

NOVA University of Newcastle Research Online

nova.newcastle.edu.au

Burrows, Tracy L.; Lucas, Hannah; Morgan, Philip J.; Bray, James; Collins, Clare E., 'Impact evaluation of an after-school cooking skills program in a disadvantaged community: back to basics', Canadian Journal of Dietetic Practice and Research Vol. 76, Issue 3, p. 126-132 (2015)

Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.3148/cjdpr-2015-005

Accessed from: http://hdl.handle.net/1959.13/1306839

1 Abstract

Purpose: Few efficacious child obesity interventions have been converted into ongoing
community programs in the after school setting. The aim of this study was to evaluate the
impact of phase 2 of *Back to Basics* cooking club at a low income school with a relatively
high indigenous population of >10% on dietary behaviours and fruit and vegetable variety in
a population at risk of obesity.

Methods: Baseline and 3-month dietary intake and Social Cognitive Theory (SCT)
constructs were collected in children mean age 9 years, 61% female. McNemar tests were

9 used for comparison of proportions between categorical variables. Cohen's *d* was used to

10 compare effect sizes across different measures.

Results: Consumption of one or more fruit servings/day significantly increased from 41% to

12 67% (P=0.02, d=0.13) and the proportion of individuals consuming takeaway food less than

once per week also increased. The SCT constructs assessed within the current study improved significantly (P<0.01), with moderate to large effect sizes (d=0.33-0.78).

15 **Conclusion:** This study documents that a previous efficacious healthy lifestyle program can

16 be adapted for use as an obesity prevention program addressing improvements in vegetable

17 and fruit intakes in a low income community with a relatively high indigenous population.

18

19 **Keywords:** obesity prevention, nutrition, low socioeconomic

20 Background

21 Increasing research attention is being focused on the translation of results from health

promotion efficacy trials into sustainable programs and current practice (1, 2). Very few

23 studies exist in this area and the time lag to implementation of findings from academic/

clinical settings to community settings, averages 17 years (3, 4). Effective dissemination of

evidence-based programs is a process that does not happen instantaneously but rather occurs
in stages that are dependent of issues such as strategic planning, funding, workforce
development, ongoing training, organisational values and policy (5).

Therefore, it is not surprising that few efficacious child obesity interventions have been 28 converted to ongoing community based programs in the after school setting (6). Many 29 interventions for preventing childhood obesity have been implemented in the school setting 30 (7) with modest environmental and behaviour changes (8, 9). A meta-analysis of these studies 31 found no consistent changes in body composition (10). Children spend less than 50% of their 32 awake time at school, studies are needed to address all of the daily influences on energy 33 34 balance and improve living environments that support healthy eating and physical activity outside of school hours (11). This includes the after school setting where many children 35 spend an increased number of hours each week and are picked up by parents or carers at the 36 37 end of their working day.

To meet these needs Back to Basics (B2B) was developed as an after-school cooking 38 39 program which incorporated the nutrition messages from the efficacious Hunter Illawarra 40 Kids Challenge Using Parent Support (HIKCUPS) child obesity intervention program (12) (Figure 1), which has demonstrated improvements in child BMI z-scores (13, 14), dietary 41 intake (15) and physical activity (16, 17) in both the short and long term (13, 14). HIKCUPS 42 was a 3 armed RCT that targeted overweight children. Participants were randomised into a 10 43 week program that was either: a parent centred dietary modification program; a child centred 44 physical activity program; or both programs simultaneously. After the HIKCUPS trial and 45 consultation using focus groups with parents from a socio-economically disadvantaged area 46 via a school community worker, the HIKCUPS program was converted to an initial pilot B2B 47 program (18) and adapted to meet the expressed needs of families whose children attended an 48 after-school program in a regional area of New South Wales (NSW), Australia. This was 49

