Original Article

Factors Influencing Health Promoting Behaviors of University Students using Pender's Model

Kim, Hee Kyung[1]

1) Professor, Department of Nursing, Kongju National University

Pender

[1]

[1]

Abstract

Purpose: The purpose of this study was to supply basic data for a health promoting program and to elevate the level of it by examining whether university students' health promoting behaviors were related to health perception, health concept, self- esteem, perceived benefits of action, perceived barriers of action, perceived self-efficacy, activity-related affect, social support, preference, prior related behavior, and a plan for action. **Method:** Subjects were 192 university students in K city. Data collection method was a structured questionnaire. Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics, t-test, ANOVA, Pearson's correlation, and stepwise multiple regression. **Result:** The most powerful predictor was previous related behavior (36%). Altogether previous related behavior, health status, a plan for action, perceived self-efficacy and number of admissions were proven to account for 57% of health promoting behaviors. **Conclusion:** It suggested that prior related behavior, health status, a plan for action, perceived self-efficacy, and number of admissions should be considered when developing a students' health promoting program.

Key words : Health behavior, Health status, Self- efficacy, University students

,   ,

(World Health Organization, 1997).   ,

(Regina & Alice, 2005).

(Kim, 1995).   1995

,
.

(Lee, Park, & Park,
1996).   .   .
,   .
•
•
(Jun, 1997; Kim, Kim, &   .
Park, 2001; Ryu, Kwon, & Lee, 2001)
.   •   .
•   .

, Ryu   (2001)   2.
, Kim   (2001)   ,   ,
,   Lee(1997)
, Im(1999)   ,   ,   .

.   1.
(Ryu et al., 2001)
(Jun, 1997; Lee, 1997; Regina & Alice, 2005)
.   .

Pender(1996)   2.

.   ,   -   ,   K   K   192   ,
,   .
,   ,   ,
,   3.
,   -
,   ,   ,   ,   ,   ,   ,
,   ,   ,
,   ,   ,   ,   ,
,   .
.   Pender
1)

.   (Ware, 1976)   Ware(1976)
.   32   5   "   " 1
1.   "   "   5
.
,   ,   ,   ,   ,   ,
,   ,   ,   ,

20
Cronbach's α .85, .79 .

2)

(Pender, 1996)
Laffrey(1986)
. 16 4 " " 1
" " 4

.

, , ,
20
Cronbach's α .83, .81 .

3)

(Taft, 1985) Rosenberg(1965)
. 10 4 "
" 1 " " 4
.
20
Cronbach's α .75, .74 .

4)

(Pender, 1996) Pender
(1999) .
8 5 " " 1 "
" 5
. 20
Cronbach's α .80,
.87 .

5)
, ,
(Pender, 1996)
Pender(1996) . 10
5 " " 1 " " 5
. 20
Cronbach's α .84,
.80 .

6)

(Bandura, 1986) Sherer (1982)
. 17 5
" " 1 " " 5
.
20
Cronbach's α .78, .85 .

7)
,
(Pender, 1999), Pender(1999)
. 12 5 " " 1
" " 5
.
20 Cronbach's α
.89, .85 .

8)

, ,
(Kahn & Antonucci, 1980)
Park(1985) . 24 4
" " 1 " " 4
. 20
Cronbach's α .98, .96 .

9)

(Pender,
1999) Pender(1999)
. 9 1 ,
0
. 20
Cronbach's α .78, .77
.

10)

6

(Pender, 1999)

Pender(1999) 7 4

" " 1 " " 4

. 20

Cronbach's α .74,

.75 .

11)

(Pender, 1999) Pender

(1999) . 7 4

" " 1 " " 4

. 20

Cronbach's α .81, .88

.

12)

,

(Pender, 1996), Pender(1996)

. 52 4 "

" 1 " " 4

.

, , , , ,

6 .

20 Cronbach's α

.86, .91 .

4.

2005 11 1 11 15

, K , ,

.

.

15-25 .

5.

