ijlpr 2022; doi 10.22376/ijpbs/lpr.2022.12.5.L11-17

International Journal of Life science and Pharma Research

ISSN 2250-0480

Research Article

Knowledge of Nutrition in Sports Person

# Examination of Nutrition Knowledge Levels of Individuals Who Received Sports Training

**Levent Ceylan[1*], Defne Ezgi Akkaya Boyraz[2], Sadettin Çaldiran[2], Tülay Ceylan[3], and Hamza Küçük[4]**

[1]*Sivas Cumhuriyet University, Faculty of Sports Sciences, Department of Coaching Education, Department of Sports Health Sciences, Sivas, Turkiye.*
[2]*Sivas Cumhuriyet University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Department of Physical Education and Sports Education, Sivas, Turkiye.*
[3]*Sivas Cumhuriyet University, Institute of Health Sciences, Department of Physical Education and Sports, Sivas, Turkiye.*
[4]*Ondokuz Mayis University, Yasar Dog u Faculty of Sports Sciences, Department of Physical Education and Sports, Department of Physical Education and Sports, Samsun, Turkiye*

**Abstract:** The aim of this research is to determine whether the nutrition lessons taken affect the students, to what extent the students adapt the learned nutrition information to their lives, whether there is a relationship between the sports branch and nutrition information, whether there is a relationship between body mass index grouping and nutrition information. A total of 202 people, 125 (61.9%) men and 77 (38.1%) women, aged 23.21±3.31 years, participated in the study. In the first part of the data collection tool prepared in the research, the personal information of the participants was asked. In the second part, "Basic Nutrition Information" scale, in the third part "Food Preference" scale was asked. The factual questionnaire containing personal information consists of 16 questions in total. Multiple choice and open-ended questions were included in the questionnaire in which personal information was asked. The height and body weights of the participants were submitted by themselves. Body mass indexes (BMI) were calculated with the given body weight and height information ((BMI) = Body Weight (kg.) / Height squared (m2.)). The collected data were analyzed using the SPSS 22 package program. The homogeneity of the data was performed using the Scheffe and Hochberg GT2 test and the Post-Hoc multiple comparison test. Pearson Correlation test was used to determine the relationship between the nutritional knowledge levels of the individuals participating in the study and their age groups, since the data showed a normal distribution. The BMI and YETBID total scores of graduates and students were compared, a significant difference was found between graduates and students ($p<0.05$). A significant difference in the YETBI D total score was found to be in favor of graduates. BMI was found to be higher in graduates compared to students. No significant difference was found when BT total scores were compared ($p>0.05$). When the total scores of the participants were evaluated according to the status of taking courses, a significant difference was found in favor of those who took courses in both YETBID and BT. As a result; Nutrition education on proper nutrition (i.e. carbohydrates, protein and fluid) should be the main focus and priority, both in order to have an impact on public health, and to increase the performance of those who do sports and to aid recovery.

**Keywords:** *Basic Nutrition Information, Food Preference, Sport Science, Graduated, Studying*

***Corresponding Author**

**Levent Ceylan , Sivas Cumhuriyet University, Faculty of Sports Sciences, Department of Coaching Education, Department of Sports Health Sciences, Sivas, Turkiye.**

**Received On 16 May 2022**
**Revised On 20 June 2022**
**Accepted On 30 June 2022**
**Published On 01 September 2022**

**Funding** This research did not receive any specific grant from any funding agencies in the public, commercial or not for profit sectors.

**Citation** Levent Ceylan , Defne Ezgi Akkaya Boyraz, Sadettin Çaldıran, Tülay Ceylan, and Hamza Küçük , Examination of Nutrition Knowledge Levels of Individuals Who Received Sports Training Received Sports Training.(2022).Int. J. Life Sci. Pharma Res.12(5), L11-17 http://dx.doi.org/ 10.22376/ijpbs/lpr.2022.12.5.L11-17

