

Study of Health Promoting Behaviours and its Determinants for University Students in India

Neetu Narwal

Maharaja Surajmal Institute, Department of Computer Applications, New Delhi, India
Email: neetunarwal@gmail.com

Abstract— The study examines the healthy behaviour of University students in New Delhi, India and infer association with socio demographic profile. A cross sectional study was performed on 286 University students in Capital City of India in the month of Feb-March 2023 to assess their healthy promoting behaviour. The survey comprised of two sections: first section had 11 questions related to socio demographic profile and second section comprises of 51 questions to assess Health profile of students using Health Promoting Lifestyle Profile (HPLP) II tool. The health profile was evaluated on six subscales i.e., health responsibility, spiritual growth, physical activity, interpersonal relationships, nutrition, and stress management. The overall 51-item HPLP tool had a Cronbach's alpha of 0.938 indicating good reliability.

The data was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics to find the determinants for health behaviour of university students. The students showed an average score of 61%(2.44) for overall health behaviour. The highest average score 2.79 was obtained for Interpersonal growth and Spiritual growth. The average body mass index (BMI) of the students was 22.44 kg/m², the BMI of male students was higher than female students. Interpersonal relationship was found to be determined by gender, BMI, faculty of study and physical activity was determined by gender and family income.

Index Terms— Health Behaviour, HPLP, Regression, Anova, t-test.

I. INTRODUCTION

A healthy lifestyle is an individual perspective on incorporating healthy choices in their life. Youth is generally considered as the healthy period; hence the government pays less attention to make them aware of the health promoting behaviour. In this age they experience an abundance of physical, social, mental challenges and are greatly influenced by culture, family, socio economic status, belief and individual preferences. Hence, we need to assess the health behaviour of youth and educate them to inculcate healthy lifestyle.

According to WHO report [2], the health of adolescent needs to be addressed as priority by all nations specifically developing countries. The report quoted that at least 20% of the youth are likely to experience some form of depression, mood disturbances, substance abuse, suicidal behaviours or eating disorders etc. Many boys and girls in developing countries enter adolescence undernourished, making them more vulnerable to disease and early death. Only 1 in 5 adolescents meets the WHO guidelines on physical activity. WHO has also pointed that non-communicable diseases are the major cause of illness and deaths worldwide specifically in developing countries and account for over 60% of deaths worldwide. Non communicable diseases are dependent on behavioral and

lifestyle of individual. In India there is no compulsory education related to social and life skills taught in the University Curriculum.

Several research assessed the health behavior of youth in different countries i.e., China, USA, Japan, Thailand, Kuwait, India etc. And tried to assess the determinants influencing health behaviors using descriptive and inferential statistics.

Table I summarizes the research study on the basis of population dynamics, place of study, year of study, socio demographic factors like gender, family status, family income, parent's educational background, BMI etc. All the research papers were analyzed, and the key findings of their research are mentioned in the Table I.

