An Investigation of the Relationship between Food Literacy and Adherence to a Healthy Diet: Consumption of Food Groups in People with Type 2 Diabetes

Fatemeh Bastami

*Nutritional Health Research Center, School of Health and Nutrition, Lorestan University of Medical Sciences, Khorramabad, Iran. (Corresponding author):

fatemeh2011bastami@gmail.com

Mehdi Haghi

Department of public health, School of Health and Nutrition, Lorestan University of Medical Sciences, Khorramabad, Iran.

Rasool Mohammadi

Social Determinants of Health Research Center, School of Health and Nutrition, Lorestan University of Medical Sciences, Khorramabad, Iran.

Seyed Mahmoud Reza Taherian

Nutritional Health Research Center, School of Health and Nutrition, Lorestan University of Medical Sciences, Khorramabad, Iran.

Zeinab Khani

Department of public health, School of Health and Nutrition, Lorestan University of Medical Sciences, Khorramabad, Iran.

Parisa Zaedi

Department of public health, School of Health and Nutrition, Lorestan University of Medical Sciences, Khorramabad, Iran.

Received: 13 December 2022 Accepted: 22 March 2023 Doi: 10.22038/jhl.2023.70710.1362

ABSTRACT

Background and Objectives: Diet adjustment is an important factor in the management of all types of diabetes. One of the factors that influences diet adherence is food literacy. The present study was conducted with the aim of investigating the relationships among food literacy, following a healthy diet, and consumption of a variety of food groups in people with type 2 diabetes.

Material and Methods: The present research was a descriptive-analytical study that was conducted on 288 people with type 2 diabetes referred to comprehensive health service centers in Khorramabad from May 2021 to April 2022. The simple random sampling method was used to select the participants. The data collection instruments included the food literacy questionnaire, diet adherence behavior survey, and a three-day food record. The data were analyzed using the independent t-test, the Pearson correlation coefficient, one-way anova, and univariate and multivariate linear regression models.

Results: The mean healthy diet and food literacy scores were 28.55 ± 6.03 and 16.21 ± 5.73 , respectively. The mean consumption of food groups during the three recorded days was less than the recommended levels in the food pyramid. Education (β :0.30) and food literacy (β :0.23) had the highest predictive power for adherence to a healthy diet. The relationships among food literacy, with the consumption of the meat group (r=0.346, p<0.001), fruits (r = 0.178, p = 0.002), vegetables (r = 0.225, p < 0.001), and fats and oils (r = -0.157, p = 0.008) were significant.

Conclusion: The mean healthy diet adherence and food literacy scores were low in the participants. Significant relationships among food literacy, the consumption of a variety of food groups, and following a healthy diet demonstrate the key role of promoting food literacy in the adherence to a healthy diet. Therefore, it is crucial to implement educational interventions to improve food literacy in diabetic patients.

Paper Type: Research Article

Keywords: Food literacy, healthy diet, food groups, type 2 diabetes.

Citation: Bastami F, Haghi M, Mohammadi R, Taherian M, Khani Z, Zaedi P. An Investigation of the Relationship between Food Literacy and Adherence to a Healthy Diet: Consumption of Food Groups in People with Type 2 Diabetes. *Journal of Health Literacy*. Summer 2023; 8(2): 74-86.

÷

75

Introduction

Diabetes is a group of metabolic diseases with different causes. Diabetic people suffer from high sugar levels in the blood (1). The prevalence of diabetes has been determined for all types (type 1, type 2, gestational diabetes), with type 2 diabetes alone accounting for 90-95% of all diabetes cases. People with type 2 diabetes are more susceptible to cardiovascular diseases in comparison with non-diabetic people (2). Diabetes leads to a decline in physical performance, deterioration of quality of life, and an increase in the number of years of life with disability, and premature death. About 60-70% of people with diabetes suffer from one or more complications caused by diabetes (3, 4).

Due to the high prevalence of diabetes, today the World Health Organization has named it a silent epidemic (5). Diabetes currently affects 246 million people worldwide. This number is expected to reach 380 million by 2025. On the other hand, by 2025, diabetes will mostly affect the developing countries (6). It is predicted that there will be about 2.5 million diabetic patients in Iran by 2025 (7).

Self-care in diabetes is a series of complicated and laborious behaviors that often require a fundamental change in lifestyle and are under the influence of several factors. The dimensions of self-care in patients with diabetes include a wide range of self-care behaviors, such as monitoring and controlling blood glucose levels, insulin therapy and the use of anti-diabetic pills, exercise and physical activities, nutrition and diet, the prevention of acute complications, including hypoglycemia and hyperglycemia, prevention of chronic complications of diabetes, foot care, smoking cessation, and other health-related behaviors (8).

Nutrition and diet are the most important of the behaviors influencing diabetes outcome

(8). Diet adjustment is an important factor in the management of all types of diabetes. Diabetic people can even control their disease by modifying the diet along with doing physical exercise. Nevertheless, adherence to the diabetic diet is one of the most important challenges in diabetes control (9). Understanding the benefits of a healthy diet by diabetic patients has a positive and significant relationship with their adherence to relevant behaviors (10).

Food literacy is an important factor in diet adherence. Food literacy involves a set of knowledge, skills, and behaviors necessary to planning, managing, choosing, preparing, and eating food (11). A systematic review showed that food literacy is considered a special form of health literacy (12). The literature review indicated that improvement in food literacy has a positive effect on nutritional behavior and well-being (13, 14).

Food literacy is very closely related to the concept of health literacy (15). According to some studies, diabetic patients with insufficient health literacy have less knowledge about their disease, and they, consequently, cannot control their blood sugar adequately (16, 17). Seyed Al-Shohadai and et al. reported a significant statistical relationship between health literacy and the self-care dimension of diet adherence (18). Previous studies have not paid attention to the relationship between food literacy and adherence to a healthy diet and have examined general health literacy in diabetic people. The association between food literacy and adherence to a healthy diet remain unclear in diabetic people (18-22). The present study was conducted to investigate the relationship between food literacy and the behavior of adherence to a healthy diet and consumption of various food groups in people with diabetes.

Materials and Methods Study design and Participants

This descriptive-analytical cross-sectional study was conducted on people with type 2 diabetes referring to comprehensive health service centers in Khorramabad from April 2021 to March 2022.

In the present study, the inclusion criteria were an age of between 18 and 60, living in Khorramabad, and having been diagnosed with type 2 diabetes by a specialist at least three months before the research. Other inclusion criteria were willingness to participate in the study, giving informed consent, active patient records in comprehensive health centers, history of 2-hour blood sugar equal to or more than 200 mg/dl after a meal or a fasting plasma glucose level more than 126 mg/dl measured on two separate occasions, glycosylated hemoglobin \geq 6.5%, being under treatment with oral hypoglycemic drugs, not suffering from advanced diseases such as liver and kidney failure, and lack of known mental disorders. The exclusion criteria were patient's unwillingness to continue participating in the study and incompletely filled questionnaires.

Sampling Method and Sample Size

The simple random sampling method was used in this study to select the participants. To this end, first, a list of all diabetic patients, referring to the comprehensive health centers of Khorramabad was prepared. Then, the simple random method was used to select the participants based on the desired sample size.

The sample size was calculated based on a study by Fallah et al (23). The standard deviation of the self-care score of adherence to a healthy diet was considered equal to $\sigma = 17.3$, the significance level was 95% (a = 0.05), and the accuracy was d = 2. In addition, the following formula was used to calculate the sample size:



Z1α/2=1.96 σ= 17.3 d=5

Validity and Reliability of Food Literacy Questionnaire

In order to ensure content validity, both quantitative and qualitative methods were used. In the qualitative method of content validation, 10 experts in the fields of health education (2 people), nutrition (5 people), statistics (2 people), and epidemiology (1 person) were interviewed and they were asked to carefully study the instrument, regarding grammaticality, the use of appropriate and understandable words, appropriate scoring, the completion time of the designed instrument, the appropriateness of the selected dimensions, and the placement of items in the appropriate way and to provide their corrective views. Experts' opinions were used in preparing the final version of the instrument.