50 phase one of the B2B program. Due to the difference in setting and the parental preference to use the children as the agents of change as well as parents, direct translation of HIKCUPS 51 was not possible. However B2B uses knowledge translation whereby strategies from 52 53 HIKCUPS have been adapted to optimise uptake in a new environment (19). Key dietary messages including how to choose healthier foods, improve recipes, get children to eat more 54 fruits and vegetables were retained and are detailed elsewhere (18). This population group 55 56 was specifically targeted given they are more likely to have inadequate intakes of fruit and vegetables and higher obesity rates than children from families with medium-to-high incomes 57 58 (20). Pilot results (phase one) with 10 families demonstrated the program to be acceptable and feasible within this community setting (18). Phase two was to evaluate the program in a 59 larger sample of children with simplified research outcome measures in an attempt to make it 60 61 sustainable in this setting. The aim of the current study was to evaluate the impact of Phase two of the B2B after-school cooking club on dietary behaviours and fruit and vegetable 62 variety in a population at risk of obesity. 63

64

65 Methods

Primary school aged children (5-12 years) attending a low income school with a relatively
high indigenous population of >10% and their parents/guardians were recruited as a
convenience sample across successive school terms (i.e. includes groups recruited across
multiple school terms; four terms per calendar year) from a single disadvantaged low socioeconomic status (SES) school in the Hunter Region, NSW, Australia.

71 The school's location, based on post-code, gave a Socio-Economic Indexes For Areas

72 (SEIFA) rank of four out of a possible maximum of 10, with one being the lowest and 10

being the highest income status. The SEIFA index is a generalised measure of socioeconomic

status derived from national population census data and allows for comparison across
geographic areas in Australia. It includes a broad definition of relative socio-economic
disadvantage in terms of people's access to material and social resources.

The school was previously identified as a NSW Priority School, which is a school that
services a low SES community; as defined by the NSW Department of Education. The
priority action school program provides enhanced resources and funding to close the gap and
maximise education outcomes.

These additional resources included a school community worker and an indigenous liaison officer who assisted with participant recruitment. Baseline and 3 month follow-up data was collected between school term 3 (July-September), 2010 and term 4(October-December), 2011. The University of Newcastle Human Research Ethics committee and the school principal approved the study. Parental consent and child assent was obtained prior to participating in the study.

87 Dietary intake Data

Child dietary intake was assessed by a sub set of questions from a larger validated FFQ 88 known as the Australian Child and Adolescent Eating Survey (ACAES). Specifically the tool 89 was validated for use with primary school aged children (21-23). The ACAES assessed 11 90 91 specific eating behaviours including breakfast eating habits; fruit consumption, vegetables consumed with evening meal, takeaway foods, sweetened beverages; and type of milk. Each 92 93 question included a range of frequency responses ranging from never to daily/ 94 weekly/monthly consumption. Due to the focus of the intervention on child fruit and vegetable intakes, questions specifically relating to these variables were collapsed into binary 95 96 variables as meeting or not meeting a predefined program recommendation. For example for 97 fruit: consuming at least one piece of fruit per day or more and for vegetables consuming

98 vegetables with main meal at least 5 times per week. Variety of fruit and vegetables was assessed individually using sub-scales scores of the Australian Recommended Food Score 99 (ARFS) for children (24) where one point was awarded for each type of vegetable or fruit 100 101 consumed at least weekly, with a maximum vegetables score of 20 and 12 for fruit. The information was self-reported by the children greater than 8 years on the day of data 102 collection, as children of this age can reliably reporter intake (22), the interviewer asked the 103 104 questions and recorded the child's response. For diet and other questionnaires, older children >7 years completed the questionnaire independently but were allowed to ask for help if they 105 106 wanted it. For children <7 years the information was collected by an interviewer from the children using the same tool. 107

