-0.13374	0.06448	0.04
Percent Fruit	7.7	10.5	1.0	0.0 - 40.0		-0.44296	0.18193	0.02
Percent Dessert	7.0	12.3	0.0	0.0 - 64.0	Sweetened beverages			
Percent Sugar-Sweetened Beverage	0.9	2.5	0.0	0.0 - 11.0				
Total number of servings	21.1	21.9	13.6	2.8-109.3	Total number of servings	-0.13476	0.01974	<0.00

Adapted Modified Diet Quality Index Score	28.7	6.1	29.4	15.0 - 37.5		Predictor	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	p- value
Price	\$25.46	7.77	24.99	\$10.99 - \$49.99		Percentage of dairy	0.18509	0.05249	0.001
Number of Tools	2.0	2.3	1.0	0.0 – 10.0		Percentage of refined	0.12629	0.04720	0.01
Number of items	31.2	26.4	20.5	5.0 – 122.0		arains			
Percent Diary	9.1	13.1	4.5	0.0 - 64.0		Derecatere of proteine	0 1 1 5 9 6		0.01
Percent Whole grain	0.2	1.2	0.0	0.0 - 15.1		Percentage of proteins	0.11560	0.04454	0.01
Percent Refined grain	21.9	15.1	20.5	0.0 – 57.0		Percentage of vegetables	0.16327	0.04573	0.001
Percent Protein	32.0	23.4	29.0	0.0 – 81.0		Percentage of fruits	0.27818	0.05806	<0.001
Percent Vegetable	18.6	19.2	14.0	0.0- 98.0		Percentage of desserts	-0.13374	0.06448	0.04
Percent Fruit	7.7	10.5	1.0	0.0 – 40.0		Percentage of sugar- sweetened beverages	-0.44296	0.18193	0.02
Percent Dessert	7.0	12.3	0.0	0.0 - 64.0					
Percent Sugar-Sweetened Beverage	0.9	2.5	0.0	0.0 - 11.0					
Total number of servings	21.1	21.9	13.6	2.8-109.3		I otal number of servings	-0.13476	0.01974	<0.001

Discussion:

- Results showed that generally the food-related toy sets did not include sugar-sweetened beverages and whole grains but did include protein, vegetables, and refined grains.
- When compared with dietary recommendations, the average sets contained fewer fruits and far more protein than recommended, but the amounts of vegetables and grains in the toy sets were **similar** to federal recommendations.⁵
- When comparing what young children consume, prior literature demonstrates children are **not consuming** as many fruits, vegetables, whole grains, or protein as recommended.¹⁵
- Toys with higher aDQI scores were more likely to contain protein, dairy, refined grains, vegetables, and fruit, and less likely to contain desserts and sugarsweetened beverages, which indicates the aDQI score demonstrates construct validity.
- However, there are limitations to use of the DQI for this purpose, such as the lack of differentiation for starchy vegetables, fried vs. grilled proteins, and whole vs. white wheat in addition to the absence of a category for fats.¹⁶
- There is opportunity for toy manufacturers to make changes to improve the healthfulness in toy sets for young children, including switching from refined to whole grains, providing healthier protein choices, including more fruits and fewer desserts, and striving to ensure food-related toy sets are more representative of official dietary recommendations.
- **Future research** can explore the impact of the use of food-related toy sets on child's dietary behaviors.

References:







Jacqueline R. Poston, Rachel E. Watkins, Stephanie Jilcott Pitts, Virginia C. Stage, and Suzanne Lazorick. Childhood Obesity.