T.C.
YEDİTEPE UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF HEALTH SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF NUTRITION AND DIETETICS

DETERMINATION OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' TRUST TO SPECIFIC PACKAGED FOODS, KNOWLEDGE AND USAGE LEVEL OF FOOD LABELS CONSIDERING DIFFERENT BMI LEVELS

MASTER'S THESIS

BEGÜM DEMİRCAN

İSTANBUL - 2019

T.C.
YEDİTEPE UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF HEALTH SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF NUTRITION AND DIETETICS

DETERMINATION OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' TRUST TO SPECIFIC PACKAGED FOODS, KNOWLEDGE AND USAGE LEVEL OF FOOD LABELS CONSIDERING DIFFERENT BMI LEVELS

MASTER'S THESIS

BEGÜM DEMİRCAN

SUPERVISOR

Assist. Prof. Dr. Arzu DURUKAN

İSTANBUL - 2019

TEZ ONAYI FORMU

Kurum : Yeditepe Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü

Program : Beslenme ve Diyetetik Yüksek Lisans Programı

Tez Başlığı : Determination of University Students' Trust to Specific Packaged Foods, Knowledge and Usage Level of Food Labels Considering Different BMI Levels

Tez Sahibi : Begüm DEMİRCAN

Sınav Tarihi : 28.01.19

Bu çalışma jurimiz tarafından kapsam ve kalite yönünden Yüksek Lisans Tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

	Unvanı, Adı-Soyadı (Kurumu)	İmza
Jüri Başkanı:	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi İrem Kaya Cebioğlu	
Tez danışmanı:	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Arzu Durukan	
Üye:	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Jak Çatak	
Üye:		
Üye:		

ONAY

Bu tez Yeditepe Üniversitesi Lisansüstü Eğitim-Öğretim ve Sınav Yönetmeliğinin ilgili maddeleri uyarınca yukarıdaki jüri tarafından uygun görülmüş ve Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu'nun 31/01/2019 tarihi ve 2019/02-07 sayılı kararı ile onaylanmıştır.

Prof. Dr. Bayram YILMAZ
Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü Müdürü

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this thesis is my own work and that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, it contains no material previously published or written by another person nor material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree except where due acknowledgment has been made in the text.

BEGÜM DEMİRCAN

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to verbalize my deep gratitude to my advisor Asst. Prof. Arzu Durukan for her continuous support, patience and enthusiasm. Her knowledge and guidance have helped me in every phase of this research and have brought me to this place. She has encouraged me to carry on and has contributed to this thesis with a major, undeniable impact. This accomplishment would not have been possible without her.

Special thanks should be given to Binnur Okan Bakır as my teacher for showing me what a good dietitian should be by sharing her wide knowledge and experience.

I would like to express my great appreciation to Prof. Dr. M. Temel Yılmaz who has always given me a hand to deal with the complexities by sharing his invaluable experience and unfailing support from the beginning of my career.

It is important for me to thank my parents, whose love and guidance are with me in whatever I pursue. I am always grateful to my mom and dad for being constant supporters and ultimate role models throughout my life. The last and the best, heartfelt thanks go to my brother for encouraging me in every situation and giving me life inspiration without knowing.

This thesis is dedicated to my precious family.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
ASBs	Artificially Sweetened Beverages
BMI	Body Mass Index
BOP	Back of Package
FOP	Front of Package
GCA	Gastronomy and Culinary Arts
NAD	Nutrition and Dietetics
PTR	Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation
SSBs	Sugar Sweetened Beverages
UHT	Ultra High Temperature
UK	United Kingdom
US	United States
WHO	World Health Organisation

ABSTRACT

Demircan, B. (2019). Determination of University Students' Trust to Specific Packaged Foods, Knowledge and Usage Level of Food Labels Considering Different BMI Levels. Yeditepe University, Institute of Health Science, Department of Nutrition and Dietetics, MSc Thesis. İstanbul.

The aim of this study is to evaluate consumers' perception of specific packaged foods and drinks, light / diet products, organic foods and food label usage behavior depending on distrust against food industry displays an overall increase in Turkey lately. Data was obtained by using a survey consisting of 14 multiple-choice questions and conducted with 299 university students (M/F=78/221) who were included randomly from three courses; Nutrition and Dietetic (NAD), Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation (PTR) and Gastronomy and Culinary Arts (GCA) in Spring Semester of 2017-2018 academic year. Total results were interpreted by taking Body Mass Index (BMI) as the key variable. As a result, a raising distrust against packaged foods and drinks was observed. Despite accepting UHT milk, packaged yoghurt, light milk groups as healthy based on their nutritional knowledge, most of them were found worried about additives inside packaged breads and light / diet snacks. With BMI values equal to or greater than 25, students' having lower food label reading rate and being less concerned about nutritional loss can be investigated in further research in the field of obesity.

Key words: Consumer Behavior, Consumer Trust, Packaged Foods, Food Labeling, Obesity

ÖZET

Demircan, B. (2019). Bir Vakıf Üniversitesindeki Öğrencilerin Belirli Paket Gıdalara Yönelik Güven Algısı ve Besin İçeriği Bilgi Düzeylerinin BKI Seviyelerine Göre Değerlendirilmesi. Yeditepe Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Beslenme ve Diyetetik Bölümü, Master Tezi. İstanbul.

Bu çalışmada, Türkiye'de son dönemde yiyecek endüstrisine karşı azalmış güvene dayanarak, tüketicilerin belirli paket gıdalara, diyet ürünlere ve organik gıdalara yönelik tutumunun, besin etiketi okuma davranışının araştırılması hedeflenmiştir. Çalışmanın verileri, 14 çoktan seçmeli sorudan oluşan bir anketin, Beslenme ve Diyetetik, Fizik Tedavi ve Rehabilitasyon ve Gastronomi ve Mutfak Sanatları olmak üzere üç ayrı bölümden randomize seçilmiş toplam 299 üniversite öğrencisine (E/K=78/221), 2017-2018 akademik yılının Bahar Dönemi'nde uygulanmasıyla elde edilmiştir. Çalışmanın sonuçları değerlendirilirken Beden Kütle İndeksi (BKI) ana değişken olarak alınmıştır. Sonuç olarak, paketlenmiş yiyecek ve içeceklere yönelik genel bir güven sorununun varlığı tespit edilmiştir. UHT sütü, paketlenmiş yoğurdu ve yağı azaltılmış süt gruplarını beslenme bilgilerine dayanarak sağlıklı kabul etmelerine rağmen, çoğu paketlenmiş ekmekler ve kalorisi azaltılmış / diyet atıştırmalıklar içerisindeki katkı maddeleri hakkında endişeli bulunmuştur. BKI değeri 25 veya üzeri olan öğrencilerin besin etiketi okuma oranının daha düşük ve besin değeri kaybı konusunda kaygısının daha az olması üzerine, obezite alanında yapılacak yeni araştırmalara ihtiyaç vardır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Tüketici Davranışı, Tüketici Güveni, Paketlenmiş Gıdalar, Besin Etiketleme, Obezite

1.INTRODUCTION

Modern age and technology have entered in our lives with carrying substantial advantages with them. Industrial food production methods including techniques for food sterilization and preservation have wiped out bacterial diseases, especially for dairy products, and ensured longer shelf life. It has been accepted as a success to provide good quality and healthier foods by using modern production methods instead traditional ones.

In today's world, while traditional products are associated with high fiber, low sugar and no additives, industrially produced foods are linked to additives and diseases like cancer in consumers' perspective (1). With the increasing effect of naturalness movement, people's perception and preferences towards specific packaged foods and drinks has changed in late years. Consumers' carefulness about what they buy and what they eat has been increased day by day. Production methods have become an important impact on consumers' liking and accepting a product. While foods that are produced with industrialized methods create negative effect on consumers, they are prone to like traditionally produced foods. Trust level for natural products is found higher than industrial packaged products (2). Consumers' perception and trust towards foods constitute and change their buying behavior (3).

People's food choices and buying behavior are also affected by food labels and ingredients. Studies show that nutrition labels are significant tools for consumers' making healthier choices (4). Although consumers look like more health oriented than before, understanding level for food labels is not found enough to improve their food choices (5). It is already found that, consumers are in a search of simple and easy to read food labels. Clear and understandable nutrition labeling is important to increase food label usage, trust towards foods / drinks and make better choices (6).

Despite the rise in people's seeking healthier options considering foods and drinks, the rate for illnesses caused by obesity has been increasing alarmingly of late years. According to World Health Organization (WHO), overweight and obese terms are defined as abnormal fat accumulation of body that can damage health and measured by BMI, a simple index of weight-for-height. A person with a BMI level equal to or greater than 25 is considered overweight and a person with a BMI level equal to or greater than 30 is considered obese (7). In today's world, approximately 1.6 billion adults are

overweight while there are also over 400 million obese people. When the possible causes of obesity are searched, consumers' food choices can be put forward easily. To evaluate the significant rise in the number of overweight and obese participants almost all over the world, understanding of consumers' purchase decisions, credence attributes and food label knowledge is necessarily required.

The present study is aimed to find out consumers' perception towards specific foods / drinks while investigating usage rate of food labels and ingredients that consumers mostly look for at shopping in comparison to different Body Mass Index (BMI) levels of participants. BMI is chosen as the key variable. Influence of gender, living place and university studying course was also analyzed.

To achieve this goal, data was collected by a survey consisting of 14 multiple-choice questions and applied to a total 299 students of Yeditepe University from three different courses; Nutrition and Dietetics (NAD), Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation (PTR) and Gastronomy and Culinary Arts (GCA) in Spring Semester of 2017-2018 academic year. Students from each course have been chosen randomly for the research.

With consideration of all results, a raising health concern was observed. A significant amount of participants was found having distrust against packaged breads, packaged yoghurts, UHT milks, light / diet products and organic foods. Most of the concerns were based on additives and nutritional loss. Participants whose BMI level is less than 25 were found more concerned about possible nutritional loss based on packaging and industrial methods of foods and drinks than overweight and obese students. The paper aims to fill a gap in the literature by arguing consumers' trust / distrust towards packaged breads, packaged milk and dairy products, light / diet products, processed meat products and organic foods considering different variables, particularly BMI levels.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Label, packaging and BMI

Food labels are important for consumers to understand products have which ingredients inside. People make their choices by reading information on food labels. In U.S. it was found that almost 60% of people use Back of Package (BOP) label and using ingredient list and serving size information (8)**.** Lately, people were found being more interested about nutrition and healthfulness. Food labels lead consumers to find out if products they choose to buy are healthy or unhealthy. People have assumptions about particular products and they stated that they can easily detect healthier ones (5)**.**

In Aygen's study (2012) done to investigate packaged food label usage, 53% of participants stated that they usually read the labels (9)**.** Ali and Kapoor (2009), asked consumers about whether food label helps in deciding or not to buy a certain packaged food product, %45 of them responded often. According to the results, consumers have been increasingly getting interested in knowing the ways their food is produced, processed and marketed and the impact of food intake on their health (10)**.** The findings of Gorton et al. (2008), van Trijp et al. (2007) and Güneş et al. (2014) supported that consumers mostly choose to read food labels (11, 12, 13).

In a different way, study of Malam and his friends done in UK (2009), Front of Package (FOP) labels were found being used for medical conditions or weight loss primarily. Being health conscious was also listed as a reason for shoppers to use food labels but some of these health conscious shoppers claimed that they do not need to read food labels because they were confident and they have already known what healthy and less healthy foods are (14)**.**

In the study of Peters-Texeire and Badrie, 48.8% of the consumers indicated that they ‘never’ read food label while 12.2% of them indicated ‘sometimes’. It was also stated that most of the consumers only use food labels when purchasing a new product for the first time. In their study, Peters-Texeire and Badrie (2005) found three factors affecting choices of consumers while shopping. Expiry date was found as the most significant feature on label according to the consumers. Brand name was found as a significant factor that influences consumers' choice after the importance of information on label (15)**.**

Güneş et al. (2014) found that 42% of consumers not trusting food labels. They

stated consumers have a suspicion that the ingredients written could be changed by brands in favor of their profits and not reflecting the reality (13)**.** And also as a reason of consumers' not reading food labels Malam et al. (2009) found that shoppers think labels are small and difficult to read, particularly for those who needed reading glasses. For many shoppers it was really important that the label's being simple, clear and easy to read (14)**.** Van Trijp et al. (2007) supported the same reason that many consumers prefer executions that are simple, easy to interpret and use (12)**.**

According to the study of Pelletier et al. (2004), it was found out that majority of the participants are confused about food labels and do not understand them well enough (16)**.**

Malam et al. (2009) found that calories are used for stating the healthiness and people choose items with the lower calorie rating, but not with looking at the levels of nutrients (14)**.**

In an Italian study, fat, calorie, fiber and sugar contents were received high interest respectively (6)**.** In a research of Grunert et al. (2010), fat was stated as the most important ingredient according to 49% of consumers in UK. It was followed by sugar, calorie, salt and additive content (17)**.**

2.2. Beverage preference and BMI

Individuals have increasingly turned to artificially sweetened foods and beverages during the past three decades, in an attempt to lose weight, or control it. Sugar sweetened beverages (SSBs) are beverages that have added sugar such as sucrose or fructose. Sugar sweetened beverages mostly have high calories and low nutritional value. SSBs can cause unhealthy weight gain, obesity and dental caries (18). Artificial sweeteners are sweeteners that contain few or no calories and have a high-intensity. Many beverages that labeled as 'sugar free' and 'diet' are artificially sweetened beverages (ASBs) (19), (20). According to European Union, an 'energy free' product is a product that contains less than 4 kcal (17 kJ) / 100 ml. According to Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, asesulfam-k, aspartame, cyclamic acid, saccharin, neohesperidin are listed as the sweeteners that can be used in beverages (21). A USA study conducted with university students (22) showed

that 70% of participants stated that they prefer SSBs although the preference rate for ASBs was only 30%.

Individuals started to use artificially sweetened foods and beverages to lose weight or control weight gain in last years. According to San Antonio Health Study, a positive link between ASBs consumption and increase in BMI was found (23)**.**

In the study of Park et al. (2017) 37.8% of 4163 participants stated they prefer SSBs and it was also found they have inadequate information about health effects of SSBs (24)**.**

Van der Host et al. (2006) investigated the effects of parenting style on adolescents' sugary beverage consumption with 383 secondary school students. According to the results, more restrictive attitudes of parents were associated with less sugary drink consumption (25)**.**

In the year of 2015, Munsell et al. (2015) conducted a survey with 982 parents. As a result, 82% of these parents stated that they provided sugary drinks for their child. Although 18% of parents rated sweetened ice tea as healthy, 42% of them stated that they provided it for their child (26)**.**

According to the results of the study consisted of 348 children and adolescents the consumption of 4 servings and more sugar sweetened beverages (SSBs) was associated with an increase of 4.80 % in body fat mass percentage (27)**.**

In a USA study conducted with university students (28) showed that 70% of participants stated that they prefer SSBs although the preference rate for ASBs was only 30%. In a study of Mihaela-Roxana (2010), argued marketing strategy towards sugar-free beverages for “healthy eaters”, Korean women were found more tended to think like ASBs healthier than men (29)**.**

2.3. Milk and dairy product preference and BMI

According to World and Turkey Milk Industry Report, milk consumption amount was found approximately 166 kg per person every year and yoghurt consumption amount was found 30.8 kg per person every year in Turkey. While drinking milk consumption of EA and USA were found 89 kg/year and 83 kg/year for Turkey the amount was found 26 kg/year (30). In Turkey, 45% of people were found not consuming milk according to

results (31).

Pasteurization is a heat treatment process to remove pathogenic bacteria and reduce the transmission of diseases. Aim of this process is to keep chemical, physical and organoleptic changes in the milk at its minimal. Ultra High Temperature (UHT) is a heat sterilization process that aims to make product commercially sterile. This process destroys all microorganisms in milk by heat treatment (32, 33).

Karakaya (2011) investigated consumer preferences between unpacked milk and packaged milk in a survey research. 26.2% of participants were found consume pasteurized milk and most of them, 87.7%, were found consume UHT milk. In Karakaya's study, it was also mentioned, consumers prefer to purchase milk from supermarkets mostly and then from markets and local groceries (34).

According to a study Çelik and his friends (2005) conducted in Şanlıurfa, it was observed that 46.3% of the milk consumed was unpacked, while 53.7 percent of the milk consumed was packaged. This study revealed that 33.7% of unpacked milk was purchased from the street, in a different manner from our study (35).

In an another study investigated consumer preferences for milk products, 59.8% of participants stated they preferred packed milk, 40.2% of them preferred to buy raw milk from street or directly from the producer they have already known (36).

In a a cross-sectional study of Akbay and Tiryaki (2007) including 18.278 households, results indicated that the most common fluid milk alternative chosen by the sample households was unpacked milk with 56.2%, followed by sterilized milk with 34.5%, and pasteurized milk with 9.3% of the overall choice alternatives (37).

In Turkey, concerns have been raised about packaged milk, especially UHT milk of late years. Consumers started to choose organic and non-packaged milk because of their concern about additives and loss of nutrient in packaged milk groups (38).

According to the results found in the study of Onurlubaş (2013), milk consumption preferences of consumers were searched and more than half of the consumers (68.1%) were found not consuming packaged milk. 34.3% of these consumers stated their reason to not to consume packaged milk as believing there are additives inside (39).

A study Haspolat has done (2016) with some milk consumers found out that there

is a trust issue according to packed milk groups. 51.3% of consumers had an opinion that there is an additive addition to the UHT milk while 14.3% of them believed naturalness is disrupted during the post-processing of UHT and pasteurized milk. The distrust of the technology in use during process and packaging of the raw milk was declared as the main cause of the negative attitudes towards milk (40).

In a study of Bozoğlu et al. (2014), most of the consumers prefer unpacked street milk and they stated reason to buy as its being free from additives first. They also mentioned about the taste, price and freshness factors. It was found that participants have a thought of unpacked street milk's being healthier than packed milk (41). Similarly, according to Erdal and Tokgöz's study (2011), families who preferred unpacked milk stated their reasons as familiarity and like (24.8%), availability (22.3%), price (20.7%) and having a thought of its being healthier than packed milk (19.8%) (42).

Pazarlıoğlu et al. (2006) revealed the effect of education on perception towards packed milk with their research. They found that according to the increase in a household's level of importance of health and level of education, the tendency to consume packaged milk also increased (43). Yayar (2012) also mentioned about educational factors in his study and stated individuals with education higher than secondary were the most likely to consume packed fluid milk than those of less educated individuals (44).

When it comes to compare perceptions about UHT milk between genders, Pazarlıoğlu et al**.** (2006) found that packed milk groups were preferred by women more than men (43).

In some countries such as China, India and Pakistan consumers are more likely to choose packaged food products because of increasing population. People started to stock packaged food and drinks in their house or apartment. In China more than 60% of people choose to consume UHT milk (45).

In Karakaya's research (2011), 11% of consumers used milk for production of home-made yoghurt (34). Erdal and Tokgöz (2011) found out more than half of the participants in their study stated that they mostly used milk for making yoghurt (42). Onurlubaş (2013) also found in her study that 51.8% of milk consumers use it for making home-made yoghurt (39).

In the study of Uzundumlu and Birinci (2013), considerable amount of consumers claimed that raw milk is healthier and yoghurt made from raw milk was tasty (46).

Bayarri et al. (2009) did not find differences between men and women about their habits concerning dairy product consumption and about their purchase intention (47).

According to European Union, a low fat product should contain 1.5 g of fat per 100 ml for liquids and 1.8 g of fat per 100 ml for semi - skimmed milk. For skimmed milk, product should contain less than 0.5 g of fat per 100 ml (22). According to Turkish Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Areas, milk with 1.5 g of fat per 100 ml is listed as semi - skimmed, milk that contain 0.15 g of fat per 100 ml is listed as skimmed (48). Yoghurt with less than 1.5% of milk fat content is listed as ‘low fat’ with new regulation (33).

In the study of Lynam et al. (2011) 22% of consumers have trust issues towards light milk and dairy products and they do not believe these products are natural. Consumers in Lynam , McKevitt and Gibney's study also have a thought that light milk and dairy products less nutritious than regular ones (49). Dal et al. (2018) found high amounts of consumption for low fat milk in their study results. 66.7% of young consumers declared they prefer light milk and 33.3% of young consumers declared they prefer regular, whole fat milk (50).

More women (58%) than men (30%) were found encouraged buying low-fat milk and dairy products in Lynam, McKevitt and Gibney's study (49). Hill et al. (2002) also shown women are more likely to consume low fat milk and dairy products and their choices can affect their partners' diet (51).