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The society, which has industrialized with scientific and technological developments, has moved from the traditional diet style to the processed food culture. Prepared foods cause health problems by affecting the biochemistry of the human body. Today, with the prolongation of the time spent outside the home, changes in home cooking, the desire not to cook and the content of consumed foods have also changed.[1] In addition to unhealthy foods, consuming less or more nutrients has negative effects on health, advances in medicine and technology have prevented some diseases, but reduced the frequency of human movement, and this change in movement brings some diseases to light.[2] Today, convenience foods and a sedentary lifestyle pose a health threat for all age groups. Young people need to be supported in terms of both nutrition and physical activity.[3] Not only sedentary youth; it is important that young people who are engaged in sports and receive training on this subject are fed properly. When the nutritional balance is not planned well, regardless of the type of sport, it affects the individual negatively, and the desired efficiency cannot be obtained from the sport. Nutrition in sports, which has turned into a separate science, has enabled the nutrient relationships to improve sports performance to be examined and to reach reliable results.[4, 5,29,30] While nutrition and sports are very related to each other, the knowledge level of our bright young people who represent our country in the field of sports and will contribute to the spread of sports in our country is very important. Considering that students studying in the field of sports sciences will inform and guide the society about sports, it is important that they integrate the nutrition-sports pair, which is essential for health, and adapt them in a correct and balanced way in their own lives and present them effectively to the society. When the literature is scanned, many scientific studies have been conducted on the nutritional habits of young people in terms of health. In the studies on the nutrition knowledge of the students of the sports sciences department; It was concluded that sports science students do not have sufficient knowledge about nutrition, the nutrients they take in relation to the performance of the athletes and the nutritional components of the foods taken should be added to the course content in more detail and they recommended that the nutrition course be given as a compulsory course in the first year of the university.[4, 6] In a study conducted on university students who do active sports, there were significant differences in nutritional knowledge between people who do team sports and those who do individual sports.[4] Various nutrition courses in the curriculum of our universities' sports science departments are offered to university youth as compulsory and optional. The aim of this research is to determine whether the nutrition lessons taken affect the students, to what extent the students adapt the learned nutrition information to their lives, whether there is a relationship between the sports branch and nutrition information, whether there is a relationship between body mass index grouping and nutrition information.

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

### *2.1. Participants Groups*

In the study, the general survey model was preferred by using the quantitative research method. The study was carried out on the basis of the volunteerism of the participants. The study group consisted of students and graduates of the faculty of sports sciences. A total of 202 people, 125 (61.9%) men and 77 (38.1%) women, aged 23.21±3.31 years, participated in the study. Age of graduates participating in the study is 24.93±2.65 years, body weight is 70.22±10.86 kg, height is 174.18±7.99 cm, age of student individuals is 21.52±3.02 years, body weight He is 65.41±11.87 kg, and his height is 172.71±8.35 cm.

### *2.2. Data Collection Tools and Data Collection*

In the first part of the data collection tool prepared in the research, the personal information of the participants was asked. In the second part, "Basic Nutrition Information" scale, in the third part "Food Preference" scale was asked. The factual questionnaire containing personal information consists of 16 questions in total. Multiple choice and open-ended questions were included in the questionnaire in which personal information was asked. The height and body weights of the participants were submitted by themselves. Body mass indexes (BMI) were calculated with the given body weight and height information ((BMI) = Body Weight (kg.) / Height squared ($m^2$.)). According to the BMI values of the participants, those below 18.5 kg/$m^2$ are in the 'weak' group, those with a value of 18.5-24.9 kg/$m^2$ are in the 'normal' group, and 25.0 kg/$m^2$. Those above the value are included in the 'slightly obese-obese' group.[7] The YETBİ D scale was used to measure the nutritional knowledge level. The applied scale consists of two parts; 20 items in the "Basic nutrition and food-health relationship" scale section and 12 items in the "Food preference" scale section. "Cronbach's Alpha", which is the internal reliability coefficient of the sections in the nutrition knowledge level scale for adults, was calculated. The internal reliability coefficient of 20 items in the "basic nutrition" title was Cronbach's Alpha=0.72, and the internal reliability coefficient of 12 items in the "nutritional preference" title was Cronbach's Alpha=0.74.[8] Those who score less than 45 in the basic nutrition section will be included in the bad grouping of nutritional knowledge, those between 45-55 will be in the middle grouping, those between 56-65 will be in the good grouping, and those over 65 will be in the very good grouping. Those who score less than 30 in the food preference section will be included in the bad grouping, those between 30-36 will be in the medium grouping, those between 37-42 will be in the good grouping, and those above 42 will be in the very good grouping.[8] This study was decided to be ethically appropriate as a result of the application dated 01.01.2022 and numbered 2022-01-02 from the Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee of Sivas Cumhuriyet University.

