RESEARCH STUDY

Open Access

Evaluasi Pemberian Intervensi Gizi terhadap Kebiasaan Makan Snack dan Status Antropometri pada Mahasiswa di Kota Malang

Evaluation of Nutrition Intervention on Snack's Eating Habits and Anthropometric Status of College Students in Malang City

Rany Adelina^{1*}, Rani Nurmayanti², Elok Widayanti³, Carissa Cerdasari⁴

ABSTRAK

Latar Belakang: Lebih dari 80% mahasiswa di Malang suka mengonsumsi snack tidak sehat misalnya snack kemasan, gorengan, dan bakso. Snack tersebut mengandung tinggi energi, karbohidrat, protein, lemak jenuh, dan garam. Kelebihan asupan energi dan zat-zat gizi tersebut berhubungan dengan meningkatnya kejadian sindroma metabolik dan faktor risiko utama penyakit kardiovaskuler.

Tujuan: Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui efektifitas pemberian intervensi edukasi gizi terhadap kebiasaan makan snack sehat dan status antropometri pada mahasiswa di kota Malang.

Metode: Penelitian ini menggunakan desain quasi-experimental: pre-test dan post-test, Non-Equivalent Control Group Design dengan 31 orang subyek penelitian yang berstatus sebagai mahasiswa di kota Malang. Intervensi gizi yang diberikan selama 3 bulan berupa edukasi terkait snack sehat dan pendampingan pembuatan snack sehat. Instrumen yang digunakan dengan pretest-posttest, kuesioner, dan semi FFQ. Pengolahan data dilakukan dengan analisis statistik deskriptif, Wilcoxon signed rank test, dan t-test berpasangan pada tingkat kepercayaan 95%.

Hasil: Terdapat peningkatan pengetahuan terkait snack sehat secara signifikan pada subyek penelitian (p<0.01) yang ditunjukkan dari hasil pre-test dan post-test sebanyak 30%. Terjadi peningkatan pengaruh 'nutrition claims' pada pemilihan snack sebanyak 31% serta terdapat perbedaan yang signifikan antara sebelum dan sesudah diberikan intervensi (p=0.013). Hasil semi FFQ snack sehat untuk kategori buah mengalami peningkatan yang signifikan setelah diberikan program intervensi (p < 0.01), sedangkan hasil semi-FFQ snack tidak sehat (kategori krakers asin, coklat/permen, pudding, dan jajan pasar) cenderung mengalami penurunan jumlah konsumsi meskipun tidak signifikan. Prevalensi overweight dan obesitas pada peserta sebelum diberikan intervensi sebanyak 29%, dan mengalami penurunan setelah diberikan intervensi menjadi 22.6% meskipun tidak ada perbedaan yang signifikan (p=0.096).

Kesimpulan: Terdapat peningkatan pengaruh atas 'nutrition claim' pada pemilihan snack, dan peningkatan konsumsi buah setelah dilakukan intervensi. Selain itu, terdapat kecenderungan penurunan prevalensi overweight dan obese meskipun tidak signifikan.

Kata Kunci: Snack, Kebiasaan Makan, Status Antropometri, Mahasiswa

ABSTRACT

Background: More than 80% of students tend to consume unhealthy snacks such as packaged snacks, fried foods, and meatballs. The unhealthy snacks contain high energy, carbohydrates, protein, saturated fat, and salt. The excess energy and those nutrients intake are related to increasing of metabolic syndromes and the main risk factors for cardiovascular disease. **Objectives:** This study aims to determine the effectiveness of giving nutritional interventions to snack's eating habits and anthropometric status of college students in Malang.

Methods:This research applied quasi-experimental design: pre-test and post-test, Non-Equivalent Control Group Design with 31 participants from college students in Malang city. Nutrition interventions provided for 3 months were in the form of giving education related to healthy snacks and assistance in making healthy snacks. The instruments used were pretest and posttest, questionnaire, and semi FFQ. Data processing was carried out by descriptive statistical analysis,Wilcoxon signed rank test, and paired t-test at a 95% confidence level.

Results: There was a significant increase in knowledge related to healthy snacks for research subjects (p < 0.01) indicated by the results of the pre-test and post-test at 30%. There was an increase in the influence of nutrition claims towards choosing snacks by 31% and there was a significant difference between before and after the intervention (p = 0.013). The results of a healthy semi FFQ snack for the fruit category experienced a significant increase after being given an intervention program (p < 0.01), while the semi FFQ results for unhealthy snacks for the category of salted crackers, chocolate / candy, pudding, and



© 2021. Adelina, et.al. **Open access under CC BY - SA license.** Received: 12-08-2019. Accented: 04-03-2021. Published online: 21-06-202

Received: 12-08-2019, Accepted: 04-03-2021, Published online: 21-06-2021. doi: 10.20473 /amnt.v5i2.2021. 166-172. Joinly Published by IAGIKMI & Universitas Airlangga market snacks tended to decrease in consumption although it is not significant. The prevalence of overweight and obese in participants before being given intervention was 29% and decreased after being given intervention to 22. **Conclusions:**There is an increase in the influence of 'nutrition claims' and fruit consumption significantly. While the prevalence of obese tends to fall even though it is not significant between college students.

Keywords: Snacks, Eating Habits, Anthropometric Status, College Students

*Correspondent:

Rany_adelina@poltekkes-malang.ac.id

Rany Adelina

¹Undergraduate Program in Applied Nutrition and Dietetics, Department of Nutrition, Politeknik Kesehatan Kementrian Kesehatan Malang, Indonesia

²D3 Nutrition Study Program, Department of Nutrition, Politeknik Kesehatan Kementrian Kesehatan Malang, Indonesia ³D3 Study Program in Pharmacy and Food Analysis, Department of Nutrition, Politeknik Kesehatan Kementrian Kesehatan Malang, Indonesia

⁴Dietisien Professional Education Study Program, Department of Nutrition, Politeknik Kesehatan Kementrian Kesehatan Malang, Indonesia

Jl. Besar Ijen No. 77 C Malang, Indonesia

Published by Universitas Airlangga and IAGIKMI

INTRODUCTION

This research is based on the number of students who lack awareness of healthy snack consumption. Problems that arise in overseas students based on the results of the study show that there are more than 80% of the 397 overseas students like to eat unhealthy snacks such as packaged snacks, fried foods, instant noodles, and meatballs.¹ These snacks contain high energy, carbohydrates, saturated fat protein, and salt. The excess salt intake is associated with the increase of blood pressure and a major risk factor for cardiovascular disease^{2,3}. Meanwhile, the high consumption of energy dense foods can increase the risk of obesity⁴. The prevalence of overweight and obesity has also become the main concern, since according to a report from the World Health Organization in 2016, 1.9 billion adults aged 18 years and over are overweight and 650 million are obese. Overweight and obesity are major risk factors for non-communicable diseases such as cardiovascular disease, type 2 diabetes mellitus, muscle bone disorders, and cancer.⁵. Even though the consumption of snacks, which are less than the three main meals, contributes to energy and nutrient intake. In case control research⁶ and cross-sectional ⁷shows that the frequency of snack consumption is associated with the consumption of energy dense foods and increases the risk of obesity. In addition, consumption of foods high in protein can also increase the risk of type 2 diabetes mellitus (DM)^{8.9}.