2.4. Organic product preference and BMI

Organic foods are foods produced by using natural sources like composted animal manure, crop rotations and mulch instead of fertilizers or pesticides. In organic agriculture, beneficial insects, birds or some naturally occurring toxins are being used. If a food is organic, it does not always mean it is natural too. Natural foods are additive free foods like refined sugar, coloring, flavoring etc. In 20th century, Europe started organic food movement against synthetic fertilizer usage in agriculture. According to U.S. Department of Agriculture, only food that is grown by certified organic producers without usage of synthetic substances can be labeled as 'organic' (52). In Turkey, according to Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, organic products should be free of GMO,

GMO based feeds, antibiotics, additives, pesticides to be labeled as ‘organic’ (53).

Williams (2002) searched consumer perception about organic foods. It was found that people choose to buy organic food because of its health benefits (54). Çelik (2013) found ‘health’ as the most important factor to determine the consumption of organic food (55). According to study of Harper and Makatouni (2002) health was found as the main motivator of consumers to purchase organic food (56). According to study of Hill et al. (2002) consisting participants from different age groups, young adults are more likely to choose organic products to avoid processed foods and preservatives (51).

All participants in Harper and Makatouni's study (2002) reported that they have high concerns about what they eat even they choose to buy organic foods or not (56). In a detailed survey research (57)**,** consumers were found not understanding whether the product they are buying is organic or not and this insecurity towards organic products based on whether it was produced organically or not. This study claimed that it could be related to inadequate organic food knowledge. Likewise, in a study of Nuttavuthisit &Thøgersen (2015) 41% of the participants stated that they believed 'products sold organic, are not really organic' (58). Lockie et al. (2002) also supported this concern with their findings; participants stated that they were suspicious about honesty and reliability of organic labels. Many of them stated that they were not sure about the products with organic label were real organic (59).

In a research done in Turkey, (60) it was found out that the amount of money spent on organic foods was only 20-40% of monthly food expenditure. The rate of people who buy organic foods at least twice a week was only 18.8. In Leblebici's study (2009), most of the participants stated high prices as a big reason to not to buy organic foods (61). Millock et al. (2002) found that most of organic food consumers were willing to pay for organic foods but they also stated they find the prices high (62).

In a Europe study Naspetti and Zanoli done (2009) consisted of 792 participants showed that knowledge of people about how organic products are produced and processed and the quality and safety of organic food was low. They claimed organic food consumers usually connected quality to health, and their awareness about safety conditions of the food and organic food was not enough (63). Leblebici (2009) found that while academicians stated that organic foods healthier than traditional foods, students have shown negative perception towards organic food mostly. As a result, it was evaluated as their inadequate knowledge in comparison to academicians' (61). The study

of Lockie et al. (2002) highlighted that there was a positive correlation between education level and organic food consumption but people were not found entirely positive or entirely negative towards organic foods. 44% of women and 33.8% of men were found consuming organic foods (59).

According to study results of Nuttavuthisit & Thøgersen (2015), participants were found believing packaged organic foods are more reliable than those available in traditional markets/groceries (58). In the study of Lockie and his friends (2002), 42% of organic consumers stated that they prefer to buy organic foods from supermarkets and 28.9% of them preferred to buy from greengrocers and then the third place was farmers with 15.5% (59).

2.5. Bread preference and BMI

In today's society, packaged breads from supermarkets are taken over beside breads from neighborhood bakeries. Bread companies are trying to keep these packaged breads fresh longer. Some concerns about possible additives inside packaged breads raised in society and people become more natural food oriented while shopping (64). People mostly stated their complaint about information regarding bread cannot be reached at supermarkets while shopping so they could not have enough (65).

Bobrow-Strain (2008) has mentioned production of bread and individual bread making shops' becoming industrialized by years in his book. All the changes in this industry, made consumers and concerned and unsure about their preferences between handmade bread, bakery bread or supermarket sliced and packaged bread (66). In a study of Ertürk et al. (2015) runned in Turkey, consumers stated that they buy their bread from mostly neighborhood bakeries and they stated supermarkets were the last choice for them. Homemade bread preference rate was found considerably high (46.2%) in this study (67). In the study of Taşçı et al. (2017), 31.8% of people were also found making their own breads (68). The findings of Gül et al. (2003), also showed that supermarkets are the last place for consumers to prefer buying bread (69). Tanık (2006) also found people prefer to purchase bread mostly from neighborhood bakeries (43%), then from groceries (29%) and as a last option, packaged breads from supermarkets (27%). In the same study, 37% of consumers stated they were concerned about additives found inside bread (70).

According to the Bread Bakers Guild of America**,** "locally made" has become a buzzword in so many foods included bread, cheese, wine and vegetables. In the study they also mentioned that, this approach described unique products of region (71).

Bal et al. (2013) found that, 70.6% of people in their study chose to consume unpacked bread. While 80.5% of the consumers were found buying bread from supermarket, 25.4% of consumers chose to buy bread from local bakery. Only 1.8% of consumers stated that they make their own bread (72).

In the study of Gül and his friends (2003) consumers stated that freshness, distances and prices are important factors while choosing bread. Participants mostly preferred unpacked breads and fibrous packed bread was their fourth decision (69). Taşçı and his friends (2017) also mentioned about the price of packaged breads in their study and 49% of consumers were found concerned about the price of packaged bread and finding it expensive (68).

In a study of Demir and Kartal's (2012) participants were asked about their bread preferences and 36% of them mentioned health effects of other types of breads besides unpacked loaf bread (whole wheat, rye bread etc.) were 'unknown' for them (73). In a study, Benson (2013) found out that, with industrialization of bread making, consumers are now unsure about what kind of bread they should prefer (74). Cop and Doğan's (2009) findings showed that there is a positive link between educational level and participants' preference for packaged breads (75).

2.6. Processed meat product preference and BMI

Consumers started to seek for less processed and extended shelf-life foods at the same time according to Rastogi's research (2013). Some technologies used for preservation can destroy microorganisms but also can change flavor, causes nutrient and vitamin loss. It increases concerns of consumers towards preservation methods (76).

In the study of Yılmaz et al. (2012) additives were found as one of the concerns towards packaged meat products. Families stated that they preferred processed meat products although they have already known they are unhealthy. Yılmaz and his friends claimed that, processed meat products' being cheap and easy to eat could be a reason for people to consume (77).

Results reached by the study of Akçay and Vatansever (2010) showed that 54.4% of meat products consumers are men while 45.6% of them are women (78). In another study have done with students (79)**,** likewise, it was found that male students were more likely to consume meat and meat products.

In a research based on almost five hundred consumer questionnaires from İstanbul (80), 31% of the respondents were found to prefer packaged processed meat products although trust level of them was found very low.

2.7. Light and diet snack preference and BMI

According to European Union Regulations, a product should not contain more than 3 g of fat per 100 g to be sold as 'low in fat'. Energy value should be reduced by at least 30% of total energy value to be sold as 'energy-reduced' and for claim of 'low energy', product cannot contain more than 40 kcal (170 kJ) / 100 g (22). In Turkey, energy and / or fat content of a product should be reduced by 25% to be stated on the label 'reduced' or 'light' (81)**.**

In a study of Chan et al. (2005) participants were asked claims about fat on food labels; most of them stated that they did not believe these fat claims reflected reality. According to Chan, Patch and Williams, some claims on food packages could be seen misleading even they were legally permitted. Consumers stated 'fat free' as being a false claim, just because small amounts of fat declared in it (82). In another study, Yılmaz and Ünal has done (2007), most of the consumers stated that they do not think that light products prevent weight gain. Consumers also do not believe that light products are healthier than regular products (83). Hill and his friends (2002) supported these results with their findings; they found out that reduced-fat products are believed to be less healthy because of ingredients added to replace the fat. They gave a place some of the claims in their study; 'My daughter informs me that some of the things they put in the reduced-fat things are more harmful, preservatives and that sort of thing.' Participants in this study also stated they do not believe what is written on low-calorie products. They claimed there is no difference in fat or calorie amount between regular products (51).

In Yılmaz and Ünal's study (2007), overweight consumers were found not liking the taste of low-calorie foods and not choose to recommend them to anyone while normal

weight consumers were found like the taste and recommend those more. Yılmaz and Ünal also mentioned a possible effect of lack of knowledge on perception towards light and diet snacks and they found out that consumers do not have enough information about low-calorie foods (83).

In the study of Memiş (2004) has done with university students, 50% of men claimed that diet and light products were not healthy while only 27.3% of women agreed this statement (84).

In a study, Kähkönen (2000) done almost twenty years ago with blind sensory tests on 743 subjects to search consumers' acceptance of fat-reduced foods, consumers did not showed health concerns for all foods even all fat containing ones. This study reached a result that; the effect of product information on consumer's acceptance differs according to the product. This study also mentioned that, some foods usually considered either as healthy or unhealthy, fat content information do not have any effect on acceptance (85).

3. Material & Method

Ethical approval for the present study was obtained from Beykent University (04.01.2018) (See ATTACHMENT 1).

3.1. Data source and study population

The study was carried out in Spring Semester of 2017-2018 academic year. The questionnaire used in this cross-sectional study, to determine the use and understanding of food labels and consumer perception towards specific foods and drinks comparing different BMI levels, was applied at Yeditepe University in Istanbul (See ATTACHMENT 2). Volunteers were asked to sign an approval form before the application of this questionnaire. (See ATTACHMENT 3). A total of 299 students with a median age of twenty-one and a median BMI of 21.2 participated in this survey, from three different university courses; Nutrition and Dietetics, Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation and Gastronomy and Culinary Arts. Sampling was random, voluntary students from different grades were included. 100 students from Nutrition and Dietetics, 99 students from Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation and 100 students from Gastronomy and Culinary Arts were included in the study. 221 of the participants were women and 78 of the participants were men. 231 of these students participated were found living at home and 68 of them were found living in a dorm room.

Participants were classified by calculating Body Mass Index (BMI) as kg / m^2 according to World Health Organization (WHO). Underweight participants who have a BMI range of < 18.5 kg/m^2 and normal weight participants who have a BMI range of 18.5-24.9 kg / m^2 were classified in the first group as lean / normal weight students. Overweight participants who have a BMI range of 25.0-30 kg / m^2 and obese participants who have a BMI range of ≥ 30 kg/m^2 were classified in the second group as overweight / obese students.

3.2. Data Collection

This is a cross sectional study and the stratified random sampling method was used. The overall sample consists of some members from different courses of the University and they were chosen randomly. With this method, members from each group

were represented in the study. Students participated in the study declared their approval by signing a particularly prepared consent form before the application of questionnaire. Questionnaire consists of 14 multiple-choice questions including label reading, decisive ingredients on food labels, decisive factors at shopping, perception towards; packaged milk and dairy products, packaged breads, processed meat products, sugar sweetened beverages and artificially sweetened beverages, light and diet products and organic foods. There is an initial section consists of demographic and personal information of participants including gender, living place and studying class at university and physical information of participants including age, weight and height information. It took approximately 5 min to complete the questionnaire (See ATTACHMENT 2).

3.3. Statistical Analysis

Epi info statistics software was used for statistical analyses of the present study. BMI levels, studying courses at university, living places and gender represented the independent variables. Food labeling usage and knowledge and perception towards specific food groups are dependent variables. Frequency analysis of variables was used for data processing. Chi - Square Test, Kruskal - Wallis Test and Kolmogorov - Smirnov Test were used to examine the differences with categorical variables. As a significance level, $p < 0.05$ was used.

4. RESULTS

A total of 299 participants completed the survey. 73.9% of the participants were women, 26.1% of them were man. Data showed that 77.3% of the participants live at home, 22.7% of them live at a dorm room. According to three different courses at university; 33.4% of them were NAD, 33.4% of them were GCA and 33.1% of them were PTR students.

Table 1. Demographic and Personal Information of Participants

Variables		n	%
Gender	Women	221	73.9
	Men	78	26.1
Living Place	Home	231	77.3
	Dorm Room	68	22.7
Studying Course at University	Nutrition and Dietetics (NAD)	100	33.4
	Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation (PTR)	99	33.1
	Gastronomy and Culinary Arts (GCA)	100	33.4
Total		299	100.0

In the study, BMI median of participants found as 21.22 kg/m^2 and 19.59 kg/m^2 for the first quartile (Q1), 23.78 kg/m^2 for third quartile (Q3). While weight median was found 60 kg, for Q1 weight median was 54 kg and for Q3 71 kg. According to the height values, median was found as 1.69 m and for Q1 and Q3 the values were found as 1.63 and 1.75 m. According to the last variable age, median was found 21 years and for Q1 and Q3 the values were found as 20 and 22 years.

Table 2. Physical Information of Participants

	BMI (kg/m^2)	Weight (kg)	Height (m)	Age (years)
n	299	299	299	299
Median	21.22	60	1.69	21
First Quartile	19.59	54	1.63	20
Third Quartile	23.78	71	1.75	22

49.5% of participants stated they always read food label information on the package of foods and drinks they buy. 16.7% of them were found not trusting the label information's reflecting the truth. 13.7% of them stated their reason for not reading labels as their being located on a hard-to-read place of the package. While 7% of participants declared they found labels to small to read, 3.3% of them stated they cannot understand the information inside. According to the study results, 9.7% of the participants stated they have no idea about food labels.

Table 3 Approach towards Food Labels

Variables	n	%
I always read food labels	148	49.5
Food labels are too small to read	21	7.0
I do not understand the information	10	3.3
The information is located on a hard-to-read place of the package	41	13.7
I do not trust the information written	50	16.7
I have no idea	29	9.7
Total	299	100.0

In the subject of decisive ingredients on food labels according to the participants, 50.6% of them stated they first look for calorie content. While 22.4% of them choose sugar as a decisive ingredient, 11.4% of them stated they look for protein content and 11% of them put fat content forward. 2.3% of participants stated that carbohydrate is the most noticeable ingredient for them and it was followed by fiber and salt content with 2% and 0.3%.

Table 4. Decisive Ingredients on Food Labels

Variables	n	%
Calorie content	151	50.5
Fat content	33	11.0
Carbohydrate content	7	2.3
Protein content	34	11.4
Sugar content	67	22.4
Salt content	1	0.3
Fiber content	6	2.0
Total	299	100.0

Considering decisive factors for consumers to purchase packed food and drinks, 37.1% of participants stated that they look for the brand of the product first. 23.4% of them were found looking for expiry date and 22.1% of them look for nutrition information essentially. While 10.4% of them reported that advertisements and recommendations were decisive for them to buy packed food and drinks, 7% of them stated they look for packaging first.

Table 5. Decisive Factors to Purchase

Variables	n	%
Packaging of the product affects me	21	7.0
Brand of the product affects me	111	37.1
Advertisements and recommendations affect me	31	10.4
I look for expiry date	70	23.4
I look for nutrition information	66	22.1
Total	299	100.0

According to the results include sugar sweetened beverages (SSBs) consumption of the students participated, 48.8% of them stated they definitely do not buy these beverages to their house or dorm room while 39.8% of them stated that they prefer to buy and consume. 11.4% of students said that they buy sugar sweetened beverages for house or dorm room but they do not consume.

Table 6. Preference for Buying and Consuming Sugar Sweetened Beverages (SSBs)

Variables	n	%
I prefer to buy and consume SSBs	119	39.8
I buy SSBs for home or room but do not consume them	34	11.4
I definitely do not buy or consume SSBs	146	48.8
Total	299	100.0

In the study, consumers answered questions about what types of milk they prefer to consume and 62.2% of them was found prefer to buy UHT milk while 26.4% stated

they buy pasteurized milk. 4.7% of the participants answered that they prefer to buy street milk. 6.7% of them were found not consuming.

Table 7. Consumer Preferences of Milk According to the Packaging Method

Variables	n	%
I prefer street milk	14	4.7
I prefer UHT milk	186	62.2
I prefer pasteurized milk	79	26.4
I do not consume milk	20	6.7
Total	299	100.0

When the preferred place for consumers to purchase fruits and vegetables is searched, 50.8% of the participants were found prefer to buy from supermarkets. 45.2% of them stated that they buy fruits and vegetables from farmer's market/greengrocery and preference for organic bazaar was 1.7%. 1.3% of the students mentioned that they grow their own fruits and vegetables and 1% of them were found not consuming.

Table 8. Place Preferred to Purchase Fruits and Vegetables

Variables	n	%
I buy fruits and vegetables from supermarkets	152	50.8
I buy fruits and vegetables from farmer's market/greengrocery	135	45.2
I buy fruits and vegetables from organic bazaar	5	1.7
I grow my own fruits and vegetables	4	1.3
I do not consume fruits and vegetables	3	1.0
Total	299	100.0

Students participated in the research stated their opinions about packaged breads and it was found that 54.8% of them worry about additives inside these breads because of the long shelf life. 24.1% of them stated that they find packaged breads healthy and they consume regularly. 9% of them claimed that packaged breads are expensive and 2.7% of the participants prefer to make their own bread. Not consuming group created 9.4% of all participants for breads.

Table 9. Perception towards Packaged Bread Groups

Variables	n	%
I find packaged breads healthy and I consume them	72	24.1
I worry about additives inside because of the long shelf life	164	54.8
I find packaged breads expensive	27	9.0
I prefer to make my own bread	8	2.7
I do not consume bread	28	9.4
Total	299	100.0

48.5% of the participants stated they find UHT milk healthy and they stated they consume. 35.5% of them were found worried about additives because of the long shelf life. 15.4% of student participants declared they think that milk loses its nutritional value after UHT. 0.7% of them stated that they find UHT milk expensive.

Table 10. Perception towards UHT Milk

Variables	n	%
I find UHT milk healthy and I consume it	145	48.5
I worry about additives inside because of the long shelf life	106	35.5
I think milk loses its nutritional value after UHT	46	15.4
I find UHT milk expensive	2	0.7
Total	299	100.0

Considering perception of consumers towards packaged / industrial yoghurts, 34.4% of the participants stated they find them healthy and they consume them. 26.8% of the participants were found worried about additives because of the long shelf life. 17.4% of the participants stated they make their own yoghurt at home and 11.7% of them find packaged yoghurt tasteless. 9.7% of the participants declared that they think packaged yoghurt has a loss of its nutritional value.

Table 11. Perception towards Packaged / Industrial Yoghurts

Variables	n	%
I find packaged yoghurt healthy and I consume it	103	34.4
I worry about additives inside because of the long shelf life	80	26.8
I think packaged yoghurt has a loss of its nutritional value	29	9.7
I find packaged yoghurt tasteless	35	11.7
I make my own yoghurt at home	52	17.4
Total	299	100.0

According to the perception of participants towards processed meat products, 56.2% of them stated they find these products unhealthy and 28.8% were found not trusting the ingredients inside them. 8.4% of the students stated they find them healthy. 6.7% of them declared that they find it easy to preserve processed meat products for a long time.

Table 12. Perception towards Processed Meat Products like Salami, Sausage, Ham, Pastrami, Dried Meat

Variables	n	%
I find processed meat products unhealthy	168	56.2
I do not trust the ingredients inside	86	28.8
I find processed meat products healthy	25	8.4
I find it easy to preserve processed meat products for a long time	20	6.7
Total	299	100.0

Participants who were investigated about their perception towards organic foods, 36.5% of them stated that they do not believe these products' being organic. 30.8% of them declared they find them unnecessarily expensive. 27.1% of the participants stated they find organic foods healthier and 5.7% of them were found as not being sure or not having an idea.

Table 13. Perception towards Organic Foods

Variables	n	%
I find organic foods healthier	81	27.1
I do not believe organic foods' being organic	109	36.5
I find organic foods unnecessarily expensive	92	30.8
I am not sure / I do not have any idea	17	5.7
Total	299	100.0

43.1% of the participants included in this research stated they do not consume light milk and dairy products. 26.4% of them declared that they find them healthy and they consume. 12.7% of them were found not liking the taste and 12.4% of them were found worried about additives inside. 5.4% of the students participated stated they do not believe that light milk and dairy products have less fat.

Table 14. Perception towards Light Milk and Dairy Products

Variables	n	%
I do not consume light milk and dairy products	129	43.1
I find light milk and dairy products healthy and I consume them	79	26.4
I worry about additives inside	37	12.4
I do not believe that light milk and dairy products have less fat	16	5.4
I do not like the taste of light milk and dairy products	38	12.7
Total	299	100.0

Participants were asked about their perception towards light and diet snacks and 27.1% of them stated that they believe these products have much more additives than regular ones. 21.4% of participants were found not having an idea about light and diet snacks. While 18.1% of them stated they find light and diet snacks healthy, 17.1% of the student participants stated that they do not believe that these products have fewer calories than regular ones. 16.4% of them were found to believe that these products have loss of their nutritional value.

Table 15. Perception towards Light / Diet Snacks

Variables	n	%
I find light / diet snacks healthy	54	18.1
I think light / diet snacks have much more additives than regular ones	81	27.1
I do not believe that light / diet snacks have fewer calories than regular ones	51	17.1
I think light / diet snacks have loss of their nutritional value	49	16.4
I do not have any idea	64	21.4
Total	299	100.0

Participants who investigated about their perception towards artificially sweetened beverages (ASBs), 61.2% of them stated they find ASBs unhealthy. While 12.7% of the participants declared they do not like the taste of ASBs, 12.4% of them declared they prefer ASBs because of their low calorie content. 7% of them were found not having an idea and 6.7% of them found ASBs healthy and consume them.