## 3. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The collected data were analyzed using the SPSS 22 package program. Data on variables such as age, height, and body weight of the participants were analyzed descriptively. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used for the normality tests of the values taken from the data, since the sample group was larger than 50. One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Depended t test were used because the data showed normal distribution. The homogeneity of the data was performed using the Scheffe and Hochberg GT2 test and the Post-Hoc multiple comparison test. Pearson Correlation test was used to determine the relationship between the nutritional knowledge levels of the individuals participating in the study and their age groups, since the data showed a normal distribution. Statistical values were evaluated at 95% confidence interval and $p<0.05$ and $p<0.01$ significance levels.

## 4. RESULTS

The body weight of the individuals participating in the study was 67.80±11.60, the height was 173.44±8.19, and the BMI (Body mass index) was 22.04±2.67. Participants' Nutrition Knowledge Level for Adults (YETBID) total score was 73.31±8.25 and food preference (BT) total score was 47.07±6.24.

**Table 1: BMI, YETBID and BT total scores of the participants by gender**

| | Gender | N | Mean ± Std. Deviation | t | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **YETBID** | Male | 125 | 72,24±8,34 | -2,391 | 0,018 |
| | Female | 77 | 75,06±7,83 | | |
| **BT** | Male | 125 | 46,38±6,24 | -2,016 | 0,045 |
| | Female | 77 | 48,19±6,13 | | |
| **BMI** | Male | 124 | 23,31±2,44 | 6,794 | 0,0001 |
| | Female | 77 | 20,93±2,36 | | |

When the BMI, YETBID and BT total scores of all participants were compared according to the table, a significant difference was found between men and women ($p<0.05$). A significant difference in YETBID and BT total scores was found in favor of female participants. BMI was higher in males than females (Table 1).

**Table 2: BMI, YETBID and BT total scores of graduates and students**

| | | N | x̄± | t | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **YETBID** | Graduate | 100 | 76,79±8,40 | 6,487 | **0,0001** |
| | Student | 102 | 69,91±6,52 | | |
| **BT** | Graduate | 100 | 47,82±5,88 | 1,687 | 0,093 |
| | Student | 102 | 46,34±6,53 | | |
| **VKI** | Graduate | 100 | 23,02±2,29 | 3,365 | **0,001** |
| | Student | 102 | 21,79±2,88 | | |

According to the table, when the BMI and YETBID total scores of graduates and students were compared, a significant difference was found between graduates and students ($p<0.05$). A significant difference in the YETBİ D total score was found to be in favor of graduates. BMI was found to be higher in graduates compared to students. No significant difference was found when BT total scores were compared ($p>0.05$) (Table 2).

**Table 3. Total scores by graduate and grade level**

| | | N | x̄ ± | F | p | Post-Hoc |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **YETBID** | Graduate (A) | 100 | 76,79±8,40 | 22,586 | 0,0001 | A>B (p=0,0001)<br>A>C (p=0,0001) |
| | 1.- 2.Grade(B) | 53 | 68,77±6,09 | | | |
| | 3.- 4.Grade (C) | 49 | 71,14±6,81 | | | |
| | Total | 202 | 73,31±8,25 | | | |
| **BT** | Graduate(A) | 100 | 47,82±5,88 | 8,840 | 0,0001 | A>B (p=0,001)<br>C>B (p=0,001) |
| | 1.- 2.Grade (B) | 53 | 44,15±6,37 | | | |
| | 3.- 4Grade (C) | 49 | 48,71±5,89 | | | |
| | Total | 202 | 47,07±6,24 | | | |

When the total scores were evaluated according to the table, a high level of significant difference was found between the 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th grades in both YETBID and BT ($p<0.05$). In the YETBID multiple comparison, the significant difference is between the graduates and the 1st - 2nd year and 3rd - 4th year ($p<0.05$). The significant difference is in favor of graduates. In BT multiple comparison, the significant difference is between the graduates and the 1st- 2nd year, and the significant difference is in favor of the graduates ($p<0.05$). In addition, a significant difference was found between the 1st and 2nd grades, in favor of the 3rd and 4th grades ($p<0.05$) (Table 3).