108 Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) Constructs

SCT constructs were incorporated into each program session and have been previously 109 mapped in detail (18). The sessions were grounded in 10 key constructs of SCT: 110 111 environment; situation; behavioural capabilities, outcomes expectations and expectancies, 112 self-control; observational learning; reinforcement, self-efficacy; emotional coping responses and reciprocal determinism. SCT constructs were assessed using a researcher developed 113 questionnaire which comprised of 51 questions and took approximately 20 minutes to 114 complete. SCT constructs of: knowledge (4 items), expectancy (9 items), self-efficacy fruit (6 115 items), self-efficacy vegetable (6 items), environment (7 items), self-control (9 items) and 116 situation (6 items) were assessed. This survey was modelled on a previous questionnaire to 117 assess self-efficacy of fruit and vegetable intake (25). A Likert scale using smiley face 118 119 responses were provided for each question and labelled either 'Strongly Disagree' through to 'Strongly Agree' or 'Never', 'Rarely', 'Sometimes, 'Often' and 'Always' depending on the 120 question for all children. Cronbach alpha statistics were used to verify internal consistency of 121

124 Intervention

The phase one intervention is described in detail elsewhere (18) and was further modified in 125 phase 2 based on results of the process evaluation, as well as facilitator feedback from the 126 127 previous pilot study Figure 1 (18). A number of modifications were made including: (i) removal of the final social BBQ to reduce the time commitment for parents and staff; (ii) 128 129 removal of the physical activity session due to lack of engagement from families; (iii) reorientation of the major focus to children to increase cooking efficacy; and (iv) addition of 130 nutrition information talk for parents in the final 30 minutes of the session before the child is 131 132 collected. The nutrition information session comprised of a range of visual nutrition displays with discussion topics, weekly recipe and homework charts to complete about family food 133 habits, as outlined in Table 1. Phase 2 of the B2B program involved 5 x 90minutes cooking 134 135 sessions after-school (3-4:30pm), once every two weeks during one school term. Each session 136 sequence was as follows: 1) children provided with a healthy afternoon tea (e.g. fruit and/or crackers with cheese and vegemite[™] spread); 2) cooking session;3) parent activity session 137 138 and 4) the meal/food prepared by child is shared with parents. Parents and children then sat together as a group to taste and discuss the meal that the children had prepared in a relaxed 139 and comfortable environment. Families were provided with a 'vegetable of the week' and 140 141 recipe to encourage them to cook with vegetables at home. For example eggplant/aubergines were provided to the families to cook with that fortnight. The practical cooking sessions 142 143 (~90mins) were designed specifically for children and were led by a trained member of the research team who had training with cooking classes and most often an accredited dietitian. 144 145 The parents' information sessions (~15mins) were facilitated by a member of the research 146 team, with assistance from the school's community liaison officer and/or indigenous support

worker. The parent education sessions (~30mins) were designed to be in an informal setting,
usually next door to where the children were cooking, and with enough space to allow parents
to engage with the material at their own pace, and to allow for hands on or visual/practical
activities and facilitate group discussion on the topic.

151 Statistical Analysis

Data was analysed using Statistics Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Statistical software 152 version 19 to conduct descriptive analysis with Wilcoxon signed rank tests used to assess 153 differences within groups over time. McNemar tests were used for comparison of proportions 154 between categorical variables including those consuming fruit at least once /day or not and 155 consuming vegetables with dinner at least 5 times per week. Cohen's d was used to compare 156 effect sizes across different measures (27) and allows for a more direct comparison of effects 157 on each outcome variable and for smaller samples. These were calculated using the mean 158 difference and the pooled standard deviation of the group (d= M_1 - M_2/δ_{pooled}). Effect sizes 159 160 were interpreted as small (d>0.20), medium (d>0.50) or large (d>0.80) (27).