Giving intervention to students with education and mentoring will increase their knowledge regarding the selection of healthy snacks, avoiding unhealthy snacks, how to read nutrition labels on packaged snacks, being aware of hazardous food additives, and general guidelines for balanced nutrition. Furthermore, mentoring, they will improve their skills in making healthy snacks. Therefore, they will improve their eating habits, become healthy, nutritious, and balanced. The social benefits that can be generated are broad, namely the research subjects will provide information to their colleagues / campus canteen / other food organizers regarding healthy and nutritionally balanced snacks. This study aims to determine the effectiveness of nutritional interventions in the form of education and assistance in making healthy snacks for students before and after treatment.

METHOD

The research design was a quasi-experimental design: pretest and post-test, and Non-Equivalent Control Group Design. The research was conducted in universities located in Malang such as Brawijaya University, State University of Malang, and State Islamic University of Malang. The screening process for taking subject sampling according to the inclusion criteria was started from April 2018 to May 2018. According to 2018 SMBPTN data, Malang is the first place for prospective students to continue their university level. Therefore, Malang city has the highest number of student contributions among other cities. The education provision was held at the Faculty of Computer Science Brawijaya University, while the assistance was carried out at the boarding house for each student from June 2018 to August 2018.

The subject of the research were taken using purposive sampling technique based on the inclusion criteria. The inclusion criteria of the subjects were students who lived in a boarding house or rented and were willing to take part in a nutrition intervention program in the form of providing education and assistance in making healthy snacks. The initial screening was conducted in 61 people, but there were only 31 students met the inclusion criteria. The recruitment of subjects was carried out by enumerators who graduated from 3-years Diploma and 4-years Diploma Nutrition through questionnaires. The enumerator provided an explanation related to the research before asking for informed consent for filling out the questionnaire. The questionnaire used as an instrument in this study contained anthropometric data (weight, height, and



© 2021. Adelina, et.al. **Open access under CC BY - SA license.** Received: 12-08-2019, Accepted: 04-03-2021, Published online: 21-06-2021. doi: 10.20473 /amnt.v5i2.2021. 166-172. **Joinly Published by IAGIKMI & Universitas Airlangga** waist circumference), snack shopping habits and orientation, and a semi-quantitative - food frequency questionnaire (SQ-FFQ) related to snack consumption. The types of snacks listed in the SQ-FFQ, which are energy-dense and high-fat foods, are categorized as unhealthy foods. Meanwhile, foods high in fiber and processed milk (including yogurt) are categorized as healthy eating. The screening questionnaire and SQFFQ are the adoption of previous research questionnaires. The questionnaire was given before and after giving the intervention. Meanwhile, to measure the level of knowledge, research subjects were given a pretest and posttest during the educational session by asking as many as 20 questions. Research tools and materials such as anthropometric tools, educational material handouts, assistance tools and materials were provided by researchers. The measurement of body weight was conducted by digital weighing scales, while the measurements and waist circumference were carried out with the Medline tape measure before and after the intervention.

Healthy and unhealthy snack consumption habits were measured by 11 semi-quantitative FFQ items adapted from the Anti-Cancer Council Dietary Questionnaire (Giles & Ireland, 1996). Based on the energy density classification, the definition of a healthy snack is a snack that has a low energy density of <150 kcal / 100 grams of BDD (Edible Weight). Including healthy snacks such as fruit, vegetables, yogurt, cheese. The category of unhealthy snacks is if they have a high energy density of 225-275 kcal / 100 grams, as what can be found in cheese crackers, sweet biscuits, cakes and pastries, chocolate, candy, sweetened drinks, and fried foods (WCRF-UK, 2007).

This research was conducted in 2018, which began with measuring eating habits using the semiquantitative FFQ form and providing a pre-test to find out knowledge before intervention. Furthermore, the intervention was given in the form of education on 4 nutritional materials from 4 sources, namely a lecturer in the Department of Nutrition, Health Polytechnic of the Ministry of Health Malang. The material presented is in the form of definitions of healthy snacks, how to read nutrition labels on packaged snacks, hazardous food additives, and general guidelines for balanced nutrition. Furthermore, the research subjects will be given assistance in making healthy snacks with recipes that have been developed by the researcher. This intervention method will be used as a development method for providing nutrition education interventions to research subjects. This research has passed the ethics test at the Health Polytechnic Research Ethics Commission of the Ministry of Health Malang with Reg. no: 469 / KEPK-POLKESMA / 2018.

Data processing was performed using descriptive statistical analysis and dependent t-test (if the data were not normally distributed, using the Wilcoxon signed-rank test) to compare the differences in control and treatment. Paired t-test to compare differences in knowledge levels through the results of the pretest and posttest (if the data are not normally distributed, use the Wilcoxon signed-rank test). Statistical test using SPSS version 23 software at a 95% confidence level.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of socio-demographic data show that 31 people consist of 21 women and 10 men. The age of the research subjects ranged from 18-24 years. Marital status there are 30 people who are not married and only 1 person is married. The majority of the research subjects were from Java as many as 23 people and other as many as 9 people. The cities of research subjects were from Bekasi, Bima, Blitar, Bojonegoro, Flores, Gresik, Jakarta, Jember, Kediri, Lamongan, Makassar, Malang Regency, Mataram, Mojokerto, Nganjuk, Pasuruan, Pati, Probolinggo, Sidoarjo, Sumbawa, and Tuban. The educational level of the research subjects were 24 people still studying S1, 5 people from D4, and S2 as many as 2 people.

There was a significant increase in knowledge in the research subjects as much as 30% (p < 0.01) which was indicated by the results of the pre-test with an average of 8 out of 20 questions and a post-test with an average of 14 out of 20 questions (Table 1). Several studies have shown the effectiveness of nutrition education in increasing nutritional knowledge, as in previous studies¹⁰⁻¹². The results of Pakhri et al's research (2018) show that there is a change in the average nutritional knowledge before and after nutrition education. The result of the T test shows that there is a significant effect where the value of p = 0.000 (α <0.05). This is because the treatment given in the form of nutritional education with materials on efforts to meet the energy, protein, and iron needs of adolescents has been successfully understood by them.¹³. The results of research by Fitri et al (2020) show that there is an effect of nutrition education about healthy and traditional snacks on the knowledge of elementary school children. Based on this, it can be seen that the provision of knowledge by means of counseling has an effect on increasing children's knowledge¹⁴.