**Table 4:Total scores according to the status of taking a nutrition**

| | Status of taking a nutrition lesson | N | x̄± | t | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **YETBID** | Students who Taking courses | 144 | 74,90±8,43 | 4,528 | **0,0001** |
| | Students who Not taking courses | 58 | 69,36±6,26 | | |
| **BT** | Students who Taking courses | 144 | 47,81±5,90 | 2,713 | **0,007** |
| | Students who Not taking courses | 58 | 45,22±6,73 | | |

***When the total scores of the participants were evaluated according to the status of taking courses, a significant difference was found in favor of those who took courses in both YETBID and BT ($p<0.05$) (Table 4).***

| Table 5:Total scores of all participants by department | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | x̄± | F | p |
| YETBID | Physical Education and Sports Teaching | 47 | 75,21±7,08 | 1,711 | 0,183 |
| | Coaching | 78 | 72,47±8,28 | | |
| | Sports Management | 77 | 73,01±8,77 | | |
| | Total | 202 | 73,31±8,25 | | |
| BT | Physical Education and Sports Teaching | 47 | 48,23±6,14 | 1,659 | 0,193 |
| | Coaching | 78 | 46,17±6,39 | | |
| | Sports Management | 77 | 47,27±6,09 | | |
| | Total | 202 | 47,07±6,24 | | |

***When the YETBID and BT total scores of all participants according to the departments were examined, no significant difference was found (p>0.05) (Table 5).***

| Table 6. Exercising status of the participants and their YETBİD and BT total scores | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Status of exercising | N | x̄± | t | p |
| YETBID | Doing exercises | 161 | 72,59±8,18 | -2,513 | **0,013** |
| | Not doing exercises | 41 | 76,17±7,96 | | |
| BT | Doing exercises | 161 | 46,97±6,49 | -0,446 | 0,656 |
| | Not doing exercises | 41 | 47,46±5,20 | | |

***Considering the YETBID total score according to the exercise status, a significant difference was found in favor of those who did not exercise (p<0.05). No significant difference was found in the BT total score (p>0.05) (Table 6).***

| Table 7. Actively licensed sports status | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Actively licensed sports status | N | x̄± | t | p |
| YETBID | Athlete who has a license | 82 | 73,43±8,77 | 0,174 | 0,862 |
| | Athlete who does not have a license | 120 | 73,23±7,90 | | |
| BT | Athlete who has a license | 82 | 46,79±6,43 | -0,528 | 0,598 |
| | Athlete who does not have a license | 120 | 47,26±6,13 | | |

***When the active sports status of the participants was examined, no significant difference was found in the total scores of YETBID and BT (p>0.05) (Table 7).***

| Table 8. YETBID and BT total scores according to team and individual sports players | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sport Branch | N | x̄± | t | p |
| YETBID | Team Sports | 129 | 74,36±8,73 | 2,700 | **0,008** |
| | Individual Sports | 62 | 71,16±7,11 | | |
| BT | Team Sports | 129 | 46,79±6,12 | -0,959 | 0,339 |
| | Individual Sports | 62 | 47,70±6,35 | | |

***Considering the YETBID total score of the participants who do team sports and individual sports, a significant difference was found in favor of those who do team sports (p<0.05). There was no significant difference in BT total score (p>0.05) (Table 8).***

| Table 9. YETBID and BT total scores according to BMI classification | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | x̄± | f | p |
| YETBID | Below 18.5 Underweight | 12 | 74,25±6,60 | 0,451 | 0,638 |
| | 18.5–24.9 Normal weight | 155 | 73,05±7,98 | | |
| | 25.0–29.9 Pre-obesity | 34 | 74,41±9,93 | | |
| | Total | 201 | 73,35±8,25 | | |
| BT | Below 18.5 Underweight | 12 | 46,66±6,67 | 0,330 | 0,719 |
| | 18.5–24.9 Normal weight | 155 | 47,27±6,30 | | |
| | 25.0–29.9 Pre-obesity | 34 | 46,35±6,03 | | |
| | Total | 201 | 47,08±6,26 | | |

***There was no significant difference in the total scores of YETBİ D and BT according to the BMI classification of the participants (p>0.05) (Table 9).***

| Table 10. The relationship between age and YETBID and BT total scores | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | YETBID | BT |
| Age | r | 0,295** | 0,211** |
| | p | 0,0001 | 0,003 |
| | N | 202 | 202 |
| **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