TABLE I. SUMMARY OF RESEARCH ON HEALTH PROMOTING LIFESTYLE BEHAVIOUR

Authors Year of study	Sample, Country	Independent variables Method	Key Findings
Sami H Alzahrani [3] et al., 2019	243 medical students, Saudi university	Gender, family income, year of study Descriptive statistics, t-test	• Average HPLP Score= 123.8 ± 19.8 (59.5%) • Health promoting profiles – physical activity, interpersonal relationship differed by gender. • Association is found between family income, year of study with HPLP II subscales.
Baharak Azami et. al. [4], 2022	343 medical sciences students, Kerman shah, Iran	Gender, Marital Status, Smoking habits, economic status Descriptive statistics, t-test	• Average HPLP Score= 2.25 ± 0.44 (56.2%) • HPLP-II score was statistically significant in terms of gender, marital status, smoking habits, and economic status ($P \leq 0.05$).
Sara M. et. al. [5], 2009	307 University Students, Mexican	Gender, Economic level, Marital Status, Employment Status, Parents education level, family income Descriptive statistics, t-test	• Overall Health profile was found to be predicted by gender, mother's education, socio economic level. • Nutrition score is predicted by mother's education.
Manisha N. Gore et. al. [6], 2020	4253 University students of STEM faculty, India	Age, gender, faculty of study, zone, residential status, location of residence Descriptive study, Univariate linear regression	• Average HPLP Score= 137.9 (66.2%) • Male students showed highest mean score in interpersonal and spiritual growth. • Female students showed highest score in interpersonal relation, spiritual. • Health responsibility found association with age, gender. • Physical activity showed association between gender, faculty of study.
Mohd. Mahmoud et. al. [7], 2021	576 Medical Students, Saudi Arabia	Age, gender, Academic year, GPA, Residence, Family Size, Family Income Descriptive statistics, t-test	• Average HPLP Score= 3.39 (84.7%). • Highest mean score reported for spiritual growth of 3.75 • Lowest score was reported for Health responsibility of 3.23 • No association was found between GPA and lifestyle dimension expect spiritual growth.
Senjam Suraj et. al. [8], 2011	200 College students, Chandigarh, India	Gender, Religion, Accommodation, Stream of study Descriptive statistics, t-test	• Average HPLP Score was 138.69 (68.6%). • Health responsibility, Physical activity has shown significant association with gender. Female score is higher in health responsibility. • Males scored higher in physical activity.
Ali Mehri et. al. [9], 2016	500 university students, Sabzevar, Iran	Gender, Marital status Descriptive statistics, t-test	• The highest score was reported for an interpersonal relationship (70.8%), and the lowest score was reported for nutrition (53.6%), and physical activity (53.4%). • Significant differences were found in physical activity by gender ($P \leq 0.05$). There were significant differences in health responsibility, spiritual growth and body mass index by marital status ($P < 0.01$).
Abeer M. et. al. [10], 2015	525 University Students, Jordan	Gender, family income, faculty of study, employment status Descriptive statistics, t-test	• Average HPLP score was 127.87 ± 19.91 (62.7 %) • Significant differences were found between Health Promoting Lifestyle Profile mean score and the mean score of its subscales and student's age, gender, employment status, family income, university type, and faculty type.
Yan-Ru Cheng et. al. [11], 2015	446 Elderly people, Yan-Ru Cheng, China	Gender, Age, Religion, Education, Degree, Cause of disability Descriptive statistics, t-test	• Average HPLP score = 109.73 (SD $\frac{1}{4}$ 16.80) • 90.6% percent of the disabled elderly demonstrated unhealthy lifestyle behaviors

Hetzy et. al. [12], 2018	200 elderly, TamilNadu India	Gender Descriptive Statistics	33.7% of the respondents were having Poor HPLP and 50 % of the respondents were having General HPLP, 6 % of the respondents were having Good HPLP and 5.5 % of the respondents were having Excellent HPLP.
Chang Nian et. al. [13], 2012	314 University Medical Students, Japan	Age, gender, whether living with family or not, income, year, and BMI Descriptive statistics, t-test	- Average HPLP score was 2.50 (SD = 0.29)(60%) - The highest mean score being for interpersonal relations (3.05 ± 0.44), and the lowest mean score being for health responsibility (2.01 ± 0.53). - Female students practiced significantly better health responsibility, interpersonal relations, and nutrition.
Fatimah et. al. [14], 2008	202 nursing students, Kuwait	BMI, gender, age, income, nationality, marital status Descriptive statistics, t-test, anova	- Average HPLP Score was 2.665 - The anova showed statistically significant differences between the BMI categories and the overall HPLP ($F = 2.665$, $P = 0.05$), as well as between the BMI and nutrition Subscale.
Sunil et. al. [15], 2017	248 Medical Students	Gender Descriptive statistics	- Average HPLP Score 2.47(SD=0.34) for male and 2.41(SD=0.27) for female students. - The highest score of 2.96(SD=0.55) & 2.96(SD=0.49) was reported in spiritual growth in male and female students. The lowest mean score for female was 1.96(SD=0.53) in term of Physical activity subscale.
Georgina Mayela et. al. [16], 2020	5443 University Students, Northeastern Mexico	Gender, faculty of study, quality of life Descriptive statistics, z-test	- Average HPLP Score was 53.9 %. - Agricultural Sciences students had the highest need for improving both lifestyle and quality of life. - Arts, Education, and Humanities, Engineering and Technology, and Social and Administrative Sciences schools ranked first in need for health promotion actions.

After careful study of the research outcome the following observations were made:

- Over all health behaviour of young adults was found to be good.
- They underperform in the health responsibility and nutrition subscales.
- Gender shows correlation with all six-health promoting behaviour.
- The overall behaviour of youth needs direction and proper education is needed for health awareness and their impact in future wellbeing.