To check content validity quantitatively, first, 10 experts were asked to review each item on a three-point Likert scale ("necessary", "useful but not necessary", and "not necessary"). Then, based on this index, the content validity ratio (CVR) was calculated. Based on the Lawsche table, statements with CVR values higher than 0.62 (p < 0.05) were retained (24). Next, the ten experts were asked to specify their opinions on three features of the questionnaire, including relevance, simplicity, and clarity, on a four-point Likert scale (for example, the following options were used to measure clarity: 1 = not clear, 2 = fairly clear, 3 = clear, 4 = quite clear). Then, the content validity index (CVI) for each item was calculated by dividing the number of experts who scored the statements 3 and 4 by the total number of experts (25). Therefore, items CVI values greater than 0.79 were acceptable (26). Based on CVI calculations, 4 items out of the

76

54 items examined were removed due to not meeting the minimum score of 0.79 and a total of 50 items remained in the questionnaire. Finally, based on CVR values obtained and according to the Lawsche table, 10 items were removed and 40 items remained and entered the next stage of the psychometric process.

The validity and reliability of this questionnaire has been evaluated in a previous study by researchers (27).

The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used to measure the reliability of the questionnaire by internal consistency (28). The reliability coefficient for the whole instrument was calculated as 0.83 and for five factors between 0.951 and 0.610. **Data Collection**

Diabetic people meeting the inclusion criteria were randomly selected and called by the health care provider to the comprehensive health service center. Questionnaires were completed by health care workers in the form of interviews for both illiterate and literate people. The data collection instrument was a questionnaire containing 4 parts.

The first part collected information on demographic characteristics, including age, sex, height, weight, marital status, education level, household income, and duration of suffering from diabetes.

The second part was designed to measure food literacy, including identification of food groups (ability to operationally classify foods), nutrition and health (ability to understand the impact of food on health), measurement of foods (ability to calculate portions), food labels (ability to read food facts), and food preparation skills. The questionnaire was designed with multiple choice options. The correct option was given a score of one and the rest of the options were given a score of zero. (Supplementary file)

The third part of the questionnaire focused on

nutritional behaviors. The behavior of adherence to a healthy diet during the last week was measured in this section. This questionnaire has been validated in a previous study (29).

The fourth part of the questionnaire focused on a three-day food consumption record. The foods and drinks consumed by the person in the last 3 days were recorded. Their servings were calculated and compared with the servings of the pyramid of food groups. If the person had consumed less or more than the recommended amount of the serving of the food group, a score of 1 was given. In addition, if the person had consumed the recommended amount of the serving of the food group, a score of 2 was given. If the person had not consumed any of the recommended food groups during the previous three days, a score of zero was given. The information obtained from the 3-day food consumption questionnaire was analyzed by the Nutritionist IV diet analysis software and reported as an average of three days.

Data Analysis

After collecting the required information, descriptive statistics were used to describe the data, calculating measures of central tendency and dispersion indices for quantitative variables and frequency and percentage for qualitative variables. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to analyze the normality of the data. In addition, independent t-tests, the Pearson correlation coefficient, ANOVA, and univariate and multivariate linear regression models were used to analyze the data. P < 0.05 was considered as the significance level.

Results

The average age of 288 diabetic participants in the study was 54.38 ± 11.52 , 58.3% of whom were women (average age: 54 ± 55) and 41.7%were men (average age: 54 ± 13). The average duration of suffering from type 2 diabetes in participants was 1.50 ± 0.50 years. Table 1 shows the demographic characteristics of the participants.

 Table 1: Frequency distribution of demographic

 characteristics of the participants

Variable	Status	Number	Percentage					
Sex	Male	120	41.7					
	Female	168	58.3					
	Lor	265	92					
Ethnicity	Persian	13	4.5					
	Lak	10	3.5					
	Single	21	7.3					
Marital Status	Married	263	91.3					
Wantar Status	Divorced or widowed	4	1.4					
	Illiterate	72	25					
Education	Diploma or Lower	110	38.2					
Lucation	Academic Education	106	36.8					
	Employed	85	29.5					
Occupation	Housewife	151	52.4					
	Unemployed	52	18.1					
Life Network Type	Living alone	13	4.5					
Life Network Type	Living in a family	275	95.5					
Family History of	Yes	168	58.3					
Diabetes	No	120	41.7					
	Low	109	37.8					
Monthly Income	Average	146	50.7					
	Good	28	9.7					
	Excellent	5	1.7					
	Underweight	8	2.8					
Body Mass Index	Normal	96	33.3					
	Overweight	125	43.4					
	Fat	59	20.5					

The average score of adherence to a healthy diet and food literacy were found to be 28.55 ± 6.03 and 16.21 ± 5.73 , respectively. The average consumption of food groups during the last three days is shown in Table 2. Their average consumption was less than the recommended amount in the food pyramid.

Table 2: The average scores of adherence to a healthy diet, food literacy, and consumption of various food groups during the last three days.

	Variables	Mean ± SD	Min	Max
Adherence to a Healthy Diet		6.03 ± 28.55	10	51
Fo	ood Literacy	5.73 ± 16.21	4	29
	Milk and Dairy	1.09 ± 0.88	0.00	4
Food Groups	Bread and Cereals	5.33 ± 2.055	0.00	14
	Meat	4.34 ± 3.25	0.00	17
	Fruit	1.38 ± 1.63	0.00	8
	Vegetables	1.49 ± 1.58	0.00	8
	Saturated Oils	0.43 ± 0.68	0.00	4

The Pearson correlation coefficient showed that there is a significant correlation between food literacy and nutritional behavior (r=0.358, p<0.001), the consumption of the meat group (r=0.346, p<0.001), fruits (r=0.178, p=0.002), vegetables (r=0.225, p<0.001), and oils (r=-0.157, p=0.008). However, no significant correlation was found between food literacy and the consumption of dairy products (r=0.016, p=0.783) and cereals and legumes (r=0.001, p=0.988).

The results showed that there was a significant relationship between the behavior of adherence to a healthy diet with education, occupation, and monthly income. In case of people with higher education, the behavior of adherence to a healthy diet was more prominent (p < 0.05). Additionally, in people with higher education, food literacy was higher (p < 0.05). Among employed individuals and housewives, the behavior of adherence to a healthy diet was higher (p < 0.05) compared to unemployed individuals. In people with a low and medium monthly income, the behavior of adherence to a healthy diet was higher (p < 0.05), compared to people a with good and high monthly income. Food literacy was found to be higher in people over 55 years old (p < 0.05). In addition, food literacy was higher in people who had a family history of diabetes (p < 0.05).

