Ovidius University Annals, Series Physical Education and Sport / SCIENCE, MOVEMENT AND HEALTH
Vol. XII, ISSUE 1, 2012, Romania
The journal is indexed in: Ebsco, SPORTDiscus, INDEX COPERNICUS JOURNAL MASTER LIST, DOAJ DIRECTORY OF OPEN ACCES JOURNALS, Caby, Gale Cengace Learning

HEALTH PROMOTING BEHAVIOURS OF TURKISH AND FOREIGNER UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

YARDIMCI MEHMET[1], YILDIZ KADİR[2] SARITAŞ NAZMİ[1],COŞKUN BETÜL[3]

Abstract
Purpose: At this study, it was aimed to compare health promoting behaviors of Turkish (TS) and Foreigner (FS) students of university.
Methods: At this study, 64 FS and 70 TS were participated voluntarily, mean age of FS and TS were 23,11 and 20,87 respectively. Volunteers were performed demographic questionnaire and Healthy Lifestyle Behaviors Scale II (HLBS). 34 Foreigner participants were performed HLBS II inventory by post and 30 participants were performed by e-mail. Independent-t test was performed for comparing groups. The level of significance was set at 0.05.
Results: Meaningful difference was found at the age parameter ($p<0.05$). Meaningful difference was not found at the body height, weight parameters ($p>0.05$).
When HLBS and its aspects were compared according to TS and FS; statistically meaningful difference was found at the healthy responsibility, spiritual growth, interpersonal relations, stress management and HLPL total parameters ($p<0.05$).
When HLBS and its aspects were compared according to male TS and FS, statistically meaningful difference was found at healthy responsibility, interpersonal relations, stress management and HLPL total parameters ($p<0.05$) but meaningful difference was not found at the physical activity, nutrition and spiritual growth parameters ($p>0.05$).
When HLBS and its aspects were compared according to female TS and FS, statistically meaningful difference was found at healthy responsibility, spiritual growth, interpersonal relations, stress management and HLPL total parameters ($p<0.05$) but Meaningful difference was not found at the physical activity and nutrition ($p>0.05$).
Conclusion: It was so clear that University students needed to be informed about Healthy Lifestyle Behaviors We thought that health, guidance and counseling unites of both campus and other environments had to work more actively with students in co-operation
Key words: Health Promoting Behaviors, University Student, Turkish, Foreigner

Introduction

According to definition of WHO, health is not only lack of illness and injury, health is completely well-being on account of physical, mental and social (N. Yardım, et al, 2009). Nowadays perceptive of health is not only devoted to prevent of illness, health propose maintenance approach based on health that protect, continue and improve health condition of individual, family and society. This perceptive was based on acquiring behaviors that protect, continue and improve well-being condition of individuals and based on judgement about their health (G.O. Çelik, et al, 2009). As for health behavior is defined that individuals believe and do any activity to be healthy and prevent the disease when person are healthy.

Health behavior is not only sightful behaving. It is includes mental events and sense conditions that are evaluated indirectly (A. Karakoç, 2006). The efforts of people to improve health status are important to be healthy to control and improve their health. Thus people improve healthier life conscious, remedy life style, perceive their own duties to keep healthy, behave guiding and improving the health by perceiving their own duties to keep healthy and abstaining the behaviors at risk.

The health levels of societies are evaluated by majority of healthy people (G. Karadeniz, 2008).

The behavior disorder that occurs in earlier age related health is risky in increased ages. So the researching health behavior of the youth in earlier age is important. The students of university represent a large part of adult population.

The relation between health and motivation should be focused so as to improve health activities for this group. Because the students occur relatively healthy, homogenous and extendable population (M.I.K. Von Bothmer, B. Fridlunt, 2005).

That the university education of students conduces to alterations on their personality development, personal life and health behavior in addition to acquire the formation is apparent in the present day. This alteration is important especially for the attitude and behaviors in the field of health.

Because their attitude and behaviors related of health effect of their own individualistically in private and effect of current and prospective family in connection with society (H. Batı, et al, 2008).