Anthropometric status in table 1 shows the mean body mass index (BMI) of study subjects in the normal category, before 22.3 ± 4.4 kg / m2 and after decreasing to 21.7 ± 4.2 kg / m2. Meanwhile, the prevalence of overweight and obesity in participants before being given intervention was 29%, and it decreased after being given the intervention to 22.6% although it was not significant (p = 0.096). The results of waist circumference showed an increase in subjects who had abnormal waist circumference by 2 people although it was not significant. However, in general there was no significant difference in waist circumference between before and after the intervention (p = 0.48). Research Baldaso, et al. (2016) also showed a decrease in BMI, especially among respondents who were obese¹⁵. The results of Hasibuan (2020) show that the results of p = 0.008 are smaller than alpha 0.05, so it can be said that there is a relationship between knowledge of eating habits and nutritional status. ¹⁶



© 2021. Adelina, et.al. **Open access under CC BY - SA license.** Received: 12-08-2019, Accepted: 04-03-2021, Published online: 21-06-2021. doi: 10.20473 /amnt.v5i2.2021. 166-172. **Joinly Published by IAGIKMI & Universitas Airlangga**

Before After n(%) 14±2.3 (70) <0.01* BMI (kg / n.2) 2.3 ± 4.4 21.7 ± 4.2 0.096 Average 22.3 ± 4.4 21.7 ± 4.2 0.096 Mainutrition 5 (16.1) 6 (19.4) 14 ± 2.3 (70) <0.01* Normal 17 (54.8) 18 (58.1) Fat 3 (9.7) 3 (9.7) Obesity 6 (19.4) 4 (13) Werage 75.7 ± 9.5 0.48 Normal 26 (63.9) 24 (77.4) Abnormal 5 (16.1) 7 (22.6) Normal 26 (63.9) 24 (77.4) Abnormal 5 (16.1) 2 (6.5) 0.688 Neutral 14 (45.2) 21 (67.7) 0 (13.2) 0.668 14 (12.9) Very rarely 1 (135.5) 4 (12.9) Very rarely 1 (23.2) 3 (9.7) 1 (13.2) 1 (13.2) 1 (13.2) 1 (13.2) 1 (13.2) 1 (13.2) 1 (13.2) 1 (13.2) 1 (13.2) 1 (13.2) 1 (13.2) 1 (13.2) 1 (13.2) 1 (13.2) 1 (13.2) 1 (13.2) 1 (13.2)	Item	Nutrition Int	Р	
n(%) n(%) Knowledge (level (pre-post test) 8 ± 1.9 (40) 14 ± 2.3 (70) <0.01 * BMI (kg /m2)		Before	After	
Knowledge level (pre-post test) 8 ± 1.9 (40) 1 ± 2.3 (70) <0.01 *		n (%)	n (%)	
BMN (kg / n2) Average 22.3 ± 4.4 21.7 ± 4.2 0.096 Malnutrition 5 (16.1) 6 (19.4) 0.096 Normal 17 (54.8) 18 (58.1) 18 Fat 3 (9.7) 3 (9.7) 0.096 Obesity 6 (19.4) 4 (13) Variation Waist (on) 75.7 ± 9.5 0.48 0.000 Mormal 26 (83.9) 24 (77.4) 0.668 Abnormal 5 (16.1) 7 (22.6) 0.668 Rarely 5 (16.1) 2 (65.) 0.068 Neutral 14 (45.2) 21 (67.7) 0.0668 Neutral 10 (32.3) 3 (9.7) 0.000 Often 11 (13.5) 4 (12.9) 0.0128 Very orlen 0 3 (9.7) 0.000 Neutral 12 (3.8) 3 (9.7) 0.000 Neutral 12 (3.8) 3 (9.7) 0.0128 Rarely 10 (32.3) 3 (9.7) 0.0128 Neutral 12 (3.6) 7 (12.0)	Knowledge level (pre-post test)	8 ± 1.9 (40)	14 ± 2.3 (70)	<0.01 *
Average 22.3 ± 4.4 21.7 ± 4.2 0.096 Mainutrition 5 (16.1) 6 (19.4) 18 (58.1) Fat 3 (9.7) 3 (9.7) 3 (9.7) Obesity 6 (19.4) 4 (13) 10.00 Waist (cm)	BMI (kg / m2)			
Mainutrition 5 (16.1) 6 (19.4) Normal 17 (54.8) 3 (9.7) Obesity 6 (19.4) 4 (13) Waist (cm) (10.10) (10.10) Average 76.4 ± 7.9 75.7 ± 9.5 0.48 Normal 26 (83.9) 24 (77.4) (10.10) Abnormal 5 (16.1) 7 (22.6) (10.10) The habit of avoiding places that sell unhealthy food (10.2) 1.63.2) 0.668 Rarely 5 (16.1) 2 (6.5) (10.10) (10.12.9) Very rarely 5 (16.1) 2 (6.5) (10.12.9) (10.12.9) Very often 0 3 (9.7) (10.12.9	Average	22.3 ± 4.4	21.7 ± 4.2	0.096
Normal 17 (54.8) 18 (58.1) Fat 3 (9.7) Obesity 6 (19.4) 4 (13) Waist (cm) - - - - Average 76.4 ± 7.9 75.7 ± 9.5 0.48 Normal 26 (83.9) 24 (77.4) - Abnormal 5 (16.1) 7 (22.6) - The habit of avoiding places that sell unhealthy food - - - Very rarely 5 (16.1) 2 (6.5) 0.668 - Neutral 14 (45.2) 21 (67.7) - - Often 11 (135.5) 4 (12.9) - - Very often 0 3 (9.7) - - Notid avoiding buying candy, chips, biscuits and cakes - - - Neutral 12 (33.7) 18 (58.1) - - Often 7 (22.6) 7 (12) - - Very often 0 1 (3.2) 3 (9.7) - - Notingly disagree 5 (16.1)	Malnutrition	5 (16.1)	6 (19.4)	
Fat 3 (9.7) 3 (9.7) Obesity 6 (19.4) 4 (13) Waist (cm)	Normal	17 (54.8)	18 (58.1)	
Obesity 6 (19.4) 4 (13) Waist (cm)	Fat	3 (9.7)	3 (9.7)	
Wase (cm) Average 75.7 ± 9.5 0.48 Normal 26 (83.9) 24 (77.4) Abnormal Abnormal 5 (16.1) 72.6) Tem babit of avoiding places that sell unhealthy food Very rarely 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) 0.668 Rarely 5 (16.1) 2 (65.) 20.668 Neutral 14 (45.2) 21 (67.7) Often Often 11 (35.5) 4 (12.9) Very often 0 0.28 Neutral 10 (32.3) 3 (9.7) 10.28 0.26 (5.1) 0.128 Rarely 10 (32.3) 3 (9.7) 10.28 0.128 0.128 Neutral 12 (38.7) 18 (58.1) 0.128 0.128 Often 7 (22.6) 7 (12) 0.0737 Very often 0 13.2) 0.737 Disagree 5 (16.1) 4 (12.9) 2.65.5 0.737 Strongly disagree 2 (6.5) 0.737 0.132 0.132 The thought of not eating lot of junk food 1 (3.2) 0.26 (5	Obesity	6 (19.4)	4 (13)	
Average 76.4 ± 7.9 75.7 ± 9.5 0.48 Normal 25 (83.9) 24 (77.4) 722.6) The habit of avoiding places that sell unhealthy food 722.6) 0.668 Rarely 5 (16.1) 2 (6.5) 0.668 Neutral 14 (45.2) 21 (67.7) 01ten 11 (35.5) 41 (2.9) Very often 0 3 (9.7) 7 7 7 The habit of avoiding buying candy, chips, biscuits and cakes 7 22 (6.5) 0.128 7 Very orten 0 3 (9.7) 18 (58.1) 7 7 Neutral 12 (38.7) 18 (58.1) 7 7 7 Often 7 (22.6) 7 (12) 7 7 7 Very often 0 1 (3.2) 3 (9.7) 7 7 Neutral 9 (29) 13 (41.9) 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	Waist (cm)			0.40