161 **Results**

A total of 51 children were recruited across the study time frame and completed the program, 162 163 the average attendance rate was 90% with a mean of nine participants per session. Not all subjects completed the questionnaires and the actual numbers varies by items and is reported 164 in Tables 2a and 2b with an average of 37 (72%) completing the majority of measures. The 165 mean age of children was nine years (range 6-13yrs, 61% female). Five children (13.5%) 166 identified as being of Aboriginal, Torres Strait Islander (ATSI) descent. No language barriers 167 168 were identified in the group. Changes from baseline to 3 months follow up for dietary behaviours and SCT outcomes are reported in Tables 2a and 2b. 169

170 Dietary Behaviours

171 At baseline 41% of participants reported consuming at least one piece of fruit/day; at 3 month follow up this increased to 67% (P=0.02 McNemar test). At baseline, 32% of the children 172 reported consuming vegetables with dinner at least 5 times per week; at 3 month follow up 173 this increased to 43%, P0.018 (not statistically significant). At baseline 36% of the children 174 reported consuming takeaway foods (e.g. Chinese, fish and chips, hamburger and chips/fries, 175 pizza) less than or equal to once a week; at 3 month follow up this increased to 56% (Z score 176 -1.84, P=0.06). At both time points >80% of children were consuming full cream milk and 177 7% were reported consuming reduced fat or skim varieties of milk. Effect sizes for dietary 178 179 behaviours were calculated and while some were small the majority were classified as being moderate to good (range d = 0.02-0.45 Tables 2a and b). While not statistically significant, 180 the variety of both fruit and vegetables reported by children increased post program. For 181 182 vegetables the baseline the median score was 7 out of a possible score of 20 (range 0-20) and at 3 month follow-up this increased to 8. For fruit the median score was 4.5 at baseline (0-11) 183 out of a possible score of 12 and increased to 6 (0-12) at 3 month follow up. 184

185 *SCT outcomes*

186 Table 2a shows SCT constructs assessed in this study for children in the back to B2B

program. All seven SCT constructs changed significantly (P<0.01) from baseline. Analysis

using Cohen's d found moderate (d>0.50) to large effects for six of the seven SCT constructs

assessed (Table 2a). In descending order these were for self-efficacy to consume fruit (d=-

190 0.78), situation (-0.70), self-control (-0.76), self-efficacy to cook and/or consume vegetables

- 191 (-0.58), expectancy (-0.55) and knowledge (-0.50) with only a small effect shown for
- 192 environment (-0.33).

193 Discussion

194 The aim of the current study was to evaluate the impact of Phase two of the B2B after-school cooking club on dietary behaviours and fruit and vegetable variety in a population at risk of 195 obesity. The current study provides an example of adaptation and knowledge translation of 196 197 key dietary messages from an efficacious RCT to the after school environment, in an effectiveness study. The Phase two B2B program was successful at increasing the proportion 198 of children reporting fruit consumption at least once per day, as well as increasing the weekly 199 200 variety of fruit and vegetables. Changes in dietary intakes included increasing weekly fruit and vegetable variety and reducing takeaway foods. The program was developed and 201 202 implemented using the theoretical framework of SCT with favourable intervention effects for six of the seven SCT constructs demonstrating moderate-to-large effect sizes. 203

While there was a reported increase in the vegetable variety, these were not statistically significant this is likely due to the small sample size and lack of statistical power. It is acknowledged that the effect sizes and impact on behavioural outcome measures will always be smaller when research programs move from efficacy to effectiveness to public health interventions.

209 Parents were engaged in the intervention and while they were not the sole agents of change, 210 as in the original HIKCUPS program, the current study fostered change in child self-efficacy for fruit and vegetable preparation and consumption. . Efficacy studies are usually conducted 211 under well-resourced for ideal 'laboratory' or controlled condition. This means they are not 212 able to be implemented in the same way when trying to translate the results to community 213 programs. Hence, the B2B program was adapted from the original HIKCUPS trial for this 214 215 reason (19). In addition, the change in format between phase one and two reduced the amount of time parents were involved, switching the focus from parents to both the child and the 216 parents as dual agents of change. The reduction in parent time commitment was based on 217 218 parental feedback from phase one. The parent education sessions focused on topics that

aligned with those previously identified for low income families (28) including messages on
role modelling and cooking and eating together. The retention in the program was high
(n=51) with no dropouts, however only three quarters of participants dedicated time to
complete the surveys which may reflect the loss of research integrity when adapting research
to community setting.

