

Comparison of Nutritional Status among Rural and Urban Govt. School Boys of Varanasi District

Rakesh kumar singh *

*Physical Education Teacher (Madhyamic Sheikha Parisad, Utter Pradesh)
(Received 09 January 2014 – Accepted & Published 19 January 2014)

Abstract

Background: The purpose of the study was comparison of Nutritional Status among Rural and Urban Govt. school boys of Varanasi District

Methods: The subject was selected from various rural and urban govt. schools of East Varanasi District and their age ranged between 14 to 17 years Keeping the feasibility criterion in mind, Construction of nutrition status chart Bajra, Jowar, Maize, Rice Wheat, Ragi, Pulses, Bengal, Gram, Block Gram, Dhal, Lentil, Leafy Vegetable, Roots and Tubers, Other Vegetable, the data was analyzed descriptive analysis

Results: The statistical analysis of data in relation to various nutritional status, i.e. Protein, Fat, Carbohydrate, Vitamin A, Vitamin C, iron, Calcium and Calories revealed the fact t-value 3.752 & 2.226 Carbohydrate & Calories intake was significant at 0.05 level with dfM.98, Also, t-values 0.096, 1.770, .467, .952, 1.144, 1.954 respectively for Protein, Fat, Calcium, Iron, Vitamin A & Vitamin C do not differ significantly at 0.05 level with df=1.98.

Keywords: Cereals, Pulses, Leafy Vegetable, Roots and Tubers, Other Vegetable

INTRODUCTION:

Nutrition is concerned primarily with the part played by nutrients in body growth development and maintenance. The word nutrient or "food factor" is used for specific dietary constituents such as proteins, vitamins and minerals. Dietetics is the practical application of the principles of nutrition; it includes the planning of meals for all. Good nutrition means maintaining a nutritional status that enables us to grow well and enjoy good health. The health is largely responsible for determining one's quality of life. The Health helps the children to pay attention to their own environments to make better healthy surroundings. Hence, the child must be taught and helped at an early age to improve his knowledge of health status. This is the responsibility of his teachers and parents. Modern Health education rarely needs to be depended but as school pupils, we should understand why it is needed and be able to explain both its need, its value to parent and others. Let us review health needs and possibilities. A final reason is that habits affect health and schools can help to develop health habits. The relation between habits and health is clear. Athletic training, gives us evidence of the effect on health of a change of habits. Read the training of boxers for reducing weight and getting with conditions.

Objective of the study:

The study was delimitation to 100 the subject was selected from various rural and urban govt. schools of East Varanasi District and their age ranged between 14 to 17 years.

Administration of Nutritional Status Chart:

The copies of the nutritional status chart were mailed to 90 Govt. school students with the request that they should give correct and accurate answer and send the completed nutritional status chart to the investigation by post at their earliest by their convenience.

Nutritional variables

- ❖ Cereals,
- ❖ Pulses
- ❖ Leafy Vegetable
- ❖ Roots and Tubers
- ❖ Vegetable

Limitations

1. No special nutrition was given to subject and any different food in it was considered as limitation of the study.
2. Economic status of the subject may not be considered.

METHODOLOGY

For the purpose of the study total number of 100 was selected from various rural and urban govt. schools of East Varanasi District and their age ranged between 14 to 17 years.the Nutritional Status Chart was use studing measuring. The data pertaining to the nutritional status of Government school students of Varanasi District were collected by administration of the nutritional status chart. An assurance was given to keep all the received information confidential. Finally the research scholar collected the data by personally visiting each school.

Statistical technique

In order to compare the nutritional status of rural & urban governmental schools of Varanasi District. Independent 't'-test was applied & level of significance was set at .05 Descriptive analysis was used to analyze the data in mean Stand deviation, df. comparison of Nutritional Status among Rural and Urban Govt. school boys of Varanasi District.

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Table-1: Comparison of Nutritional Status (Protein) of Rural and Urban Governmental Schools Students of Varanasi District

Nutritional components	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t-value
Protein	rural	45	102.9200	107.22043	88	.096
	urban	45	98.6360	278.62019		

***Significant at 0.05 level with df=88 Tab 105 (88)= 1.98**

It is evident from table-1 that t values is 0.096 which is not significant at 0.05 level with df=1.98. This shows that there is no significant difference exists between rural and urban school students in relation to their protein intake.

Table- 2: Comparison of Nutritional Status (Fat) of Rural and Urban Governmental Schools Students of Varanasi District

Nutritional components	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t-value
fat	Rural	45	520.3446	1521.79870	88	1.170

	urban	45	228.4515	696.13970	
--	-------	----	----------	-----------	--

***Significant at 0.05 level with df=88 , Tab 105 (88)= 1.98**

It is evident from table-2 that t values is 1.170 which is not significant at 0.05 level with df=1.98. This shows that there is no significant difference exists between rural and urban school students in relation to their fat intake.