Table 16. Perception towards Artificially Sweetened Beverages (ASBs)

Variables	n	%
I find ASBs healthy and consume them	20	6.7
I prefer ASBs because of their low calorie content	37	12.4
I do not like the taste of ASBs	38	12.7
I find ASBs unhealthy	183	61.2
I do not have any idea	21	7.0
Total	299	100.0

41.7% of the students who look for calorie content first, 36.4% of the students who look for fat content first, 14.3% of the students who stated they look for carbohydrate content first, 50% of the students who look for protein content first, 31.3% of the students who look for sugar content first and 83.3% of the students who stated they look for fiber content first stated they prefer to buy and consume sugar sweetened beverages.

12.6% of the students who look for calorie content first, 15.2% of the students who look for fat content first, 28.6% of the students who stated they look for carbohydrate content first, 5.9% of the students who look for protein content first, 9% of the students

who look for sugar content first stated that they buy SSBs for home/room but they do not consume them.

45.7% of the students who stated they look for calorie content first, 48.5% of the students who stated they look for fat content first, 57.1% of the students who stated they look for carbohydrate content first and 44.1% of students who look for protein content first were found definitely do not buy SSBs.

59.7% of the students who stated they look for sugar content first were also stated they definitely do not buy SSBs.

100% of the students who look for salt content first and 16.7% of students who look for fiber content first declared they definitely do not buy SSBs.

Table 17. The Link Between Decisive Food Label Ingredients and Preference for Buying and Consuming Sugar Sweetened Beverages

Preference for Buying and Consuming Sugar Sweetened Beverages			I prefer to buy and consume	I buy for home or room but do not consume	I definitely do not buy	Total
Decisive Food Label Ingredients	**Calorie**	n	63	19	69	151
		%	41.7	12.6	45.7	100.0
	Fat	n	12	5	16	33
		%	36.4	15.2	48.5	100.0
	Carbohydrate	n	1	2	4	7
		%	14.3	28.6	57.1	100.0
	Protein	n	17	2	15	34
		%	50.0	5.9	44.1	100.0
	Sugar	n	21	6	40	67
		%	31.3	9.0	59.7	100.0
	Salt	n	0	0	1	1
		%	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
	Fiber	n	5	0	1	6
		%	83.3	0.0	16.7	100.0

28.5% of the students who look for calorie content first, 12.1% of the students who look for fat content first, 42.9% of students who stated they look for carbohydrate content first, 26.5% of students who look for protein content first, 17.9% of students who look for sugar content first and 16.7% of students who look for fiber content first stated they find packaged breads healthy and they consume them.

53% of students who look for calorie content first, 69.7% of students who look for fat content first, 57.1% of students who stated they look for carbohydrate content first, 44.1% of students who look for protein content first, 59.7% of students who look for sugar content first and 33.3% of students look for fiber content first were found worried about additives inside packaged bread groups because of the long shelf life.

9.3% of students who look for calorie content first, 9.1% of the students who look for fat content first, 14.7% of students who look for protein content first, 4.5% of students who look for sugar content first and 33.3% of students look for fiber content first stated they find packaged breads expensive.

8.8% of students who look for protein content first, 6% of students who look for sugar content first and 100% of students who stated they look for salt content first stated they prefer to make their own bread.

9.3% of students who look for calorie content first, 9.1% of students who look for fat content first, 5.9% of students who look for protein content first, 11.9% of students who look for sugar content first and 16.7% of students look for fiber content first were found not consuming bread.

Table 18. The Link between Decisive Food Label Ingredients and Perception towards Packaged Bread Groups

Perception towards Packaged Bread Groups			I find packaged breads healthy and I consume them	I worry about additives inside because of the long shelf life	I find packaged breads expensive	I prefer to make my own bread	I do not consume bread	Total
Decisive Food Label Ingredients	**Calorie**	n	43	80	14	0	14	151
		%	28.5	53.0	9.3	0.0	9.3	100.0
	Fat	n	4	23	3	0	3	33
		%	12.1	69.7	9.1	0.0	9.1	100.0
	Carbohydrate	n	3	4	0	0	0	7
		%	42.9	57.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
	Protein	n	9	15	5	3	2	34
		%	26.5	44.1	14.7	8.8	5.9	100.0
	Sugar	n	12	40	3	4	8	67
		%	17.9	59.7	4.5	6.0	11.9	100.0
	Salt	n	0	0	0	1	0	1
		%	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
	Fiber	n	1	2	2	0	1	6
		%	16.7	33.3	33.3	0.0	16.7	100.0

18.5% of students who chose calorie content as a decisive ingredient, 15.2% of students who look for fat content first, 28.6% of students who look for carbohydrate content first, 20.6% of students who look for protein content first, 17.9% of students who look for sugar content first at shopping stated they find light / diet snacks healthy.

29.1% of students who look for calorie content first, 30.3% of students who look for fat content first, 28.6% of students who look for carbohydrate content first, 31.3% of students who look for sugar content first, 100% of students who look for salt content first and 50% of students who look for fiber content first at shopping have a thought that light / diet snacks have much more additives than regular ones.

17.2% of students who look for calorie content first, 21.2% of students who look for fat content first, 14.7% of students who look for protein content first, 17.9% of students who look for sugar content first and 16.7% of students who look for fiber content first were found not believing that light / diet snacks have fewer calories than regular ones.

17.9% of students who look for calorie content first, 12.1% of students who look for fat content first, 14.3% of students who look for carbohydrate content first, 14.7% of students who look for protein content first and 17.9% of students who look for sugar content first stated they think light / diet snacks have loss of their nutritional value.

17.2% of students who chose calorie content as a decisive ingredient at shopping, 21.2% of students who look for fat content first, 28.6% of students who look for carbohydrate content first, 50% of students who look for protein content first, 14.9% of students who look for sugar content first and 33.3% of students who look for fiber content first declared they have no idea about light / diet snacks.

Table 19. The Link between Decisive Food Label Ingredients and Perception towards Light / Diet Snacks

Perception towards Light / Diet Snacks			I find light / diet snacks healthy	I think light / diet snacks have much more additives than regular ones	I do not believe that light / diet snacks have fewer calories than regular ones	I think light / diet snacks have loss of their nutritional value	I do not have any idea	Total
Decisive Food Label Ingredients	**Calorie**	n	28	44	26	27	26	151
		%	18.5	29.1	17.2	17.9	17.2	100.0
	Fat	n	5	10	7	4	7	33
		%	15.2	30.3	21.2	12.1	21.2	100.0
	Carbohydrate	n	2	2	0	1	2	7
		%	28.6	28.6	0.0	14.3	28.6	100.0
	Protein	n	7	0	5	5	17	34
		%	20.6	0.0	14.7	14.7	50.0	100.0
	Sugar	n	12	21	12	12	10	67
		%	17.9	31.3	17.9	17.9	14.9	100.0
	Salt	n	0	1	0	0	0	1
		%	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
	Fiber	n	0	3	1	0	2	6
			0.0	50.0	16.7	0.0	33.3	100.0

7.3% of the students who look for calorie content first, 6.1% of students who look for fat content first, 8.8% of students who look for protein content first, 4.5% of students who look for sugar content first and 16.7% of students look for fiber content first stated they find ASBs healthy and consume them.

15.9% of the students who look for calorie content first, 6.1% of students who look for fat content first, 14.3% of students who look for carbohydrate first, 8.8% of students who look for protein content first, 7.5% of students who look for sugar content first and 33.3% of students look for fiber content first stated they prefer ASBs because of their low calorie content.

12.6% of the students who look for calorie content first, 18.2% of students who look for fat content first, 17.6% of students who look for protein content first, 9% of students who look for sugar content first and 16.7% of students look for fiber content first stated they do not like the taste of ASBs.

57.6% of the students who chose calorie content as a decisive ingredient on food label stated they find ASBs unhealthy. 63.6% of the students participated in this study who chose fat content as a decisive ingredient on food label and 71.4% of the students who declared they look for carbohydrate content first stated that they find ASBs unhealthy. 58.8% of the students who look protein content first, 71.6% of students who look sugar content first, 100% of students who look for salt content first and 16.7% of students who look for fiber content first stated they find ASBs unhealthy.

6.6% of the students who look for calorie content first, 6.1% of students who look for fat content first, 14.3% of students who look for carbohydrate first, 5.9% of students who look for protein content first, 7.5% of students who look for sugar content first and 16.7% of students look for fiber content first were found not having an idea about ASBs.

Table 20. The Link between Decisive Food Label Ingredients and Perception towards Artificially Sweetened Beverages (ASBs)

Perception towards Artificially Sweetened Beverages (ASBs)			I find ASBs healthy and consume them	I prefer ASBs because of their low calorie content	I do not like the taste of ASBs	I find ASBs unhealthy	I do not have any idea	Total
Decisive Food Label Ingredients	**Calorie**	n	11	24	19	87	10	151
		%	7.3	15.9	12.6	57.6	6.6	100.0
	Fat	n	2	2	6	21	2	33
		%	6.1	6.1	18.2	63.6	6.1	100.0
	Carbohydrate	n	0	1	0	5	1	7
		%	0.0	14.3	0.0	71.4	14.3	100.0
	Protein	n	3	3	6	20	2	34
		%	8.8	8.8	17.6	58.8	5.9	100.0
	Sugar	n	3	5	6	48	5	67
		%	4.5	7.5	9.0	71.6	7.5	100.0
	Salt	n	0	0	0	1	0	1
		%	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
	Fiber	n	1	2	1	1	1	6
		%	16.7	33.3	16.7	16.7	16.7	100.0

14.3% of participants who prefer street milk, 66.1% of participants who prefer UHT milk, 24.1% of participants who prefer pasteurized milk and 5% of participants who do not consume milk stated that they find UHT milk healthy to consume.

57.1% of participants who prefer street milk, 25.8% of participants who prefer UHT milk, 50.6% of participants who prefer pasteurized milk and 50% of participants who do not consume milk stated that they are worried about additives inside of UHT milk because of the long shelf life.

21.4% of participants who prefer street milk, 8.1% of participants who prefer UHT milk, 24.1% of participants who prefer pasteurized milk and 45% of participants who do not consume milk stated they think milk loses its nutritional value after UHT.

7.1% of participants who prefer street milk and 1.3% of participants who prefer pasteurized milk stated they find UHT milk expensive.

Table 21. The Link between Consumer Preferences of Milk According to the Packaging Method and Perception towards UHT Milk

Perception towards UHT Milk			I find UHT milk healthy and I consume it	I worry about additives inside because of the long shelf life	I think milk loses its nutritional value after UHT	I find UHT milk expensive	Total
Consumer Preferences of Milk According to the Packaging Method	**I prefer street milk**	n	2	8	3	1	14
		%	14.3	57.1	21.4	7.1	100.0
	I prefer UHT milk	n	123	48	15	0	186
		%	66.1	25.8	8.1	0.0	100.0
	I prefer pasteurized milk	n	19	40	19	1	79
		%	24.1	50.6	24.1	1.3	100.0
	I do not consume milk	n	1	10	9	0	20
		%	5.0	50.0	45.0	0.0	100.0

42.9% of participants who prefer street milk, 41.9% of participants who prefer UHT milk, 40.5% of participants who prefer pasteurized milk and 65% of participants who do not consume milk stated they do not consume light milk and dairy products.

7.1% of participants who prefer street milk, 29% of participants who prefer UHT milk, 25.3% of participants who prefer pasteurized milk and 20% of participants who do not consume milk stated they find light milk and dairy products healthy and I consume them.

14.3% of participants who prefer street milk, 10.8% of participants who prefer UHT milk, 16.5% of participants who prefer pasteurized milk and 10% of participants who do not consume milk were found worried about additives inside of light milk and dairy products.

14.3% of participants who prefer street milk, 3.8% of participants who prefer UHT milk, 7.6% of participants who prefer pasteurized milk and 5% of participants who do not consume milk stated they do not believe that light milk and dairy products have less fat.

21.4% of participants who prefer street milk, 14.5% of participants who prefer UHT milk and 10.1% of participants who prefer pasteurized milk stated they do not like the taste of light milk and dairy products.

Table 22. The Link between Consumer Preferences of Milk According to the Packaging Method and Perception towards Light Milk and Dairy Products

Perception towards Light Milk and Dairy Products			I do not consume light milk and dairy products	I find light milk and dairy products healthy and I consume them	I worry about additives inside of light milk and dairy products	I do not believe that light milk and dairy products have less fat	I do not like the taste of light milk and dairy products	Total
Consumer Preferences of Milk According to the Packaging Method	**I prefer street milk**	n	6	1	2	2	3	14
		%	42.9	7.1	14.3	14.3	21.4	100.0
	I prefer UHT milk	n	78	54	20	7	27	186
		%	41.9	29.0	10.8	3.8	14.5	100.0
	I prefer pasteurized milk	n	32	20	13	6	8	79
		%	40.5	25.3	16.5	7.6	10.1	100.0
	I do not consume milk	n	13	4	2	1	0	20
		%	65	20	10	5	0	100.0

The difference between preference for buying and consuming sugar sweetened beverages (SSBs) and perception towards artificially sweetened beverages (ASBs) was found statistically significant ($p < 0.05$)

14.3% of the students prefer to buy and consume SSBs and 2.1% of students who definitely do not buy or consume SSBs stated they find ASBs healthy and consume them.17.6% of the students prefer to buy and consume SSBs, 8.8% of students who buy SSBs for home or room but do not consume them and 8.9% of students who definitely do not buy or consume SSBs stated they prefer ASBs because of their low calorie content.

18.5% of the students prefer to buy and consume SSBs, 14.7% of students who buy SSBs for home or room but do not consume them and 7.5% of students who definitely do not buy or consume SSBs declared that they do not like the taste of ASBs.

40.3% of the participants who prefer to buy and consume SSBs stated they find ASBs unhealthy. 70.6% of the participants who buy SSBs for home/room but do not consume them stated that they find ASBs unhealthy. 76% of the participants who do not buy or consume SSBs also stated that they find ASBs unhealthy.

9.2% of the students prefer to buy and consume SSBs, 5.9% of students who buy SSBs for home or room but do not consume them and 5.5% of students who definitely do not buy or consume SSBs were found not having an idea about ASBs.

Table 23. The Link between Preference for Buying and Consuming Sugar Sweetened Beverages (SSBs) and Perception towards Artificially Sweetened Beverages (ASBs)

Perception towards Artificially Sweetened Beverages (ASBs)			I findASBs healthy and consume them	I prefer ASBs because of their low calorie content	I do not like the taste of ASBs	I find ASBs unhealthy	I do not have any idea	Total	□2	p
Preference for Buying and Consuming Sugar Sweetened Beverages (SSBs)	**I prefer to buy and consume SSBs**	n	17	21	22	48	11	119		
		%	14.3	17.6	18.5	40.3	9.2	100.0		
	I buy SSBs for home or room but do not consume them	n	0	3	5	24	2	34	43.57	0.000
		%	0.0	8.8	14.7	70.6	5.9	100.0		
	I definitely do not buy or consume SSBs	n	3	13	11	111	8	146		
		%	2.1	8.9	7.5	76.0	5.5	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between approach towards food labels and BMI levels was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

51% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 42.9% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated they always read food labels.

6.2% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 10.7% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated they found food labels too small to read.

2.9% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 5.4% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 were found not understanding the information on food labels.

15.2% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 7.1% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 declared that ‘the information is located on a hard-to-read place of the package’.

16.9% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 16.1% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 were found not trusting the information written on food labels.

7.8% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 17.9% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they have no idea about food labels.

Table 24. Approach towards Food Labels According to BMI Levels

Variables		BMI				□2	p
		Normal and Underweight BMI < 25		Overweight and Obese BMI ≥ 25			
		n	%	n	%		
Approach towards Food Labels	I always read food labels	124	51.0	24	42.9	9.700	0.084
	Food labels are too small to read	15	6.2	6	10.7		
	I do not understand the information	7	2.9	3	5.4		
	The information is located on a hard-to-read place of the package	37	15.2	4	7.1		
	I do not trust the information written	41	16.9	9	16.1		
	I have no idea	19	7.8	10	17.9		
	Total	243	100.0	56	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between decisive factors to purchase and BMI levels was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

6.2% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 10.7% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they are affected by packaging of the product at shopping.

36.2% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 41.1% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they are affected by brand of the product at shopping.

10.7% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 8.9% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they are affected by advertisements and recommendations while purchasing a product.

24.3% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 19.6% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they look for expiry date while purchasing a product.

22.6% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 19.6% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they look for nutrition information while purchasing a product.

Table 25. Decisive Factors to Purchase According to BMI Levels

Variables		BMI				□2	p
		Normal and Underweight BMI < 25		Overweight and Obese BMI ≥ 25			
		n	%	n	%		
Decisive Factors of Purchasing	Packaging of the product affects me	15	6.2	6	10.7	2.366	0.669
	Brand of the product affects me	88	36.2	23	41.1		
	Advertisements and recommendations affect me	26	10.7	5	8.9		
	I look for expiry date	59	24.3	11	19.6		
	I look for nutrition information	55	22.6	11	19.6		
	Total	243	100	56	100		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between preference for buying and consuming SSBs and BMI levels was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

37.9% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 48.2% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they prefer to buy and consume SSBs.

11.9% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 8.9% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they buy SSBs for home or room but they do not consume them.

50.2% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 42.9% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they definitely do not buy or consume SSBs.

Table 26. Preference for Buying and Consuming Sugar Sweetened Beverages (SSBs) According to BMI Levels

Variables		BMI				□2	p
		Normal and Underweight BMI < 25		Overweight and Obese BMI ≥ 25			
		n	%	n	%		
Preference for Buying and Consuming Sugar Sweetened Beverages (SSBs)	I prefer to buy and consume SSBs	92	37.9	27	48.2	2.091	0.352
	I buy SSBs for home or room but I do not consume them	29	11.9	5	8.9		
	I definitely do not buy or consume SSBs	122	50.2	24	42.9		
	Total	243	100.0	56	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between consumer preferences of milk with different packaging methods and BMI levels was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

4.9% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 3.6% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they prefer street milk.

63% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 58.9% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they prefer UHT milk.

26.3% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 26.8% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they prefer pasteurized milk.

5.8% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 10.7% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they do not consume milk.

Table 27. Consumer Preferences of Milk with Different Packaging Methods According to BMI Levels

Variables		BMI				□2	p
		Normal and Underweight BMI < 25		Overweight and Obese BMI ≥ 25			
		n	%	n	%		
Consumer Preferences of Milk with Different Packaging Methods	I prefer street milk	12	4.9	2	3.6	1.973	0.578
	I prefer UHT milk	153	63.0	33	58.9		
	I prefer pasteurized milk	64	26.3	15	26.8		
	I do not consume milk	14	5.8	6	10.7		
	Toplam	243	100	56	100		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between perception towards packaged bread groups and BMI levels was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

22.6% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 30.4% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they find packaged breads healthy and they consume them.

58% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 41.1% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 were found worried about additives inside packaged breads because of the long shelf life.

9.1% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 8.9% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they find packaged breads expensive.

2.9% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 1.8% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they make their own bread.

7.4% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 17.9% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they do not consume bread.

Table 28. Perception towards Packaged Bread Groups According to BMI Levels

Variables		BMI				□2	p
		Normal and Underweight BMI < 25		Overweight and Obese BMI ≥ 25			
		n	%	n	%		
Perception towards Packaged Bread Groups	I find packaged breads healthy and I consume them	55	22.6	17	30.4	9.024	0.061
	I worry about additives inside because of the long shelf life	141	58.0	23	41.1		
	I find packaged breads expensive	22	9.1	5	8.9		
	I prefer to make my own bread	7	2.9	1	1.8		
	I do not consume bread	18	7.4	10	17.9		
	Total	243	100	56	100		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between perception towards UHT milk and BMI levels was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

47.3% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 53.6% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they find UHT milk healthy and they consume it.

35% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 37.5% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 were found worried about additives inside UHT milk because of the long shelf life.

16.9% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 8.9% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they think milk loses its nutritional value after UHT.

0.8% of participants who have BMI less than 25 stated that they find UHT milk expensive.

Table 29. Perception towards UHT Milk According to BMI Levels

Variables		BMI				□2	p
		Normal and Underweight BMI < 25		Overweight and Obese BMI ≥ 25			
		n	%	n	%		
Perception towards UHT Milk	I find UHT milk healthy and I consume it	115	47.3	30	53.6	2.775	0.428
	I worry about additives inside because of the long shelf life	85	35.0	21	37.5		
	I think milk loses its nutritional value after UHT	41	16.9	5	8.9		
	I find UHT milk expensive	2	0.8	0	0.0		
	Total	243	100	56	100		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between perception towards packaged / industrial yoghurts and BMI levels was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

32.9% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 41.1% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they find packaged yoghurt healthy and they consume it.