To compare the healthy life style behaviors of Turkish and foreign university students was aimed in this study.

Method

[1]Physical Education and Sport Department of Erciyes University, Kayseri/ TURKEY
[2]Healthy Science Institute of Erciyes University Kayseri/TURKEY
[3]Physical Education and Sport Department of Niğde University, Niğde/TURKEY
Email: ymehmet@erciyes.edu.tr
Received 21.09.2011 / Accepted 09.11.2011

Participants

In this study, 18-30 aged 64 foreigner university from 4 countries and 70 university students from Physical Education and Sport Department of Erciyes University, totally 134 students were participated voluntarily. While 34 foreigner volunteers were participated to study by post, other foreigner volunteers were participated by e-mail.

Data collection method

Socio-demographic and HLBS II inventory were performed by volunteers. HLBS II inventory was developed by S.N. Walker et al. (1987), re-organized in 1996. This is a self-administered questionnaire with 52 questions covering different aspects of 6 factors. The HPLP-II is a 52-item scale consisting of four-point responses; scores range from 52 to 208. The construct validity was confirmed through factor analysis. A reliability and validity study in Turkey was made by N. Esin (1997) (S. Özkan, E. Yılmaz, 2008, S.N. Walker, D.M. Hill Polerecky, 1996, T. Yu-Yıng, C. Shu Pi, 2002).

These factors are health responsibility (3, 9, 15, 21, 27, 33, 39, 45, 51), nutrition (2, 8, 14, 20, 26, 32, 38, 44, 50), stress (5, 11, 17, 23, 29, 35, 41, 47), spirituality (6, 12, 18, 24, 30, 36, 42, 48, 52), interpersonal relations and physical activity (4, 10, 16, 22, 28, 34, 40, 46).

The HPLP II asks respondents to select one of four answer choices. The answer choices are rated from 1 to 4 (1 = never, 2= sometimes, 3= often, 4= routinely).

The scores are then totaled in each of the six subscales and results are tabulated. The subscales with the lowest scores indicate areas of weakness (S.N. Walker, D.M. Hill Polerecky, 1996, D. Mcelligot, et al, 2009, A. Zaybak, Ç. Fadıloğlu, 2004, E.J. Dubois, 2006, M. Cürcani, et al, 2010). The lowest and highest score of the scale for whole were as 52 and 208 points respectively (S.N. Walker, D.M. Hill Polerecky, 1996, M. Cürcani, et al, 2010, Z. Bahar, et al, 2008).

Statistical Analysis

Statistical evaluations of data from the study were done by SPSS 13.0 package program. As statistical representation of arithmetic mean ± standard error values shown. Normality of distribution was tested with Shapirowilk and kolmogrow simirnow tests and distribution was observed normally distributed. To compare the independent groups was used compared with independent t test. The level of significance was set at 0.05.

Results

Table 1. The Comparison of socio-demographic characteristics of TS and FS

Variable	Groups	n	X±Sx	T	p
Age	F.S	64	23.11±0.50	4.06	**0.000***
	T.S	70	20.87±0.22		
Height	F.S	64	170.91±1.06	-0.68	0.497 NS
	T.S	70	171.93±1.06		
Weight	F.S	64	65.67±1.48	0.48	0.631 NS
	T.S	70	64.66±1.49		

NS: Non Significance, *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 F.S: Foreign Students, T.S: Turkish students.

According to table 1, meaningful difference was found at the age, parameter (p<0.05). Statistically meaningful difference was not found at the body height, body weight, numbers of brothers, income parameters (p>0.05).

Table 2. The Comparison of HLBS values of TS and FS.