Normal 26 (83.9) 24 (7.4) Abnormal 5 (16.1) 7 (22.6) The habit of avoiding places that sell unhealthy food 2 (6.5) 0.668 Rarely 5 (16.1) 2 (6.5) 0.668 Neutral 14 (45.2) 21 (67.7) 0 Often 11 (35.5) 4 (12.9) 2 (6.5) 0.128 Very often 0 3 (9.7) 2 (6.5) 0.128 Rarely 10 (32.3) 3 (9.7) 2 (6.5) 0.128 Neutral 7 (22.6) 7 (12) 2 (6.5) 0.128 Neutral 7 (22.6) 7 (12) 2 (6.5) 0.737 Often 7 (22.6) 7 (12) 2 (6.5) 0.737 Neutral 9 (29) 13 (41.9) 2 (6.5) 0.737 Disagree 1 (3.2) 3 (9.7) 2 (6.5) 0.737 Neutral 9 (29) 33 (41.9) 2 (6.5) 0.737 Strongly disagree 2 (6.5) 9 (29) 2 (6.5) 0.935 Disagree 1 (Average	76.4 ± 7.9	/5./±9.5	0.48
Abnormal 5 (15.1) 7 (22.6) The habit of avoiding places that sell unhealthy fod 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) 0.668 Rarely 5 (16.1) 2 (6.5) 0.668 Neutral 14 (45.2) 21 (67.7) 0 (67.7) Often 0 3 (9.7) 0 The habit of avoiding buying candy, chips, biscuits and cakes 7 7 Very rarely 2 (6.5) 2 (6.5) 0.128 Neutral 12 (38.7) 18 (58.1) 0 Often 0 13.2) 13 (9.7) Neutral 12 (38.7) 18 (58.1) 0 Often 7 (22.6) 7 (12) 7 Very often 0 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) The thought of not eating lots of high-fat snacks 7 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) Agree 5 (16.1) 4 (12.9) 5 (16.1) 4 (12.9) Strongly disagree 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) Agree 5 (16.1) 4 (12.9) 1 (3.2) Neutral 7 (22.6)	Normal	26 (83.9)	24 (77.4)	
The habit of avoiding places that sell unhealthy food 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) 0.668 Rarely 5 (16.1) 2 (6.5) 0 Neutral 14 (45.2) 21 (67.7) 0 Often 11 (35.5) 4 (12.9) Very often 0 3 (9.7) The habit of avoiding buying candy, chips, biscuits and cakes Very rarely 2 (6.5) 0.665 0.128 Rarely 10 (32.3) 3 (9.7) 18 (58.1) 0 0 Neutral 12 (38.7) 18 (58.1) 0 0 0 Very often 7 (22.6) 7 (12) 0 0 0 Very often 9 (29) 13 (41.9) 0 0 0 0 Neutral 9 (29) 13 (41.9) 0	Abnormal	5 (16.1)	7 (22.6)	
Very rarely 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) 0.668 Rarely 5 (16.1) 2 (6.5)	The habit of avoiding places that sell unh	ealthy food		0.000
Rarely 5 (16.1) 2 (6.5) Neutral 14 (45.2) 21 (67.7) Often 0 3 (9.7) The habit of avoiding buying candy, chips, biscuits and cakes Very rarely 2 (6.5) 2 (6.5) 0.128 Rarely 10 (32.3) 3 (9.7) Neutral 12 (38.7) 18 (58.1) Often 7 (22.6) 7 (12) Very often 0 1 (3.2) Often 7 (22.6) 0.737 Disagree 1 (3.2) 3 (9.7) Neutral 9 (29.0) 13 (41.9) Neutral 9 (29.9) 13 (41.9) Agree 1 (35.5) 9 (29) 13 (41.9) <td>Very rarely</td> <td>1 (3.2)</td> <td>1 (3.2)</td> <td>0.668</td>	Very rarely	1 (3.2)	1 (3.2)	0.668
Nettral 14 (452) 21 (67.7) Often 11 (35.5) 4 (12.9) Very often 0 3 (9.7) The habit of avoiding buying candy, chips, biscuits and cakes 2 (6.5) 0.128 Rarely 2 (6.5) 2 (6.5) 0.128 Rarely 10 (32.3) 3 (9.7) 18 (58.1) Often 7 (22.6) 7 (12) Very often 0 1 (3.2) The thought of not eating lots of high-fat snacks 3 (9.7) Strongly disagree 5 (16.1) 2 (6.5) 0.737 Disagree 1 (3.2) 3 (9.7) 13 (41.9) Agree 5 (16.1) 4 (12.9) 14 (45.2) Strongly disagree 5 (16.1) 4 (12.9) 14 (45.2) Strongly agree 1 (1 (35.5) 9 (29) 14 (45.2) The thought of not eating a lot of junk food 1 (3.2) 0.935 Disagree 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) Agree 7 (22.6) 9 (29) 1 (3.2) Strongly agree 1 (4 (45.2) <	Rarely	5 (16.1)	2 (6.5)	
Otten 11 (35.5) 4 (12.9) Very often 0 3 (9.7) The habit of avoiding buying candy, chips, biscuits and cakes	Neutral	14 (45.2)	21 (67.7)	
Very often 0 3 (9.7) The habit of avoiding buying candy, chips, biscuits and cakes 0 2 (6.5) 0.128 Rarely 10 (32.3) 3 (9.7) 0 0 Neutral 12 (38.7) 18 (58.1) 0 0 Often 7 (22.6) 7 (12) 0 0 0 0 Very often 0 1 (3.2) 3 (9.7) 0 <td>Often</td> <td>11 (35.5)</td> <td>4 (12.9)</td> <td></td>	Often	11 (35.5)	4 (12.9)	
Internation of avoiding buying candy, chips, biscuits and cakes Very rarely 2 (6.5) 2 (6.5) 0.128 Rarely 10 (32.3) 3 (9.7) Neutral 12 (38.7) 18 (58.1) Often 7 (22.6) 7 (12) Very often 0 1(3.2) The thought of not eating lots of high-fat snacks 3 (9.7) Strongly disagree 5 (16.1) 2 (6.5) 0.737 Disagree 1 (3.2) 3 (9.7) 18 (58.1) Agree 5 (16.1) 4 (12.9) 14 (12.9) Strongly agree 11 (35.5) 9 (29) 13 (41.9) Agree 5 (16.1) 4 (12.9) 15 (10.1) Strongly agree 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) The thought of not eating a lot of junk food 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) Disagree 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) Agree 7 (22.6) 9 (29) 2 (6.5) 0.935 Disagree 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) Agree 7 (22.6) 9 (29) 3 (1 (10.0) 0.15	Very often	U	3 (9.7)	