***According to the table, a highly significant positive difference was found between age and YETBID and BT total scores (p<0.05) (Table 10).***

## 5. DISCUSSION

The aim of this study is to investigate the nutritional knowledge levels of the students and graduates of the faculty of sports sciences. According to the results of this study, when the basic nutrition and nutrition-health knowledge and food preferences were evaluated in terms of gender, a significant difference was found between men and women. Basic nutrition (n =77, 75.06 ± 7.83 points) and food preference (n =77, 48.19 ± 6.13 points) scores of female participants were found higher compared to males (YETBID n=125, 72.24 ± 8.34 score; BT n=125, 46.38 ± 6.24 points) (Table 1). There are existing studies of nutritional knowledge on men and women. Of these, in the study of Vázquez-Espino et al. (2022), female football players playing in the football team (n = 30, 31.8 ± 3.52 points) had a higher nutritional knowledge score than male football players (n = 42, 26.4 ± 2.42 points), but no significant difference was found.[10] In the study of Spronk et al. (2015), female athletes significantly outperformed and scored better than men in terms of knowledge of nutrient sources.[11] This finding may reflect less interest in healthy eating in studies of the non-athlete population and athletes.[11-14] As stated in the studies in the literature, there is a common opinion that the level of nutritional knowledge is higher in women.[9-14] This may be due to the fact that the age of the participants in this study (23.21±3.31 years) was in the period to take care of their physical appearance. We can also assume that women today use social media resources more than men in terms of appearance. This may suggest that women are more informed about nutrition. In the study, when the BMI and YETBID total scores of graduates and students were compared, a significant difference was found between graduates and students. A significant difference in the YETBİ D total score was found to be in favor of graduates. MI was found to be higher in graduates compared to students. No significant difference was found when BT total scores were compared. BT mean scores of graduates (n =100, 47.82 ± 5.88 points) were higher than students (n =102, 46.34 ± 6.53 points) (Table 2). It is thought that the fact that the graduates have higher nutritional knowledge than the student individuals may be due to the fact that not all of the students in the student group have taken nutrition lessons yet, and that the level of nutrition knowledge is positively affected as time passes, depending on the age of the graduates (Table 10). As a matter of fact, when the total scores according to the graduate and grade level were compared in Table 3; in this study, a high level of significant difference was found between the 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th grades in YETBID and BT. In the YETBID multiple comparison, the significant difference is between the graduates and the 1st - 2nd year and 3rd - 4th year. The significant difference is in favor of graduates. In BT multiple comparison, the significant difference is between the 1st and 2nd year graduates, and the significant difference is in favor of the graduates. In addition, a significant difference was found between the 1st and 2nd grades, in favor of the 3rd and 4th grades (Table 3). This shows the result that the higher the grade level, the higher the average nutritional knowledge level. It may be due to the fact that the students take the nutrition course at the next grade level and that there may be content related to nutrition in the faculty of sports sciences. When the literature is examined, Gönenç-Solsun (2021)[31] found a significant difference between the nutritional knowledge level scores of the participants according to the class they are studying. She stated that this difference was due to the high median score of 4th grade students' nutritional knowledge level. We can state that there are studies in the literature that have reached different results. Of these; the study conducted by Hornstrom et al. (2011) it was reported that no significant result was found when the athletes' grades were compared with their nutritional knowledge scores.[15] In another study, the knowledge level of athlete nutrition of student athletes was found to be insufficient and it was stated that there was no relationship between them and the grade level.[16] When the total scores of the participants were evaluated according to the status of taking a nutrition course, a significant difference was found in favor of those who took the course in both basic nutrition and nutrition-health knowledge and food preference (Table 4). Which is the expected result. The fact that the participants in this study have nutritional knowledge is a sign that they also pay attention to health literacy. When we look at similar studies, it was emphasized by Devlin and Belski (2015) that potential nutrition education was effective in participants who took courses on the carbohydrate and protein content of foods.[17] Vázquez-Espino et al. (2022), in their study on nutrition knowledge, according to the results of their study on athletes, college students, philosophy students, technical staff working in teams, and nutrition dietetics students were the nutrition dietetic students with the highest nutritional knowledge. In addition, a significant difference was found in the nutritional knowledge level in favor of nutrition dietetics students. [10] The common idea that emerged from this study and the other study is that nutrition education has an effect on individuals' nutritional knowledge. In our study when the YETBID and BT total scores of all participants according to the departments in the study were examined, no significant difference was found (Table 5). The absence of a significant difference may be due to the fact that the students studying in these departments take optional or compulsory nutrition courses. Dalbudak et al. (2021), in their study on individuals studying at the Faculty of Sports Sciences, Department of Physical Education and Sports Teaching, Sports Management and Coaching, did not show a statistically significant difference in attitudes, knowledge, anxiety and interests about adequate and balanced nutrition according to the department they studied.[18] Considering the YETBID total score according to the exercise status, a significant difference was found in favor of those who did not exercise. No significant difference was found in the BT total score (Table 6). It can be said that the opposite result was obtained in the study. The expected result was that the individuals who exercised had a high level of nutritional knowledge. However, it may be due to the different sample groups of the individuals participating in the study and