Demographical characteristicsFead letterageAddeema (50)Meam (50)SexMale16.59 (5.47)29.40 (5.50)Sex15.94 (5.47)12.79 (6.34)Sex15.32 (5.81)0.27.59 (6.34)Age\$5517.01 (5.56)0.28.54 (6.48)Age16.39 (5.47)0.28.57 (6.02)Marital StatusMarried16.19 (5.74)0.28.77 (6.02)Marrial StatusMarried16.19 (5.74)0.28.77 (6.02)Divorced or widowed18.00 (3.36)0.25.50 (8.85)EducationMarried16.29 (5.62)0.132Academic education19.66 (4.78)0.132Education19.66 (4.78)0.132Academic education10.66 (4.78)0.131 (9.13)Occupation15.44 (5.16)0.27.87 (5.02)Humployed15.26 (5.09)0.000Married Status15.25 (5.63)0.27.50 (5.63)Married Status15.26 (5.63)0.27.50 (5.63)Married Status15.25 (5.63)0.27.50 (5.63)Married Status15.25 (5.63)0.25.50 (5.63)Married Status15.25 (5.63)0.25.50 (5.63)Married Status16.23 (6.24)0.001Married Status15.25 (5.63)0.25.50 (5.63)Married Status15.25 (5.63)0.28.70 (5.79)Married Status15.25 (5.63)0.28.70 (5.79)Married Status15.25 (5.63)0.28.70 (5.79)Married Status15.25 (5.63)0.28.70 (5.79)Married Status15.37 (6.42)0.28.63 (6.8	in people with type 2 diabetes							
characteristicsMealeMean (SD)Mean (SD)SexMale16.59 (5.47)29.40 (5.50)P-value0.3110.057Age5 5515.32 (5.31)28.56 (5.62)Age5 5517.01 (5.56)28.54 (6.48)P-value0.0140.708Married16.19 (5.74)28.77 (6.02)Divorced or widowed18.00 (3.36)25.50 (8.85)Marrial StatusMarried118.00 (3.36)25.50 (8.85)P-value0.8170.132Education19.66 (4.78)31.39 (4.59)Academic education19.66 (4.78)31.39 (4.59)OccupationHousewife15.72(5.96)29.42(5.18)OccupationHousewife15.72(5.96)29.42(5.18)Uffe Network TypeLiving alone16.23 (6.24)30.30 (5.36)Living in a Family16.21 (5.72)28.87 (6.05)Family History of DiabetesYes17.59 (5.93)28.39 (6.22)Nonthily IncomeYes0.0010.479Monthily IncomeGood14.82 (5.29)26.85 (5.81)Monthily IncomeAverage16.33 (5.11)29.88 (5.87)Body Mass IndexNormal15.51 (5.82)28.84 (6.61)Overweight6.74 (5.58)28.84 (5.61)Overweight6.74 (5.58)28.64 (5.64)Overweight6.63 (5.63)28.64 (5.64)Overweight6.63 (5.63)28.64 (5.64)Overweight6.63 (5.63)28.64 (5.64)Overweight6.63 (5.63)28.6	Demographical	Statuc	Food Literacy	Adherence to a Healthy Diet				
SexFemale15.94 (5.91)27.95 (6.34)0.00570.3110.057Age\$5515.32 (5.81)28.56 (5.62)Age>5517.01 (5.56)28.84 (6.48)P-vite0.0140.708Marital StatusMarried16.04 (6.16)26.38 (5.38)Marital StatusMarried18.00 (3.36)25.50 (8.85)Divorced or widowed18.00 (3.66)25.50 (8.85)Educationdiploma or lower15.44 (5.16)27.87 (5.83)Academic education19.66 (4.78)31.39 (4.59)Academic education19.66 (4.78)31.39 (4.59)OccupationEmployed17.29 (5.96)29.90 (5.55)OccupationHousewife15.72 (5.96)29.90 (5.55)Unemployed15.86 (6.00)27.50 (6.39)Unemployed15.86 (6.00)27.50 (6.39)Uife Network TypeLiving an Family16.21 (5.72)28.47 (6.06)Life Network TypeVes17.59 (5.39)28.39 (6.22)Monthiy IncomeYes15.85 (6.14)27.38 (5.61)Monthiy IncomeGood14.82 (5.29)26.85 (6.88)Good14.82 (5.29)26.85 (6.88)25.00 (7.58)Body Mass IndexMorrmal15.37 (6.47)25.87 (7.07)Normal15.37 (6.47)25.87 (7.07)Normal15.51 (5.82)28.88 (6.61)P-vate0.4070.360P-vator0.4700.360Protocol26.85 (5.83)28.61 (5.63)Good15.51 (5.28) <th>characteristics</th> <th>Status</th> <th>Mean (SD)</th> <th>Mean (SD)</th>	characteristics	Status	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)				
Female15.94 (5.91)27.95 (6.34)Pvite0.3110.057Age\$5515.32 (5.81)28.56 (5.62)Age>5517.01 (5.56)28.54 (6.48)Pvite0.0140.708Marrial StatusMarried16.19 (5.74)28.77 (6.02)Divorced or widowed18.00 (3.36)25.50 (8.85)Divorced or widowed18.00 (3.36)25.50 (8.85)EducationIlliterate12.29 (4.88)25.43 (6.42)Educationdiploma or lower15.44 (5.16)27.87 (5.83)Academic education19.66 (4.78)31.39 (4.59)OccupationEmployed15.22 (5.96)29.42 (5.18)Unemployed15.86 (6.00)27.50 (6.39)Uiving alone16.23 (6.24)30.30 (5.36)Living alone16.23 (5.29)28.47 (6.06)Uiving in a Family16.21 (5.72)28.47 (6.06)Emily History of DiabetsYes17.59 (5.39)Pvite0.0010.479Monthiy IncomeGood14.82 (5.29)Average16.83 (5.11)29.88 (5.61)Good14.82 (5.29)26.85 (6.88)Excellent13.60 (3.36)25.00 (7.58)Body Mass IndexInderweight15.37 (6.47)25.87 (7.07)Body Mass Index<64 6rars	Cou	Male	16.59 (5.47)	29.40 (5.50)				
Age \leq 55 15.32 (5.81) 28.56 (5.62) P-value 0.014 0.708 Marital Status Single 16.04 (6.16) 26.38 (5.38) Marital Status Married 16.19 (5.74) 28.77 (6.02) Divorced or widowed 18.00 (3.36) 25.50 (8.85) P-value 0.817 0.132 Education diploma or lower 15.44 (5.16) 27.87 (5.83) Academic education 19.66 (4.78) 31.39 (4.59) P value < 0.001	Sex	Female	15.94 (5.91)	27.95 (6.34)				
Age > 55 17.01 (5.56) 28.54 (6.48) P.v= 0.014 0.708 Marital Status Single 16.04 (6.16) 26.38 (5.38) Married 16.19 (5.74) 28.77 (6.02) Divorced or widowed 18.00 (3.36) 25.50 (8.85) P.v= 0.817 0.132 Education 19.66 (4.78) 28.73 (6.42) Academic education 19.66 (4.78) 31.39 (4.59) Occupation Employed 17.29 (5.03) 29.90 (5.55) Occupation Housewife 15.72 (5.96) 29.42 (5.18) Unemployed 15.86 (6.00) 27.50 (6.39) Cocupation Living alone 16.23 (6.24) 30.30 (5.36) Life Network Type Living alone 16.23 (6.24) 30.30 (5.36) Family History of Diabetes Yes 17.59 (5.93) 28.39 (6.22) Family History of Diabetes Yes 17.59 (5.93) 28.39 (6.22) Monthly Income Good 14.82 (5.29) 26.85 (6.88) Excellent 13.60 (3.36) 25.00 (7.58)	P-va	lue	0.311	0.057				
Image: style	4 ~~	≤ 55	15.32 (5.81)	28.56 (5.62)				
Single 16.04 (6.16) 26.38 (5.38) Marital Status Married 16.19 (5.74) 28.77 (6.02) Divorced or widowed 18.00 (3.36) 25.50 (8.85) P-value 0.817 0.132 Education diploma or lower 15.44 (5.16) 27.87 (5.83) Academic education 19.66 (4.78) 31.39 (4.59) P value < 0.001	Age	> 55	0.014 0.708					
Marital Status Married 16.19 (5.74) 28.77 (6.02) Divorced or widowed 18.00 (3.36) 25.50 (8.85) $P \cdot valuererererererererererererererererererer$	P-va	lue	0.014	0.708				
Divorced or widowed18.00 (3.36)25.50 (8.85)P-value0.8170.132Education111terate12.29 (4.88)25.43 (6.42)Education15.44 (5.16)27.87 (5.83)Academic education19.66 (4.78)31.39 (4.59)P value< 0.001		Single	16.04 (6.16)	26.38 (5.38)				
P-value 0.817 0.132 Education Illiterate 12.29 (4.88) 25.43 (6.42) Education diploma or lower 15.44 (5.16) 27.87 (5.83) Academic education 19.66 (4.78) 31.39 (4.59) P value < 0.001	Marital Status	Married	16.19 (5.74)	28.77 (6.02)				
Interact EducationInteract diploma or lower12.29 (4.88)25.43 (6.42)Educationdiploma or lower15.44 (5.16)27.87 (5.83)Academic education19.66 (4.78)31.39 (4.59)P value< 0.001		Divorced or widowed	18.00 (3.36)	25.50 (8.85)				
Education diploma or lower Academic education 15.44 (5.16) 27.87 (5.83) P value < 0.001	P-va	lue	0.817	0.132				
Academic education19.66 (4.78)31.39 (4.59)P< 0.001		Illiterate	12.29 (4.88)	25.43 (6.42)				
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c } \hline P value & < 0.001 & < 0.001 \\ \hline & 0.001 & < 0.001 \\ \hline & 0.001 & & < 0.001 \\ \hline & 0.001 & & & & \\ \hline & 0.002 & & & & \\ \hline & 0.003 & & & & \\ \hline & 0.006 & & & & \\ \hline & 0.009 & & & & & \\ \hline & 0.006 & & & & \\ \hline & 0.009 & & & & & \\ \hline & 0.006 & & & & \\ \hline & 0.006 & & & & \\ \hline & 0.009 & & & & & \\ \hline & 0.006 & & & & \\ \hline & 0.001 & & & & \\ \hline & 0.001 & & & & & \\ \hline & 0.001 & & & \\ \hline & 0.01 & & & \\ \hline & 0.01 & & \\ \hline & 0.$	Education	diploma or lower	15.44 (5.16)	27.87 (5.83)				
$\begin{array}{ c c c c } & Employed & 17.29(5.03) & 29.90(5.55) \\ & Housewife & 15.72(5.96) & 29.42(5.18) \\ & Unemployed & 15.86(6.00) & 27.50(6.39) \\ \hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$		Academic education	19.66 (4.78)	31.39 (4.59)				
Occupation Housewife $15.72(5.96)$ $29.42(5.18)$ Unemployed $15.86(6.00)$ $27.50(6.39)$ P-vater 0.099 0.006 Life Network Type Living alone $16.23(6.24)$ $30.30(5.36)$ Life Network Type Living in a Family $16.21(5.72)$ $28.47(6.06)$ P-vater 0.985 0.255 Family History of Diabetes Yes $17.59(5.93)$ $28.39(6.22)$ No $15.22(5.39)$ $28.79(5.79)$ P-vater 0.001 0.479 Monthly Income Low $15.85(6.14)$ $27.38(5.61)$ Average $16.83(5.51)$ $29.88(5.87)$ Good $14.82(5.29)$ $26.85(6.88)$ Excellent $13.60(3.36)$ $25.00(7.58)$ Body Mass Index Underweight $15.37(6.47)$ $25.87(7.07)$ Normal $15.51(5.82)$ $28.38(6.61)$ 0.901 Overweight $6.74(5.58)$ $28.61(5.80)$ $29.08(5.41)$ Duration of Diabetes <6 Years	P va	lue	< 0.001	< 0.001				