Very rarely 2 (6.5) 2 (6.5) 0.128 Rarely 10 (32.3) 3 (9.7) 18 (58.1) Neutral 12 (38.7) 18 (58.1) 10 (32.2) Often 7 (22.6) 7 (12) 10 (32.2) Very often 0 1 (3.2) 10 (32.2) The thought of not eating lots of high-fat snacks 2 (6.5) 0.737 Disagree 1 (3.2) 3 (9.7) 10 (32.3) Neutral 9 (29) 13 (41.9) 10 (32.9) Agree 5 (16.1) 4 (12.9) 10 (32.9) Strongly disagree 2 (6.5) 9 (29) 0.935 Disagree 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) Neutral 7 (22.6) 9 (29) 1 (3.2) Neutral 7 (22.6) 9 (29) 1 (3.2) Agree 7 (22.6) 9 (29) 1 (3.2) Agree 7 (22.6) 9 (29) 1 (3.2) Agree 1 (4 (4.5.2) 15 (48.4) 1 (3.2) Strongly agree 1 (4 (4.5.2) 1 (3.10)	The habit of avoiding buying candy, chips	, discuits and cakes		0.420
Name 10 (32.3) 3 (9.7) Neutral 12 (38.7) 18 (58.1) Often 7 (22.6) 7 (12) Very often 0 1 (3.2) The thought of not eating lots of high-fat snacks 3 (9.7) Strongly disagree 5 (16.1) 2 (6.5) 0.737 Disagree 1 (3.2) 3 (9.7) 3 (9.7) Neutral 9 (29) 13 (41.9) 3 (9.7) Agree 5 (16.1) 4 (12.9) 3 (9.7) Strongly agree 11 (35.5) 9 (29) 3 (41.9) Strongly agree 11 (35.5) 9 (29) 3 (41.9) Meutral 7 (22.6) 9 (29) 9 (29) The thought of not eating a lot of junk food 10 (32.1) 10 (32.9) Neutral 7 (22.6) 4 (12.9) 10 (32.9) Agree 7 (22.6) 4 (12.9) 10 (41.2) Strongly agree 14 (45.2) 15 (48.4) 10 (32.3) Nettral 29 (93.5) 31 (100) 0.157 <0.8 km	very rarely	2 (6.5)	2 (6.5)	0.128
Neutral12 (38.7)18 (38.1)Often7 (22.6)7 (12)Very often01 (3.2)The thought of not eating lots of high-fat snacksStrongly disagree5 (16.1)2 (6.5)0.737Disagree1 (3.2)3 (9.7)13 (41.9)Agree5 (16.1)4 (12.9)13 (41.9)Agree5 (16.1)4 (12.9)13 (41.9)Strongly agree1 (3.2)9 (29)14 (41.9)Strongly disagree2 (6.5)2 (6.5)0.935Disagree1 (3.2)1 (3.2)1 (3.2)Neutral7 (22.6)9 (29)14 (45.2)Neutral7 (22.6)9 (29)15 (48.4)Strongly agree14 (45.2)15 (48.4)The distance to the nearest supermarket from the residence $Vertion (10, 0, 157)$ < 0.8 km29 (93.5)31 (100)0.157 < 0.8 km29 (93.5)00Accustomed to checking labels on packages $Vertion (10, 32.3)$ 0.206Not25 (80.6)21 (67.7)2 (38.7)Yes10 (32.3)19 (61.3)0.013 *Not21 (67.7)12 (38.7)12 (38.7)Be affected by discount offers	Rarely	10 (32.3)	3 (9.7)	
Otten 7 (22.6) 7 (12) Very often 0 1 (3.2) The thought of not eating lots of high-fat snacks 2 (6.5) 0.737 Disagree 1 (3.2) 3 (9.7) Neutral 9 (29) 13 (41.9) Agree 5 (16.1) 4 (12.9) Strongly agree 1 (35.5) 9 (29) The thought of not eating a lot of junk food 7 7 Strongly disagree 2 (6.5) 0.935 Disagree 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) Neutral 7 (22.6) 9 (29) Agree 7 (22.6) 9 (29) Agree 7 (22.6) 4 (12.9) Strongly agree 14 (45.2) 15 (48.4) The distance to the nearest supermarket from the residence 7 <0.8 km	Neutral	12 (38.7)	18 (58.1)	
The thought of not eating lots of high-fat snacks Strongly disagree 5 (16.1) 2 (6.5) 0.737 Disagree 1 (3.2) 3 (9.7) Neutral 9 (29) 13 (41.9) Agree 5 (16.1) 4 (12.9) Strongly agree 11 (35.5) 9 (29) The thought of not eating a lot of junk food 5 0.737 Strongly disagree 2 (6.5) 9 (29) The thought of not eating a lot of junk food 1 (3.2) 0.935 Disagree 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) 0.935 Agree 7 (22.6) 4 (12.9) 1 (3.2) Agree 7 (22.6) 4 (12.9) 1 (3.2) Strongly agree 1 4 (45.2) 15 (48.4) 1 (3.2) The distance to the nearest supermarket from the residence 0.8 km 2 (6.5) 0 <0.8 km	Offen	7 (22.6)	7 (12)	
Strongly disagree 5 (16.1) 2 (6.5) 0.737 Disagree 1 (3.2) 3 (9.7) Neutral 9 (29) 13 (41.9) Agree 5 (16.1) 4 (12.9) Strongly agree 11 (35.5) 9 (29) The thought of not eating a lot of junk food 5 0.737 Strongly disagree 2 (6.5) 9 (29) The thought of not eating a lot of junk food 1 (3.2) 0.935 Disagree 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) Neutral 7 (22.6) 9 (29) 1 (3.2) Agree 7 (22.6) 4 (12.9) 1 (3.2) Strongly agree 14 (45.2) 15 (48.4) 1 (3.2) The distance to the nearest supermarket from the residence 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) 2 (9.3.5) 31 (100) 0.157 <0.8 km	The thought of not acting late of high for	U	1 (3.2)	
Strongly disagree 5 (15.1) 2 (6.5) 0.757 Disagree 1 (3.2) 3 (9.7) 1 Agree 5 (16.1) 4 (12.9) 3 Agree 5 (16.1) 4 (12.9) 3 Strongly agree 11 (35.5) 9 (29) 3 The thought of not eating a lot of junk food 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) Neutral 7 (22.6) 9 (29) Agree 7 (22.6) 9 (29) Agree 7 (22.6) 4 (12.9) Strongly agree 14 (45.2) 15 (48.4) The distance to the nearest supermarket from the residence	Ine thought of not eating lots of high-fat		2 (6 5)	0 727
Disagree 1 (3.2) 3 (9.7) Neutral 9 (29) 13 (41.9) Agree 5 (16.1) 4 (12.9) Strongly agree 11 (35.5) 9 (29) The thought of not eating a lot of junk food 9 (29) Strongly disagree 2 (6.5) 2 (6.5) 0.935 Disagree 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) Neutral 7 (22.6) 9 (29) 4 (12.9) Agree 7 (22.6) 9 (29) 4 (12.9) Strongly agree 14 (45.2) 15 (48.4) 15 (48.4) The distance to the nearest supermarket from the residence 0 0.157 0 < 0.8 km		5 (10.1)	2 (0.3)	0.737
Agree 5 (25) 13 (41.9) Agree 5 (16.1) 4 (12.9) Strongly agree 11 (35.5) 9 (29) The thought of not eating a lot of junk food 1 (3.2) 0.935 Disagree 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) Neutral 7 (22.6) 9 (29) Agree 7 (22.6) 9 (29) Agree 7 (22.6) 4 (12.9) Strongly agree 14 (45.2) 15 (48.4) The distance to the nearest supermarket from the residence 15 (48.4) <0.8 km	Disagree	1 (3.2)	3 (9.7)	