the fact that the participants with high nutritional knowledge levels consisted of individuals who did not exercise. In addition, we can say that individuals who do and do not exercise have a high average of nutritional knowledge and both groups have a high level of nutritional knowledge. When we look at similar studies, Sedek and Yih (2014) stated in their study that the nutritional knowledge levels of the athletes who exercise (83.7±6.84) and the individuals who do not exercise (83.5±6.23 points) are at a good level in both groups.[19] There are studies in which individuals who exercise have better nutritional knowledge than those who do not exercise.[20,21,22] When the active sports status of the participants was examined, no significant difference was found in the total scores of YETBID and BT (Table 7). In addition, it was determined that the scores of the participants were close to each other. In this study, the fact that the scores of the individuals who actively do and do not do sports are close to each other may be due to the large number of participants who take nutrition lessons or the fact that they are in sports sciences even though they do not take nutrition lessons. When the studies on individuals who actively do or do not do sports are examined, Shifflett et al. (2002) concluded that the nutritional knowledge level of elite athletes in sports nutrition knowledge is higher than that of college-level athletes and non-athletes in the USA.[23] In the study of Türkeri et al. (2020), it can be said that university students who do sports pay attention to their nutritional status and eat regularly and well compared to university students who do not do sports.[24] Considering the YETBID total score of the participants who do team sports and individual sports, a significant difference was found in favor of those who do team sports ($p<0.05$).[10] No significant difference was found in the BT total score (Table 8). In their study, Spronk et al. (2015) found that the averages of team and individual athletes were close to each other in the level of nutritional knowledge and they did not find a significant difference.[11] Bozkurt and Nizamlıoğ lu (2005) evaluated the highest 10 points in their study on nutrition knowledge, and the average knowledge score of individual athletes (7.95) was significantly different from those who were engaged in team sports (7.23 points).[4] It has been reported in various studies that the nutritional information of athletes is also insufficient.[14, 25, 26] On the other hand, there are other studies that adequately determine nutritional information .[27, 28] Considering the importance of nutrition for both athletes and university students who do not do sports, it is necessary to increase their knowledge on nutrition. When the studies are examined, it is seen that there are no clear results on the nutritional knowledge level of team or individual athletes. While some studies mention that there is no difference, some studies have found results in favor of team or individual athletes. This may be related to the fact that the sample groups in the studies are different from each other or whether they have received nutrition education (from school, seminar, coaches). There was no significant difference in the total scores of YETBID and BT according to the BMI classification of the participants (Table 9). In the study, a highly significant positive difference was found between age and YETBID and BT total scores (Table 10). In the study, we can say that as the age progresses, especially the individuals who study or graduate from university become conscious about nutrition and health. Devlin and Belski (2015), in their study, did not find a relationship between nutritional knowledge and age in elite athletes. Because of this, older and more experienced players seemed to know no more than their younger peers. Also, for experienced athletes, the nutritional knowledge level was not higher than the non-athletic population despite working with a dietitian for several years.[20] Spronk et al. (2015) found a positive relationship between age and nutritional knowledge level in their study.[11]

## 6. CONCLUSION

In the study, it was revealed that the participants who took nutrition courses had high food preference and nutritional knowledge level. This situation has revealed the importance of receiving nutrition class training. With this result, this study presented to the literature that the nutritional knowledge levels of the students taking nutrition courses could be increased to good levels. In conclusion, nutrition education on proper nutrition (i.e. carbohydrates, protein and fluid) should be the main focus and priority, both in order to have an impact on public health, and to increase the performance of those who do sports and to aid recovery. It should not be neglected that they have knowledge about food sources in order to improve their nutritional quality and help them achieve an ideal body composition. Eating disorders in university students will trigger many problems. Before these problems arise, it is recommended that young people take measures that can increase their nutritional behaviors and knowledge levels from health centers or nutritionists within the universities free of charge.