224 **Limitations** include that one school was used for recruitment, the sample size is small and a 225 control group was not feasible. A further limitation is that in order to accommodate the after school setting and the time constraints, the questions for both diet and SCT were taken from 226 previously validated tools, but the subset used was not validated. Hence results should be 227 228 interpreted with caution. Complete dietary intake was not assessed as part of this study so it cannot be concluded that substantial diet improvements were achieved, however overall 229 increases in diet quality in children has been associated with better growth profiles (29). In 230 231 addition the goal of the program was not unknown to participants so results shown for this study may also be attributed to social desirability. 232

233 Relevance for practice: If dietary programs in Australia, Canada and internationally are to be translated to sustainable environments in indigenous groups in the after school setting, 234 235 documentation of the process will be of value to practitioners and researchers. The BTB program was about targeting minority indigenous groups who are of greater risk of obesity 236 related ill health. The current study, phase two of B2B, was very different from phase one in 237 which the program was developed based on what the population group "thought" they wanted 238 in terms of content, whereas the current study presents the revised program based on the 239 240 feedback and learnings from phase one. Reliability values (cronbach alphas) for SCT constructs were low for the domain of knowledge. This may be a true effect size, or partly 241 attributed to the small sample size. Further research with a larger sample size is warranted. In 242 243 addition strategies to increase knowledge could be strengthened when the program is revised.

- As part of adapting research programs both dietetic practitioners and researchers need to 244
- allow adequate time to consult with the relevant stakeholders, conduct needs assessments and 245
- to contextualise program components to the community needs. Further this may need to be 246
- done over a number of program iterations. Key challenges in translational research include 247
- the stop and start nature of the program (i.e. lack of continuum), varying personnel being 248
- involved in the community program, across sites and subsequent school terms. 249
- Future studies should ensure adequate descriptions of interventions and mapping of 250

successful components from efficacy trials to program components as first steps in 251

developing sustainable community based interventions. 252

References 253

254 Westfall J, Mold J, Fagnan L. Practice Based research - Blue Highways on the NIH roadmap. J 1. 255 Am Med Assoc. 2007;297(4):403-6.

256 2. Glasgow R, Lichtenstein E, Marcus A. Why don't we see more translation of health 257 promotion research to practice? Rethinking the efficacy-to-effectiveness transition. . Am J Public 258 Health. 2003;93(8):1261-5.

259 3. Morris Z, Wooding S, Grant J. The answer is 17 years, what is the question: understanding 260 time lags in translational research. J R Soc Med. 2011;104(12):510-20.

261 Milat A, Bauman A, Redman S, Curac N. Public Health Research outputs from efficacy to 4. 262 dissemination: a bibiliometric analysis. BMC Public Health. 2011;11:934.

263 5. Brownson R, Kreuter M, Arrington B, True W. Translating scientific discoveries into public health action: how can schools of public health move us forward? Public Health Rep. 2006;121(1):97-264 265 103.

266 6. Welsby D, Nguyen B, O'Hara B, Hughes C, Bauman A, Hardy L. Process evaluation of an upscaled community based child obesity treatment program: NSW Go4Fun[®]. BMC Public Health. 267 268 2014;14:140.

- Oude Luttikhus H BL, Shrewsbury VA, O'Malley C, Stolk RP, Summerbell CD. Interventions for 269 7. 270 treating obesity in children (Review). The Cochrane Library. 2009.
- 271 Doak CM VT, Renders CM Seidel JC. The prevention of overweight and obesity in children 8. and adolescents: a review of interventions and programs. Obesity Reviews. 2006;7:111-36. 272
- 273 9. Summerbell CD WE, Edmunds LD, Kerr D. Interventions for preventing obesity in children. 274 Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2005.
- 275 10. Harris KCKL, Schulzer M, Retallack J. Effect of school-based physical activity interventions on 276 body mass index in children: a meta analysis. CMAJ. 2009;180(7).
- 277 11. Economos CD HR, Goldberg J, Must A, Naumova E, Collins J, Nelson M. A community 278 Intervention Reduces BMI z-score in Children: Shape Up Sommerville First Year Results. Obesity. 279 2007;15(5).
- Jones R, Okely A, Collins C, Morgan P, Steele J, Warren J, et al. The HIKCUPS Trial: a multi site 280 12.
- 281 randomised controlled trial of a combined physical activity skill development and dietary
- 282 modification program in overweight and obese children. BMC Public Health. 2007;7(15).