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Unemployed & 15.86(6.00) & 27.50(6.39) \\ \hline Unemployed & 15.86(6.00) & 27.50(6.39) \\ \hline Unemployed & 0.099 & 0.006 \\ \hline 0.099 & 0.006 \\ \hline 0.006 & 0.006 \\ \hline 0.001 & 0.025 \\ \hline 0.001 & 0.0479 \\ \hline 0.001 & 0.479 \\ \hline 0.0$		Employed	17.29(5.03)	29.90(5.55)				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c } \hline P-va \sqcup & 0.099 & 0.006 \\ \hline P-va \sqcup & 0.099 & 0.006 \\ \hline Living alone & 16.23 (6.24) & 30.30 (5.36) \\ \hline Living in a Family & 16.21 (5.72) & 28.47 (6.06) \\ \hline P-va \sqcup & 0.985 & 0.255 \\ \hline P-va \sqcup & 0.985 & 0.255 \\ \hline P-va \sqcup & 0.085 & 0.255 \\ \hline P-va \sqcup & 0.001 & 0.479 \\ \hline P-va \sqcup & 0.164 & 0.001 \\ \hline P-va \sqcup & 0.163 & 0.583 & 0.28.61 \\ \hline P-va \sqcup & 0.163 & 0.583 & 0.28.61 \\ \hline P-va \sqcup & 0.163 & 0.583 & 0.28.61 \\ \hline P-va \sqcup & 0.163 & 0.583 & 0.28.61 \\ \hline P-va \sqcup & 0.164 & 0.163 & 0.28.61 \\ \hline P-va \sqcup & 0.164 & 0.163 & 0.28.61 \\ \hline P-va \sqcup & 0.164 & 0.163 & 0.28.61 \\ \hline P-va \sqcup & 0.164 & 0.163 & 0.28.61 \\ \hline P-va \sqcup & 0.164 & 0.164 \\ \hline P-va \sqcup & 0.164 & 0.164 \\ $	Occupation	Housewife	15.72(5.96)	29.42(5.18)				
Life Network Type Living alone 16.23 (6.24) 30.30 (5.36) Living in a Family 16.21 (5.72) 28.47 (6.06) P-value 0.985 0.255 Family History of Diabetes Yes 17.59 (5.93) 28.39 (6.22) No 15.22 (5.39) 28.79 (5.79) P-value 0.001 0.479 Monthly Income Low 15.85 (6.14) 27.38 (5.61) Average 16.83 (5.51) 29.88 (5.87) Good 14.82 (5.29) 26.85 (6.88) Excellent 13.60 (3.36) 25.00 (7.58) Body Mass Index Underweight 15.37 (6.47) 25.87 (7.07) Normal 15.51 (5.82) 28.38 (6.61) 29.88 (5.41) Overweight 6.74 (5.58) 28.61 (5.80) 28.61 (5.80) Fat 16.33 (5.83) 29.08 (5.41) 29.08 (5.41) Duration of Diabetes < 6 Years		Unemployed	15.86(6.00)	27.50(6.39)				
Life Network TypeLiving in a Family $16.21 (5.72)$ $28.47 (6.06)$ P-value0.9850.255Family History of DiabetesYes $17.59 (5.93)$ $28.39 (6.22)$ Family History of DiabetesNo $15.22 (5.39)$ $28.79 (5.79)$ P-value0.0010.479Monthly IncomeLow $15.85 (6.14)$ $27.38 (5.61)$ Average $16.83 (5.51)$ $29.88 (5.87)$ Good $14.82 (5.29)$ $26.85 (6.88)$ Excellent $13.60 (3.36)$ $25.00 (7.58)$ Dervalue0.1640.001P-value0.1640.001P-value0.1640.001Fat $15.51 (5.82)$ $28.38 (6.61)$ Overweight $6.74 (5.58)$ $28.61 (5.80)$ Fat $16.33 (5.83)$ $29.08 (5.41)$ Duration of Diabetes < 6 Years $16.81 (5.63)$ $28.43 (5.46)$ Average $15.58 (5.79)$ $28.68 (6.60)$	P-va	lue	0.099	0.006				
Living in a Family16.21 (5.72) $28.47 (6.06)$ P-value0.9850.255Family History of DiabetesYes17.59 (5.93) $28.39 (6.22)$ No15.22 (5.39) $28.79 (5.79)$ P-value0.0010.479Monthly IncomeLow15.85 (6.14)27.38 (5.61)Average16.83 (5.51)29.88 (5.87)Good14.82 (5.29)26.85 (6.88)Excellent13.60 (3.36)25.00 (7.58)P-value0.1640.001P-value0.1640.001Body Mass IndexUnderweight15.37 (6.47)25.87 (7.07)Normal15.51 (5.82)28.38 (6.61)Overweight6.74 (5.58)28.61 (5.80)Fat16.33 (5.83)29.08 (5.41)Duration of Diabetes< 6 Years		Living alone	16.23 (6.24)	30.30 (5.36)				
Family History of Diabetes Yes 17.59 (5.93) 28.39 (6.22) No 15.22 (5.39) 28.79 (5.79) P-value 0.001 0.479 Monthly Income Low 15.85 (6.14) 27.38 (5.61) Average 16.83 (5.51) 29.88 (5.87) Good 14.82 (5.29) 26.85 (6.88) Excellent 13.60 (3.36) 25.00 (7.58) P-value 0.164 0.001 P-value 0.164 0.001 Body Mass Index Underweight 15.37 (6.47) 25.87 (7.07) Normal 15.51 (5.82) 28.38 (6.61) 28.61 (5.80) Fat 16.33 (5.83) 29.08 (5.41) 29.08 (5.41) Duration of Diabetes < 6 Years	Life Network Type	Living in a Family	16.21 (5.72)	28.47 (6.06)				
Family History of Diabetes No 15.22 (5.39) 28.79 (5.79) P-value 0.001 0.479 Monthly Income Low 15.85 (6.14) 27.38 (5.61) Average 16.83 (5.51) 29.88 (5.87) Good 14.82 (5.29) 26.85 (6.88) Excellent 13.60 (3.36) 25.00 (7.58) P-value 0.164 0.001 P-value 0.164 0.001 Monthly Income Underweight 15.51 (5.82) 28.38 (6.61) Body Mass Index Normal 15.51 (5.82) 28.38 (6.61) Overweight 6.74 (5.58) 29.08 (5.41) Fat 16.33 (5.83) 29.08 (5.41) Duration of Diabetes < 6 Years	P-va	lue	0.985	0.255				
No 15.22 (5.39) 28.79 (5.79) P-value 0.001 0.479 Monthly Income Low 15.85 (6.14) 27.38 (5.61) Average 16.83 (5.51) 29.88 (5.87) Good 14.82 (5.29) 26.85 (6.88) Excellent 13.60 (3.36) 25.00 (7.58) P-value 0.164 0.001 P-value 0.164 0.001 Body Mass Index Underweight 15.51 (5.82) 28.38 (6.61) Goverweight 6.74 (5.58) 28.61 (5.80) Fat 16.33 (5.83) 29.08 (5.41) Duration of Diabetes < 6 Years	F (1) (1) (1) (1) (1)	Yes	17.59 (5.93)	28.39 (6.22)				
Low 15.85 (6.14) 27.38 (5.61) Average 16.83 (5.51) 29.88 (5.87) Good 14.82 (5.29) 26.85 (6.88) Excellent 13.60 (3.36) 25.00 (7.58) P-value 0.164 0.001 P-value 0.164 0.001 Body Mass Index Underweight 15.37 (6.47) 25.87 (7.07) Body Mass Index Overweight 6.74 (5.58) 28.61 (5.80) Fat 16.33 (5.83) 29.08 (5.41) Duration of Diabetes < 6 Years	amily History of Diabetes		15.22 (5.39)	28.79 (5.79)				
Monthly Income Average Good 16.83 (5.51) 29.88 (5.87) Body Mass Index Excellent 13.60 (3.36) 25.00 (7.58) Body Mass Index Underweight 15.37 (6.47) 25.87 (7.07) Body Mass Index Underweight 15.51 (5.82) 28.38 (6.61) Fat 16.33 (5.83) 29.08 (5.41) Duration of Diabetes < 6 Years	P-va	lue	0.001	0.479				
Monthly Income Good 14.82 (5.29) 26.85 (6.88) Excellent 13.60 (3.36) 25.00 (7.58) P-value 0.164 0.001 Body Mass Index Underweight 15.37 (6.47) 25.87 (7.07) Body Mass Index Underweight 6.74 (5.58) 28.38 (6.61) Fat 16.33 (5.83) 29.08 (5.41) P-value 0.470 0.360 Puration of Diabetes < 6 Years		Low	15.85 (6.14)	27.38 (5.61)				
Good 14.82 (5.29) 26.85 (6.88) Excellent 13.60 (3.36) 25.00 (7.58) P-value 0.164 0.001 Body Mass Index Underweight 15.37 (6.47) 25.87 (7.07) Body Mass Index Overweight 6.74 (5.58) 28.38 (6.61) Duration of Diabetes Fat 16.33 (5.83) 29.08 (5.41) Body Mass Index 0.470 0.360	Monthly Income	Average	16.83 (5.51)	29.88 (5.87)				
P-value 0.164 0.001 Body Mass Index Underweight 15.37 (6.47) 25.87 (7.07) Body Mass Index Normal 15.51 (5.82) 28.38 (6.61) Overweight 6.74 (5.58) 28.61 (5.80) Fat 16.33 (5.83) 29.08 (5.41) P-value 0.470 0.360 Duration of Diabetes < 6 Years	wontiny income	Good	14.82 (5.29)	26.85 (6.88)				
Body Mass Index Underweight Normal 15.37 (6.47) 25.87 (7.07) Body Mass Index Normal 15.51 (5.82) 28.38 (6.61) Overweight 6.74 (5.58) 28.61 (5.80) Fat 16.33 (5.83) 29.08 (5.41) P-value 0.470 0.360 Duration of Diabetes < 6 Years		Excellent	13.60 (3.36)	25.00 (7.58)				
Body Mass Index Normal 15.51 (5.82) 28.38 (6.61) Dverweight 6.74 (5.58) 28.61 (5.80) Fat 16.33 (5.83) 29.08 (5.41) P-value 0.470 0.360 Duration of Diabetes < 6 Years	P-va	lue	0.164	0.001				
Body Mass Index Overweight 6.74 (5.58) 28.61 (5.80) Fat 16.33 (5.83) 29.08 (5.41) P-value 0.470 0.360 Duration of Diabetes < 6 Years		Underweight	15.37 (6.47)	25.87 (7.07)				
Overweight 6.74 (5.58) 28.61 (5.80) Fat 16.33 (5.83) 29.08 (5.41) P-value 0.470 0.360 Duration of Diabetes < 6 Years	Dedution	Normal	15.51 (5.82)	28.38 (6.61)				
P-value 0.470 0.360 Duration of Diabetes < 6 Years	BOOM MASS INDEX	Overweight	6.74 (5.58)	28.61 (5.80)				
Duration of Diabetes < 6 Years 16.81(5.63) 28.43 (5.46) > 6 Years 15.58 (5.79) 28.68 (6.60)		Fat	16.33 (5.83)	29.08 (5.41)				
Duration of Diabetes > 6 Years 15.58 (5.79) 28.68 (6.60)	P-va	lue	0.470	0.360				
> 6 Years 15.58 (5.79) 28.68 (6.60)		< 6 Years	16.81(5.63)	28.43 (5.46)				
P-value 0.078 0.931	Duration of Diabetes	> 6 Years	15.58 (5.79)	28.68 (6.60)				
	P-va	lue	0.078	0.931				