## 7. AUTHORS CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

Dr.Levent Ceylan, Mrs.Defne Ezgi Akkaya Boyraz, Mr.Saadettin Çaldıran, Mrs.Tülay Ceylan, and Dr.Hamza Küçük conceptualized and gathered the data with regard to this work. Dr.Levent Ceylan and Dr.Hamza Küçük analyzed these data and necessary inputs were given towards the designing of the manuscript. All authors discussed the methodology and results and contributed to the final manuscript.

## 8. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Conflict of interest declared none.

## 9. REFERENCES


1. Kocatepe D, Tırıl A. Healthy nutrition and traditional foods. J Tourism Gastronomy Stud. 2015;55:63.
2. Baysal A. Sağlıklı beslenme ve Akdeniz diyeti. Beslenme Diyet Derg. 1996;25(1):21-9.
3. Ermiş E, Doğan E, Erİllİ NA, Satici A. Üniversite öğ rencilerinin beslenme alışkanlıklarının incelenmesi: Ondokuz mayıs üniversitesi örneğ i. Spor Performans Araştırmaları Derg;6(1). doi: 10.17155/spd.67561.
4. Bozkurt İ, Nizamlıoğlu M. Beden eğitimi ve spor yüksekokullarında okuyan aktif spor yapan öğrencilerin beslenme alışkanlıklarının belirlenmesi ve değerlendirilmesi. Selçuk Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Derg. 2005;14:209-15.
5. Üstdal KM, Köker HA. Spor dallarında beslenme ve yüksek performans bilgisi. [Kayseri: can ofset Matbaacılık]; 1991.