Objective of the research

- To ascertain the health promoting behaviour among university students in India.
- To find association between sociodemographic profiles like gender, age, family status, family income, parent's educational background, BMI of students with the six subscale of health promoting lifestyle behaviour.
- To find the determinants of health promoting behaviour of college students.

II. METHODOLOGY OF THE RESEARCH

This study performed cross sectional study on University students in New Delhi, India. A convenience sampling was used and during survey the students were in no stress related to studies or any other deadlines. The participants were informed about the purpose of the survey and to ensure anonymity, individual names were not taken in the survey. The Google form was designed, and form link was shared with students in their WhatsApp groups/personally.

The survey questionnaire comprised of two parts: the first part entails 11 questions pertaining to socio demographic profile of individuals like gender, age, height, weight, faculty of study, academic performance, family status, family income, mother's education, and father's education. The weight and height were used to calculate the BMI (kg/m^2) of participants, and they were categorised as underweight ($<18.5 \text{ kg/m}^2$), normal ($18.5\text{-}24.9 \text{ kg/m}^2$) and overweight ($>25 \text{ kg/m}^2$) as per WHO recommendation. The second part entails 51 questions of HPLP II tool developed by Walker et. al. [1995] questionnaire measuring the six aspects of health behaviour of participants in terms of Health responsibility, Physical activity, Nutrition, Spiritual Growth, Interpersonal Relations, Stress

Management. In this study we dropped one question as it was not applicable in Indian society. All the questions were marked on 4 point Likert Scale – Never(1), Sometimes(2), Frequently (3) and Routinely(4).

The maximum HPLP II score for an individual is 204, it was categorised as poor if the score is less than 82 ($\leq 40\%$), moderate if the score is between 83-124 (between 41%-60%), good if the score is between 125-164 (between 61%-80%) and excellent if the score is above 165 ($>80\%$).

Data was analyzed using the Statistical Package SPSS version 25 (SPSS) for descriptive and inferential statistics. The independent sample t-test was performed to compare gender with HPLP II and six subscales. The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test was performed to compare mean score of HPLP II and all subscales with other factors BMI Category, Faculty of study, Academic Performance, Family Status, Family income, Father's Education, Mother's Education. Pearson correlation test was performed on HPLP and its subscales. All the sociodemographic variables were analysed with stepwise linear regression analysis.

III. RESULTS

The overall reliability of the questionnaire was found to be extra ordinary, it had Cronbach alpha of 0.934. The six subscales had Cronbach's alpha in the range of 0.768 to 0.874 as shown in Table II. All the six subscales of HPLP II were found to be statistically significant ($p < 0.001$) and positively correlated with each other. The correlation coefficients were in the range of 0.237 to 0.774. The Total HPLP -II score showed positive and significant correlation with all other six subscales with correlation coefficient ranging from 0.676 to 0.860 as seen in Table II.

TABLE II. CORRELATION BETWEEN HPLP SUBSCALES AND DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS.

	Correlation coefficients							Descriptive Statistics				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total HPLP	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Cronbach Alpha
Health	1	.482**	.564**	.542**	.465**	.602**	.781**	.89	3.56	1.81	.537	0.81
Physical	.482**	1	.592**	.386**	.237**	.490**	.707**	1.00	4.00	2.47	.746	0.87
Nutrition	.564**	.592**	1	.577**	.334**	.585**	.771**	1.00	3.89	2.64	.503	0.65
Spiritual	.542**	.386**	.577**	1	.599**	.774**	.834**	1.22	4.00	2.78	.592	0.87
Interpersonal	.465**	.237**	.334**	.599**	1	.560**	.676**	1.63	3.88	2.79	.534	0.76
Stress	.602**	.490**	.585**	.774**	.560**	1	.860**	1.25	4.00	2.53	.613	0.77
HPLPT	.781**	.707**	.771**	.834**	.676**	.860**	1	1.39	3.96	2.54	.464	.85

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.0001$

A. DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS

The survey was conducted on 286 university students in New Delhi, India out of which 172 were males and 114 were females. Table III shows the demographic details of all the participants. The 86.7% of students were graduates and rest were postgraduates. The study conducted survey on different faculty of study in college, 33% students of the students were from Commerce Department, 49% were from Science Department and 17% were from Humanities Department.