27.6% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 23.2% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 were found worried about additives inside packaged yoghurt because of the long shelf life.

11.1% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 3.6% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they think packaged yoghurt has a loss of its nutritional value.

10.3% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 17.9% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they find packaged yoghurt tasteless.

18.1% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 14.3% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they make their own yoghurt.

Table 30. Perception towards Packaged / Industrial Yoghurts According to BMI Levels

Variables		BMI				□2	p
		Normal and Underweight BMI < 25		Overweight and Obese BMI ≥ 25			
		n	%	n	%		
Perception towards Packaged / Industrial Yoghurts	I find packaged yoghurt healthy and I consume it	80	32.9	23	41.1	6.478	0.166
	I worry about additives inside because of the long shelf life	67	27.6	13	23.2		
	I think packaged yoghurt has a loss of its nutritional value	27	11.1	2	3.6		
	I find packaged yoghurt tasteless	25	10.3	10	17.9		
	I make my own yoghurt	44	18.1	8	14.3		
	Total	243	100	56	100		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between perception towards processed meat products and BMI levels was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

58.4% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 46.4% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they find processed meat products unhealthy.

28.8% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 28.6% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 were found that not trusting the ingredients inside processed meat products.

6.6% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 16.1% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they find processed meat products healthy.

6.2% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 8.9% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they find it easy to preserve processed meat products for a long time.

Table 31. Perception towards Processed Meat Products like Salami, Sausage, Ham, Pastrami, Dried Meat According to BMI Levels

Variables		BMI				□2	p
		Normal and Underweight BMI < 25		Overweight and Obese BMI ≥ 25			
		n	%	n	%		
Perception towards Processed Meat Products	I find processed meat products unhealthy	142	58.4	26	46.4	6.585	0.086
	I do not trust the ingredients inside	70	28.8	16	28.6		
	I find processed meat products healthy	16	6.6	9	16.1		
	I find it easy to preserve processed meat products for a long time	15	6.2	5	8.9		
	Total	243	100	56	100		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between perception towards organic foods and BMI levels was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

29.2% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 17.9% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they find organic foods healthier than regular ones.

35.4% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 41.1% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 were found not believing organic foods' being organic.

30.5% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 32.1% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they find organic foods unnecessarily expensive.

4.9% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 8.9% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they are not sure or they do not have any idea about organic foods.

Table 32. Perception towards Organic Foods According to BMI Levels

Variables		BMI				Toplam		□2	p
		Normal and Underweight BMI < 25		Overweight and Obese BMI ≥ 25					
		n	%	n	%	n	%		
Perception towards Organic Foods	I find organic foods healthier	71	29.2	10	17.9	81	100.0	3.888	0.274
	I do not believe organic foods' being organic	86	35.4	23	41.1	109	100.0		
	I find organic foods unnecessarily expensive	74	30.5	18	32.1	92	100.0		
	I am not sure / I do not have any idea	12	4.9	5	8.9	17	100.0		
	Total	243	100	56	100	299	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between perception towards light milk and dairy products and BMI levels was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

43.6% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 41.1% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 were found not consuming light milk and dairy products.

12.3% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 19.6% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they find light milk and dairy products healthy and they consume them.

11.1% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 17.9% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 were found worried about additives inside light milk and dairy products

4.9% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 7.1% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 were found not believing that light milk and dairy products have less fat.

28% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 14.3% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they do not like the taste of light milk and dairy products.

Table 33. Perception towards Light Milk and Dairy Products According to BMI Levels

Variables		BMI				□2	p
		Normal and Underweight BMI < 25		Overweight and Obese BMI ≥ 25			
		n	%	n	%		
Perception towards Light Milk and Dairy Products	I do not consume light milk and dairy products	106	43.6	23	41.1	3.489	0.480
	I find light milk and dairy products healthy and I consume them	68	12.3	11	19.6		
	I worry about additives inside	27	11.1	10	17.9		
	I do not believe that light milk and dairy products have less fat	12	4.9	4	7.1		
	I do not like the taste of light milk and dairy products	30	28.0	8	14.3		
	Total	243	100	56	100		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between perception towards light / diet snacks and BMI levels was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

18.9% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 14.3% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they find light / diet snacks healthy.

22.2% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 28.6% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 were found thinking light / diet snacks have much more additives than regular ones.

16.5% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 19.6% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 were found not believing that light / diet snacks have fewer calories than regular ones.

15.6% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 19.6% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they think light snacks have loss of their nutritional value.

26.7% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 17.9% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they do not have any idea about light / diet snacks.

Table 34. Perception towards Light / Diet Snacks According to BMI Levels

Variables		BMI				□2	p
		Normal and Underweight BMI < 25		Overweight and Obese BMI ≥ 25			
		n	%	n	%		
Perception towards Light / Diet Snacks	I find light / diet snacks healthy	46	18.9	8	14.3	1.720	0.787
	I think light / diet snacks have much more additives than regular ones	65	22.2	16	28.6		
	I do not believe that light / diet snacks have less calories than regular ones	40	16.5	11	19.6		
	I think light snacks have loss of their nutritional value	38	15.6	11	19.6		
	I do not have any idea	54	26.7	10	17.9		
	Total	243	100	56	100		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between perception towards ASBs and BMI levels was found statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

7% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 5.4% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they find ASBs healthy and consume them.

9.9% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 23.2% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they prefer ASBs because of their low calorie content.

11.5% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 17.9% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 were found not liking the taste of ASBs.

65.4% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 42.9% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they find ASBs unhealthy.

6.2% of participants who have BMI less than 25 and 10.7% of participants who have BMI equal to or greater than 25 stated that they do not have any idea about ASBs.

Table 35. Perception towards Artificially Sweetened Beverages (ASBs) According to BMI Levels

Variables		BMI				□2	p
		Normal and Underweight BMI < 25		Overweight and Obese BMI ≥ 25			
		n	%	n	%		
Perception towards Artificially Sweetened Beverages (ASBs)	I find ASBs healthy and consume them	17	7.0	3	5.4	13.288	0.010
	I prefer ASBs because of their low calorie content	24	9.9	13	23.2		
	I do not like the taste of ASBs	28	11.5	10	17.9		
	I find ASBs unhealthy	159	65.4	24	42.9		
	I do not have any idea	15	6.2	6	10.7		
	Total	243	100.0	56	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The difference between consumers' approach towards food labels and their studying department at university was found statistically significant ($p < 0.05$)

62% of the participants studying NAD, 36.4% of participants studying PTR and 50% of participants studying GCA stated that they always read food labels while shopping.

4% of NAD students, 8.1% of PTR students and 9% of GCA students claimed that food labels are too small to read.

4% of the students studying PTR, 4% of the students studying NAD and 2% of the students studying GCA stated they do not understand the information inside food labels.

13% of students who are studying NAD, 15.2% of students who are studying PTR and 13% of students who are studying GCA stated that the information is located on a hard-to-read place of the package and they cannot read food label.

14% of NAD students, 22.2% of PTR students and 14% of GCA students were found not trusting the information written on food labels.

Participants that having no idea about food labels consist of students from 3% of NAD department, 14.1% of PTR department, 12% of GCA department and respectively.

Table 36. Approach towards Food Labels According to Different University Courses

Approach towards Food Labels			I always read food labels	Food labels are too small to read	I do not understand the information	The information is located on a hard-to-read place of the package	I do not trust the information written	I have no idea	Total	□2	p
University Course	NAD	n	62	4	4	13	14	3	100	19.529	0.034
		%	62.0	4.0	4.0	13.0	14.0	3.0	100.0		
	PTR	n	36	8	4	15	22	14	99		
		%	36.4	8.1	4.0	15.2	22.2	14.1	100.0		
	GCA	n	50	9	2	13	14	12	100		
		%	50.0	9.0	2.0	13.0	14.0	12.0	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value
NAD: Nutrition and Dietetics
PTR: Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation
GCA: Gastronomy and Culinary Arts

The difference between consumers' decisive ingredients on food labels and their studying department at university was found statistically significant ($p < 0.05$)

55% of NAD students chose calorie content as a decisive ingredient for them at shopping. 52.5% of PTR students and 44% of GCA students also stated they look for calorie content first while shopping.

11% of NAD students, 5.1% of PTR students and 17% of GCA students stated that fat is a decisive ingredient for them at shopping.

5% of NAD students, 1% of PTR students and 1% of GCA students stated that carbohydrate is a decisive ingredient for them at shopping.

3% of NAD students, 12.1% of PTR students and 19% of GCA students chose protein as a decisive ingredient for them at shopping.

24% of students studying NAD, 26.3% of students studying PTR and 17% of students studying GCA stated that sugar is a decisive ingredient for them while buying a product.

1% of NAD students stated they look for salt content first at shopping.

1% of NAD students, 3% of PTR students and 2% of GCA students chose fiber as a decisive ingredient for them while buying a product.

Table 37. Decisive Ingredients on Food Labels According to Different University Courses

Decisive Ingredients on Food Labels			Calorie content	Fat content	Carbohydrate content	Protein content	Sugar content	Salt content	Fiber content	Total	□2	p
University Course	NAD	n	55	11	5	3	24	1	1	100		
		%	55.0	11.0	5.0	3.0	24.0	1.0	1.0	100.0	28.708	0.004
	PTR	n	52	5	1	12	26	0	3	99		
		%	52.5	5.1	1.0	12.1	26.3	0.0	3.0	100.0		
	GCA	n	44	17	1	19	17	0	2	100		
		%	44.0	17.0	1.0	19.0	17.0	0.0	2.0	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value
NAD: Nutrition and Dietetics
PTR: Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation
GCA: Gastronomy and Culinary Arts

The link between consumers' decisive factors to purchase a food/drink product and their studying department at university was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$)

6% of NAD students, 7.1% of PTR students and 8% of GCA students stated that packaging of the product affects them while shopping.

34% of NAD students, 35.4% of PTR students and 42% of GCA students stated that they are affected by brand name of the product while shopping.

9% of NAD students, 8.1% of PTR students and 14% of GCA students stated that they are affected by advertisements and recommendations while buying a food or drink product.

24% of NAD students, 29.3% of PTR students and 17% of GCA students stated that they look for expiry date first while buying a product.

27% of NAD students, 20.2% of PTR students and 19% of GCA students declared that they look for nutrition information written on food label before buying a product.

Table 38. Decisive Factors to Purchase According to Different University Courses

Decisive Factors to Purchase			Packaging of the product affects me	Brand of the product affects me	Advertisements and recommendations affect me	I look for expiry date	I look for nutrition information	Total	□2	p
University Course	NAD	n	6	34	9	24	27	100	8.142	0.420
		%	6.0	34.0	9.0	24.0	27.0	100.0		
	PTR	n	7	35	8	29	20	99		
		%	7.1	35.4	8.1	29.3	20.2	100.0		
	GCA	n	8	42	14	17	19	100		
		%	8.0	42.0	14.0	17.0	19.0	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value
NAD: Nutrition and Dietetics
PTR: Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation
GCA: Gastronomy and Culinary Arts

The link between consumers' preference for buying and consuming sugar sweetened beverages (SSBS) and their studying department at university was found statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

32% of NAD students, 37.4% of PTR students and 50% of GCA students stated they prefer to buy and consume SSBs.

17% of NAD students, 7.1% of PTR students and 10% of GCA students stated they buy SSBs for home or room but do not consume them.

51% of NAD students, 55.6% of PTR students and 40% of GCA students stated that they definitely do not buy or consume SSBs.

Table 39. Preference for Buying and Consuming Sugar Sweetened Beverages (SSBs) According to Different University Courses

Preference for Buying and Consuming Sugar Sweetened Beverages (SSBs)			I prefer to buy and consume SSBs	I buy SSBs for home or room but do not consume them	I definitely do not buy or consume SSBs	Total	□2	p
University Course	NAD	n	32	17	51	100	11.461	0.022
		%	32.0	17.0	51.0	100.0		
	PTR	n	37	7	55	99		
		%	37.4	7.1	55.6	100.0		
	GCA	n	50	10	40	100		
		%	50.0	10.0	40.0	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value
NAD: Nutrition and Dietetics
PTR: Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation
GCA: Gastronomy and Culinary Arts

The link between consumers' preferences of milk according with different packaging methods and their studying department at university was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$)

2% of NAD students, 8.1% of PTR students and 4% of GCA students were found prefer street milk.

64% of NAD students, 57.6% of PTR students and 65% of GCA students stated they prefer UHT milk.

30% of NAD students and 22.2% of PTR students and 27% of GCA students were found prefer pasteurized milk.

4% of NAD students, 12.1% of PTR students and 4% of GCA students stated they do not consume milk.

Table 40. Consumer Preferences of Milk with Different Packaging Methods According to Different University Courses

Consumer Preferences of Milk According to the Packaging Method			I prefer street milk	I prefer UHT milk	I prefer pasteurized milk	I do not consume milk	Total	□2	p
University Course	NAD	n	2	64	30	4	100	12.284	0.056
		%	2.0	64.0	30.0	4.0	100		
	PTR	n	8	57	22	12	99		
		%	8.1	57.6	22.2	12.1	100		
	GCA	n	4	65	27	4	100		
		%	4.0	65.0	27.0	4.0	100		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value
NAD: Nutrition and Dietetics
PTR: Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation
GCA: Gastronomy and Culinary Arts

The link between consumers' fruits and vegetables purchasing place preferences and their studying department at university was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$)

61% of NAD students, 46.5% of PTR students and 45% of GCA students were found buying fruits and vegetables from supermarkets.

35% of NAD students, 48.5% of PTR students and 52% of GCA students stated they buy fruits and vegetables from farmer’s market / greengrocery.

3% of NAD students, 1% of PTR students and 1% of GCA students stated they buy fruits and vegetables from organic bazaar.

3% of PTR students, 1% of GCA students were found growing their own fruits and vegetables.

1% of NAD students, 1% of PTR students and 1% of GCA students stated they do not consume fruits and vegetables.

Table 41. Place Preferred to Purchase Fruits and Vegetables According to Different University Courses

Place Preferred to Purchase Fruits and Vegetables			I buy fruits and vegetables from supermarkets	I buy fruits and vegetables from farmers market / greengrocery	I buy fruits and vegetables from organic bazaar	I grow my own fruits and vegetables	I do not consume fruits and vegetables	Total	□2	p
University Course	NAD	n	61	35	3	0	1	100	11.76	0.162
		%	61.0	35.0	3.0	0.0	1.0	100.0		
	PTR	n	46	48	1	3	1	99		
		%	46.5	48.5	10	3.0	1.0	100.0		
	GCA	n	45	52	1	1	1	100		
		%	45.0	52.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value
NAD: Nutrition and Dietetics
PTR: Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation
GCA: Gastronomy and Culinary Arts

The link between consumers' perception towards packaged bread groups and their studying department at university was found statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

22% of NAD students, 25.3% of PTR students and 25% of GCA students stated they find packaged breads healthy and they consume them.

66% of NAD students, 52.5% of PTR students and 46% of GCA students stated they are worried about additives inside packaged breads because of the long shelf life.

2% of NAD students, 12.1% of PTR students and 13% of GCA students stated they find packaged breads unnecessarily expensive.

1% of NAD students, 2% of PTR students and 5% of GCA students were found making their own bread.

9% of NAD students, 8.1% of PTR students and 11% of GCA students declared they do not consume bread.

Table 42. Perception towards Packaged Bread Groups According to Different University Courses

Perception towards Packaged Bread Groups			I find packaged breads healthy and I consume them	I worry about additives inside because of the long shelf life	I find packaged breads expensive	I prefer to make my own bread	I do not consume bread	Total	□2	p
University Course	NAD	n	22	66	2	1	9	100	16.031	0.042
		%	22.0	66.0	2.0	1.0	9.0	100		
	PTR	n	25	52	12	2	8	99		
		%	25.3	52.5	12.1	2.0	8.1	100		
	GCA	n	25	46	13	5	11	100		
		%	25.0	46.0	13.0	5.0	11.0	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value
NAD: Nutrition and Dietetics
PTR: Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation
GCA: Gastronomy and Culinary Arts

The link between consumers' perception towards UHT milk and their studying department at university was found statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

49% of NAD students, 36.4% PTR students and 60% GCA students stated they find UHT milk healthy and I consume it.

35% of NAD students, 44.4% PTR students and 27% GCA students were found worried about additives inside UHT milk because of the long shelf life.

15% of NAD students, 19.2% PTR students and 12% of GCA students stated they think milk loses its nutritional value after UHT.

1% of NAD students and 1% of GCA students declared they find UHT milk expensive.

Table 43. Perception towards UHT Milk According to Different University Courses

Perception towards UHT Milk			I find UHT milk healthy and I consume it	I worry about additives inside because of long shelf life	I think milk loses its nutritional value after UHT	I find UHT milk expensive	Total	□2	p
University Course	NAD	n	49	35	15	1	100	12.695	0.048
		%	49.0	35.0	15.0	1.0	100.0		
	PTR	n	36	44	19	0	99		
		%	36.4	44.4	19.2	0.0	100.0		
	GCA	n	60	27	12	1	100		
		%	60.0	27.0	12.0	1.0	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value
NAD: Nutrition and Dietetics
PTR: Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation
GCA: Gastronomy and Culinary Arts

The link between consumers' perception towards packaged / industrial yoghurts and their studying department at university was found statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

36% of NAD students, 27.3% of PTR students and 40% of GCA students stated they find packaged yoghurt healthy and consume it.

36% of NAD students, 24.2% of PTR students and 20% of GCA students were found worried about additives inside packaged / industrial yoghurt because of long shelf life.

12% of NAD students, 12.1% of PTR students and 5% of GCA students stated that they think packaged yoghurt has a loss of its nutritional value.

5% of NAD students, 14.1% of PTR students and 16% GCA students declared they find packaged yoghurt tasteless.

11% of NAD students, 22.2% of PTR students and 19% of GCA students were found making their own yoghurt at home.

Table 44. Perception towards Packaged / Industrial Yoghurts According to Different University Courses

Perception towards Packaged / Industrial Yoghurts			I find packaged yoghurt healthy and I consume it	I worry about additives inside because of long shelf life	I think packaged yoghurt has a loss of its nutritional value	I find packaged yoghurt tasteless	I make my own yoghurt at home	Total	□2	p
University Course	NAD	n	36	36	12	5	11	100	20.744	0.008
		%	36	36.0	12.0	5.0	11.0	100		
	PTR	n	27	24	12	14	22	99		
		%	27.3	24.2	12.1	14.1	22.2	100		
	GCA	n	40	20	5	16	19	100		
		%	40.0	20.0	5.0	16.0	19.0	100		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value
NAD: Nutrition and Dietetics
PTR: Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation
GCA: Gastronomy and Culinary Arts

The link between consumers' perception towards processed meat products like salami, sausage, ham, pastrami, dried meat and their studying department at university was found statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

66% of NAD students, 60.6% of PTR students and 42% of GCA students stated they find processed meat products unhealthy.

28% of NAD students, 25.3% of PTR students and 33% of GCA students were found not trusting the ingredients inside processed meat products.

2% of NAD students, 8.1% of PTR students and 15% of GCA students declared they find processed meat products healthy.

4% of NAD students, 6.1% of PTR students and 10% of GCA students stated they find it easy to preserve processed meat products for a long time.

Table 45. Perception towards Processed Meat Products Like Salami, Sausage, Ham, Pastrami, Dried Meat According to Different University Courses

Perception towards Processed Meat Products Like Salami, Sausage, Ham, Pastrami, Dried Meat			I find processed meat products unhealthy	I do not trust the ingredients inside	I find processed meat products healthy	I find it easy to preserve processed meat products for a long time	Total	□2	p
University Course	NAD	n	66	28	2	4	100	19.607	0.003
		%	66.0	28.0	2.0	4.0	100.0		
	PTR	n	60	25	8	6	99		
		%	60.6	25.3	8.1	6.1	100.0		
	GCA	n	42	33	15	10	100		
		%	42.0	33.0	15.0	10.0	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value
NAD: Nutrition and Dietetics
PTR: Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation
GCA: Gastronomy and Culinary Arts

The link between consumers' perception towards organic foods and their studying department at university was found statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

36% of NAD students, 36.4% of PTR students and 9% of GCA students stated they find organic foods healthier.

29% of NAD students, 30.3% of PTR students and 50% of GCA students stated they do not believe organic foods' being organic.

28% of NAD students, 30.3% of PTR students and 34% of GCA students stated they find organic foods unnecessarily expensive.

7% of NAD students, 3% of PTR students and 7% of GCA students were found not having an idea about organic foods.