Variable	Group	n	X±Sx	T	p
Health Responsibility	F.S	64	18.67±0.50	-3.50	**0.001****
	T.S	70	21.50±0.63		
Physical Activity	F.S	64	17.48±0.60	-0.94	0.346 NS
	T.S	70	18.20±00.47		
Nutrition	F.S	64	18.50±0.45	-1.15	0.250 NS
	T.S	70	19.24±0.46		
Spiritual Growth	F.S	64	28.20±0.55	-2.28	**0.024***
	T.S	70	29.90±0.50		
Interpersonal Relations	F.S	64	26.94±0.48	-17.20	**0.000*****

	T.S	70	47.07±1.07		
Stress Management	F.S	64	20.08±0.47	-7.30	**0.000*** **
	T.S	70	24.76±0.43		
HLBS Total	F.S	64	129.88±2.21	-9.07	**0.000*** **
	T.S	70	160.67±2.54		

NS: Non Significance, *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 F.S: Foreign Students, T.S: Turkish students.

According to Table 2, Meaningful differences were found at the health responsibility (p<0.01), Spiritual Growth (p<0.05), Interpersonal Relations, Stress Management and HLBS Total parameters (p<0.001). Meaningful difference was not found at the Physical Activity and Nutrition parameters (p>0.05)

Table 3. The Comparison of HLBS values of male TS and FS.

Variable	Group	n	X±Sx	T	P
Health Responsibility	F.S	34	18.74±0.75	-2.015	**0.048***
	T.S	40	21.08±0.86		
Physical Activity	F.S	34	18.38±0.87	0.284	0.777 NS
	T.S	40	18.08±0.67		
Nutrition	F.S	34	18.50±0.57	-0.621	0.536 NS
	T.S	40	19.05±0.66		
Spiritual Growth	F.S	34	28.74±0.78	-0.874	0.385 NS
	T.S	40	29.63±0.67		
Interpersonal Relations	F.S	34	26.85±0.67	-12.880	**0.000*** **
	T.S	40	47.15±1.42		
Stress Management	F.S	34	20.82±0.68	-3.860	**0.000*** **
	T.S	40	24.38±0.62		
HLBS Total	F.S	34	132.03±3.32	-5.538	**0.000*** **
	T.S	40	159.35±3.56		

NS: Non Significance, *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 F.S: Foreign Students, T.S: Turkish students.

According to Table 3, Meaningful differences were found at the Health Responsibility (p<0.05), Interpersonal Relations, Stress Management and HLBS Total (p<0.001). Meaningful difference was not found at the Physical Activity, Nutrition and Spiritual Growth (p>0.05).

Table 4. The Comparison of HLBS values of male TS and FS.

Variable	Group	n	X±Sx	T	p
Health Responsibility	F.S	30	18.60±0.67	-3.019	**0.004** **
	T.S	30	22.07±0.93		
Physical Activity	F.S	30	16.47±0.81	-1.845	0.070 NS
	T.S	30	18.37±0.63		
Nutrition	F.S	30	18.50±0.71	-1.051	0.297 NS
	T.S	30	19.50±0.63		
Spiritual Growth	F.S	30	27.60±0.79	-2.424	**0.018***
	T.S	30	30.27±0.77		
Interpersonal Relations	F.S	30	27.03±0.69	-11.196	**0.000*** **
	T.S	30	46.97±1.64		
Stress Management	F.S	30	19.23±0.63	-7.039	**0.000*** **
	T.S	30	25.27±0.58		
HLBS Total	F.S	30	127.43±2.81	-7.661	**0.000*** **
	T.S	30	162.43±3.60		

NS: Non Significance, *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 F.S: Foreign Students, T.S: Turkish students.

According to Table 4, meaningful differences were found at the Health Responsibility (p<0.01), Spiritual Growth (p<0.05), Interpersonal Relations, Stress Management and HLBS Total parameters (p<0.001). However Meaningful difference was not found at the Physical Activity and Nutrition parameters (p>0.05).

Discussion

In this study, 134 university students which were 64 from 4 different country and 70 from Physical Education and Sport Department of Erciyes University, aged between 18-39 were participated voluntarily. Mean age of FS and TS were found as 23.11±0.50 and 20.87±0.22 respectively.

Meaningful difference was found at this parameter (p<0.01). At literature, there are studies which haven't found meaningful difference at the age parameter (Mcelligot, et al, 2009, H.Ö. Can, et al, 2008).