Agree 3 (16.1) 4 (12.9) Strongly agree 11 (35.5) 9 (29) The thought of not eating a lot of junk food 2 (6.5) 0.935 Strongly disagree 2 (6.5) 1 (3.2) Disagree 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) Neutral 7 (22.6) 9 (29) Agree 7 (22.6) 4 (12.9) Strongly agree 14 (45.2) 15 (48.4) The distance to the nearest supermarket from the residence	Agroo	9 (29) E (16 1)	13 (41.9)	
The thought of not eating a lot of junk food 5 (29) Strongly disagree 2 (6.5) 2 (6.5) 0.935 Disagree 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) Neutral 7 (22.6) 9 (29) 4 (12.9) Agree 7 (22.6) 4 (12.9) 5 (48.4) The distance to the nearest supermarket from the residence 5 (6.5) 0 0.157 <0.8 km	Agree	5 (10.1) 11 (25 5)	4 (12.9)	
Strongly disagree 2 (6.5) 2 (6.5) 0.935 Disagree 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) Neutral 7 (22.6) 9 (29) Agree 7 (22.6) 4 (12.9) Strongly agree 14 (45.2) 15 (48.4) The distance to the nearest supermarket from the residence <0.8 km	The thought of not eating a lot of junk for	II (55.5)	9 (29)	
Strongly disagree 2 (6.5) 2 (6.5) 0.935 Disagree 1 (3.2) 1 (3.2) Neutral 7 (22.6) 9 (29) Agree 7 (22.6) 4 (12.9) Strongly agree 14 (45.2) 15 (48.4) The distance to the nearest supermarket from the residence <0.8 km	The thought of not eating a lot of junk lot			0.025
Disagree $1 (3.2)$ $1 (3.2)$ Neutral $7 (22.6)$ $9 (29)$ Agree $7 (22.6)$ $4 (12.9)$ Strongly agree $14 (45.2)$ $15 (48.4)$ The distance to the nearest supermarket from the residence $< 0.8 \text{ km}$ $29 (93.5)$ $31 (100)$ 0.157 $\geq 0.8 \text{ km}$ $2 (6.5)$ 0 0 Accustomed to checking labels on packagesYes $6 (19.4)$ $10 (32.3)$ 0.206 Not $25 (80.6)$ $21 (67.7)$ $Affected by nutrition claims$ Ves $10 (32.3)$ $0.013 *$ Yes $10 (32.3)$ $19 (61.3)$ $0.013 *$ $21 (67.7)$ $12 (38.7)$ Be affected by discount offers	Strongly disagree	2 (6.5)	2 (6.5)	0.935
Neutral 7 (22.6) 9 (29) Agree 7 (22.6) 4 (12.9) Strongly agree 14 (45.2) 15 (48.4) The distance to the nearest supermarket from the residence <0.8 km	Disagree	1 (3.2)	1 (3.2)	
Agree $7(22.6)$ $4(12.9)$ Strongly agree $14(45.2)$ $15(48.4)$ The distance to the nearest supermarket from the residence $<0.8 \text{ km}$ $29(93.5)$ $31(100)$ 0.157 $\geq 0.8 \text{ km}$ $2(6.5)$ 0 0 Accustomed to checking labels on packagesYes $6(19.4)$ $10(32.3)$ 0.206 Not $25(80.6)$ $21(67.7)$ $0.013*$ Yes $10(32.3)$ $19(61.3)$ $0.013*$ Not $21(67.7)$ $12(38.7)$ 0.206	Agree	7 (22.6)	9 (29)	
Strongly agree 14 (45.2) 15 (48.4) The distance to the nearest supermarket from the residence $< 0.8 \text{ km}$ 29 (93.5) 31 (100) 0.157 $\geq 0.8 \text{ km}$ 2 (6.5) 0 0 0 Accustomed to checking labels on packages 0 0 0 Yes 6 (19.4) 10 (32.3) 0.206 Not 25 (80.6) 21 (67.7) 0 Affected by nutrition claims 7 7 19 (61.3) 0.013 * Not 21 (67.7) 12 (38.7) 0 10	Agree	7 (22.6)	4 (12.9)	
<0.8 km	The distance to the propert supervised	14 (45.2) from the residence	15 (48.4)	
 ≥ 0.8 km ≥ 0.8 km 2 (6.5) 0 Accustomed to checking labels on packages Yes 6 (19.4) 10 (32.3) 0.206 21 (67.7) Affected by nutrition claims Yes 10 (32.3) 19 (61.3) 0.013 * 12 (38.7) Be affected by discount offers Affected by discount offers 10 (32.3) 12 (38.7) Be affected by discount offers Affected by discount offers Affected by discount offers Affected by discount offers Affected by discount offers Affected by discount offers Affected by discount offers 	so 8 km		21 (100)	0 157
Accustomed to checking labels on packages 0 Yes 6 (19.4) 10 (32.3) 0.206 Not 25 (80.6) 21 (67.7) Affected by nutrition claims 10 (32.3) 0.013 * Yes 10 (32.7) 12 (38.7) Be affected by discount offers 50		29 (93.3)	31 (100)	0.157
Yes 6 (19.4) 10 (32.3) 0.206 Not 25 (80.6) 21 (67.7) Affected by nutrition claims 7es 10 (32.3) 19 (61.3) 0.013 * Not 21 (67.7) 12 (38.7) Be affected by discount offers	2 U.8 KIII Accustomed to checking labels on package	2 (0.5)	0	
Not 25 (80.6) 21 (67.7) Affected by nutrition claims 10 (32.3) 19 (61.3) 0.013 * Not 21 (67.7) 12 (38.7)		es 6 (10 4)	10 (22 2)	0.206
Affected by nutrition claims 23 (80.0) 21 (07.7) Yes 10 (32.3) 19 (61.3) 0.013 * Not 21 (67.7) 12 (38.7)	Tes Not	0 (19.4)	10 (32.3)	0.200
Yes 10 (32.3) 19 (61.3) 0.013 * Not 21 (67.7) 12 (38.7) Be affected by discount offers 21 (67.7) 12 (38.7)	Affected by putrition claims	25 (80.0)	21(07.7)	
Not 21 (67.7) 12 (38.7) Be affected by discount offers 12 (38.7)	Voc	10 (22 2)	19 (61 3)	0.013 *
Be affected by discount offers	Not	21 (67 7)	12 (28 7)	0.015
be anected by discount offers	Be affected by discount offers	21(07.7)	12 (38.7)	
		20 (64 5)	19 (61 3)	0 705
Not 11 (35 5) 12 (32 7)	Not	20 (04.3)	12 (22 7)	0.705
Accustomed to carrying a shonning list when huving snacks	Accustomed to carrying a shonning list wi	hen huving snacks	12 (30.7)	
		11 (25 5)	12 (38 7)	0 705
Not 20 (64.5) 19 (61.3)	Not	20 (64.5)	19 (61.3)	0.700