SPSS Win 12.0 Program

, ,

t-test, ANOVA ,

Scheffe' Post-hoc procedure , , ,

, , ,

, , , ,

,

Pearson's correlation analysis ,

.

Cronbach's α .

1.

<Table 1>.

19 27 21.3 21

60.5%(115) , 74.0%

(142) 1-2 51.8%(99)

. 58.1%(112)

89.5%(172

) 10

88.0%(168) .

55.8%(106)

81.0%(153)

11.1 .

78.6%(151) 1.4

. 1 70.7%

(117) 1

36.2%(43) .

75.4%(132) ,

74.1%(138)

.

2.

, , ,

, , ,

, , ,

<Table 1> General characteristics of the subjects

(N=192)

Characteristics	Classification	f(%)	Mean
Age(years)	≥21	115(60.5)	21.3
	≤22	77(39.5)	
Sex	Male	50(26.0)	
	Female	142(74.0)	
Grade	1-2	99(51.8)	
	3-4	93(48.2)	
Religion	Yes	112(58.1)	
	No	80(41.9)	
Economic status	High	20(10.5)	
	Medium-Low	172(89.5)	
Monthly income	<100,000	168(88.0)	
(won)	≥100,000	23(12.0)	
Health status	Good	106(55.8)	
	Bad	84(44.2)	
Duration of disease	0	153(81.0)	11.1
(months)	<60	26(13.7)	
Admission frequency	0	151(78.6)	1.4
	≥1	40(21.4)	
Exercise	0	75(39.3)	1.83
frequency/week	≥1	117(70.7)	
Duration of exercise	≤30	39(33.6)	
(minutes)	31-60	35(30.2)	
	≥60	43(36.2)	
Smoking	Yes	60(24.6)	
	No	132(75.4)	
Drinking	Rare	14(8.1)	
	Often	138(74.1)	
	Frequent	40(17.8)	

2.87
2.33   .

<Table 2> Degree of health promoting behavior and related research variables   (N=192)

Variables	Mean(SD)	Range
Health perception	3.10(.28)	1-5
Health concept	3.04(.33)	1-4
Self-esteem	2.55(.38)	1-4
Perceived benefits	3.98(.63)	1-5
Perceived barriers	3.01(.59)	1-5
Perceived self-efficacy	3.02(.44)	1-5
Activity-related affect	2.77(.41)	1-5
Social support	3.56(.61)	1-5
Preference	.37(.21)	0-1
Previous related behavior	2.53(.47)	1-4
A plan for action	1.66(.44)	1-3
Health promoting behavior	2.56(.33)	1-4
Spiritual growth	2.83(.43)	1-4
Responsibility	2.33(.45)	1-4
Diet	2.47(.43)	1-4
Exercise	2.42(.55)	1-4
Interpersonal relationship	2.87(.43)	1-4
Stress management	2.63(.45)	1-4

3.

<Table 3>.

,   (t=3.92, p=.00),
(F=3.27, p=.04)

.

,   1
30

.   ,   ,   ,   ,   ,
,   ,   ,   ,

.

4.

<Table 4>.

(r=.47, p=.00),
(r=.26, p=.00),   (r=.20, p=.01),
(r=.26, p=.00),   (r=.33, p=.00),   (r=.20,

<Table 2>.
3.10
3.04
,   2.55
.
3.98
3.01
.   3.02

2.77
.
3.56   .
0.37
,
2.53
.   1.66
,   2.56

< Table 3> Difference of health promoting behavior by general characteristics (N= 192)