Table 3: Relationships among demographic characteristics with food literacy and adherence to a healthy diet in people with type 2 diabetes

Different parameters influencing adherence to a healthy diet, including predictor variables (occupation, first-degree family history of diabetes, marital status, duration of disease, type of life network, food literacy, BMI, age, gender, monthly family income, literacy level, and the consumption of food groups) were entered into the regression model (Table 3). The regression model was able to predict the behavior of adherence to a healthy diet by 0.252 (Table 4). This model showed that 1-unit increase in education level improved food consumption behavior during the previous week by 30% (p < 0.001) and 1-unit increase in food literacy was able to improve food consumption behavior during the previous week by 23% (p = 0.001) (Table 5).

 Table 4: Correlation of food literacy with adherence to a healthy diet and consumption of food groups in people with type 2 diabetes

		Adherence to a Healthy Diet	Meat Milk and I Dairy		Bread and Cereals	Fruit	Vegetables	Saturated Oils
Food Literacy	R	0.358	0.346	0.016	-0.001	0.178	0.225	-0.157
	p	<0.001	<0.001	0.783	0.988	0.002	<0.001	0.008

Table 5: Linear regression analysis in relation to predicting adherence to a healthy diet in people with type 2diabetes

Source of Change		tandard icients	Standard coefficients	t-value	p-value	RI	R2	2 R2 Adjusted
	В	Std. Error	Bata					
Constant value	13.868	4.907		2.826	0.005			
Food literacy	0.239	0.072	0.227	3.336	0.001			
Milk and dairy	0.696	0.370	0.102	1.880	0.061			
Bread and cereals	0.268	0.166	0.091	1.618	0.107			
Meat	0.149	0.112	0.080	1.331	0.184			
Fruit	0.424	0.216	0.115	1.965	0.050			
Vegetables	0.012	0.222	0.003	0.052	0.958			
Saturated oils	-0.497	0.500	-0.056	-0.994	0.321			
Duration of diabetes	0.726	0.648	0.060	1.120	0.264			
Sex	-0.163	0.736	-0.013	-0.221	0.825	0.502	0.252	0.202
Family history of diabetes	-0.667	0.684	-0.055	-0.975	0.330			
Life network type	-2.629	1.588	-0.091	-1.656	0.099			
Marital status	1.546	1.158	0.074	1.334	0.183			
Occupation	0.605	0.518	0.068	1.168	0.244			
Education	2.387	0.540	0.308	4.421	<0.001			
Monthly income	-0.147	0.499	-0.017	-0.295	0.768			
Body mass index	0.062	0.036	0.093	1.710	0.088			
Age	0.041	0.030	0.078	1.379	0.169			

÷

Discussion

This study showed that demographic variables, consumption of food groups, and food literacy predict the behavior of adherence to a healthy diet by 0.25%. In case of diabetic patients, there is little information on food literacy and adherence to a healthy diet and their predictors, and this issue has led the creation of hypotheses in this field.

The results of the study showed that there is a significant relationship between the level of food literacy and the behavior of adherence to a healthy diet in diabetic people. One-unit increase in the food literacy of people can improve the behavior of adherence to a healthy diet during the previous week by 23%. This finding is consistent with Mahnoush Raisi and et al. who reported a significant relationship between the level of health literacy of patients with type 2 diabetes and the self-care behavior of adherence to a healthy diet. One-unit increase in the level of health literacy improved self-care behavior in people by %29 (22).