 Table 1. Differences in Knowledge Level, Anthropometric Status, Habits and Orientation in Eating Snacks Before and After the Nutrition Intervention (n = 31)

* Wilcoxon Signed Rank test to analyze the difference before and after with a significance of p < 0.05.



© 2021. Adelina, et.al. Open access under CC BY - SA license.

Received: 12-08-2019, Accepted: 04-03-2021, Published online: 21-06-2021. doi: 10.20473 /amnt.v5i2.2021. 166-172. Joinly Published by IAGIKMI & Universitas Airlangga

Table 1 also shows that the habit of avoiding places that sell unhealthy foods has increased in frequency, although not significantly (p = 0.668). Before being given the intervention program, no one chose 'very often', but after being given the intervention there were 3 people who chose 'very often' (9.7%). Then, the habit of avoiding buying candy, chips, biscuits, and cakes before being given the program, no one chose 'very often', increased although not significantly (p = 0.128). Furthermore, there was a decrease from the agreement and strongly agree to the agreement that there were not many high-fat snacks, although there was no significant difference (p = 0.737). Then, the thought of not eating a lot of junk food has decreased from the statement of agreeing and strongly agreeing, although there was no significant difference (p = 0.935). In addition, the majority

of participants have close access to supermarkets and residences. Then, there was an increase in the habit of checking labels on packages by 25%. However, there was no significant difference between before and after the intervention program was given (p = 0.206). Furthermore, there was an increase in compliance with nutrition claims by 31% and there was a significant difference between before and after the intervention program was given (p = 0.013). Then there was an increase in the effect of discount offers on snack shopping by 31%, although there was no significant difference between before and after the intervention program was given (p = 0.705). Other than that,

Item	Nutrition Intervention (gram / serving)		Р
	Before	After	
Healthy Snack			
Fruit	22.9 ± 24.5	84.5 ± 80.5	< 0.01 *
Vegetable	45.4 ± 71.9	35.7 ± 44.2	0.203
Processed milk	16.8 ± 26.3	24.6 ± 34.6	0.313
Unhealthy Snack			
Sweet biscuits	21.1 ± 41.9	35.8 ± 65.3	0.269
Potato chips	18.6 ± 42.9	21.6 ± 47.6	0.575
Salt krakers	11.7 ± 29.2	11.2 ± 22.2	0.886
Fried food b	36.4 ± 39.4	43.6 ± 42.9	0.914
Pastry / cake	16.6 ± 34.4	17.4 ± 34.2	0.768
Chocolate / candy	11.7 ± 20.8	6.7 ± 8.8	0.746
Sweet drinks	159.7 ± 142.1	177.4 ± 158.4	0.494
lce cream	18.9 ± 22.7	40.6 ± 57.9	0.019 *
Pudding	7.6 ± 17.7	6.6 ± 13.9	0.876
Market snacks	33.9 ± 61.6	28.1 ± 46.1	0.923
Meatballs	21.9 ± 28.8	33.6 ± 36.3	0.148

* Wilcoxon Signed Rank test to analyze the difference before and after with a significance of p <0.05. mean ± SD in grams ^ayogurt, cheese and skim milk

^bPaired t-test

Table 2 shows the semi-quantitative results of the healthy snack FFQ for the fruit category experienced a significant increase after being given a service program (p <0.01). This result is in accordance with the research of Baldaso, et al. (2016) which also showed an increase in fruit consumption after nutrition education interventions were carried out. The research of Ningrum et al (2019) stated that counseling with booklet media succeeded in increasing fruit consumption in the intervention group by 0.63 portions, but the results of the Mann Whitney test showed that there was no difference in fruit consumption before giving nutritional counseling (p = 0.53) and after giving counseling. nutrition (p = 0.74) between the control and intervention groups. Meanwhile, the Mann Whitney test on the difference in the mean portion of fruit consumption showed that there was a significant difference between the control group and the intervention group $(p = 0.01)^{17}$.

In the vegetable and dairy category (table 2), it shows that there is no significant difference between before and after being given the service program. However, there is a tendency for increased consumption of dairy products, while vegetables have decreased. The semi-quantitative results of the FFQ for unhealthy snacks for the category of salty crackers, chocolate / candy, pudding, and market snacks tended to decrease in the amount of consumption, although not significantly. Then for the category of meatballs, sweet biscuits, potato chips, fried foods, pastries / cakes, and sweet drinks, the consumption tends to increase. In addition, the ice cream category experienced a significant increase (p = 0.019) after being given the intervention. Nuryani's research (2018) states thatThe habit of eating snacks among elementary school children is 78.4% and it is found that there is a relationship between eating habits and nutritional status (p = 0.030)¹⁸.