TABLE III. DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF INDIVIDUALS

Socio-demographic characteristics		Frequencies (n)	Percentage (%)	Socio-demographic characteristics		Frequencies (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender –	Female	114	39.9	Family Income	Below 5 Lakhs	100	35.0
	Male	172	60.1		Between 5-10 Lakhs	94	32.9
Edn Lvl -	Graduate	248	86.7		Between 10-15 Lakhs	42	14.7
	Post Graduate	38	13.3		Between 15-20 Lakhs	26	9.1
Faculty -	Commerce	94	32.9		Between 20-25 Lakhs	8	2.8
	Humanities	48	16.8		Above 25 Lakhs	16	5.6
	Science	140	49				
Acad. Per.	Between 50-59	8	2.8	Father Edn	No Education	32	11.2

	Between 60-74	68	23.8		Graduate	182	63.6
	Between 75-90	162	56.6		Post Graduate	70	24.5
	Above 90	48	16.8		Doctorate	2	.7
Family Status	Joint	88	30.8	Mother Edn	No Education	58	20.3
	Nuclear	192	67.1		Graduate	162	56.6
					Post Graduate	64	22.4
					Doctorate	2	.7

The academic performance of all the students were recorded in four scales: 16.8% of students scored above 90 percentage, 56.6 % of students scored between 75-90 percentage, 23.8% of the students scored in the range 60-75 percentage, and 2.8% students score between 50-59 percentage. The participants were also asked about the family status whether they stay in Joint family or nuclear family. 30.8% of students stay in joint family and 67.2% students stays in nuclear family.

The participants were asked about the family annual income, it was recorded in six groups. The 35% of students belong to family with income below 5 Lakhs per annum, 32.9% students belong to family with income between 5-10 Lakhs per annum, 14.7% students belong to family with income are between 10-15 Lakhs per annum, 9.1% students belong to family with income between 15-20 Lakhs per annum, 2.8% students have family income between 20-25 Lakhs per annum and only 5.6% students belong to family with income above 25 Lakhs per annum. The participants were asked about the educational background of their father and mother. The 11.2% participants have fathers were with no education, 63.6% of participants fathers were graduate and 25.2% participants father are post graduate and above. More percentage of participants have mother with no education 20.3% than father, 56.6% of participants mother are graduate and 23.1% participants mother were post graduate and above.

B. ASSOCIATION OF SOCIO DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ON HPLP AND SIX SUBSCALES

The Table IV shows the result of independent t-test and one way Anova on sociodemographic variables i.e., gender, BMI, faculty of study, academic performance, family status, father's education, mothers education and family income on HPLP II and its six subscales.

The following observations were reported:

- The result shows that average BMI of all the participants was 22.43 kg/m² (normal range), female shows slightly lesser average BMI value 22.71 kg/m² then males with average BMI value 22.91 kg/m².
- The HPLP II average score of all the participants was reported under good category with score 2.54 out of 4 (63.5%), gender wise not much difference was found in the total HPLP II Score.
- The highest average score in the six subscales was reported for Interpersonal skills (2.793 out of 4) and the lowest average score was reported for health responsibility (1.815 out of 4).
- Regarding the six subscales, participants in this study scored highest in Interpersonal relationships 2.783(69.8%). The influence of culture and spirituality in India helps the Indian students to score well in spiritual wellbeing.
- Health responsibility score lowest 1.815 (45.3%) in this study and the response of maximum studies showed that youth have less inclination towards health and wellbeing [7], [13], [16], [18].
- In the health responsibility subscale females showed high average than males (1.820 vs 1.811), in spiritual growth showed 2.818 vs 2.770 and in interpersonal skills showed 2.995 vs 2.659.
- In physical activity subscale males showed higher average mean score of 2.655 vs 2.192 and in nutrition scored 2.688 vs 2.584 of females. Both male and females shows almost equal score in stress management (Female -2.535 / Male-2.537).
- The BMI also showed statistically significant association with nutrition subscale only.
- The Faculty of study was found to be significantly associated with overall HPLP and all the six subscales, it was similar to findings of Manisha [6], Georgina [16] and Abeer [10].
- The Academic performance and family status of the participant has shown no association with any of the HPLP total or subscale values.
- The study also found that Parents education has significant positive association with interpersonal relationship and stress management, this was similar to study of Abeer [10], Sundari[18].
- The family income was also found to be associated with interpersonal relationship and stress management.