283 13. Okely A, Collins C, Morgan P, Jones R, Warren J, Cliff D, et al. Multi-site randomized
284 controlled trial of a child-centred physical activity program, a parent-centred dietary modification
285 program, or both in obese children: The HIKCUPS study. Journal of Paediatrics. 2010;157:388-94.

Collins C, Okely A, Morgan P, Jones R, . BT, Cliff D, et al. Long-term outcomes of the HIKCUPS
 multi-site randomized trial: Efficacy of a parent-centred dietary-modification program, child-centred
 physical activity program or both in overweight children. Pediatrics. 2011;127:619-27.

Burrows T, Warren J, Baur L, Collins C. Impact of a child obesity intervention on dietary
intake and behaviors. . IJO. 2008;32(10):1481-8.

291 16. Cliff DP, Okely AD, Morgan PJ, Steele JR, Jones RA, Colyvas K, et al. Movement skills and
292 physical activity in obese children: randomised controlled trial. Medicine & Science in Sports and
293 Exercise. 2011;43(1):90-100.

294 17. Burrows T, C C, Warren J. Long term changes in food consumption trends in overweight
295 children enrolled in the HIKCUPS intervention. Journal of Pediatric Gastroentrology and Nutrition.
296 2011;53(5):543-7.

18. Burrows T, Bray J, Morgan P, Collins C. Pilot intervention in an economically disadvantaged
community: The back to Basics after school lifestyle program. Nutrition and Dietetics. 2013. Epub 29
Jan doi: 10.1111/1747-0080.12023.

Rychetnik L, Bauman A, Laws R, King L, Rissel C, Nutbeam D, et al. Translating research for
evidence based public health: key concepts and future directions. J Epidemiol Community Health.
2012;66:1187-92.

303 20. O'Dea J. Socio-cognitive and nutritioinal factors associated with body mass index in children
 304 and adolescents: possibilities for childhood obesity prevention. Health Educ Res. 2006;21:796-805.

Burrows T, Berthton B, Garg M, Collins C. Validation of food frequency questionnaire using
 red blood cell membrane fatty acids. . Eur J Clin Nutr. 2012;66:825-9.

Burrows T, Truby H, Morgan PJ, Callister R, Davies PSW, Collins CE. A comparison and
validation of child versus parent reporting of children's energy intake using food frequency
questionnaires versus food records: Who's an accurate reporter? Clin Nutr. 2013;32(4):613-8.

Marshall S, Watson J, Burrows T, Guest M, Collins C. The development and evaluation of the
 Australian Child and Adolescent Recommended Food Score: a cross-sectional study. Nutr J.
 2012;11(1):96.

31324.Huxley S, Watson J, Burrows T, Guest M, C. C. The development and evaluation of the314Australian Recommended Food Score for Kids (ARFSK). Nutrition Journal. 2012;11(1):art no 96.

Thompson V, Bachman C, Baranowski T, Cullen K. Self-efficacy and Norm Measures for Lunch
Fruit and Vegetable Consumption are Reliable and Valid Among Fifth Grade Students. Journal of
Nutrition Education and Behaviour. 2007;39:2-7.

318 26. Nunnaly J. Psychometric theory. New York McGraw-Hill.; 1978.

319 27. Cohen J. Statistical Power Analysis Behavioural Sciences. 2nd ed. HIllsdale N, editor:

320 Lawrence Earlbaum and Associates; 1988.

White A, Wilson J, Burns A, Blum-Kemelor D, Singh A, Race P, et al. Use of Qualitative
research to inform development of nutrition messages for low income mothers of pre school
children. Journal of Nutrition Education and Behaviour. 2011;43(1):19-26.