Table 46. Perception towards Organic Foods According to Different University Courses

Perception towards Organic Foods			I find organic foods healthier	I do not believe organic foods' being organic	I find organic foods unnecessarily expensive	I am not sure / I do not have any idea	Total	□2	p
University Course	NAD	n	36	29	28	7	100	28.169	0.000
		%	36.0	29.0	28.0	7.0	100.0		
	PTR	n	36	30	30	3	99		
		%	36.4	30.3	30.3	3.0	100.0		
	GCA	n	9	50	34	7	100		
		%	9.0	50.0	34.0	7.0	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value
NAD: Nutrition and Dietetics
PTR: Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation
GCA: Gastronomy and Culinary Arts

The link between consumers' perception towards light milk and dairy products and their studying department at university was found statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

44% of NAD students, 42.4% of PTR students and 43% of GCA students were found not consuming light milk and dairy products.

30% of NAD students, 27.3% of PTR students and 22% of GCA students stated they find light milk and dairy products healthy and they consume them.

11% of NAD students, 17.2% of PTR students and 9% of GCA students were found worried about additives inside light milk and dairy products.

3% of NAD students, 5.1% of PTR students and 8% of GCA students stated they do not believe that light milk and dairy products have less fat.

12% of NAD students, 8.1% of PTR students and 18% of GCA students stated they do not like the taste of light milk and dairy products.

Tablo 47. Perception towards Light Milk and Dairy Products According to Different University Courses

Perception towards Light Milk and Dairy Products			I do not consume light milk and dairy products	I find light milk and dairy products healthy and I consume them	I worry about additives inside	I do not believe that light milk and dairy products have less fat	I do not like the taste of light milk and dairy products	Total	□2	p
University Course	NAD	n	44	30	11	3	12	100	10.467	0.234
		%	44.0	30.0	11.0	3.0	12.0	100.0		
	PTR	n	42	27	17	5	8	99		
		%	42.4	27.3	17.2	5.1	8.1	100.0		
	GCA	n	43	22	9	8	18	100		
		%	43.0	22.0	9.0	8.0	18.0	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value
NAD: Nutrition and Dietetics
PTR: Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation
GCA: Gastronomy and Culinary Arts

The link between consumers' perception towards light / diet snacks and their studying department at university was found statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

17.2% of NAD students, 17% of PTR students and 20% of GCA students stated they find light / diet snacks healthy.

25% of NAD students, 33.3% of PTR students and 23% of GCA students stated they think light / diet snacks have much more additives than regular ones.

23% of NAD students, 13.1% of PTR students and 15% of GCA students were found not believing that light / diet snacks have fewer calories than regular ones.

24% of NAD students, 12.1% of PTR students and 13% of GCA students stated they think light / diet snacks have loss of their nutritional value.

11% of NAD students, 24.2% of PTR students and 29% of GCA students stated they have no idea about light / diet snacks.

Tablo 48. Perception towards Light / Diet Snacks According to Different University Courses

Perception towards Light / Diet Snacks			I find light / diet snacks healthy	I think light / diet snacks have much more additives than regular ones	I do not believe that light / diet snacks have fewer calories than regular ones	I think light / diet snacks have loss of their nutritional value	I do not have any idea	Total	□2	p
University Course	NAD	n	17	25	23	24	11	100	19.191	0.014
		%	17.0	25.0	23.0	24.0	11.0	100.0		
	PTR	n	17	33	13	12	24	99		
		%	17.2	33.3	13.1	12.1	24.2	100.0		
	GCA	n	20	23	15	13	29	100		
		%	20.0	23.0	15.0	13.0	29.0	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value
NAD: Nutrition and Dietetics
PTR: Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation
GCA: Gastronomy and Culinary Arts

The link between consumers' perception towards artificially sweetened beverages (ASBs) and their studying department at university was found statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

7% of NAD students, 4% of PTR students and 9% of GCA students stated they find ASBs healthy and consume them.

9% of NAD students, 9.1% of PTR students and 19% of GCA students stated they prefer ASBs because of their low calorie content.

3% of NAD students, 20.2% of PTR students and 15% of GCA students declared they do not like the taste of ASBs.

73% of NAD students, 58.6% of PTR students and 52% of GCA students stated they find ASBs unhealthy.

8% of NAD students, 8.1% of PTR students and 5% of GCA students were found not having an idea about ASBs.

Table 49. Perception towards Artificially Sweetened Beverages (ASBs) According to Different University Courses

Perception towards Artificially Sweetened Beverages (ASBs)			I find ASBs healthy and consume them	I prefer ASBs because of their low calorie content	I do not like the taste of ASBs	I find ASBs unhealthy	I do not have any idea	Total	□2	p
University Course	NAD	n	7	9	3	73	8	100	24.030	0.002
		%	7.0	9.0	3.0	73.0	8.0	100.0		
	PTR	n	4	9	20	58	8	99		
		%	4.0	9.1	20.2	58.6	8.1	100.0		
	GCA	n	9	19	15	52	5	100		
		%	9.0	19.0	15.0	52.0	5.0	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value
NAD: Nutrition and Dietetics
PTR: Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation
GCA: Gastronomy and Culinary Arts

The link between consumers' approach towards food labels and their living places was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

50.6% of students living at home and 45.6% of students living in a dorm room stated they always read food labels.

6.9% of the students living at home and 7.4% of students living in a dorm room stated that they found food labels too small to read.

3.5% of students living at home and 2.9% of students living in a dorm room stated they do not understand the information written on food labels.

14.7% of students living at home and 10.3% of students living in a dorm room declared that the information is located on a hard-to-read place of the package.

14.7% of students living at home and 23.5% of students living in a dorm room stated they do not trust the information written on food labels.

9.5% of students living at home and 10.3% of students living in a dorm room were found not having an idea about food labels.

Table 50. Approach towards Food Labels According to Living Places

Approach towards			I always read food labels	Food labels are too small to read	I do not understand the information	The information is located on a hard-to-read place of the package	I do not trust the information written	I have no idea	Total	□2	p
Living Place	Home	n	117	16	8	34	34	22	231	3.549	0.616
		%	50.6	6.9	3.5	14.7	14.7	9.5	100.0		
	Dorm Room	n	31	5	2	7	16	7	68		
		%	45.6	7.4	2.9	10.3	23.5	10.3	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between consumers' decisive ingredients on food labels and their living places was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

48.9% of students living at home and 55.9% of students living in a dorm room chose calorie content as a decisive ingredient on food label while shopping.

11.7% of students living at home and 8.8% of students living in a dorm room stated they look for fat content first at shopping.

2.6% of students living at home and 1.5% of students living in a dorm room stated they look for carbohydrate content first at shopping.

12.6% of students living at home and 7.4% of students living in a dorm room stated they look for protein content first at shopping.

22.5% of students living at home and 22.1% of students living in a dorm room stated they look for sugar content first at shopping.

0.4% of students living at home declared they look for salt content first at shopping.

1.3% of students living at home and 4.4% of students living in a dorm room stated they look for fiber content first at shopping.

Table 51. Decisive Ingredients on Food Labels According to Living Places

Decisive Ingredients on Food Labels			Calorie content	Fat content	Carbohydrate content	Protein content	Sugar content	Salt content	Fiber content	Total	□2	p
Living Place	Home	n	113	27	6	29	52	1	3	231	5.266	0.510
		%	48.9	11.7	2.6	12.6	22.5	0.4	1.3	100.0		
	Dorm Room	n	38	6	1	5	15	0	3	68		
		%	55.9	8.8	1.5	7.4	22.1	0.0	4.4	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between consumers' decisive ingredients on food labels and their living places was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

8.2% of students living at home and 2.9% of students living in a dorm room stated that packaging of the product affects them while shopping.

35.1% of students living at home and 44.1% of students living in a dorm room stated that brand of the product affects them while shopping.

11.3% of students living at home and 7.4% of students living in a dorm room stated that advertisements and recommendations affect them while shopping.

24.2% of students living at home and 20.6% of students living in a dorm room declared they look for expiry date while purchasing a product.

21.2% of students living at home and 25% of students living in a dorm room stated they look for nutrition information while purchasing a product.

Table 52. Decisive Factors to Purchase According to Living Places

Decisive Factors to Purchase			Packaging of the product affects me	Brand of the product affects me	Advertisements and recommendations affect me	I look for expiry date	I look for nutrition information	Total	□2	p
Living Place	Home	n	19	81	26	56	49	231	4.661	0.324
		%	8.2	35.1	11.3	24.2	21.2	100.0		
	Dorm Room	n	2	30	5	14	17	68		
		%	2.9	44.1	7.4	20.6	25.0	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between consumers' preference for buying and consuming sugar sweetened beverages (SSBs) and their living places was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

41.1% of students living at home and 35.3% of students living in a dorm room stated they prefer to buy and consume SSBs.

12.6% of students living at home and 7.4% of students living in a dorm stated they buy SSBs for home or room but do not consume them.

46.3% of students living at home and 57.4% of students living in a dorm declared they definitely do not buy or consume SSBs.

Table 53. Preference for Buying and Consuming Sugar Sweetened Beverages (SSBs) According to Living Places

Preference for Buying and Consuming Sugar Sweetened Beverages (SSBs)			I prefer to buy and consume SSBs	I buy SSBs for home or room but do not consume them	I definitely do not buy or consume SSBs	Total	χ^2	p
Living Place	Home	n	95	29	107	231	3.008	0.222
		%	41.1	12.6	46.3	100.0		
	Dorm Room	n	24	5	39	68		
		%	35.3	7.4	57.4	100.0		

χ^2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between consumers' preference of milk with different packaging method and their living places was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

5.6% of students living at home and 1.5% of students living in a dorm stated they prefer street milk.

61.5% of students living at home and 64.7% of students living in a dorm stated they prefer UHT milk.

26.8% of students living at home and 25% of students living in a dorm declared they prefer pasteurized milk.

6.1% of students living at home and 8.8% of students living in a dorm stated they do not consume milk.

Table 54. Consumer Preferences of Milk with Different Packaging Methods According to Living Places

Consumer Preferences of Milk According to the Packaging Method			I prefer street milk	I prefer UHT milk	I prefer pasteurized milk	I do not consume milk	Total	□2	p
Living Place	Home	n	13	142	62	14	231	2.694	0.441
		%	5.6	61.5	26.8	6.1	100.0		
	Dorm Room	n	1	44	17	6	68		
		%	1.5	64.7	25.0	8.8	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between consumers' preferred place to purchase fruits and vegetables and their living places was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

49.8% of students living at home and 54.4% of students living in a dorm room stated they buy fruits and vegetables from supermarkets.

45.9% of students living at home and 42.6% of students living in a dorm room stated they buy fruits and vegetables from farmer's market/greengrocery.

1.7% of students living at home and 1.5% of students living in a dorm room declared they buy fruits and vegetables from organic bazaar.

1.7% of students living at home and 1.5% of students living in a dorm room stated they grow their own fruits and vegetables.

0.9% of students living at home and 1.5% of students living in a dorm room declared they do not consume fruits and vegetables.

Table 55. Place Preferred to Purchase Fruits and Vegetables According to Living Places

Place Preferred to Purchase Fruits and Vegetables			I buy fruits and vegetables from supermarkets	I buy fruits and vegetables from farmer's market/greengrocery	I buy fruits and vegetables from organic bazaar	I grow my own fruits and vegetables	I do not consume fruits and vegetables	Total	□2	p
Living Place	Home	n	115	106	4	4	2	231	1.734	0.785
		%	49.8	45.9	1.7	1.7	0.9	100.0		
	Dorm Room	n	37	29	1	0	1	68		
		%	54.4	42.6	1.5	0.0	1.5	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between consumers' perception towards packaged bread groups and their living places was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

24.2% of students living at home and 23.5% of students living in a dorm room stated they find packaged breads healthy and they consume them.

54.5% of students living at home and 55.9% of students living in a dorm room were found worried about additives inside because of the long shelf life.

7.8% of students living at home and 13.2% of students living in a dorm room stated they find packaged breads expensive.

3.5% of students living at home declared they prefer to make their own bread.

10% of students living at home and 7.4% of students living in a dorm room were found not consuming bread.

Table 56. Perception towards Packaged Bread Groups According to Living Places

Perception towards Packaged Bread Groups			I find packaged breads healthy and I consume them	I worry about additives inside because of the long shelf life	I find packaged breads expensive	I prefer to make my own bread	I do not consume bread	Total	□2	p
Living Place	Home	n	56	126	18	8	23	231	4.487	0.344
		%	24.2	54.5	7.8	3.5	10.0	100.0		
	Dorm Room	n	16	38	9	0	5	68		
		%	23.5	55.9	13.2	0	7.4	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between consumers' perception towards UHT milk and their living places was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

48.1% of students living at home and 50% of students living in a dorm room stated they find UHT milk healthy and they consume it.

35.1% of students living at home and 36.8% of students living in a dorm room were found worried about additives inside of UHT milk because of long shelf life.

16.5% of students living at home and 11.8% of students living in a dorm room stated they think milk loses its nutritional value after UHT.

0.4% of students living at home and 1.5% of students living in a dorm room stated they find UHT milk expensive.

Table 57. Perception towards UHT Milk According to Living Places

Perception towards UHT Milk			I find UHT milk healthy and I consume it	I worry about additives inside because of the long shelf life	I think milk loses its nutritional value after UHT	I find UHT milk expensive	Total	□2	p
Living Place	Home	n	111	81	38	1	231	1.679	0.642
		%	48.1%	35.1%	16.5%	0.4%	100.0		
	Dorm Room	n	34	25	8	1	68		
		%	50.0%	36.8%	11.8%	1.5%	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between consumers' perception towards packaged / industrial yoghurts and their living places was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

33.8% of students living at home and 36.8% of students living in a dorm room stated they find packaged yoghurt healthy and they consume it.

25.1% of students living at home and 32.4% of students living in a dorm room were found worried about additives inside packaged / industrial yoghurts because of long shelf life.

10.4% of students living at home and 7.4% of students living in a dorm room stated they think packaged / industrial yoghurt has a loss of its nutritional value.

12.1% of students living at home and 10.3% of students living in a dorm room declared they find packaged / industrial yoghurt tasteless.

18.6% of students living at home and 13.2% of students living in a dorm room were found making their own yoghurts at home.

Table 58. Perception towards Packaged / Industrial Yoghurts According to Living Places

Perception towards Packaged / Industrial Yoghurts			I find packaged yoghurt healthy and I consume it	I worry about additives inside because of the long shelf life	I think packaged yoghurt has a loss of its nutritional value	I find packaged yoghurt tasteless	I make my own yoghurt	Total	□2	p
Living Place	Home	n	78	58	24	28	43	231	2.691	0.611
		%	33.8	25.1	10.4	12.1	18.6	100.0		
	Dorm Room	n	25	22	5	7	9	68		
		%	36.8	32.4	7.4	10.3	13.2	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between consumers' perception towards processed meat products and their living places was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

52.4% of students living at home and 69.1% of students living in a dorm room stated they find processed meat products unhealthy.

31.2% of students living at home and 20.6% of students living in a dorm room were found not trusting the ingredients inside of processed meat products.

9.1% of students living at home and 5.9% of students living in a dorm room stated they find processed meat products healthy.

7.4% of students living at home and 4.4% of students living in a dorm room declared they find it easy to preserve processed meat products for a long time.

Table 59. Perception towards Processed Meat Products Like Salami, Sausage, Ham, Pastrami, Dried Meat According to Living Places

Perception towards Processed Meat Products Like Salami, Sausage, Ham, Pastrami, Dried Meat			I find processed meat products unhealthy	I do not trust the ingredients inside	I find processed meat products healthy	I find it easy to preserve processed meat products for a long time	Total	□2	p
Living Place	Home	n	121	72	21	17	231	5.993	0.112
		%	52.4	31.2	9.1	7.4	100.0		
	Dorm Room	n	47	14	4	3	68		
		%	69.1	20.6	5.9	4.4	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between consumers' perception towards organic foods and their living places was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

29% of students living at home and 20.6% of students living in a dorm room stated they find organic foods healthier than regular foods.

35.1% of students living at home and 41.2% of students living in a dorm room were found not believing organic foods' being organic.

30.3% of students living at home and 32.4% of students living in a dorm room stated they find organic foods unnecessarily expensive.

5.6% of students living at home and 5.9% of students living in a dorm room were found not sure or not having an idea about organic foods.

Table 60. Perception towards Organic Foods According to Living Places

Perception towards Organic Foods			I find organic foods healthier	I do not believe organic foods' being organic	I find organic foods unnecessarily expensive	I am not sure / I do not have any idea	Total	□2	p
Living Place	Home	n	67	81	70	13	231	1.990	0.575
		%	29.0	35.1	30.3	5.6	100.0		
	Dorm Room	n	14	28	22	4	68		
		%	20.6	41.2	32.4	5.9	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between consumers' perception towards light milk and dairy products and their living places was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

41.6% of students living at home and 48.5% of students living in a dorm room were found not consuming light milk and dairy products.

26% of students living at home and 27.9% of students living in a dorm room stated they find light milk and dairy products healthy and they consume them.

13% of students living at home and 10.3% of students living in a dorm room were found worried about additives inside light milk and dairy products.

5.6% of students living at home and 4.4% of students living in a dorm room stated they do not believe that light milk and dairy products have less fat than regular ones.

13.9% of students living at home and 8.8% of students living in a dorm room stated they do not like the taste of light milk and dairy products.

Table 61. Perception towards Light Milk and Dairy Products According to Living Places

Perception towards Light Milk and Dairy Products			I do not consume light milk and dairy products	I find light milk and dairy products healthy and I consume them	I worry about additives inside	I do not believe that light milk and dairy products have less fat	I do not like the taste of light milk and dairy products	Total	□2	p
Living Place	Home	n	96	60	30	13	32	231	2.167	0.705
		%	41.6	26.0	13.0	5.6	13.9	100.0		
	Dorm Room	n	33	19	7	3	6	68		
		%	48.5	27.9	10.3	4.4	8.8	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between consumers' perception towards light / diet snacks and their living places was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

18.2% of students living at home and 17.6% of students living in a dorm room stated they find light / diet snacks healthy.

26% of students living at home and 30.9% of students living in a dorm room declared they think light / diet snacks have much more additives than regular ones.

16.5% of students living at home and 19.1% of students living in a dorm room were found not believing that light / diet snacks have fewer calories than regular ones.

16.9% of students living at home and 14.7% of students living in a dorm room stated they think light / diet snacks have loss of their nutritional value.

22.5% of students living at home and 17.6% of students living in a dorm room were found not having an idea about light / diet snacks.

Table 62. Perception towards Light / Diet Snacks According to Living Places

Perception towards Light / Diet Snacks			I find light / diet snacks healthy	I think light / diet snacks have much more additives than regular ones	I do not believe that light / diet snacks have fewer calories than regular ones	I think light / diet snacks have loss of their nutritional value	I do not have any idea	Total	□2	p
Living Place	Home	n	42	60	38	39	52	231	1.427	0.839
		%	18.2	26.0	16.5	16.9	22.5	100.0		
	Dorm Room	n	12	21	13	10	12	68		
		%	17.6	30.9	19.1	14.7	17.6	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between consumers' perception towards artificially sweetened beverages (ASBs) and their living places was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

6.5% of students living at home and 7.4% of students living in a dorm room stated they find ASBs healthy and consume them.

11.7% of students living at home and 14.7% of students living in a dorm room declared they prefer ASBs because of their low calorie content.

14.3% of students living at home and 7.4% of students living in a dorm room stated they do not like the taste of ASBs.

59.7% of students living at home and 66.2% of students living in a dorm room stated they find ASBs unhealthy.

7.8% of students living at home and 4.4% of students living in a dorm room were found not having an idea about ASBs.

Table 63. Perception towards Artificially Sweetened Beverages (ASBs) According to Living Places

Perception towards Artificially Sweetened Beverages (ASBs)			I find ASBs healthy and consume them	I prefer ASBs because of their low calorie content	I do not like the taste of ASBs	I find ASBs unhealthy	I do not have any idea	Total	□2	p
Living Place	Home	n	15	27	33	138	18	231	3.642	0.457
		%	6.5	11.7	14.3	59.7	7.8	100.0		
	Dorm Room	n	5	10	5	45	3	68		
		%	7.4	14.7	7.4	66.2	4.4	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between consumers' perception towards food labels and gender differences was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

50.2% of women participants and 47.4% of men participants stated they always read food labels.

6.3% of women participants and 9% of men participants declared that food labels are too small to read.

3.6% of women participants and 2.6% of men participants stated they do not understand the information in food labels.

14.9% of women participants and 10.3% of men participants stated that the information is located on a hard-to-read place of the package.

16.7% of women participants and 16.7% of men participants declared that they do not trust the information written.

8.1% of women participants and 14.1% of men participants stated they do not have any idea.