6. Yıldırım İ, Yıldırım Y, Tortop Y, Poyraz A. Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin beslenme alışkanlıkları ve bunları etkileyen faktörler. Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri. Dergisi. 2011;8(1):1375-91.
7. World Health Organization. Obesity and overweight [internet]; 2021; [cited Feb 10 2022]. Available from: https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/obesity-and-overweight.
8. Batmaz H. Yetişkinler için beslenme bilgi düzeyi ölçeği geliştirilmesi ve geçerlik-güvenirlik çalışması [Master's thesis]. İstanbul: Marmara University; 2018.
9. Hendrie GA, Coveney J, Cox D. Exploring nutrition knowledge and the demographic variation in knowledge levels in an Australian community sample. Public Health Nutr. 2008;11(12):1365-71. doi: 10.1017/S1368980008003042, PMID 18671887.
10. Vázquez-Espino K, Rodas-Font G, Farran-Codina A. Sport nutrition knowledge, attitudes, sources of ınformation, and dietary habits of sport-team athletes. Nutrients. 2022;14(7):1345. doi: 10.3390/nu14071345, PMID 35405958.
11. Spronk I, Heaney SE, Prvan T, O'Connor HT. Relationship between general nutrition knowledge and dietary quality in elite athletes. Int J Sport Nutr Exerc Metab. 2015;25(3):243-51. doi: 10.1123/ijsnem.2014-0034, PMID 25252338.
12. Parmenter K, Waller J, Wardle J. Demographic variation in nutrition knowledge in England. Health Educ Res. 2000;15(2):163-74. doi: 10.1093/her/15.2.163, PMID 10751375.
13. Spendlove JK, Heaney SE, Gifford JA, Prvan T, Denyer GS, O'Connor HT. Evaluation of general nutrition knowledge in elite Australian athletes. Br J Nutr. 2012;107(12):1871-80. doi: 10.1017/S0007114511005125, PMID 22018024.
14. Dunn D, Turner LW, Denny G. Nutrition knowledge and attitudes of college athletes. Sport J. 2007;10(4).
15. Hornstrom GR, Friesen CA, Ellery JE, Pike K. Nutrition knowledge, practices, attitudes, and information sources of mid-American conference college softball players. Food Nutr Sci. 2011;02(2):109-17. doi: 10.4236/fns.2011.22015.
16. Andrews A, Wojcik JR, Boyd JM, Bowers CJ. Sports nutrition knowledge among mid-major division ı university student-athletes. J Nutr Metab. 2016;2016:1-5. doi: 10.1155/2016/3172460.
17. Devlin BL, Belski R. Exploring general and sports nutrition and food knowledge in elite male Australian Athletes. Int J Sport Nutr Exerc Metab. 2015;25(3):225-32. doi: 10.1123/ijsnem.2013-0259, PMID 25387042.
18. Dalbudak İ, Yasar O, Afyon YA, Çelikbilek S, Mulazimoglu O. Relationship between the personal characteristics and the attitudes of adequate and balanced nutrition of the students at the faculty of sports sciences. Prog Nutr. 2021;23;Suppl 2:1-13. doi: 10.23751/pn.v23iS2.12019.
19. Sedek R, Yih TY. Dietary habits and nutrition knowledge among athletes and non-athletes in National University of Malaysia (UKM). Pak J Nutr. 2014;13(12):752-9. doi: 10.3923/pjn.2014.752.759.
20. Cavadini C, Decarli B, Grin J, Narring F, Michaud PA. Food habits and sport activity during adolescence: differences between athletic and non-athletic teenagers in Switzerland. Eur J Clin Nutr. 2000;54(1);Suppl 1:S16-20. doi: 10.1038/sj.ejcn.1600979, PMID 10805033.
21. Kim HK, Kwon JS, Kim C, Kim JH, Kim CH, Kim KM. The comparative study on food consumption patterns, dietary behavior, and nutrition knowledge of Korean professional soccer players and nonathletic males. Korean J Community Nutr. 2008;13(2):164-75.
22. Sadhu AR, Kotwal D. Knowledge–Attitude–Practice (KAP) study and nutrition education of athletic and nonathletic teenagers (13-18 years). In ergonomics in caring for people. Berlin: Springer; 2018.
23. Shifflett B, Timm C, Kahanov L. Understanding of athletes' nutritional needs among athletes, coaches, and athletic trainers. Res Q Exerc Sport. 2002;73(3):357–62:357-62. doi: 10.1080/02701367.2002.10609032. PMID 12230345.
24. Türkerİ C. Spor yapan ve yapmayan üniversite öğ rencilerinin beslenme alışkanlıkları üzerine bir inceleme: Çukurova üniversitesi örneğ i. jisr. 2020;13(70):1263-70. doi: 10.17719/jisr.2020.4174.
25. Burns RD, Schiller MR, Merrick MA, Wolf KN. Intercollegiate student athlete use of nutritional supplements and the role of athletic trainers and dietitians in nutrition counseling. J Am Diet Assoc. 2004;104(2):246-49. doi: 10.1016/j.jada.2003.11.013, PMID 14760575.
26. Wong SH, Ha ASC, Lu Y, Xu B. Nutrition knowledge and attitudes of athletes and coaches in Hong Kong, Beijing, and Shanghai. Med Sci Sports Exer. 2004;36(Supplement):349. doi: 10.1249/00005768-200405001-01674.
27. Corley G, Demarest-Litchford M, Bazzarre TL. Nutrition knowledge and dietary practices of college coaches. J Am Diet Assoc. 1990;90(5):705-09. doi: 10.1016/S0002-8223(21)01607-2, PMID 2335685.
28. Juzwiak CR, Ancona-Lopez F. Evaluation of nutrition knowledge and dietary recommendations by coaches of adolescent Brazilian athletes. Int J Sport Nutr Exerc Metab. 2004;14(2):222-35. doi: 10.1123/ijsnem.14.2.222, PMID 15118195.
29. Gopı ME, Narayanan A. Anthropometric indices, clinical symptoms and nutritional knowledge of adolescent girls of Vaniyambadi, Vellore District, Tamil Nadu. Int J Pharma Bio Sci. 2018;9(4):206-12. doi: 10.22376/ijpbs.2018.9.4.b206-212.
30. Joseph B, Priya M. Review on nutritional, medicinal and pharmacological properties of guava (Psidium guajava Linn.). Int J Pharm Biol Sci. 2011;2(1):53-69.
31. Solsun BG. Athlete Nutrition Knowledge Level and Factors Related to Nutritional Habits in Aksaray University Faculty of Sport Sciences Students (Doctoral dissertation, Necmettin Erbakan University (Turkey)).