Table- 3: Comparison of Nutritional Status (Carbohydrate) of Rural and Urban Governmental Schools Students of Varanasi District

Nutritional components	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t-value
Carbohydrate	Rural	45	738.7945	780.80071	88	3.752*
	urban	45	243.5036	417.66952		

***Significant at 0.05 level with df=88 Tab 105 (88)= 1.98**

It is evident from table-3 that t-value is 3.752 which significant at 0.05 level with dfM.98. It reveals that there is significant difference of Carbohydrate intake among rural & urban Govt.

Table- 4: Comparison of Nutritional Status (Calcium) of Rural and Urban Governmental Schools Students of Varanasi District

Nutritional components	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t-value
Calcium	Rural	45	1031.6424	892.26230	88	.467
	urban	45	846.9648	2500.49480		

***Significant at 0.05 level with df=88 Tab_{t,05}(88)=1.98**

It is evident from table-4 that t values is 0.467 which is not significant at 0.05 level with df=1.98. This shows that there is no significant difference exist between rural and urban school students in relation to their Calcium intake.

Table- 5: Comparison of Nutritional Status (Iron) of Rural and Urban Governmental Schools Students of Varanasi District

Nutritional components	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t-value
Iron	Rural	45	487.9234	1136.41217	88	.952
	urban	45	297.1302	717.16844		

*** Significant at 0.05 level with df=88 Tab t_{.05} (88)= 1.98**

It is evident from table-5 that t values is 0.952 which is not significant at 0.05 level with df=1.98. This shows that there is no significant difference exist between rural and urban school students in relation to their Iron intake.

Table- 6: Comparison of Nutritional Status (Vitamin-C) of Rural and Urban Governmental Schools Students of Varanasi District

Nutritional components	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t-value
Vitamin C	Rural	45	11077.7363	57274.89266	88	1.144
	urban	45	1308.6932	1818.88934		

****Significant at 0.05 level with df=88 Tab_{t,05}(88)=1.98**

It is evident from table-6 that t values is 1.144 which is not significant at 0.05 level with df=1.98. This shows that there is no significant difference exist between rural and urban school students in relation to their Vitamin C intake.

Table- 7: Comparison of Nutritional Status (Vitamin-A) of Rural and Urban Governmental Schools Students of Varanasi District

Nutritional components	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t-value
Vitamin A	Rural	45	1800.5222	3033.32705	88	1.954
	urban	45	729.0952	2080.98475		

***Significant at 0.05 level with df=88 ,Tab t₀₅ (88)= 1.98**

It is evident from table-7 that t values is 1.954 which is not significant at 0.05 level with df=1.98. This shows that there is no significant difference exist between rural and urban school students in relation to their Vitamin A intake.

Table- 8: Comparison of Nutritional Status (Calories) of Rural and Urban Governmental Schools Students of Varanasi District

Nutritional components	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t-value
Calories	Rural	45	2486.6380	1992.85619	88	2.226
	urban	45	1592.4945	1813.69786		

***Significant at 0.05 level with df=88 Tab t₀₅ (88)= 1.98**

It is evident from table-8 that t-value is 2.226 which significant at 0.05 level with df=1.98. It reveals that there is significant difference of Carbohydrate intake among rural & urban Govt., schools students of various district.

Discussion of Findings

The statistical analysis of data in relation to various nutritional status, i.e. Protein, Fat, Carbohydrate, Vitamin A, Vitamin C, iron, Calcium and Calories revealed the fact t-value 3.752 & 2.226 Carbohydrate & Calories intake was significant at 0.05 level with dfM.98, Also, t-values 0.096, 1.770, .467, .952, 1.144, 1.954 respectively for Protein, Fat, Calcium, Iron, Vitamin A & Vitamin C do not differ significantly at 0.05 level with df=1.98.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the statistical findings following conclusions have been drawn:

1. The analysis of data revealed that there was significant difference among in relation to Carbohydrate calories among rural & urban school students and rural students had greater calorie & carbohydrate intake.
2. The statistical finding also revealed that there were no significant difference in relation to fatty protein, Vitamin A & C, Iron & Calcium among rural and urban school students.

References:

- Bucher Charles A.,(1986). *Function of Physical Education* (Saint Louis, The Mosby Company).
Emmet Halt L., (1992). *Food, Health and Growth* (Newyork the Mac Millan Company).
Falkner Frank and Tanner J.M., (1986). *Methodology and ecological, genetic. and nutritional effects on growth*, 2nd ed. Volume 3, New York, Plenum Press.