Mean height of FS and TS were found as 170.91±1.06 and 171.93±1.06 respectively. Mean weight were found FS and TS as 65.67±1.48 and 64.66±1.49 respectively. Meaningful difference was not found at these parameters.

When the sub-dimensions of the HLBS analyzed, the highest average of the behaviors which contributed to improve health, was observed among the Turkish students in interpersonal relations.

When the Turkish and foreign students were compared from the perspective of health responsibilities, significant difference was found. Health responsibility point average was found as high in a study made on university students (N. Tuğut, M. Bekar, 2008).

In another study, It was found that getting older was increased the health responsibilities of the people (G. Karadeniz 2008)

A significant difference was not found when the physical activity levels of the TS and FS. Likewise, a significant difference in the physical activity levels of the university students was not found in another study (A. Zaybak, Ç. Fadıloğlu, 2004). This result is similar to our findings.

Significant difference was found in the average points of Spiritual Growth of TS and FS. In terms of average points, our study is similar to former studies (N. Esin, 1997). But at literature we could see some studies which were found higher (S.R. Hawks, et al., 2002) and lower (W.H. Hui, 2002, M. Chen, et al., 2001) values.

In the comparison of TS and FS according to interpersonal relations parameter, statistically significant difference was found.

When the students were compared about being Turkish or foreign, it was seen that the interpersonal relations of TS were more than FS. In another study which was carried out similarly, it was found that the subgroup has been statistically significant (F. Özbaşaran, 2004).

When the stress management parameter of the TS and FS was compared, significant difference was found.

The average of stress point of TS was significantly higher than FS value. Similarly, in a different study made on the university students, the stress management average point of subgroup was found as significantly different (F. Özbaşaran, 2004).

A significant difference was found in the average total points of HLBS of TS and FS the HLBS Total value of the TS are significantly higher than FS.

It was seen that the HLBS Total values are mid-range but the average of the TS was higher than the average of FS. Similarly, HLBS Total rate was detected as low in the abroad studies (J. Tashiro, 2002, MM. Bagwell, H.A. Bush, 2000).

Consequently, in this study which has been carried out to compare the healthy life style behaviors of Turkish and foreign students, it has been found that the Turkish and foreign students are mid-ranged according to healthy life style behavior scale.

That the point of the HLBL scale becomes high shows that the person has more positive health behavior. In this regard, it has been detected that the Turkish students have more health behaviors than the foreign students do.

It is necessary that the personal and environmental negativeness should be swept away and the self-confidence should be provided.

It is necessary to increase the number of observations and countries and carry out the experiment again.

References

BAGWELL, M.M., BUSH, H.A., 2000, *Improving health promotion for blue-collar workers*. Journal of Nursing Care Quality; 14(4): 65-71.

BAHAR, Z., BEŞER, A., GÖRDES, N., ERSIN, F., KISSAL, A., 2008, *Sağlıklı Yaşam Biçimi Davranışları Ölçeği II'nin Geçerlilik ve Güvenirlilik Çalışması.* C.Ü. Hemşirelik Yüksekokulu Dergisi; 12 (1).

BATI, H., TEZER, E., DUMAN, E., et al., 2003, *Üniversite öğrencilerinde sağlıklı yaşam biçimi davranışı değerlendirilmesi.* 8. Halk Sağlığı Günleri, Poster Sunumu; 227.

CAN, H.Ö., CEBER, E., SOĞUKPINAR, N., et al. 2008, *Eating Habits, Knowledge about Cancer Prevention and the HPLP Scale in Turkish Adolescents*. Asian Pacific J Cancer Prev. 9: pp. 569-574.

CHEN, M.Y., HUANG, L-H., WANG, E.K., et al, 2001, *The effectiveness of health promotion counseling for overweight adolescent nursing students in Taiwan*. Public Health Nursing, 18, 350.

CÜRCANI, M., TAN, M., ÖZDELIKARA, A., 2010, *Hemşirelerin Sağlıklı Yaşam Biçimi Davranışları ve Etkileyen Faktörlerin Belirlenmesi*. TAF Preventive Medicine Bulletin; 9(5): 487-492.