TABLE IV. DISTRIBUTION OF HPLP II AND ITS SUBSCALE ACCORDING TO SOCIO DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS

Descriptive Features	Health Responsibility	Physical Activity	Nutrition	Spiritual Growth	Interpersonal relationships	Stress Management	HPLP II Total
Gender:							
Female	1.82 ±0.40	2.19(0.6)	2.58(0.4)	2.81(0.5)	2.99(0.4)	2.53(0.6)	2.53(0.3)
Male	1.81 ±0.50	2.65(0.7)	2.26(0.5)	2.77(0.6)	2.66(0.5)	2.54(0.6)	2.55(0.5)
t-value/ p-value	1.948/ 0.164	0.55/.001***	3.251/0.072	1.428/0.233	10.34/0.001***	3.833/ 0.51	4.872/0.028**
BMI							
Below 18.5	1.70 ± 0.41	2.27 ± 0.70	2.58 ± 0.57	2.88 ± 0.44	2.91 ± 0.50	2.53 ± 0.50	128.08 ±
Btn 18.5-24.9	1.83 ± 0.54	2.52 ± 0.74	2.69 ± 0.47	2.78 ± 0.58	2.78 ± 0.54	2.57 ± 0.62	21.06
Above 25	1.80 ± 0.57	2.36 ± 0.88	2.48 ± 0.55	2.75 ± 0.68	2.79 ± 0.499	2.42 ± 0.61	130.97 ±
F-value; p-value	0.609/0.545	1.92/0.14	4.33/.014***	.357/ 0.70	0.698/ 0.498	1.24/ 0.291	22.75
							126.0 ± 27.76
							1.03/ 0.357
Faculty of Study							
Commerce	1.67 ± 0.38	2.34 ± 0.60	2.55 ± 0.43	2.74 ± 0.51	2.85 ± 0.46	2.46 ± 0.50	126.25 ±
Humanities	1.97 ± 0.68	2.73 ± 0.74	2.89 ± 0.39	3.04 ± 0.62	3.06 ± 0.49	2.84 ± 0.63	17.39
Science	1.84 ± 0.54	2.45 ± 0.81	2.61 ± 0.55	2.71 ± 0.59	2.64 ± 0.54	2.45 ± 0.63	142.83 ±
F-value/p-value	0.509/.00***	3.33/0.020*	5.76/ 0.0***	6.12/ 0.0***	10.914/ 0.0***	7.85/0.00***	23.85
							126.78 ±
							25.65
							9.03/
							0.000***
Academic Perf.							
First Div	2.03 ±0.49	2.34 ±0.84	2.75 ±0.46	3.14 ±0.59	2.66 ±0.66	2.94 ±0.56	135.25 ±24.86
Second Div	1.81 ±0.54	2.47 ±0.75	2.64 ±0.5	2.78 ±0.59	2.8 ±0.53	2.53 ±0.61	129.6 ±23.68
F value/p-value	1.29/ 0.257	.239/ .625	.34/.559	2.88/.091	.543/.462	3.53/0.061	.442/ .507
Family Status							
Nuclear	1.80 ± 0.43	2.46 ± 0.68	2.71 ± 0.39	2.85 ± 0.50	2.83 ± 0.454	2.63 ± .55	131.56 ±
Joint	1.82 ± 0.57	2.46 ± 0.77	2.61 ±0.54	2.76 ±0.624	2.77 ±0.566	2.49 ± 0.63	19.24
t value/ p-value	0.252/ 0.80	-0.079/ 0.937	1.45/ 0.14	1.22/ 0.223	0.815/ 0.416	1.77/ 0.07	128.94 ±
							25.42
							0.862/ 0.389
Father Education							
Uneducated	1.89 ±0.64	2.66 ±0.74	2.76 ±0.53	2.97 ±0.63	2.73 ±0.54	2.69 ±0.76	135.56 ±26.07
Graduate	1.78 ±0.51	2.43 ±0.76	2.63 ±0.49	2.76 ±0.55	2.75 ±0.56	2.47 ±0.55	127.49 ±22.32
Post Graduate	1.88 ±0.55	2.49 ±0.72	2.64 ±0.51	2.79 ±0.67	2.92 ±0.43	2.66 ±0.67	132.89 ±25.44
F value /p-value	1.29 / 0.27	1.26 / 0.28	0.97/.38	1.82/ 0.163	2.91/ 0.056*	3.56/ 0.030*	2.44/0.089
Mother Edn							
Uneducated	1.79 ±0.53	2.43 ±0.8	2.63 ±0.57	2.92 ±0.51	2.7 ±0.48	2.63 ±0.66	129.76 ±21.59
Graduate	1.81 ±0.53	2.51 ±0.69	2.68 ±0.45	2.73 ±0.59	2.77 ±0.53	2.47 ±0.57	128.99 ±22.07
Post Graduate	1.86 ±0.57	2.42 ±0.84	2.58 ±0.57	2.83 ±0.65	2.93 ±0.58	2.63 ±0.65	131.64 ±28.98
F value/p-value	.264/ 0.768	0.412/0.663	.939/ 0.392	2.40/0.092	3.25/ 0.040*	2.57/ 0.078	0.292/0.747
Family Income							
Less than 5 LPA	16.22 ±4.74						127.74 ±20.96
Btn 5-10 LPA	16.26 ±5.47						127.66 ±27.42
Above 10 LPA	16.54 ±4.27						134.09 ±21.98
F value/p-value	2.28/ 0.103						2.28/0.103
		18.52 ±5.89	23.54 ±4.38	25.4 ±4.69	21.46 ±4.21	20.54 ±4.37	
		19.38 ±5.73	23.89 ±4.24	24.45 ±6.35	22.53 ±4.19	19.13 ±5.47	
		21.52 ±5.96	24.07 ±4.98	25.46 ±4.82	23.13 ±4.31	21.17 ±4.68	
		0.126/ 0.88	0.337/0.714	1.07/ 0.34	3.85/ 0.02*	4.35/ 0.01**	

C. REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF THE SIGNIFICANT SOCIO DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS ON HPLP AND SIX SUBSCALES

Associations between individual sociodemographic variables and sub-scales of HPLP scores were tested using multivariate regression analysis and associations with $p < 0.2$ was included in the multivariate analyses. The six

factors that were found to be significant in this study were gender, BMI, faculty of study, father's education, mother's education, and family income.

The regression analysis result is shown in Table V

- Overall health behavior shows the variability of 18% and is predicted by gender and family income.
- Physical activity shows 37.6% variability and is predicted by family income and gender.
- Interpersonal growth shows the highest variability of 40.3% and predicted by gender, BMI and faculty of study.
- Other subscale doesn't show any significant variability predicted by sociodemographic features.

TABLE V: RESULT OF REGRESSION ANALYSIS

Variable	Health Responsibility	Physical Activity	Nutrition	Spiritual Growth	Interpersonal relationships	Stress Management	HPLP II Total
Gender	-.029	.427***	.098	-0.063	-0.299***	.005	0.735**
BMI	-0.002	-0.014	-0.013	-0.007	-0.019**	-0.016	-0.614
Faculty of Study	0.090	.023	.023	.001	-0.078**	.004	.557
Father Education	-0.013	-0.091	-0.041	-0.067	.059	.033	-1.078
Mother Education	0.026	.006	-0.011	-0.030	0.057	-0.026	0.421
Family Income	.011	-0.016***	.033	.038	0.050	-0.054*	2.610**
R2	0.159	0.376***	.0176	.126	.403***	0.158	0.180
p-value	0.301	.000	.180	.612	.000	.312	.159

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.0001

IV. CONCLUSION

The study analyzed the health promoting behaviour of university students on six parameters – Health Responsibility, Physical Activity, Nutrition, Spiritual Growth, Interpersonal relationships, Stress Management and Total Health Promoting behavior. The data showed that gender seems to have significant effect on physical activity, interpersonal relationships and Total HPLP score. The BMI and faculty of study seems to have significant effect on interpersonal relationships of individuals. Family income also has a significant effect on Total HPLP score, physical activity and interpersonal relationships.

The total health behaviour of the university students was found to be 2.54 out of 4, which is in the good category. The highest average score in the six subscales is shown in Interpersonal skills (2.793 out of 4) and the lowest average score is shown in health responsibility (1.815 out of 4) just like many of the research studies on youth. It is suggested that health promoting behavior of university students can be enhanced by organizing workshops, training, and compulsory physical activities along with academics.