A previous study on the relationship between health literacy, blood pressure, and salt consumption in the diet of patients with hypertension showed that most studies found a significant positive relationship between health literacy and blood pressure control (30). Patients who have high health literacy are more likely to comply with medications, because they are more likely to ask medical questions and participate in decision making. A systematic review and meta-analysis indicated that the awareness of Iranian diabetic patients of their disease in terms of health literacy is not enough, but mostly insufficient in both sexes (31). However, the present findings are contrary to the results obtained in Sweden, where more than half of diabetic patients had sufficient health literacy (32). The literature review indicated that health literacy in diabetic patients is related to self-confidence, self-management behavior, blood sugar control, and health outcomes. Better education in participants from developed countries has led to this difference (33). Education is one of the factors related to health literacy. Inadequate health literacy in diabetic patients seems to be a problem in many different societies, indicating the need to pay more attention to health literacy in diabetic patients.

In the present study, the average behavior of adherence to a healthy diet was found to be 28.55 \pm 6.03 and the average food literacy was 16.21 \pm 5.73. The causes of poor management of chronic diseases such as hypertension and diabetes are multifaceted, including obesity (34), treatment adherence (35), diet, and other lifestyle factors (36). Nevertheless, previous studies that focused on these chronic diseases have shown patients with health literacy have better control over the disease (32, 37-46). cross-sectional online survey was conducted among a sample of Dutch adults to investigate food literacy. Participants who had a higher level of food literacy reported significant and frequent consumption of fruit, vegetables, and fish (47).

The significant relationship between food literacy and the behavior of adherence to a healthy diet indicates the key role of promoting food literacy in adherence to a healthy diet. Therefore, educational interventions to improve food literacy in diabetic patients are critical.

The results of the present study showed that there is a significant direct relationship between food literacy and adherence to a healthy diet. Diabetic people with sufficient food literacy have more adherence to a healthy diet (such as consuming more servings from the groups of vegetables, fruits, and dairy products), and as a result of their behaviors, they show better self-care. A previous review study showed that there is a significant relationship between health literacy and self-care in type 2 diabetes patients. Health literacy has a positive effect on their selfcare behaviors, especially food related behaviors, which is consistent with our results (48).

The results of the present study showed that there is a significant relationship between the age and the level of education of people with their behavior of adherence to a healthy diet. Older people and people who had a higher level of education showed better behavior in case of adherence to healthy diet and they were healthier. A study conducted in Ahvaz, Iran, with special focus on determining the level of health literacy and its relationship with some factors in patients with type 2 diabetes showed that the health literacy of diabetic patients in Ahvaz is insufficient. In addition, a significant relationship was observed between the dimensions of health literacy with age and education. Older age and higher education level was associated with improved health literacy (49).

Health professionals should pay attention to the identification of demographic variables and the needs and abilities of diabetics. A study surveyed the effects of health literacy levels on health outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes in West Jamaica. The results showed that age and education level are significantly related to health literacy levels. As the age and education level increases, the level of health literacy improves (50). It seems logical that these people better follow diets meant to control diabetes and have the ability to plan and manage more appropriately and make better decisions about food consumption.

In addition, generally, people naturally gain more experience and general literacy as their age increases and finally improve their food literacy. In contrast, people with lower experience and education level had a less healthy diet and compliance behavior. Naturally, these people do not adopt proper management in choosing food. As a result, they are not successful in controlling their disease. Therefore, our findings emphasize that health care providers should identify diabetic patients with low food literacy and low education level, consider the existing challenges in this field, and use effective health communication methods to efficiently manage the conditions of these people.

In the present study, the average consumption of various food groups including vegetables, fruits, and dairy products during the last three days was lower than the recommended amount in the food pyramid. In addition, the Pearson correlation coefficient showed that there was a significant direct relationship between food literacy and the consumption of food from meat, fruits, and vegetables groups. A previous study showed that the consumption of vegetables (78%), dairy products (44%), and fruits (23.3%) in 78%, 44% and 23.3% of Iranian women was less than the recommended amount in the food pyramid (51).

In most studies conducted in Iran, the average consumption of dairy products, fruits, and vegetables was reported to be lower than the recommended amount in the food pyramid (52-54). In a study in Saudi Arabia, 39% of the participants consumed milk daily, while 48% never or rarely did so (55). A research in Spain reported the amount of fruit and vegetable consumption to be less than 25% (56). A study in Nigeria also showed that only a quarter of the surveyed participants consumed vegetables regularly (57).

The noteworthy point in the present study was that the average meat consumption was higher than the recommended amount in the food pyramid. In a study conducted in Yasouj, the consumption of meat, legumes, eggs, and grains in 50% of samples was reported to be equal to the recommended amount (54). In the western regions of the country, such as Lorestan, Kermanshah, Ilam, etc., the consumption of red meat is higher, and meat plays an important role in the food basket, indicating the influence of the cultural factor in the nutrition of the people of these regions, and of course, the fact that farmers of these areas are more involved in animal husbandry is an effective parameter for food choice.

A study conducted in Finland showed that there is a direct relationship between the pattern of consumption of vegetables and fruits with the level of literacy and social education of people in the society (58). A study conducted in Tehran reported that people with university education consume more fruits, vegetables and dairy products (59). Considering the relationship between the level of public literacy and disease care behaviors such as nutritional management, physical activity, and response to treatment, it is recommended to pay more attention to the health literacy of the society and especially chronic patients such as those with diabetes, patients with kidney and cardiovascular diseases, in order to ensure proportionate consumption of food groups, as many studies have confirmed that increasing the level of food literacy in diabetics and increasing their adherence to a healthy diet lead to improvements in their health level.

In addition, the present study showed a significant relationship between food literacy and family history. In people who had a family history of diabetes, there was higher food literacy probably due to learning from family members and relatives.

The noteworthy point of the study was that despite the quarantine conditions and traffic restrictions during the coronavirus pandemic, the questionnaires were completed by health care workers. Therefore, all literate and illiterate people were in equal conditions to answer the questions of the questionnaire (60, 61). **Limitations:** The main limitation of the study was that, due to the spread of the coronavirus disease, it was not possible to carry out the research in several cities due to compliance with quarantine regulations during the COVID-19 pandemic. It is suggested to conduct the study in several cities of Iran at the same time on people with diabetes in order to obtain better results. In addition, there were few studies on food literacy among diabetic people, so the results of the present study were compared with similar studies.

Conclusion

In the present study, the prediction rate for food literacy in relation to the behavior of adherence to a healthy diet was found to be low. The most possible reason is that the management of chronic diseases such as hypertension and diabetes is multifaceted. The results of previous studies also confirm this issue (34-36).

Acknowledgements: The authors would like thank the Vice Chancellorship for Research of the Lorestan University of Medical Sciences and health care officials for their cooperation.

Availability of data and materials: The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Conflict of Interest: All authors have read and approved the content of the article. The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Ethical consideration: This study was approved by the ethics committee of the Lorestan University of Medical Sciences (IR.LUMS.REC.1399.241). The objectives of the research were clearly

explained to the participants and they were assured that they could leave the study whenever they wanted and the confidentiality of their information. Generally, participation in the study was based on informed consent and voluntary. **Funding:** This study was funded by Lorestan University of Medical Sciences.

Authors' contributions: F.B. and M.H. have made substantial contributions to the conception and design. F.B. and M.M. and Z.Kh. and P.Z. participated in the study design and data acquisition. F.B. and S-M.T. were involved in drafting and revising the manuscript, which was critical for important intellectual content.