Even though the consumption of snacks, which are less than the three main meals, contributes to energy and nutrient intake. In case control research⁶ and crosssectional⁷ shows that the frequency of snack consumption is associated with the consumption of energy dense foods and increases the risk of obesity.

Labeling related to nutritional information has been recommended by WHO as a policy measure to promote a healthy diet, which can prevent and control obesity and non-communicable diseases.¹⁹. Labeling of nutritional information on food packaging, especially snacks, can also improve consumers' ability to identify unhealthy foods, which is the key to behavior change²⁰. In addition, nutritional information labels serve as a boost by making nutritional information stand out more²¹.

The limitation in this study is that from the initial screening there were 61 people, only some of them came during education and were willing to participate in assistance in making healthy snacks. Even though they had received an explanation before conducting the study and signed an informed consent.

CONCLUSION

There is a significant increase in knowledge in research subjects as much as 30%. In addition, the prevalence of obesity tends to fall, although not significantly. The habit of avoiding places that sell unhealthy food tends to increase, although not significantly. The habit of avoiding buying candy, chips, biscuits and cakes tended to increase, although not significantly. All participants did not experience difficulties in accessing food to supermarkets due to the proximity of their residence. There has been an increase in the habit of checking labels before buying snack packs as well as an increase in the influence of nutrition claims and discount offers for snack shopping. There is an increase in the habit of carrying a shopping list when buying snacks and a significant increase in the amount of fruit consumption.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Thank you to all research subjects for participating in this research. In addition, thanks are also conveyed to Nusa, Sofi, Gita, Dila, Rara, Rendy, and Hida as enumerators in this research. And thanks to Eulia Irsa as the main writer assistant.

Conflict of Interest and Funding Disclosure

There is no conflict of interest between the authors. This research was funded by the Health Polytechnic of the Malang Ministry of Health in the 2018 budget year.

REFERENCES

- Adelina, R. Hubungan Tingkat Pendidikan dan Pola Makan Mahasiswa yang Merantau di Kota Malang, Indonesia dan di Kota Taipei, Taiwan. (2016).
- 2. He, F. J., Li, J. & Macgregor, G. A. Effect of longer-Term modest salt reduction on blood pressure.

Cochrane Database Syst. Rev. **3**, (2013).

- GBD 2015 Risk Factors Collaborators. Global, regional, and national comparative risk assessment of 79 behavioural, environmental and occupational, and metabolic risks or clusters of risks 1990–2015: A systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2015. Lancet 388, 1659–1724 (2016).
- Troesch, B. *et al.* Increased Intake of Foods with High Nutrient Density Can Help to Break the Intergenerational Cycle of Malnutrition and Obesity. 6016–6037 (2015) doi:10.3390/nu7075266.
- 5. WHO. Obesity and overweight. (2019).
- Novaes, J., Franceschini Sdo, C. & Priore, S. Mother's overweight, parents' constant limitation on the foods and frequent snack as risk factors for obesity among children in Brazil. *Arch Latinoam Nutr.* 58, 256–264 (2008).
- Murakami, K. & Livingstone, M. Associations between meal and snack frequency and overweight and abdominal obesity in US children and adolescents from National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) 2003–2012. Br J Nutr. 115, 1819–1829 (2016).
- Liu, A., Silvestre, M. & Poppitt, S. Prevention of type 2 For, diabetes through lifestyle modification: is there a role higher-protein diets? Adv Nutr 6, 665–673. (2015).
- Layman, D., Clifton, P., Gannon, M. & Al., E. Protein in Clin, optimal health: heart disease and type 2 diabetes. *Am J Nutr* 87, 15715–1575S. (2008).
- Tavakoli, H. R., Dini-Talatappeh, H., Rahmati-Najarkolaei, F. & Fesharaki, G. Efficacy of HBM-Based Dietary Education Intervention on Knowledge, Attitude, and Behavior in Medical Students. *Iran Red Crescent Med J* 18, e23584 (2016).
- Vardanjani, A. E., Reisi, M., Javadzade, H., Pour, Z. G. & Tavassoli, E. The Effect of nutrition education on knowledge, attitude, and performance about junk food consumption among students of female primary schools. J Educ Heal. Promot 4, 53 (2015).
- Wang, D., Stewart, D., Chang, C. & Shi, Y. Effect of a school-based nutrition education program on adolescents ' nutrition-related knowledge , attitudes and behaviour in rural areas of China. *Environ. Health Prev. Med.* 271–278 (2015) doi:10.1007/s12199-015-0456-4.
- Pakhri, A., Sukmawati & Nurhasanah. Pengaruh Edukasi Gizi Terhadap Pengetahuan Gizi Dan Asupan Energi, Protein Dan Besi Pada Remaja. Makassar. Media Kesehat. Politek. Kesehat. Kemenkes Makassar 13, 39–43 (2018).
- 14. Fitri, Y., Rahmad, A., Suryana & Nurbaiti. Pengaruh Penyuluhan Gizi Tentang Jajanan Tradisional Terhadap Peningkatan Pengetahuan Dan Perilaku Jajan Anak Sekolah. J. AcTion Aceh



© 2021. Adelina, et.al. **Open access under CC BY - SA license.** Received: 12-08-2019, Accepted: 04-03-2021, Published online: 21-06-2021. doi: 10.20473 /amnt.v5i2.2021. 166-172. **Joinly Published by IAGIKMI & Universitas Airlangga** Nutr. J. 5, 13–18 (2020).

- Baldasso, J. G., Galante, P. & Ganen, A. D. E. P. Impact of actions of food and nutrition education program in a population of adolescents Impacto das ações de um programa de educação. *Rev. Nutr., Campinas* 29, 65–75 (2016).
- Hasibuan, T. Status Gizi Siswa Smp Berdasarkan Pengetahuan, Sikap Dan Kebiasaan Makan Jajanan vol. 5 no.1. Palembang. *J. 'Aisyiyah Med.* 5, 151–161 (2020).
- Ningrum, N., Ambarwati, R. & Sulistyowati, E. Pengaruh Konseling Dengan Media Booklet Terhadap Konsumsi Sayur Buah Dan Fast Food Pada Remaja Obesitas. J. Ris. Gizi 7, 75–78 (2019).
- Nuryani, R. Kebiasaan jajan berhubungan dengan status gizi siswa anak sekolah di Kabupaten Gorontalo. J. Gizi Indones. (The Indones. J. Nutr. 6, 114–122 (2018).
- 19. World Health Organization. *Global Action Plan* for the Prevention and Control of NCDs 2013– 2020. (2013).
- 20. Michie, S., van Stralen, M. & West, R. The behaviour change wheel: a new method for characterising and designing behaviour change interventions. *Implement. Sci.* **6**, 42 (2011).
- 21. Reisch, L. & Sunstein, C. Do Europeans like nudges? *Judgm. Decis. Mak.* **11**, 310–325 (2016).