REFERENCES

- [1] Walker, S. N., K. R. Sechrist, and N. J. Pender. 1995. "Health Promotion Model-Instruments to Measure Health Promoting Lifestyle: Health-promoting Lifestyle Profile [HPLP II] (Adult Version)." <https://deepblue.lib.umich.edu>
- [2] <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/adolescents-health-risks-and-solutions>
- [3] Health-promoting lifestyle profile and associated factors among medical students in a Saudi university, Sami H Alzahrani, Ahmad Azam Malik, Jamil Bashawri, Saleh Ageel Shaheen, Musab Mamdouh Shaheen, Abdullah Abdulaziz Alsaib, Mubarak Abdullah Mubarak, Youssouf Souleymane Adam and Hassan Khaled Abdulwasssi, SAGE Open Medicine, Volume 7: 1–7, 2019
- [4] Health-Promoting Lifestyle and Associated Factors among Medical Sciences Students in Kermanshah, Iran: A Cross-Sectional Study, Baharak Azami Gilan, Maryam Janatolmakan, Hossein Ashtarian, Mansour Rezaei, and Alireza Khatony, Journal of Environmental and Public Health, Hindawi Journal of Environmental and Public Health, Volume 2021, Article ID 6691593, 6 pages.
- [5] Socio demographic predictors of health behaviors in Mexican college students, Sara M. Ulla Diez and Adriana Prex-fortis, Health promotion International Vol 25 1, 2009, pp-85-93
- [6] Manisha N. Gore, Kavitha C. Menon, Abhijeet A. Safai, Sharvari Shukla & Rajiv Yeravdekar (2021) Determinants of health-promoting lifestyles amongst Indian University students, International Journal of Health Promotion and Education, 59:3, 135-144, 2021
- [7] Mohammed Mahmoud Al-Momani, Pak Journal of Med Sci, Vol 37 Issue 2, pp-561-566, 2021
- [8] Senjam Suraj, Amarjeet Singh, Study of sense of coherence health promoting behaviour in north Indian students, Indian Journal of Medical Res, 134, 2011, pp-645-652.
- [9] Suraj Senjam, Amarjeet Singh, Health promoting behaviour among college students in Chandigarh, India, Indian Journal of Community Health, Vol 24, Issue 1, Jan 2012.

- [10] Health Promoting Lifestyle and its Determinants Among University Students in Sabzevar, Iran Ali Mehri, Mahnaz Solhi¹, Gholamreza Garmaroudi, Haidar Nadrian², Shirin Shahbazi Sighaldehy, International Journal of Preventive Medicine, Vol 7 , 2016
- [11] Factors Affecting Health-Promoting Behaviors of University Students in Jordan Abeer M. Shaheen¹, Omayyah S. Nassar¹, Huda M. Amre¹, Ayman M. Hamdan-Mansour^{1,2} Health, 2015, 7, 1-8, Published Online January 2015.
- [12] Yan-Ru Cheng, Investigation and countermeasures on the health-promoting lifestyle of the disabled elderly in a rural area , Chinese Nursing Research Vol 2 (2015) pp- 107-109, 2015.
- [13] A Descriptive Study To Assess Level Of Health Promotion Behavior Among Rural Elderly At Selected Villages Of Trichy District, Tamil Nadu, Hetzy SK¹ and Juliet S², International Journal of Advanced Research, Vol 6, Issue 5, pp- 966-971, 2018.
- [14] Assessment of health promoting lifestyle profile in Japanese University Students Chang-Nian Wei, Koichi Harada Kimiyo Ueda, Kumika Fukumoto, Keiki Minamoto, Atsushi Ueda Environment Health Prev Med (2012) Vol 17, pp 222-227.
- [15] Health-promoting lifestyle and body mass index among College of Nursing students in Kuwait:A correlational study, Fatimah Al-Kandari, rn, dns, Victoria L. Vidal, rn, man and Deepa Thomas, Nursing and Health Sciences (2008), 10, 43–50.
- [16] Sunil Chouhan, Analysing health promoting life styles of medical students in Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh, India by HPLP-II, International Journal of Community Medicine and Public Health, 2017 Jan;4(1):195-199, 2017.
- [17] Lifestyle, Quality of Life, and Health Promotion Needs in Mexican University Students: Important Differences by Sex and Academic Discipline, Georgina Mayela Núñez-Rocha, Cynthia Karyna López-Botello, Ana María Salinas-Martínez, Hiram V. Arroyo-Acevedo, Rebeca Thelma Martínez-Villarreal and María Natividad Ávila-Ortiz, Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health, 17, 8024, 2020.