Table 64. Approach towards Food Labels According to Gender Differences

Approach towards Food Labels			I always read food labels	Food labels are too small to read	I do not understand the information	The information is located on a hard-to-read place of the package	I do not trust the information written	I do not have any idea	Total	□2	p
Gender	Woman	n	111	14	8	33	37	18	221	3.884	0.566
		%	50.2	6.3	3.6	14.9	16.7	8.1	100.0		
	Man	n	37	7	2	8	13	11	78		
		%	47.4	9.0	2.6	10.3	16.7	14.1	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between consumers' decisive ingredients on food labels and gender differences was found statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

55.7% of women participants and 35.9% of men participants stated that they look for calorie content first at shopping.

10% of women participants and 14.1% of men participants stated they look for fat content first at shopping.

2.3% of women participants and 2.6% of men participants stated they look for carbohydrate content first at shopping.

5% of women participants and 29.5% of men participants stated they look for protein content first at shopping.

24.4% of women participants and 16.7% of men participants stated they look for sugar content first at shopping.

0.5% of women participants stated they look for salt content first at shopping.

2.3% of women participants and 1.3% of men participants stated they look for fiber content first at shopping.

Table 65. Decisive Ingredients on Food Labels According to Gender Differences

Decisive Ingredients on Food Labels			Calorie content	Fat content	Carbohydrate content	Protein content	Sugar content	Salt content	Fiber content	Total	□2	p
Gender	Woman	n	123	22	5	11	54	1	5	221	38.016	0.000
		%	55.7	10.0	2.3	5.0	24.4	0.5	2.3	100.0		
	Man	n	28	11	2	23	13	0	1	78		
		%	35.9	14.1	2.6	29.5	16.7	0.0	1.3	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between consumers' decisive factors to purchase and gender differences was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

5.4% of women participants and 11.5% of men participants stated that packaging of the product affect them.

36.2% of women participants and 39.7% of men participant stated that brand of the products affects them.

12.2% of women participants and 5.1% of men participants stated that advertisements and recommendations affect them.

23.5% of women participants and 23.1% of men participants stated that they look for expiry date.

22.6% of women participants and 20.5% of men participants stated that they look for nutrition information.

Table 66. Decisive Factors to Purchase According to Gender Differences

Decisive Factors to Purchase			Packaging of the product affects me	Brand of the product affects me	Advertisements and recommendations affect me	I look for expiry date	I look for nutrition information	Total	□2	p
Gender	Woman	n	12	80	27	52	50	221	6.174	0.187
		%	5.4	36.2	12.2	23.5	22.6	100.0		
	Man	n	9	31	4	18	16	78		
		%	11.5	39.7	5.1	23.1	20.5	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between consumers' preference for buying and consuming sugar sweetened beverages (SSBs) and gender differences was found statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

35.7% of women participants and 51.3% of men participants stated they prefer to buy and consume SSBs.

14% of women participants and 3.8% of men participants stated they buy SSBs for home or room but do not consume them.

50.2% of women participants and 44.9% of men participants stated they definitely do not buy or consume SSBs.

Table 67. Preference for Buying and Consuming Sugar Sweetened Beverages (SSBs) According to Gender Differences

Preference for Buying and Consuming Sugar Sweetened Beverages (SSBs)			I prefer to buy and consume SSBs	I buy SSBs for home or room but do not consume them	I definitely do not buy or consume SSBs	Total	□2	p
Gender	Woman	n	79	31	111	221	9.090	0.011
		%	35.7	14.0	50.2	100.0		
	Man	n	40	3	35	78		
		%	51.3	3.8	44.9	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between consumer preferences of milk according to the packaging method and gender differences was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

5.4% of women participants and 2.6% of men participants stated they prefer street milk.

62.4% of women participants and 61.5% of men participants stated they prefer UHT milk.

26.7% of women participants and 25.6% of men participants stated they prefer pasteurized milk.

5.4% of women participants and 10.3% of men participants stated they do not consume milk.

Table 68. Preference for Milk with Different Packaging Methods According to Gender Differences

Consumer Preferences of Milk According to the Packaging Method			I prefer street milk	I prefer UHT milk	I prefer pasteurized milk	I do not consume milk	Total	□2	p
Gender	Woman	n	12	138	59	12	221	3.051	0.384
		%	5.4	62.4	26.7	5.4	100.0		
	Man	n	2	48	20	8	78		
		%	2.6	61.5	25.6	10.3	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between place preferred to purchase fruits and vegetables and gender differences was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

52% of women participants and 47.4% of men participants stated that they buy fruits and vegetables from supermarkets.

44.8% of women participants and 46.2% of men participants stated that they buy fruits and vegetables from farmer's market/greengrocery.

1.8% of women participants and 1.3% of men participants stated that they buy fruits and vegetables from organic bazaar.

0.9% of women participants and 2.6% of men participants were found growing their own fruits and vegetables.

0.5% of women participants and 2.6% of men participants were found not consuming fruits and vegetables.

Table 69. Place Preferred to Purchase Fruits and Vegetables According to Gender Differences

Place Preferred to Purchase Fruits and Vegetables			I buy fruits and vegetables from supermarkets	I buy fruits and vegetables from farmer's market/greengrocery	I buy fruits and vegetables from organic bazaar	I grow my own fruits and vegetables	I do not consume fruits and vegetables	Total	□2	p
Gender	Woman	n	115	99	4	2	1	221	4.108	0.392
		%	52.0	44.8	1.8	0.9	0.5	100.0		
	Man	n	37	36	1	2	2	78		
		%	47.4	46.2	1.3	2.6	2.6	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between perception towards packaged bread groups and gender differences was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

23.1% of women participants and 26.9% of men participants stated that they find packaged breads healthy and they consume them.

58.4% of women participants and 44.9% of men participants were found worried about additives inside packaged breads because of the long shelf life.

7.7% of women participants and 12.8% of men participants stated that they find packaged breads expensive.

2.3% of women participants and 3.8% of men participants stated that they prefer to make their own bread.

8.6% of women participants and 11.5% of men participants stated they do not consume bread.

Table 70. Perception towards Packaged Bread Groups According to Gender Differences

Perception towards Packaged Bread Groups			I find packaged breads healthy and I consume them	I worry about additives inside because of the long shelf life	I find packaged breads expensive	I prefer to make my own bread	I do not consume bread	Total	□2	p
Gender	Woman	n	51	129	17	5	19	221	5.022	0.285
		%	23.1	58.4	7.7	2.3	8.6	100.0		
	Man	n	21	35	10	3	9	78		
		%	26.9	44.9	12.8	3.8	11.5	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between perception towards UHT milk and gender differences was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

45.2% of women participants and 57.7% of men participants stated they find UHT milk healthy and they consume it.

36.2% of women participants and 33.3% of men participants were found worried about additives inside because of the long shelf life.

17.6% of women participants and 9% of men participants stated they think milk loses its nutritional value after UHT.

0.9% of women participants stated they find UHT milk expensive.

Table 71. Perception towards UHT Milk According to Gender Differences

Perception towards UHT Milk			I find UHT milk healthy and I consume it	I worry about additives inside because of the long shelf life	I think milk loses its nutritional value after UHT	I find UHT milk expensive	Total	□2	p
Gender	Woman	n	100	80	39	2	221	5.499	0.139
		%	45.2	36.2	17.6	0.9	100.0		
	Man	n	45	26	7	0	78		
		%	57.7	33.3	9.0	0.0	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between perception towards packaged / industrial yoghurts and gender differences was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

17.6% of women participants and 9% of men participants stated that they find packaged yoghurt healthy and they consume it.

17.6% of women participants and 9% of men participants were found worried about additives inside because of the long shelf life.

17.6% of women participants and 9% of men participants stated they think packaged yoghurt has a loss of its nutritional value.

17.6% of women participants and 9% of men participants declared they find packaged yoghurt tasteless.

17.6% of women participants and 9% of men participants stated they make their own yoghurt at home.

Table 72. Perception towards Packaged / Industrial Yoghurts According to Gender Differences

Perception towards Packaged / Industrial Yoghurts			I find packaged yoghurt healthy and I consume it	I worry about additives inside because of the long shelf life	I think packaged yoghurt has a loss of its nutritional value	I find packaged yoghurt tasteless	I make my own yoghurt at home	Total	□2	p
Gender	Woman	n	72	64	20	23	42	221	5.252	0.262
		%	32.6	29.0	9.0	10.4	19.0	100.0		
	Man	n	31	16	9	12	10	78		
		%	39.7	20.5	11.5	15.4	12.8	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between perception towards processed meat products like salami, sausage, ham, pastrami, dried meat and gender differences was found statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

62.9% of women participants and 37.2% of men participants stated that they find processed meat products unhealthy.

27.6% of women participants and 32.1% of men participants declared that they do not trust the ingredients inside.

4.1% of women participants and 20.5% of men participants stated that they find processed meat products healthy.

5.4% of women participants and 10.3% of men participants stated that they find it easy to preserve processed meat products for a long time.

Table 73. Perception towards Processed Meat Products According to Gender Differences

Perception towards Processed Meat Products Like Salami, Sausage, Ham, Pastrami, Dried Meat			I find processed meat products unhealthy	I do not trust the ingredients inside	I find processed meat products healthy	I find it easy to preserve processed meat products for a long time	Total	□2	p
Gender	Woman	n	139	61	9	12	221	27.827	0.000
		%	62.9	27.6	4.1	5.4	100.0		
	Man	n	29	25	16	8	78		
		%	37.2	32.1	20.5	10.3	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between perception towards organic foods and gender differences was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

28.1% of women participants and 24.4% of men participants stated that they find organic foods healthier than regular foods.

35.3% of women participants and 39.7% of men participants stated that they do not believe organic foods' being organic.

30.8% of women participants and 30.8% of men participants stated that they find organic foods unnecessarily expensive.

5.9% of women participants and 5.1% of men participants stated that they are not sure or they do not have any idea about organic foods.

Table 74. Perception towards Organic Foods According to Gender Differences

Perception towards Organic Foods			I find organic foods healthier	I do not believe organic foods' being organic	I find organic foods unnecessarily expensive	I am not sure / I do not have any idea	Total	□2	p
Gender	Woman	n	62	78	68	13	221	0.661	0.882
		%	28.1	35.3	30.8	5.9	100.0		
	Man	n	19	31	24	4	78		
		%	24.4	39.7	30.8	5.1	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between perception towards light milk and dairy products and gender differences was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

41.6% of women participants and 47.4% of men participants stated that they do not consume light milk and dairy products.

28.1% of women participants and 21.8% of men participants stated that they find light milk and dairy products healthy and they consume them.

11.8% of women participants and 14.1% of men participants were found worried about additives inside.

4.1% of women participants and 9% of men participants stated that they do not believe that light milk and dairy products have less fat.

14.5% of women participants and 7.7% of men participants declared that they do not like the taste of light milk and dairy products.

Table 75. Perception towards Light Milk and Dairy Products According to Gender Differences

Perception towards Light Milk and Dairy Products			I do not consume light milk and dairy products	I find light milk and dairy products healthy and I consume them	I worry about additives inside	I do not believe that light milk and dairy products have less fat	I do not like the taste of light milk and dairy products	Total	□2	p
Gender	Woman	n	92	62	26	9	32	221	6.239	0.182
		%	41.6	28.1	11.8	4.1	14.5	100.0		
	Man	n	37	17	11	7	6	78		
		%	47.4	21.8	14.1	9.0	7.7	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between perception towards light / diet snacks and gender differences was found statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

19% of women participants and 15.4% of men participants stated that they find light / diet snacks healthy.

29.4% of women participants and 20.5% of men participants stated that they think light / diet snacks have much more additives than regular ones.

17.6% of women participants and 15.4% of men participants stated that they do not believe that light / diet snacks have fewer calories than regular ones.

18.6% of women participants and 10.3% of men participants stated that they think light / diet snacks have loss of their nutritional value.

15.4% of women participants and 38.5% of men participants declared that they do not have any idea about light / diet snacks.

Table 76. Perception towards Light / Diet Snacks According to Gender Differences

Perception towards Light / Diet Snacks			I find light / diet snacks healthy	I think light / diet snacks have much more additives than regular ones	I do not believe that light / diet snacks have fewer calories than regular ones	I think light / diet snacks have loss of their nutritional value	I do not have any idea	Total	□2	p
Gender	Woman	n	42	65	39	41	34	221	19.041	0.001
		%	19.0	29.4	17.6	18.6	15.4	100.0		
	Man	n	12	16	12	8	30	78		
		%	15.4	20.5	15.4	10.3	38.5	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

The link between perception towards artificially sweetened beverages (ASBs) and gender differences was not found statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

6.8% of women participants and 6.4% of men participants stated that they find ASBs healthy and consume them.

11.3% of women participants and 15.4% of men participants stated that they prefer ASBs because of their low calorie content.

10% of women participants and 20.5% of men participants declared that they do not like the taste of ASBs.

64.7% of women participants and 51.3% of men participants stated that they find ASBs unhealthy.

7.2% of women participants and 6.4% of men participants stated that they do not have any idea.

Table 77. Perception towards Artificially Sweetened Beverages (ASBs)

Perception towards Artificially Sweetened Beverages (ASBs)			I find ASBs healthy and consume them	I prefer ASBs because of their low calorie content	I do not like the taste of ASBs	I find ASBs unhealthy	I do not have any idea	Total	□2	p
Gender	Woman	n	15	25	22	143	16	221	7.596	0.108
		%	6.8	11.3	10.0	64.7	7.2	100.0		
	Man	n	5	12	16	40	5	78		
		%	6.4	15.4	20.5	51.3	6.4	100.0		

□2: Chi Squared Test Value

5. DISCUSSION

Lately people are more interested in production methods, ingredients of the food they consume and effects of these on their health (10). Consumers believe that they can easily discriminate healthy foods from unhealthy ones and they have already known about the differences according to Lando et al. (2007) and Malam et al. (2009) (5, 14). In this study, it is searched about consumers' reading and understanding of food labels and the most obviously it was found that half of the students always look for information on food labels. Consistent with our research, Aygen et al. (2012), Ali and Kapoor (2009), Gorton et al. (2007), van Trijp et al. (2008) and Güneş et al. (2014) found in their studies that most of the consumers are likely to read food labels (9, 10, 11, 12, 13).

In the light of the comparison results between BMI and label usage, our study showed that food label reading rate decreases from lean / normal weight to overweight / obese students. It was found out that NAD students have a significant higher rate for label reading in comparison to GCA and PTR students, as we expected. When label reading rate of participants compared according to their gender, not significantly, women were found more likely to read food labels. When it comes to causes of not reading food labels, not trusting the labels and difficulty to read owing to place of the label were found as main reasons. Similar to our findings, Güneş et al. (2014) found that almost half of the consumers were found not trusting that food labels reflect truth (13). According to the study of Pelletier et al. (2004) most of the consumers claimed they cannot understand food labels easily (16). Van Trijp et al. (2007) and Malam et al. (2009) also found that shoppers have a difficulty to read food labels because they are too small and want simple and clear labels to read and understand (12, 14). We found out that, students from all three courses mostly stated they do not trust authenticity of labels. Similar to the results of other studies have done, there is a significant distrust towards food labels.

It is hypothesized that calorie can be an important factor for consumers at shopping. In this study, concerning which information consumers had looked for; the most frequently mentioned one was found as calorie, likewise findings of Malam et al. (2009) (14). Sugar, protein and fat were found as other decisive ingredients on food label according to consumers respectively. Other studies, Banterle et al. (2012) and Grunert et al. (2010) have done, found almost similar results to our study but differently, consumers were more likely to take care of fiber or salt content rather than protein content (6, 17).

While NAD and PTR students mostly look for sugar content, GCA students care about protein content at shopping. As we expected, NAD students were more likely to look for sugar, carbohydrate, salt and fiber content rather than other courses.

Depending on gender, despite the importance of calorie content for both genders, the second factor that affects choices was found as sugar for women and protein for men. Brand, expiry date and nutrition information on label were found having great influence on consumers' choices, in a similar way to Peters-Texeire and Badrie's (2005) findings (15). According to our results, different from overweight / obese students, lean / normal weight students were found mostly check expiry date. As an expected result, overweight / obese students were found affected by brand and packaging of the product more than lean / normal weight students. Concerning different courses, NAD students are less likely to be affected by brand name based on their nutritional education, as predicted. Not significantly, more students living in a dorm room choose their food by looking at brand than students living at home. Men were found a little more brand oriented than women and they affected by packaging much more than women while shopping.

According to beverage consumption, our findings showed that half of the consumers do not buy SSBs but a significant amount of them still buy and consume SSBs, similar to the results of Park et al. (2017) (24). A considerable amount of students was found buying SSBs for their living place but not consuming them. We supposed this condition could be related to parental behaviors or habits according to drinks. Studies of van der Horst et al. (2006) and Munsell et al. (2015) supported this idea and showed the effects of parental choices on choices of children according to foods and drinks (25, 26). It could also explain our study results showing that students living at home and buying SSBs but not consuming them have a high rate than the ones living in a dorm room. According to BMI levels, consumption rate for SSBs increases from lean / normal weight participants to overweight / obese ones, not surprisingly. Supportedly, Martin - Calvo et al. (2014) were found a positive relationship between SSBs consumption and body fat increase in their study (27). In our study, according to courses, most of the NAD and PTR students stated they definitely do not buy or consume SSBs, NAD students have the lowest rate for consumption, as we expected. It can be explained as effect of health education on these courses indeed. Study showed that men have a significant higher rate, 51.3%, for buying and consuming SSBs than women, 35.7%. In addition, a considerable amount of women, 14%, has a tendency to buy SSBs for home or dorm room but not

consuming them. Additionally, participants in this study who look for calorie, fat, carbohydrate and sugar content first at shopping were found mostly not consuming SSBs, although the rate of buying and consuming SSBs for participants who chose protein as a decisive content was significantly higher.

It can be claimed that consumers who focused on protein content were less likely to focus on healthiness of the product. More than half of the participants stated they find ASBs unhealthy although a considerable amount of them stated they prefer ASBs because of their low calorie content. Almost half of the participants, 40.3%, who buy and consume SSBs, stated that they find ASBs unhealthy. 70.6% of the students found buying but not consuming SSBs stated they find ASBs unhealthy too. In a similar way to our results, Delagu et al. (2016) found that university students prefer SSBs double times higher than ASBs (28). It was found out that overweight / obese participants are more taste-oriented towards ASBs consumption and not liking the taste with a higher rate than lean / normal weight students. Women participants stated they find ASBs unhealthy with a considerably higher rate than men participants although in the study of Mihaela-Roxana (2010), more women found to consume and trust ASBs than men (29). In our study especially students care about protein content primarily and students care about calories primarily have the highest consumption rates for ASBs. A considerable amount of students look for calorie content first was found consuming ASBs because of low calorie content, not surprisingly.

Concerning milk preference, as we expected, more than half of the participants, 62.2%, were found prefer to consume UHT milk and then pasteurized milk, 26.4%, similar to results of Karakaya's study (2011) (34). Although our study participants' consisting of university students, almost 5% of participants were found prefer street milk. According to study results of Çelik et al. (2005) and Şeker et al. (2012) although more than half of them prefer packaged milk, there is still a high percentile, almost 40%, of people buy street milk (35, 36). Akbay and Tiryaki (2007) found even higher rate, 56.2%, for preference of unpackaged street milk in their study (37). Street milk consumption decreases from PTR students and GCA students to NAD students, even results were not found statistically significant. NAD students have the lowest rate for street milk consumption and the highest rate for pasteurized milk consumption, as it is expected. It is supposed that, this result could be explained with the effect of nutritional information on choices of students. Students living at home have five times higher rate for consuming

street milk than students living in a dorm room, expectedly. It is assumed, they have a higher opportunity to find street milk as well. Women participants have two times more consumption rate for street milk than men participants. In this study, 35.5% of participants were found concerning with the additives of UHT milk and 15.4% of them concerning about possible nutritional loss. Even students, who don't consume milk, were found concerning with the possible additives inside UHT milk. Onurlubaş (2013), Haspolat Kaya (2016), Bozoğlu et al. (2014), Erdal and Tokgöz (2011) also supported this distrust issue towards packaged milk in their studies (39, 40, 41, 42). Concerning university courses, most of GCA students, 60%, and NAD students, 49%, find UHT milk healthy while the rate for PTR students is low, 36.4%. Higher consumption rate of GCA and NAD students could be interpreted as these courses' having information about food production and packaging methods. In the same way to our study, Pazarlıoğlu et al. (2006) and Yayar (2012) found that there is a positive link between household's level of importance of health and level of education and the preference for packaged milk (43, 44).