ÇELİK, G.O., MALAK, A.T., BEKTAŞ, M., et al, 2009, *Sağlık Yüksekokulu Öğrencilerinin Sağlığı Geliştirme Davranışlarını Etkileyen Etmenlerin İncelenmesi*. Anatol J Clin Investing; 3(3):164-169.

DUBOIS, E.J., 2006, Assessment *of health-promotıng factors in college students' lifestyles*. pp. 101-103.

ESIN, N., 1997, *Determination and improvement of healthy behaviors of industrial workers. Istanbul University Institute of Medical Sciences*. Florence Nightingale Nursing Training School, Doctorate Thesis Istanbul.

HAWKS, S.R., MADANAT, H.N., MERRILL, R.M., et al, 2002, *A crossculturalcom parisons of health promoting behaviors among college students*. Int Elect J Health Education; 5, 84-92.

HUI, W.H., 2002, *The health-promoting lifestyles of undergraduate nurses in Hong Kong*. *J Prof Nurs*, 18, 101-111.

KARADENIZ, G., UÇUM, E.Y., DEDELI, Ö., KARAAĞAÇ, Ö., 2008, *The Health Life Style Behaviors of University Students*. TAF Preventive Medicine Bulletin; 7(6):497-502

KARAKOÇ, A., 2006, *Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin Sağlıklı Yaşam Biçimi Davranışları ve Bu Davranışları Etkileyen Bazı Faktörlerin Belirlenmesi*. Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimler Enstitüsü. Yüksek lisans Tezi; ss. 12, 15-17, 34.

MCELLIGOTT, D., SIEMERS, S., THOMAS, L., KOHN, N., 2009, *Health promotion in nurses: Is there a healthy nurse in the house*. Applied Nursing Research; 22: 211–215.

ÖZBAŞARAN, F., ÇETINKAYA, A., GÜNGÖR, N., 2004, *Health Behaviors of Students in School of Health in Celal Bayar University*. Atatürk Üniv. Hemşirelik Yüksekokulu Dergisi; Cilt: 7, Sayı: 3.

ÖZKAN, S., YILMAZ, E., 2008, *The health-promoting lifestyles of nurses working at hospital. Fırat Sağlık Hizmetleri Dergisi, Cilt: 3, Sayı: 7.*

TASHIRO, J., 2002, Exploring health promoting lifestyle behaviors of Japanese college women: perceptions, practices, and issues. Health Care Women International; 23(1): 59-70.

TUĞUT, N., BEKAR, M., 2008, Cumhuriyet University student's healthy perception state and the correlation of health promotion life style. Atatürk Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Yüksekokulu Dergisi; 11: 3.

ÜNALAN, D., ŞENOL, V., ÖZTÜRK, A., ERKORKMAZ, Ü., 2007, A Research on the relation between the healthy life style behaviors and self-care levels of the students in health and social programs of vocational collages. İnönü Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi Dergisi; 14(2) 101-109.

VON BOTHMER, M.I.K., FRIDLUNT, B., 2005, Gender differences in health habits and in motivation for a healthy lifestyle among Swedish university students. Nursing and Health Sciences; 7, 107–118.

WALKER, S.N., HILL-POLERECKY, D.M., 1996, Psychometric evaluation of the health-promoting lifestyle profile II. Unpublished Manuscript University of Nebraska Medical Center.

YARDIM, N., GÖĞEN, S., MOLLAHALILOĞLU, S., 2009, Sağlığın Geliştirilmesi (Health Promotion): Dünyada ve Türkiye'de Mevcut Durum. İstanbul Tıp Fak. Dergisi. 72: 29-35.

YU-YING, T., SHU-PI, C., 2002, Health promotion behaviors in Chinese family caregivers of patients with stroke Health Promotion. International Oxford University Press. Vol. 17, No. 4.

ZAYBAK A, FADILOĞLU Ç., 2004, Determınıng of the health promotıon behavıors of unıversıty students and the factors affectıng these behavıors. Ege Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Yüksek Okulu Dergisi 20 (1): 77-95.