References

- Kasaeyan N, Forghani B, Faghih Imani B, Hoseinpour M, Amini M. The relationship between food habits and fasting blood sugar and glycosylated hemoglobin in (type 2) diabetics. Iranian Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism. 2002;4(1):9-13.
- Newman JD, Rockman CB, Kosiborod M, Guo Y, Zhong H, Weintraub HS, et al. Diabetes mellitus is a coronary heart disease risk equivalent for peripheral vascular disease. American heart journal. 2017;184:114-20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ahj.2016.09.002 PMid:28224925 PMCid:PMC5325078
- Lael-Monfared E, Tehrani H, Teiho Z, Jafari A. The study of eye care behaviors in patients with type 2 diabetes. Journal of Diabetes & Metabolic Disorders. 2020;19:257-63. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40200-020-00499-z PMid:32550174 PMCid:PMC7271095
- 4. Tamayo T, Rosenbauer J, Wild S, Spijkerman A, Baan C, Forouhi N, et al. Diabetes in Europe: an update. Diabetes research and clinical practice. 2014;103(2):206-17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diabres.2013.11.007 PMid:24300019
- Imani A, Dabirian A. Telenursing Benefits in patients with Diabetes: A Review Article. Journal of Shahid Beheshti School of Nursing & Midwifery. 2014;23(83).
- 6. Ziaei-Rad M, Vahdaninia M, Montazeri A. Sexual dysfunctions in patients with diabetes: a study from Iran. Reproductive Biology and Endocrinology. 2010;8(1):50. h tt p s://doi.org/10.1186/1477-7827-8-50 PMid:20482781 PMCid:PMC2887879
- Amini M, Parvaresh E. Prevalence of macro-and microvascular complications among patients with type 2 diabetes in Iran: a systematic review. Diabetes research and clinical practice. 2009;83(1):18-25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diabres.2008.10.010

PMid:19091437

- Anderson R, Funnell M, Carlson A, Saleh-Statin N, Cradock S, Skinner TC. Facilitating self-care through empowerment. Psychology in diabetes care. 2000:69-97. https://doi.org/10.1002/0470846569.ch4
- 9. Chawla R, Madhu SV, Makkar BM, Ghosh S, Saboo B, Kalra S, et al. RSSDI-ESI Clinical Practice Recommendations for the Management of Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus 2020. Indian J Endocrinol Metab. 2020;24(1):1-122. https://doi.org/10.4103/ijem.IJEM_225_20 PMid:32699774 PMCid:PMC7328526
- 10. Jafari A, Zadehahmad Z, Armanmehr V, Talebi M, Tehrani H. The evaluation of the role of diabetes health literacy and health locus of control on quality of life among type 2 diabetes using the Path analysis. Scientific Reports. 2023;13(1):5447. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-32348-3 PMid:37012271 PMCid:PMC10070490
- 11. Krause CG, Beer-Borst S, Sommerhalder K, Hayoz S, Abel T. A short food literacy questionnaire (SFLQ) for adults: findings from a Swiss validation study. Appetite. 2018;120:275-80. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2017.08.039 PMid:28912107
- 12. Krause C, Sommerhalder K, Beer-Borst S, Abel T. Just a subtle difference? Findings from a systematic review on definitions of nutrition literacy and food literacy. Health promotion international. 2016;33(3):378-89. h tt p s://doi.org/10.1093/heapro/daw084 PMid:27803197 PMCid:PMC6005107
- Colatruglio S, Slater J. Challenges to acquiring and utilizing food literacy: Perceptions of young Canadian adults. Canadian Food Studies/La Revue canadienne des études sur l'alimentation. 2016;3(1):96-118. https://doi.org/10.15353/cfs-rcea.v3i1.72
- Begley A, Vidgen H. An overview of the use of the term food literacy. Food Literacy: Key concepts for health and education. 2016:17-34.
- Nutbeam D. The evolving concept of health literacy. Social science & medicine. 2008;67(12):2072-8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2008.09.050 PMid:18952344
- 16. Khorsani, Charooghchyan, peyman, Sahebkar, Moghzi. Investigating health literacy in patients with type2 diabets referring to the health houses of Chenaran in 2016. Journal of Khorasan University of Medical Sciences.9(2):191-83.
- McQueen D, McQueen DV, Kickbusch I, Potvin L, Balbo L, Abel T, et al. Health and modernity: the role of theory in health promotion: Springer Science & Business Media; 2007. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-37759-9
- Seyedoshohadaee M, Barasteh S, Jalalinia F, Eghbali M, Nezami M. The relationship between health literacy and self-care behaviors in patients with type 2 diabetes. Iranian Journal of Nursing Research. 2016;10(4):43-51.
- 19. Reisi M, Mostafavi F, Javadzade H, Mahaki B, Tavassoli E, Sharifirad G. Impact of health literacy, self-efficacy, and outcome

85

expectations on adherence to self-care behaviors in iranians with type 2 diabetes. Oman medical journal. 2016;31(1):52. h tt p s : // d o i . o r g / 1 0 . 5 0 0 1 / o m j . 2 0 1 6 . 1 0 PMid:26813680 PMCid:PMC4720937

- 20. Osborn CY, Paasche-Orlow MK, Bailey SC, Wolf MS. The mechanisms linking health literacy to behavior and health status. American journal of health behavior. 2011;35(1):118-28. h tt p s : / / d o i . o r g / 1 0 . 5 9 9 3 / A J H B . 3 5 . 1 . 1 1 PMid:20950164 PMCid:PMC3085858
- Reisi M, Mostafavi F, Javadzade H, Mahaki B, Tavassoli E, Sharifirad G. Communicative and critical health literacy and self-care behaviors in patients with type 2 diabetes. Iranian journal of Diabetes and Metabolism. 2016;14(3):199-208.
- 22. Olyani S, Tehrani H, Esmaily H, Rezaii MM, Vahedian-Shahroodi M. Assessment of health literacy with the Newest Vital Sign and its correlation with body mass index in female adolescent students. International journal of adolescent medicine and health. 2017;32(2):20170103. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijamh-2017-0103 PMid:28942437
- Fallah B, Moshtagh Eshgh Z. The effects of basic conditioning factors on self-care behaviors of patients with type 2 diabetes referred to Yazd Research Center, 2014. SSU_Journals. 2018;25(10):770-9.
- 24. Lawshe CH. A quantitative approach to content validity1. Personnel psychology. 1975;28(4):563-75. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1975.tb01393.x
- Vakili MM, Hidarnia AR, Niknami S. Development and psychometrics of an interpersonal communication skills scale (ASMA) among Zanjan health volunteers. Journal of hayat. 2012;18(1):5-19.
- 26. Delshad Noghabi A, Moshki M. The Impact of Education on the Basis of the Theory of Planned Behavior on the Level and Method of Supervision of Their Parents on Watching Television by Students. Journal of Torbat Heydariyeh University of Medical Sciences. 2014;1(4):7-17.
- 27. Bastami F, Mardani M, Rezapour P. Development and psychometric analysis of a new tool to assess food literacy in diabetic patients. BMC nutrition. 2022;8(1):1-11. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40795-022-00626-4 PMid:36384714 PMCid:PMC9666971
- 28. Santos JRA. Cronbach's alpha: A tool for assessing the reliability of scales. Journal of extension. 1999;37(2):1-5.
- 29. Salahshouri A, Zamani Alavijeh F, Mahaki B, Mostafavi F. Effectiveness of educational intervention based on psychological factors on achieving health outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes. Diabetol Metab Syndr. 2018;10:67-. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13098-018-0368-8 PMid:30186372 PMCid:PMC6122479
- 30. Mohd Isa D, Shahar S, He FJ, Majid HA. Associations of Health Literacy with Blood Pressure and Dietary Salt Intake among Adults: A Systematic Review. Nutrients. 2021;13(12):4534. h tt p s : / / d o i . o r g / 10.3390 / n u 13124534 PMid:34960086 PMCid:PMC8707038