For this study, the rate for finding UHT milk healthy and consuming it increases from lean / normal weight students to overweight / obese ones. The link between perception towards UHT milk and BMI levels was not found statistically significant but lean / normal weight students were found more concerned about nutritional loss of UHT milk than overweight / obese students. Although there is no significant difference, women were found much more suspicious about health effects, additives and nutritional value of UHT milk than men but they mostly consume it. Pazarlıoğlu et al. (2006) found that women are more likely to prefer packaged milks rather than men (43). It is assumed that UHT milk's shelf-life knowledge, being easy-to-preserve can be an explanation for higher consumption rate of students living in a dorm room than the ones living at home. Students living at home were found more concerned about nutritional loss.

Likewise, there are trust issues towards UHT milk, concerns towards packed / industrial yoghurts are also existing according to our findings. A considerable amount of participants, 17.4%, was found making home-made yoghurts. Similar results were found in studies of Karakaya (2011), Erdal & Tokgöz (2013) and Onurlubaş (2011) (34, 39, 42). In our study 11.7% of participants also stated they find packaged yoghurt tasteless in a similar way to Uzundumlu and Birinci's findings (2013) (46). Our study results showed that 26.8% of the participants were found worried about additives and a considerable amount of participants, 9.7%, was found worried about nutritional loss of packaged

yoghurt. Consumption rate for packaged yoghurt was found only 34.4%. It is assumed that, these results could give us some reasons about why people decided to make their own yoghurt at home lately. Considering BMI levels, there is no significant difference but mostly lean / normal weight participants were found focused on possible additives inside and nutritional loss of packaged yoghurts. Overweight / obese participants were found more taste oriented and the rate of declaring that packaged yoghurt is tasteless was higher for them, as expected. Students living at home have the biggest rate for making home-made yoghurt but the rate for students living in a dorm room cannot be underestimated at all. There is no significant difference between women and men perception according to packaged yoghurts likewise findings of Bayarri et al. (2009) (47). Men were found more likely to accept packaged yoghurt as healthy and consume it than women. Not surprisingly, the rate for making their own yoghurt at home is much higher for women.

Additionally, according to the results, an important amount of students, 43.1% stated they do not consume light milk and dairy products. Only 26.4% of them were found trusting and consuming light milk and dairy products. Students were found suspicious about light milk and dairy products' having less fat than regular ones and worried about the additives inside. Similar results were found in the study of Lynam et al. (2011) (49). Low preference of light milk and dairy products in our study can be related to our participants' based on university students. Adversely, in the study of Dal et al. (2018) young consumers were found mostly prefer light milk rather than regular, whole fat milk (50). Concerning BMI levels, not significantly, overweight / obese participants have higher rates for worrying about additives inside of light milk and dairy products and higher rates for not believing their having less fat than regular ones. Some of the concerns towards light milk and dairy products could be based on lack of information, we assumed. Results of this study showed that NAD students are less suspicious about light milk and dairy products than PTR and GCA students. GCA students were found more taste-oriented, as we expected. In a supported manner, findings of study of Robb et al. (2006) showed that consumption of low fat milk groups changes according to income, living environment and educational level of people (86). More students living at home were found worried about additives inside light milk and dairy products and having a thought that they are tasteless than students living in a dorm room, not significantly. Women are more likely to buy low-fat milk and dairy products in a similar way to the studies of

Lynam et al. (2011) and Hill et al. (2002) (49, 51). Men were found more suspicious about light milk and dairy products' having less fat and they are worried about additives inside, more than women in our study. Not surprisingly, students who stated they prefer street milk have the highest rate for not liking the taste of light milk and dairy products. They also do not believe these products' having less fat. All the students prefer pasteurized milk, street milk and UHT milk were found worried about additives inside light milk and dairy products. Even so, students prefer UHT milk have the highest rate for finding light milk and dairy products healthy, as expected.

It is aimed to find out perception of individuals towards organic foods. 27.1% of participants find organic foods healthier than regular foods. Williams (2002), Çelik (2013) and Harper et al. (2002) found in their studies that people buy organic food because of its health benefits (54, 55, 56). According to study of Hill et al. (2002) people choose organic products to avoid preservatives (51). Considering our findings, an important amount of participants, 36.5%, were found not trusting organic products' being truly organic likewise findings of Harper and Makatouni's (2002), Eti İçli et al. (2016), Nuttavuthisit &Thøgersen (2015) and Lockie et al. (2002) (56, 57, 58, 59). In our study, 30.8% of participants stated they find organic products unnecessarily expensive likewise participants of the studies of Kacur Leblebici (2009) and Millock et al. (2002) (61, 62). Even it was not found statistically significant, lean / normal weight participants were found more likely to believe that organic foods are healthier than regular foods. Significantly higher amount of GCA students were found concerned about organic foods' being truly organic. NAD and PTR students are more prone to believe organic foods' being healthier. This could be associated with GCA students' having a different perspective towards organic foods with information they have learnt about agricultural methods in our country. Eti İçli et al. (2016), Lockie et al. (2002), Kacur Leblebici (2009) and Naspetti & Zanoli (2009) also stated their results are related with education level and inadequate knowledge (57, 59, 61, 63). Students living at home were found prone to think organic products are healthier than regular foods in comparison with students living in a dorm room although there is no significant difference was found. Men were found a little more concerned about organic foods' being real organic than women, not significantly. Our findings showed that women are prone to think that organic foods are healthier than regular foods in comparison to men in a similar way to the study of Lockie et al. (2002) (59).

Considering preferred places to buy fruits and vegetables, 50.8% of the students were found buying their groceries from supermarkets, 45.2% of them were found preferring farmer's market/greengrocery, similar results were obtained from the study of Lockie et al. (2002) and Nuttavuthisit &Thøgersen (2015) also found that participants mostly trust packaged organic foods from supermarkets than those available in traditional markets / groceries (59, 58). Our findings showed that only 1.7% of students stated they buy fruits and vegetables from organic bazaar and 1.3% of students were found growing their own fruits and vegetables. Considering different studying courses, while most of NAD students choose to buy fruits and vegetables from supermarket, GCA students both choose farmers market or greengrocery and supermarket. NAD students have highest rate for choosing organic bazaar to purchase fruits and vegetables, not surprisingly. Although there was no statistically significant difference, 54.4% of students living in a dorm room were found choosing supermarkets while the rate for students living at home were 49.8%. Students living at home have the highest rate for growing their own fruits and vegetables, not surprisingly. Students living in a dorm room were found more likely to not to consume fruits and vegetables, as expected. Place preference of women and men to buy fruits and vegetables was found almost similar. Men were found more likely to not to consume fruits and vegetables than women, as expected.

In this study, perception towards packaged breads is also searched. Nielsen (2005), Nagyova et al. (2009), Bobrow-Strain (2008) and Tanık (2006) mentioned raised consumer concerns about packaged breads in their studies (64, 65, 66, 70). According to our study results, more than half of participants, 54.8% were found worried about additives inside packaged breads because of their long shelf life and only 24.1% of them stated that they find packaged breads healthy. Additionally, 9.4% of participants were not consuming bread. Findings of Ertürk et al. (2015), Taşçı et al. (2017), Gül et al. (2003), Tanık et al. (2006) and Ekmekçi Bal et al. (2013) showed that people mostly prefer unpackaged breads to buy (67, 68, 69, 70, 72). Studies showed that, while preference for unpackaged breads is rising, a considerable amount of people are making their own bread at home (67, 68, 72). According to our study, 2.7% of participants were found making their own bread. Our participants' being university students could explain this low rate for making home-made breads, we assume. Almost 10% of our participants stated that they find packaged breads expensive in a similar way to the findings of Taşçı et al. (2017) that supported price concern of consumers (68).

Regarding BMI levels, while 30.4% of overweight / obese participants find packaged breads healthy and consume them, the rate for lean / normal weight participants was 22.6%. Lean / normal weight participants were found more suspicious about additives inside packaged breads because of the long shelf life. Overweight / obese students' non-consuming rate for bread was found more than two times higher than lean / normal weight students, not significantly but considerably. This could cast a light between bread consumption rate and obesity in a detailed research. NAD students were found as the most concerned ones about additives inside packaged breads with a considerably higher rate, 66%. They also have the least consumption for packaged breads sure. While some of GCA students and PTR students stated they find packaged breads expensive, the rate for NAD students was found very low. GCA students have the highest rate for making their own bread, expectedly. They also have the highest rate for not consuming bread. Knowledge about ingredients and bread types could affect preferences about breads, we assumed. Demir & Kartal (2012) and Benson (2013) mentioned in their studies that there is a lack of knowledge about bread types, ingredients that affects bread preference and perception (73, 74). It is assumed there could be a link between trust towards packaged breads and nutritional knowledge and Cop and Doğan's (2009) findings supported this assumption (75). Both students living at home and living in a dorm room were found worried about additives inside packaged breads because of long shelf life. Students living in a dorm room are more likely to find packaged breads expensive. It is assumed that some of the students living at home could be living with their family and do not even know the price of packaged breads exactly. Only students living at home stated that they make their own bread, not surprisingly.

Women were found having more concerns about additives inside packaged breads than men. Men are more likely to find packaged breads healthy and consume them than women. Non consumer rate of men, 11.5%, was found higher than women, 8.6%. Consumers who look for fat content first at shopping were found as the most worried ones about additives inside packaged breads. They were followed by consumers who look for sugar, carbohydrate, calorie and protein content, respectively. Almost half of the students, who chose carbohydrate content as a decisive ingredient at shopping, 42.9%, stated they find packaged breads healthy and they consume them. Both fiber content oriented and protein content oriented students stated they find packaged breads expensive with a higher rate than others. Students making their own bread were the ones who chose

protein, sugar or salt as a decisive ingredient at shopping.

The results can cast a new light on perception towards processed meat products. 56.2% of students stated that they find these products unhealthy and 28.8% of them were found not trusting the ingredients inside them. Our findings showed that only 8.4% of the students stated they find processed meat products healthy. 6.7% of students declared their reason to choose processed meat products as easy to preserve for a long time, in a similar way to the studies of Yılmaz et al. (2012) and Azabağaoğlu et al. (2006) showing people consume processed meat products although they know they are unhealthy (77, 80). Significant results were obtained by evaluating perceptions according to BMI levels. While 16.1% of overweight / obese students stated that they find processed meat products healthy, the rate for lean / normal weight students was only 6.6%. These results can provide evidence to create a link between processed meat products and obesity although they were not found statistically significant. The rate for accepting processed meat products as unhealthy decreases clearly through NAD students, PTR students and it reaches its lowest level with GCA students. GCA students also have the highest rate for finding processed meat products healthy in comparison to NAD and PTR students. Surprisingly, GCA students also have the highest rate for not trusting the ingredients inside processed meat products. This result could be explained by their submitting 'easy-to-preserve' as a reason for consuming processed meat products with a higher rate than NAD and PTR students also. These results can be interpreted to make a connection between knowledge and perception towards processed meat products. Students living in a dorm room were found more likely to think processed meat products are unhealthy rather than students living at home.

Results showed that, the amount of students living at home and finding processed meat products healthy was five times higher than students living in a dorm room and finding processed meat products healthy. Because some of the students living at home are living with their family too and these products are more attainable for them at home, we can evaluate these results as 'family effect'. While much more than half of women, 62.9%, were found accepting that processed meat products are unhealthy, the rate for men was only 37.2%. A great number of men also stated they find these products healthy, not surprisingly. Similar results were obtained in the studies of Akçay & Vatansever (2010) and Bayrak et al. (2010) (78, 79).

Regarding perception and possible concerns towards light and diet snacks, 27.1%

of participants in our study stated that they believe light and diet snacks have much more additives than regular ones and only 18.1% of them stated they find light and diet snacks healthy. 16.4% of participants were found believing that these products have loss of their nutritional value. Interestingly, 17.1% of the participants stated were found not believing that these products have fewer calories than regular ones. Similarly, findings of Hill et al. (2002), Chan et al. (2005) and Yılmaz et al. (2007) supported this distrust towards light / diet snacks' having fewer calories or less fat than regular ones (51, 82, 83). In the present study, there are also students submitting that they have no idea about light and diet snacks consisting of 21.4% of all participants. Similarly, likewise in studies of Hill et al. and Yılmaz et al. people were found confused about light and diet snacks and their ingredients. In a blind study, Kähkönen (2000) even showed that consumers acceptance of foods as healthy or unhealthy differs according to the products and fat content do not affect this. (85). According to BMI levels, not statistically significant but considerably important results were achieved. The rate for concerning about additives and nutritional loss was higher for overweight / obese students. Overweight / obese students were found as non-believers for light and diet snacks' having fewer calories with a relatively higher rate than lean / normal weight students. This denial can cast a light on the link between obesity and consumption of and concerns towards light and diet snacks. In Yılmaz and Ünal's study (2007) overweight participants were found not liking the taste of light and diet products (83). Expectedly, a greater percentile of lean / normal weight students stated they have no idea about light and diet snacks. From the results, GCA students have a higher rate to think that light and diet snacks are healthy rather than NAD and PTR students. NAD students were found more concerned about nutritional loss and more suspicious about these products' having fewer calories, indeed. Both PTR students and NAD students were found worried about light and diet foods' having more additives than regular foods. These concerns of NAD students could be interpreted by seeking for natural products to consume based on a nutritional education. These results can maintain an environment to discuss the relationship between knowledge and perception towards light and diet products. NAD students' not believing light and diet snacks' having fewer calories or fat should be investigated, we assume. The rates for not having an idea about light and diet snacks decreases through NAD students, PTR students and reaches its lowest level with GCA students, as expected. Although there is no statistically significant difference was found, students living in a dorm room were found more worried about additives and more suspicious about light and diet products' having fewer calories.

Students living at home were found more likely to say 'I do not have an idea about light and diet snacks'. However, better results were achieved when it comes to compare genders. As we expected, number of women accepting that light and diet snacks are healthy is approximately four times more than men. Similar results were obtained in the study of Memiş (2004) (84). According to our findings, women were found more concerned and more suspicious about light and diet snacks in nutritional loss, additives and calorie issues too. Expectedly, most of the men were found having no idea about light and diet snacks even. Participants mostly focused on carbohydrate content have the highest rate for believing light and diet snacks are healthy. Besides, other participants were found worried about light and diet snacks' having more additives than regular ones, except participants who focused on protein content. Participants who choose protein as a decisive factor for them at shopping have the highest rate for not having an idea about light and diet snacks. As it is mentioned before according to our previous findings; this could be cast a light on individuals who look for protein content first at shopping can be less likely to care about nutritional loss and additives, more likely to focus on protein content instead.

6.CONCLUSION

In recent years, number of people who are concerned about ingredients of foods and drinks that they consume has been on the rise. There is no previous research evaluating consumers' buying behavior and perception of packaged products associating BMI levels. It is aimed to investigate food label knowledge and perception towards specific products as taking different BMI levels into consideration mainly, in addition to other variables; gender, living place and studying course. In the final analysis, this study reached significant results. Participants were found having distrust towards specific packaged products based on concerns such as additives and nutritional loss. In addition, the rate of participants who do not trust food labels' reflecting the truth about ingredients, light / diet products' being truly low in fat / calorie and organic products' being real organic was found significant. Women were found more concerned about additives in the products. Considering NAD students' food label knowledge, trust and perception towards products, importance of nutrition knowledge was appeared. Students' with high levels of BMI, not significantly but considerably, having lower label reading rate, lower consumption rate of bread while having higher consumption rate of SSBs and processed meat products can cast a light between obesity and consumer behavior in further researches.

7. REFERENCES

1) Bildtgård. Trust in food in modern and late-modern societies. Anthropology of food. 2008: p. 99-128.

2) Fernqvist F, Ekelund L. Credence and the effect on consumer liking of food. Food Quality and Preference. 2013: p. 340-353.

3) Segovia MS, Palma MA. Buying your way into a healthier lifestyle: a latent class analysis of healthy food. Applied Economics. 2016: p. 1965-1977.

4) Campos S, Doxey J, Hammond D. Nutrition labels on pre-packaged foods: a systematic review. Public Health Nutrition. 2011: p. 1496 - 1506.

5) Lando AM, Labiner-Wolfe J. Helping Consumers Make More Healthful Food Choices: Consumer Views on Modifying Food Labels and Providing Point-of-Purchase Nutrition Information at Quick-service Restaurants: Elsevier Inc. on Behalf of The Society For Nutrition Education; 2007.

6) Banterle A, Cavaliere A, Ricci EC. Food Labelled Information: An Empirical Analysis of Consumer Preferences Milano: Int. J. Food System Dynamics; 2012.

7) WHO. www.euro.who.int. [Online]. [cited 2018 November 4. Available from: http://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/disease-prevention/nutrition/a-healthy-lifestyle/body-mass-index-bmi.

8) Ollberding NJ, Wolf RL, Contento I. Food Label Use and Its Relation to Dietary Intake among US Adults. 2011 May.

9) Aygen FG. Attitudes and Behavior of Consumers Related to the Inspection of Food Labels İstanbul: İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi; 2012.

10 Ali J, Kapoor S. Understanding consumers' perspectives on food labelling in Indiaijcs_825 724.734. 2009: p. 724-734.

11 Gorton D, Mhurchu CN, Chen Mh, Dixon R. Nutrition labels: a survey of use, understanding and preferences among ethnically diverse shoppers in New Zealand New Zealand: Public Health Nutrition; 2008.

12 van Trijp H, van Kleef E, Paeps F, Ferna´ndez-Celem´ın L. Consumer preferences for front-of-pack calories labelling Brussels: Public Health Nutrition; 2007.

13 Güneş FE, Aktaç Ş, Korkmaz İO. Tüketicilerin Gıda Etiketlerine Yönelik Tutum ve Davranışları İstanbul: Academic Food Journal; 2014.

14 Malam S, Clegg S, Kirwan S, McGinigal S, BSR. Comprehension and use of UK nutrition signpost labelling schemes London: Food Standards Agency; 2009.

15 Peters-Texeira A, Badrie N. Consumers' perception of food packaging in Trinidad, West Indies and its related impact on food choices Trinidad and Tobago: International Journal of Consumer Studies; 2005.

16 Pelletier AL, Chang WW, Delzell JE, McCall JW. Patients' Understanding and Use of Snack Food Package Nutrition Labels Tennessee: J Am Board Fam Pract; 2004.

17 Grunert KG, M. Wills J, Fernandez-Celemın L. Nutrition knowledge, and use and understanding of nutrition information on food labels among consumers in the UK Aarhus V.: Elsevier Ltd.; 2010.

18 www.who.int. [Online]. [cited 2018 10 24. Available from: https://www.who.int/elena/titles/ssbs_childhood_obesity/en/.

19 Low-Calorie Sweeteners. [Online]. [cited 2018 10 24. Available from: https://www.hsph.harvard.edu/nutritionsource/healthy-drinks/artificial-sweeteners/.

20 Additional Information about High-Intensity Sweeteners Permitted for Use in Food in the United States. [Online]. [cited 2018 10 24. Available from: https://www.fda.gov/food/ingredientspackaginglabeling/foodadditivesingredients/ucm397725.htm.

21 Tarım ve Köyişleri Bakanlığı. Türk Gıda Kodeksi Gıda Maddelerinde Kullanılan Tatlandırıcılar Tebliği. Resmi Gazete; 2002. Report No.: No: 2002/56.

22 European Union,. Regulation (Ec) No 1924/2006 Of The European Parliament and of The Council. ; 2006.

23 Fowler SP, Williams K, Resendez RG, Hunt KJ, Hazuda HP, Stern MP. Fueling the Obesity Epidemic? Artificially Sweetened Beverage Use and Long-term Weight Gain. 2008.

24 Park S, Lundeen EA, Pan L, Blanck HM. Impact of Knowledge of Health Conditions on Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Intake Varies Among US Adults Atlanta: American Journal of Health Promotion; 2017.

25 van der Horst K, Kremers S, Ferreira I, Singh A, Oenema A, Brug J. Perceived parenting style and practices and the consumption of sugar-sweetened beverages by adolescents Amsterdam: Advance Access publication; 2006.

26 Munsell CR, Harris JL, Sarda V, Marlene B S. Parents' beliefs about the healthfulness of sugary drink options: opportunities to address misperceptions Boston : Public Health Nutrition: 2015.

27 Martin-Calvo N, Martinez-Gonzalez MA, Bes-Rastrollo M, Gea A, Ochoa MC, Marti A, et al. Sugar-sweetened carbonated beverage consumption and childhood/adolescent obesity: a case–control study Pamplona: Public Health Nutrition; 2014.

28 Delagu F, Huddas C, Steven K, Hachem S, Lodhia L, Fernandez R, et al. A Dissociation Between Recognition and Hedonic Value in Caloric and Non-caloric Carbonated Soft Drinks Southfield: Frontiers in Psychology; 2016.

29 Mihaela-Roxana I. An Analysıs Of Korean Consumers' Attitudes and Beliefs towards Sugar-Free Beverages Korea: Agricultural and Resource Economics Review; 2010.