324 29. Marshall S, Burrows T, Collins C. Systematic review of diet quality indices and their
325 associations with health-related outcomes in children and adolescents. Journal of Human Nutrition
326 and Dietetics. 2014;Feb doi: DOI: 10.1111/jhn.12208.

327

328

329

Session	Children's Cooking Component	Parents Information Session Topic	Parent Engagement
Session 1 Assessment 1	Food Hygiene Safety in the kitchen Crunchy Crostini's	Why food? Benefits of eating fruits and vegetables?	Health benefits of fruits and vegetables. Visual display of fresh fruit & veg.
Session 2	Fruit Salad and smoothie	Getting the balance right- How much food should my child eat?	Visual display showing a day of healthy food for a typical child.
Session 3	English muffin Pizza's	Family food habits	Reading food Labels Categorise foods according to fat/ energy
Session 4	Bush Beef Stir Fry	Goal setting/ monitoring	Setting a personal and family goal
Session 5	Apple Berry crumble	Congratulations- Evaluation and feedback	

Assessment 2		

331

332

333

334Table 2a: Changes in Social Cognitive Theory Constructs (SCT) for children participating in

the Back to Basics Program

336

SCT Construct (n)	Mean ± SD	Mean \pm SD	Ζ	P value	Effect size	Cronbach α
					Cohen's d ^a	
	Baseline	Follow up				
Knowledge (n= 33)	1.48 ± 0.47	1.67±0.28	-2.31	0.02	-0.50	0.57
Self-efficacy (fruit)	4.06 ±0.84	4.57±0.38	-3.63	< 0.001	-0.78	0.80
(n= 36)						
Self-efficacy	3.82±0.93	4.26±0.56	-2.61	0.009	-0.58	0.86
Vegetables (n= 35)						
Environment (n=	3.69±0.69	3.94±0.78	-2.01	0.045	-0.33	0.72
35)						
Self-control (n= 35)	2.91±0.82	3.51±0.75	-3.44	0.001	-0.76	0.80
Situation (n= 35)	4.24±0.54	4.59±0.45	-3.00	0.003	-0.70	0.70
Expectancy (n= 35)	4.51±0.53	4.77±0.41	-3.22	0.001	-0.55	0.79

337 Z statistic analysed with Wilcoxon signed rank test, ^a Small effect size Cohen's *d*

=0.2, moderate effect size =0.50, large effect =0.80

339

- 340 Table 2b: Changes in dietary behaviours as assessed by The Australian Eating Survey for
- 341 children in the Back to Basics program

Dietary behaviour	Mean \pm SD	Mean \pm SD	Z	P value	Effect size Cohen's d ^a
	Baseline	Follow up			
Pieces of fruit / day (n=	5.47±1.63	5.69±1.65	-1.17	0.24	-0.13
45)					
Vegetables consumed	3.91±0.97	4.11±1.0	-1.38	0.17	-0.20
with evening meal (n=					
45)					
Takeaway consumption	2.98±1.23	2.50±0.88	-1.84	0.07	0.45
(n=40)					
Consume evening meal	3.87±1.96	3.41±1.92	-1.57	0.12	0.23
in front of the TV (n=					
39)					
Time spent watching	1.95±0.86	1.97±0.81	-0.29	0.76	-0.02
TV (n= 39)					
Weekly pocket money	2.05±1.30	2.15±1.48	-	0.96	-0.07
(n= 39)			0.005		
Consumption of snacks	2.51±0.84	2.81±0.94	-1.85	0.06	-0.33
(n= 37)					
Glasses of sweetened	2.11±1.13	1.95±0.94	-1.07	0.28	0.15
drinks (n= 37)					
Type of milk (n= 37)	3.48±1.15	3.53±1.22	-0.21	0.83	-0.04

- 342 Z statistic analysed with Wilcoxon signed rank test, ^a Small effect size Cohen's *d*
- 343 = 0.2, moderate effect size = 0.50, large effect = 0.80