- 31. Momeni M, Mirmohammadkhani M, Ziari A. Health Literacy in the Population of Diabetic Patients in Iran: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Iranian Journal of Public Health. 2020;49(4):617. h tt p s : // d o i . o r g / 10.18502/ijph.v49i4.3167 PMid:32548041 PMCid:PMC7283175
- 32. Borji M, Tarjoman A, Otaghi M, Khodarahmi Z, Sharifi A. The relationship between health literacy and general health status of patients with type II diabetes. Bioscience Biotechnology Research Communications. 2017;10(2):138-42. https://doi.org/10.21786/bbrc/10.2/24
- 33. Zuercher E, Diatta ID, Burnand B, Peytremann-Bridevaux I. Health literacy and quality of care of patients with diabetes: A crosssectional analysis. Primary care diabetes. 2017;11(3):233-40. h tt p s://doi.org/10.1016/j.pcd.2017.02.003 PMid:28292571
- 34. Jiang SZ, Lu W, Zong XF, Ruan HY, Liu Y. Obesity and hypertension. Exp Ther Med. 2016;12(4):2395-9. h tt p s : //doi.org/10.3892/etm.2016.3237 h tt p s : //doi.org/10.3892/etm.2016.3667 PMid:27703502 PMCid:PMC5038894
- 35. Poulter NR, Borghi C, Parati G, Pathak A, Toli D, Williams B, et al. Medication adherence in hypertension. Journal of hypertension. 2020;38(4):579-87. https://doi.org/10.1097/HJH.000000000002294 PMid:31834123
- 36. Beilin L. Lifestyle and hypertension-an overview. Clinical and experimental hypertension. 1999;21(5-6):749-62. https://doi.org/10.3109/10641969909061005 PMid:10423098
- 37. Heizomi H, Iraji Z, Vaezi R, Bhalla D, Morisky DE, Nadrian H. Gender Differences in the Associations Between Health Literacy and Medication Adherence in Hypertension: A Population-Based Survey in Heris County, Iran. Vascular health and risk management. 2020;16:157. https://doi.org/10.2147/VHRM.S245052 PMid:32368074 PMCid:PMC7186197
- 38. Shibuya A, Inoue R, Ohkubo T, Takeda Y, Teshima T, Imai Y, et al. The relation between health literacy, hypertension knowledge, and blood pressure among middle-aged Japanese adults. Blood pressure monitoring. 2011;16(5):224-30. https://doi.org/10.1097/MBP.0b013e32834af7ba PMid:21857504
- 39. Gaffari-Fam S, Babazadeh T, Oliaei S, Behboodi L, Daemi A. Adherence to a health literacy and healthy lifestyle with improved blood pressure control in Iran. Patient preference and adherence. 2020;14:499. h tt p s : / / d o i . o r g / 10.2147 / P P A . S 2 4 4 8 2 0 PMid:32184576 PMCid:PMC7061438
- 40. Mohammadi Z, Banihashemi AT, Asgharifard H, Bahramian M, Baradaran HR, Khamseh ME. Health literacy and its influencing factors in Iranian diabetic patients. Medical journal of the Islamic Republic of Iran. 2015;29:230.
- 41. Reisi M, Mostafavi F, Javadzade H, Mahaki B, Tavassoli E, Sharifirad G. Communicative and critical health literacy and

self-care behaviors in patients with type 2 diabetes. Iranian journal of Diabetes and Metabolism. 2015;14(3):199-208.

- 42. Shayan N, Ozcebe H, Arici M. fp676 evaluation of health literacy (hl) and quality of life (qol) in hemodialysis patients: is it different in diabetic patients? Nephrology Dialysis Transplantation. 2018;33(suppl_1):i273-i. https://doi.org/10.1093/ndt/gfy104.FP676
- 43. Singh S, Acharya SD, Kamath A, Ullal SD, Urval RP. Health literacy status and understanding of the prescription instructions in diabetic patients. Journal of Diabetes Research. 2018;2018. h tt p s : // d o i . o r g / 10.1155/2018/4517243 PMid:29992169 PMCid:PMC6016215
- 44. Juul L, Rowlands G, Maindal HT. Relationships between health literacy, motivation and diet and physical activity in people with type 2 diabetes participating in peer-led support groups. Primary care diabetes. 2018;12(4):331-7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pcd.2018.02.005 PMid:29559207
- 45. Hussein SH, Almajran A, Albatineh AN. Prevalence of health literacy and its correlates among patients with type II diabetes in Kuwait: A population based study. Diabetes research and clinical practice. 2018;141:118-25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diabres.2018.04.033 PMid:29729374
- 46. Niknami M, Mirbalouchzehi A, Zareban I, Kalkalinia E, Rikhtgarha G, Hosseinzadeh H. Association of health literacy with type 2 diabetes mellitus self-management and clinical outcomes within the primary care setting of Iran. Australian Journal of Primary Health. 2018;24(2):162-70.
 h tt p s : / / d o i . o r g / 1 0 . 1 0 7 1 / P Y 1 7 0 6 4 PMid:29622058
- 47. Poelman MP, Dijkstra SC, Sponselee H, Kamphuis C, Battjes-Fries MC, Gillebaart M, et al. Towards the measurement of food literacy with respect to healthy eating: the development and validation of the self perceived food literacy scale among an adult sample in the Netherlands. International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity. 2018;15(1):1-12. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12966-018-0687-z PMid:29914503 PMCid:PMC6006995
- 48. Marciano L, Camerini A-L, Schulz PJ. The role of health literacy in diabetes knowledge, self-care, and glycemic control: a metaanalysis. Journal of general internal medicine. 2019;34(6):1007-17. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-019-04832-y PMid:30877457 PMCid:PMC6544696
- 49. Noroozi M, Madmoli Y, Derikvand M, Saki M. Investigating health literacy level and its relation with some factors in patients with type 2 diabetes in Ahvaz-2018. Journal of Health Literacy. 2019;4(1):43-52.
- 50. Singh SG, Aiken J. The effect of health literacy level on health outcomes in patients with diabetes at a type v health centre in Western Jamaica. International journal of nursing sciences. 2017;4(3):266-70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnss.2017.06.004 PMid:31406751 PMCid:PMC6626165
- 51. Pasdar Y, Rezaie M, Darbandi M. Dietary Pattern and Food

Consumption among Kermanshah Households, 2011. Journal of Kerman University of Medical Sciences. 2014;21(1).

- 52. Jessri M, Mirmiran P, Golzarand M, Rashidkhani B, Hosseini-Esfahani F, Azizi F. Comparison of trends in dietary pattern in Iran, Middle Eastern and North African countries from 1961 to 2005. Pajoohandeh journal. 2011;16(1):1-10.
- 53. Ghassemi H, Harrison G, Mohammad K. An accelerated nutrition transition in Iran. Public health nutrition. 2002;5(1a):149-55. h tt p s : / / d o i . o r g / 1 0 . 1 0 7 9 / P H N 2 0 0 1 2 8 7 PMid:12027278
- 54. Safari M, Saadatmand N, Azarman M. Food intake pattern and related factors in women referred to medical and health centers of Yasouj-2006. Dena. 2007;2(2):27-37.
- 55. Washi SA, Ageib MB. Poor diet quality and food habits are related to impaired nutritional status in 13-to 18-year-old adolescents in Jeddah. Nutrition Research. 2010;30(8):527-34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nutres.2010.07.002 PMid:20851306
- 56. Llull R, del Mar Bibiloni M, Martínez E, Pons A, Tur JA. Compliance with the 2010 nutritional objectives for the Spanish population in the Balearic Islands' adolescents. Annals of Nutrition and Metabolism. 2011;58(3):212-9. h tt p s : / / d o i . o r g / 10.1159 / 000330114 PMid:21778708
- 57. Ijarotimi OS, Ekeh O, Ajayi OP. Nutrient composition of selected medicinal leafy vegetables in Western Nigeria. Journal of medicinal food. 2010;13(2):476-9. h tt p s://doi.org/10.1089/jmf.2009.0023 PMid:20412021
- 58. Lallukka T, Pitkäniemi J, Rahkonen O, Roos E, Laaksonen M, Lahelma E. The association of income with fresh fruit and vegetable consumption at different levels of education. European journal of clinical nutrition. 2010;64(3):324-7. h tt p s : // d o i . o r g / 10.1038/ejcn.2009.155 PMid:20087380
- 59. Rezazadeh A, Rashidkhani B, Omidvar N. Association of major dietary patterns with socioeconomic and lifestyle factors of adult women living in Tehran, Iran. Nutrition. 2010;26(3):337-41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nut.2009.06.019 PMid:19819112
- 60. Mirzaei A, Kazembeigi F, Kakaei H, Jalilian M, Mazloomi S, Nourmoradi H. Application of health belief model to predict COVID-19-preventive behaviors among a sample of Iranian adult population. Journal of Education and Health Promotion. 2021;10(1):69. https://doi.org/10.4103/jehp.jehp_747_20 PMid:34084816 PMCid:PMC8057168
- 61. Shahnazi H, Ahmadi-Livani M, Pahlavanzadeh B, Rajabi A, Hamrah MS, Charkazi A. Assessing preventive health behaviors from COVID-19: a cross sectional study with health belief model in Golestan Province, Northern of Iran. Infectious diseases of poverty. 2020;9(1):1-9. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40249-020-00776-2 PMid:33203453 PMCid:PMC7671178