30 ASÜD. World and Turkey Milk Industry Report Ankara: Ambalajlı Süt ve Süt Ürünleri Sanayicileri Derneği (ASÜD); 2010.

31 SAGEM. Türkiye Beslenme ve Sağlık Araştırması 2010. Ankara:; 2010.

32 Kök F, Büyükyörük S, Göksoy EÖ. Pasteurized Milk and UHT Sterilized Milk. Gıda Hijyeni ve Teknolojisi. 2017.

33 Gıda, Tarım ve Hayvancılık Bakanlığı. İçme Sütleri Tebliği. Resmi Gazete; 2017.

34 Karakaya E. İstanbul İlinde Tüketicilerin Süt ve Süt Ürünleri Tüketim Alışkanlıkları İstanbul; 2011.

35 Çelik Y, Karlı B, Bilgiç A, Çelik Ş. The Level of Milk Consumption and Consumption Pattern of Consumers In Sanliurfa Urban Areas Şanlıurfa: Tarım Ekonomisi Dergisi 2005; 2005.

36 Şeker İ, Şeker P, Şahin M, Özen Vs, Akdeniz A, Erkmen O, et al. Determination of Consumer Habits Milk Consumption in Elazığ and the Factors Affecting these Habits Elazığ: F.Ü.Sağ.Bil.Vet.Derg.; 2012.

37 Akbay C, Tiryaki GY. Unpacked and packed fluid milk consumption patternsand preferences in Turkey Kahramanmaraş: Agricultural Economics; 2007.

38 Topcu Y, Baran D, Denizli G. Tüketicilerin Süt Tüketim Tercih Modellerini Temel Alan Pazarlama Taktik ve Stratejilerinin Belirlenmesi. Erzurum:; 2016.

39 Onurlubaş E. The factors affecting milk consumption preferences of the consumers in Edirne Keşan township. 2013.

40 Haspolat Kaya I. Consumers' Perception and Attitudes toward Packaged Milk in Turkey—A Descriptive Study Ankara: Food and Nutrition Sciences; 2016.

41 Bozoğlu M, Huang CL, Florkowski WJ, Topuz Kılıç B, Alhas Eroğlu N. Consumers' Awareness of Food Safety Issues and Their Purchase Intention toward Safety Labeled Dairy Products Samsun, Trabzon: Gıda Güvencesi ve Güvenliği; 2014.

42 Erdal G, Tokgöz K. Factors Affecting Preferences of Packed and Unpacked Milk Consumption of Consumers: A Case Study of Erzincan Erzincan: KMÜ Sosyal ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi; 2011.

43 Pazarlioğlu MV, Miran B, Üçdoğruk Ş, Abay C. Using econometric modelling to predict demand for fluid and farm milk: A case study from Turkey İzmir: Elsevier Ltd.; 2006.

44 Yayar R. Consumer characteristics influencing milk consumption preference. The Turkey case Tokat: Theoretical and Applied Economics; 2012.

45 Ak S. Global UHT Milk Market is Expected to Reach USD 137.7 Billion by 2019: Transparency Market Research, prnewswire.com. [Online]; 2014 [cited 2018 October 21.

46 Uzundumlu AS, Birinci A. Analysis of Factors Affecting Consumers in Raw Milk Consumption: The Case Study of Erzurum Erzurum: Alınteri; 2013.

47 Bayarri S, Carbonell I, Barrios EX, Costell E. Acceptability of Yogurt and Yogurt-Like Products: Influence of Product Information and Consumer Characteristics and Preferences Valencia: Journal of Sensory Studies; 2009.

48 Tarım ve Köyişleri Bakanlığı. Çiğ Süt ve Isıl İşlem Görmüş İçme Sütleri Tebliği. Resmi Gazete; 2000. Report No.: No: 2000/6.

49 Lynam AM, McKevitt A, Gibney MJ. Irish consumers' use and perception of nutrition and health claims Dublin: Public Health Nutrition; 2011.

50 Dal NE, Korkmaz İ, Oral MA. Genç Tüketicilerin İçme Sütü Tüketim Alışkanlıkları Antalya: International Journal of Social Science; 2018.

51 Hill DS, Knocks B, Hamilton J, Parr H, Stringer M. Reduced-fat foods: the shopper's viewpoint Coleraine: International Journal of Consumer Studies; 2002.

52 Robert L. P. Organic and Local Food. In Robert L. P. Food Politics : What Everyone Needs to Know. New York: Oxfor University; 2010. p. 139-155.

53 Tarım ve Köyişleri Bakanlığı. Organik Tarımın Esaslarına ve Uygulanmasına İlişkin Yönetmelik. Resmi Gazete; 2010. Report No.: No: 27676.

54 Williams C. Nutritional quality of organic food: shades of grey or shades of green? UK: Proc Nutr Soc.; 2002.

55 Çelik S. Who and Why Buy Organic Food? A Field Research İstanbul: Selcuk University Journal of Institute of Social Sciences; 2013.

56 C. Harper G, Makatouni A. Consumer perception of organic food production and farm animal welfare Reading: British Food Journal; 2002.

57 Eti İçli G, Kamil Anıl N, Kılıç B. The Affecting Factors of Consumers' Organic Food Purchase Choices Turkey: Kırklareli Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi; 2016.

58 Nuttavuthisit K, Thøgersen J. The Importance of Consumer Trust for the Emergence of a Market for Green Products: The Case of Organic Food Aarhus C: Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht; 2015.

59 Lockie , Lyons K, Lawrence , Mummery K. Eating 'Green': Motivations Behind Organic Food Consumption in Australia Lockie S, Lyons K, editors. Malden: European Society for Rural Sociology; 2002.

60 Uysal Karahan Ö, Miran B, Abay C, Boyacı M, Janssen M, Hamm U. Türkiye'de Tüketicilerin Organik Logolara Yaklaşımları Şanlıurfa: Türkiye IX. Tarım Ekonomisi Kongresi; 2010.

61 Kacur Leblebici L. Erciyes Üniversitesi İİBF Akademik ve İdari Personeli İle İİBF İşletme Gündüz ve İkinci Öğretim Öğrencilerinin Organik Ürünleri Algılamaları Erciyes: Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi; 2009.

62 Millock K, Hansen LG, Wier M, Andersen LM. Willingness to Pay for Organic Foods: A Comparison between Survey Data and Panel Data from Denmark France; 2002.

63 Naspetti S, Zanoli R. Organic Food Quality and Safety Perception Throughout Europe Ancona: Journal of Food Products Marketing; 2009.

64 Nielsen PV. Packaging, Quality Control, and Sanitation of Bakery Products: Taylor & Francis Group; 2005.

65 Nagyová L, Rovný P, Stávková J, Uličná M, Maďarová L. Consumer Perception of Bread Quality: Acta Universitatis Agriculturae Et Silviculturae Mendelianae Brunensıs Sborník Mendelovy ZeměDěLské A Lesnıcké Unıverzıty V Brně; 2009.

66 Bobrow-Strain A. White Bread Bio-politics: Purity, Health, and the Triumph of Industrial Baking Beacon: SAGE Journals; 2008.

67 Ertürk A, Arslantaş N, Sarıca D, Demircan V. Isparta İli Kentsel Alanda Ailelerin Ekmek Tüketimi ve İsrafı Isparta: Akademik Gıda; 2015.

68 Taşcı R, Karabak S, Bolat M, Acar O, Şanal T, Pehlivan A, et al. Ankara İlinde Ekmekte Tüketici Tercihleri Ankara: Tarla Bitkileri Merkez Araştırma Enstitüsü Dergisi,; 2017.

69 Gül A, Işık H, Bal T, Özer S. Bread Consumption and Waste of Households in Urban Area of Adana Province Adana: Electronic Journal of Polish Agricultural Universities; 2003.

70 Tanık O. The Determination of Quality Applications in the Bread Production and Customer's Pleasure Dynamics Trakya; 2006.

71 www.bbga.org. [Online].; 2013. Available from: https://www.bbga.org/.

72 Ekmekçi Bal Z, Sayılı M, Gözener B. Tokat İli Merkez İlçede Ailelerin Ekmek Tüketimleri Üzerine Bir Araştırma Tokat: Journal of Agricultural Faculty of Gaziosmanpasa University; 2013.

73 Demir KM, Kartal H. Konya İlinde Farklı Ekmek Çeşitlerini Tüketen Bireyler Üzerinde Yapılan Bir Anket Çalışması Konya: Electronic Journal of Food Technologies; 2012.

74 Benson A. The Rise and Fall of Bread in America USA: School of Arts & Sciences; 2013.

75 Cop R, Doğan H. Ekmek Üretiminde Yeni Ürün Geliştirme ve Tüketici Tutumlarıyla İlgili Bir Uygulama: Journal of Social Sciences; 2009.

76 Rastogi NK. Recent developments in high pressure processing of foods. ; 2013.

77 Yılmaz E, Oraman Y, Yılmaz İ. The Effects of Economic Crisis on Consumers Attitude and Behaviour regarding meat and meat products in Tekirdag Tekirdağ: 10. Ulusal Tarım Ekonomisi Kongresi; 2012.

78 Akçay Y, Vatansever Ö. A Research on Red Meat Consumption: A Case Study of Urban Area in Kocaeli Province Kocaeli: Çankırı Karatekin Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi; 2010.

79 Bayrak U, Gram E, Mengeş E, Okumuş ZG, Sayar HC, Skrijelj E. The Knowledge and Attıtude of University Students About Health Habitude and Cancer İzmir: Tıp FaküLtesi DergiSi; 2010.

80 Azabağaoğlu MÖ, Unakıtan G, Demirkol C. Consumer Behavior Analysis for Food Safcty in Proccsscd Meat Products İstanbul: Türkiye VII. Tarım Ekonomisi Kongresi; 2006.

81 Türk Gıda Kodeksi. Gıda Maddelerinde Kullanılan Tatlandırıcılar Tebliği. Resmi Gazete; 2006. Report No.: Tebliğ No: 2006/45.

82 Chan C, Patch C, Williams P. Australian consumers are sceptical about but influenced by claims about fat on food labels Australia: European Journal of Clinical Nutrition; 2005.

83 Yılmaz MK, Ünal S. Düşük Kalorili (Light) Gıda Kullanan Tüketicileri Kullanım Sıklığına Göre Ayırma Üzerine Bir Araştırma Erzurum: dergipark.ulakbim.gov.tr; 2007.

84 Memiş E. Üniversite Öğrencilerinde Şişmanlık (Obezite) Durumu ve Diyet Ürünleri Kullanmaları Üzerinde Bir Araştırma Ankara; 2004.

85 Kahkönen P. Consumer Acceptance of Reduced-Fat Foods – The Effects of Product Information Helsinki: Helsinki University Press; 2000.

86 Robb CA, Reynolds LM, Abdel-Ghany M. Consumer preference among fluid milks: low-fat vs. high-fat milk consumption in the United States Tuscaloosa: International Journal of Consumer Studies; 2006.

04.01.2018

T.C. BEYKENT ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SAĞLIK BİLİMLERİ ETİK KURULU

Diyetisyen Begüm DEMİRCAN'ın **"Bir Vakıf Üniversitesindeki Öğrencilerin Belirli Paket Gıdalara Yönelik Güven Algısı ve Besin İçeriği Bilgi Düzeylerinin BKI Seviyelerine Göre Değerlendirilmesi"** başlıklı araştırması Etik Kurulumuzca uygun görülmüştür.

ETİK KURUL ÜYELERİ

ÜYE
Prof.Dr. İbrahim ERCAN

ÜYE
Prof.Dr. Halil TUNALI

ÜYE
Prof.Dr. İsmet Artun ÖNCEL

ÜYE
Prof.Dr. Münevver GÖKYİĞİT

ÜYE
Prof.Dr. Yıldız ATAMER

ÜYE
Prof.Dr. Musa Üstün GÜLDAĞ

ÜYE
Prof.Dr. Zafer ÖZSOY

ÜYE
Prof.Dr. Firdevs ŞENEL

BAŞKAN
Prof.Dr. Burak Ömür ÇAKIR

YEDİTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ BESLENME VE DİYETETİK YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZ ÇALIŞMASI

–Bir Vakıf Üniversitesindeki Öğrencilerin Belirli Paket Gıdalara Yönelik Güven Algısı ve Besin İçeriği Bilgi Düzeylerinin BKI Seviyelerine Göre Değerlendirilmesi Soru Formu-

GÖRÜŞÜLEN TARİH : ……/…….. / 2018 ID NO: …….

Cinsiyet :

Yaş :

Boy :

Kilo :

Fakülte, Bölüm ve Sınıf :
(Çift Anadal ya da Yandal varsa belirtiniz.)

Yaşanan Yer (Ev/Yurt/Apart) :

S01. Yiyecek-içeceklerin ambalajları üzerindeki besin etiketleri ile ilgili düşünceniz nedir?

a) Mutlaka okuyorum
b) Yazılar çok küçük olduğu için okuyamıyorum
c) Yazılanları anlamıyorum
d) Paketin okunması zor kısmında yer aldığı için okumuyorum
e) Yazılanların doğruluğuna inanmıyorum
f) Bir fikrim yok

S02. Besin değeri bilgilerini okurken en çok hangisine dikkat edersiniz?

a) Kalorisi
b) Yağ içeriği
c) Karbonhidrat içeriği
d) Protein içeriği
e) Şeker içeriği
f) Tuz içeriği
g) Lif içeriği

S03. Yiyecek-içecek tercihinizde en çok hangisinden etkilenirsiniz?

a) Ambalajı etkiler
b) Markasına bakarım
c) Reklamlar ve tavsiyelerden etkilenirim
d) Son tüketim tarihine bakarım
e) Besin değeri bilgilerine bakarım

S04. Eve/Yurda şekerli, gazlı içeceklerden (kola grubu, şekerli sodalar, soğuk çaylar) alıyor musunuz?

a) Evet alıyorum ve tüketiyorum
b) Evet alıyorum ama kendim tüketmiyorum
c) Hayır kesinlikle almıyorum

S05. Sütü satın alırken hangisini tercih ediyorsunuz?

a) Açık süt alıyorum
b) UHT (ambalajlı süt) alıyorum
c) Pastörize süt (günlük süt) alıyorum
d) Süt tüketmiyorum

S06. Sebze-meyve alışverişlerinizi nereden yapıyorsunuz?

a) Marketten alıyorum
b) Pazardan/manavdan alıyorum
c) Organik pazardan alıyorum
d) Kendim yetiştiriyorum
e) Sebze-meyve tüketmiyorum

S07. Hazır paketlenmiş ekmekler ile ilgili düşünceniz nedir?

a) Sağlıklı buluyorum ve tüketiyorum
b) Uzun raf ömrü katkı maddesi olduğunu düşündürüyor
c) Fazla pahalı buluyorum
d) Ekmeği kendim yapmayı tercih ediyorum
e) Ekmek tüketmiyorum

S08. Ambalajlı (UHT) sütler ile ilgili düşünceniz nedir?

a) Sağlıklı buluyorum ve tüketiyorum
b) Uzun raf ömrü katkı maddesi olduğunu düşündürüyor
c) Besin değerini kaybettiğini düşünüyorum
d) Fiyatı yüksek geliyor

S09. Markette satılan yoğurtlarla ilgili düşünceniz nedir?

a) Sağlıklı buluyorum ve tüketiyorum
b) Uzun raf ömrü katkı maddesi olduğunu düşündürüyor
c) Besin değerini kaybettiğini düşünüyorum
d) Lezzetli bulmuyorum
e) Yoğurdu kendim yapmayı tercih ediyorum

S10. Salam, sucuk, sosis, jambon, pastırma, kuru etler gibi işlenmiş et ürünleri ile ilgili düşünceniz nedir?

a) Sağlığa zararlı olduğunu düşünüyorum
b) İçeriğinin doğruluğuna güvenmiyorum
c) Sağlıklı buluyorum
d) Uzun süre bozulmaması saklamamı kolaylaştırıyor

S11. Organik olarak satılan ürünler ile ilgili düşünceniz nedir?

a) Daha sağlıklı buluyorum
b) Organik olduğuna inanmıyorum
c) Gereğinden fazla pahalı buluyorum
d) Emin değilim / Bir fikrim yok

S12. Yağı azaltılmış süt ve süt ürünleri ile ilgili düşünceniz nedir?

a) Tüketmiyorum
b) Sağlıklı buluyorum ve tercih ediyorum
c) Katkı maddesi olduğunu düşünüyorum
d) Yağının azaldığına inanmıyorum
e) Tadını beğenmiyorum

S13. Light ve diyet atıştırmalıklar ile ilgili düşünceniz nedir?

a) Sağlıklı buluyorum
b) Daha çok katkı maddesi olduğunu düşünüyorum
c) Kalorisinin az olduğuna inanmıyorum
d) Besin değerinin azaldığını düşünüyorum
e) Bir fikrim yok

S14. Marketlerde satılan tatlandırıcılı içecekler (light kola, soğuk çay, limonata vb.) ile ilgili düşünceniz nedir?

a) Sağlıklı buluyorum ve tüketiyorum
b) Kalorisi az olduğu için tercih ediyorum
c) Tadını beğenmiyorum
d) Sağlıksız buluyorum
e) Bir fikrim yok

Anketimiz sona erdi. Katılımınız için teşekkürler...

ASGARİ BİLGİLENDİRİLMİŞ GÖNÜLLÜ OLUR FORMU

Sizi Yeditepe Üniversitesi tarafından yürütülen 14 soruluk bir anket çalışmasına davet ediyoruz. Araştırmaya katılmak tamamen gönüllülük esasına dayalıdır. Anketi yanıtlamanız, araştırmaya katılım için onam verdiğiniz biçiminde yorumlanacaktır. Araştırma sırasında sizden alınan bilgiler araştırmacıda saklı kalacak ve toplanan veriler yalnızca bilimsel amaçla kullanılacak; araştırma sonuçlarının yayımlanması halinde dahi gönüllünün kimliği gizli kalacaktır.

Ankette bulunan sorulara vereceğiniz yanıtların doğruluğu, araştırmanın niteliği açısından oldukça önemlidir. Bu nedenle, ankette bulunan sorulara doğru yanıt vermenizi rica eder, işbirliğiniz için teşekkür ederiz.

Araştırmanın Amacı:
Besin etiketi içeriklerini bilme ve okuma, belirli paket gıdalara yönelik tutumlar ile Beden Kütle İndeksi (BKI) arasındaki bağlantının incelenmesi araştırmanın amacını oluşturmaktadır.

Araştırmanın Süresi: Her bir gönüllü ile görüşmenin ortalama 5-6 dakika sürmesi planlanmaktadır. Araştırmanın 2 ay sürmesi planlanmaktadır.

Katılması Beklenen Gönüllü Sayısı: 300 kişi

Araştırmaya Katılan Araştırıcılar: Dyt. Begüm Demircan

Katılımcının

Adı - Soyadı:

İmzası:

ÖZGEÇMİŞ

Kişisel Bilgiler

Adı	Begüm	**Soyadı**	Demircan
Doğum Yeri	Balıkesir	**Doğum Tarihi**	14.01.1991
Uyruğu	T.C.	**TC Kimlik No**	22619337148
E-mail	demircanbeg@gmail.com	**Tel**	05387454587

Öğrenim Durumu

Derece	Alan	Mezun Olduğu Kurumun Adı	Mezuniyet Yılı
Doktora			
Yüksek Lisans	Beslenme ve Diyetetik	**Yeditepe Üniversitesi**	
Lisans	Beslenme ve Diyetetik	**Yeditepe Üniversitesi**	2014
Lise	Sayısal (MF)	**Antalya Anadolu Lisesi**	2009

Başarılmış birden fazla sınav varsa(KPDS, ÜDS, TOEFL; EELTS vs), tüm sonuçlar yazılmalıdır

Bildiği Yabancı Dilleri	Yabancı Dil Sınav Notu (#)
İngilizce	YDS: 76
İspanyolca	

İş Deneyimi (Sondan geçmişe doğru sıralayın)

Görevi	Kurum	Süre (Yıl - Yıl)
Diyabet Diyetisyeni	Arateus Reaktif Hipoglisemi ve Diyabet Kliniği	2014 - Halen
		-

Bilgisayar Bilgisi

Program	Kullanma becerisi
Microsoft Word	Çok iyi
Microsoft Excel	Çok İyi

*****Çok iyi, iyi, orta, zayıf olarak değerlendirin

Bilimsel Çalışmaları

SCI, SSCI, AHCI indekslerine giren dergilerde yayınlanan makaleler

Diğer dergilerde yayınlanan makaleler

Uluslararası bilimsel toplantılarda sunulan ve bildiri kitabında (*Proceedings*) basılan bildiriler

Hakemli konferans/sempozyumların bildiri kitaplarında yer alan yayınlar

Diğer (Görev Aldığı Projeler/Sertifikaları/Ödülleri)