Characteristics	Classification	Mean(SD)	t or F score	p
Age(years)	≥21	2.57(.32)	1.62	.11
	≤22	2.44(.48)		
Sex	Male	2.54(.40)	.30	.59
	Female	2.57(.31)		
Grade	1-2	2.59(.31)	1.12	.27
	3-4	2.53(.36)		
Religion	Yes	2.55(.32)	.12	.73
	No	2.57(.35)		
Economic status	High	2.62(.46)	.91	.37
	Medium-Low	2.55(.32)		
Monthly income (won)	<100,000	2.55(.33)	-1.32	.19
	≥100,000	2.65(.39)		
Health status	Good	2.64(.33)	3.92	.00
	Bad	2.46(.32)		
Duration of disease (months)	0	2.57(.32)	1.32	.19
	<60	2.40(.59)		
Admission(times)	0	2.54(.34)	-1.80	.07
	≥1	2.64(.31)		
Exercise weekly (times)	0	2.55(.33)	-.44	.66
	≥ 1	2.58(.31)		
Duration of exercise (minutes)	≤30	2.55(.33)A	3.27	.04
	31-60	2.58(.31)		
	≥60	2.72(.32)B		
Smoking	Yes	2.58(.32)	1.54	.13
	No	2.35(.37)		
Drinking	Rare	2.84(.31)	.734	.48
	Often	2.58(.42)		
	Frequent	2.52(.33)		

p=.01), (r=.34, p=.00),
(r=.14, p=.04), (r=.59, p=.00),
(r=.22, p=.00)

, ,
, ,
, ,
, ,
,
.

(r=-.06, p=.40)

.

5.

<Table 5>.

, , , ,
, , ,
, ,
,

36%,
12%, 4%, 3%
2% 5
57% .

< Table 4> Correlation of the scores between health promoting behavior and research variables (N= 192)

Variables	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X6	X7	X8	X9	X10	X11	X12
X1	1.00											
X2	.32***	1.00										
X3	.33***	.17*	1.00									
X4	.17*	.12	.10	1.00								
X5	-.14	-.11	-.26***	.24***	1.00							
X6	.33***	.21**	.43***	.06	-.30***	1.00						
X7	-.03	.01	-.07	-.15*	-.05	-.06	1.00					
X8	.20**	.13	.27***	.51***	.12	.14*	-.18*	1.00				
X9	.12	.01	-.06	.06	.14*	-.08	-.07	.07	1.00			
X10	.34***	.17*	.14	.20**	.00	.20**	-.08	.27***	.06	1.00		
X11	.16*	.04	-.01	-.01	.06	-.07	.08	.01	.22**	.15*	1.00	
X12	.47***	.26***	.20**	.26***	.06	.33***	.20**	.34***	.14*	.59***	.22**	1.00

* p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001

X1: Health perception X2: Health concept X3: Self-esteem X4: Perceived benefits of action X5: Perceived barriers of action
X6: Perceived self-efficacy X7: Activity-related affect X8: Social support X9: Preference X10: Previous related behavior
X11: A plan for action X12: Health promoting behavior

<Table 5> Influencing factors in health promoting behavior of subjects   (N= 192)

Variables	R	R² Change amount	R²	t	p
Previous related behavior	.34	.60	.36	.36	6.40	.00
Health status	.15	.69	.12	.48	4.68	.00
A plan for action	.17	.72	.04	.52	3.08	.00
Perceived self-efficacy	.15	.74	.03	.55	2.71	.01
Number of admission	.06	.76	.02	.57	2.31	.02

(1996)   253

,   ,   ,   ,

1.   , Jun   (2002)

, Ryu   (2001)   ,

Jun(1997)

2.56

Lee   Han(1996)   2.56 ,   .   Lee(1996), Ryu   (2001)

Lee(1996)   2.52 , Lee(1997)   2.50 , Jun(1997)   2.49

Ryu   (2001)   2.16   Regina   Alice(2005)   (Duffy, 1993; Jun, 2001)

2.30

. Park, Lee, Park   Chang(1999)

4.0 (1-5)   .

.   ,

2.87

2.33   .   Jun,

Kim   Cho(2002), Jun(1997)   ,

Lee(1997)   Huh,

Chung   Yeoum(1998)   .

2.

.

,   ,   ,   ,

,   ,   ,   ,

,   ,

,   1   ,   ,

30   ,   ,   ,

,   ,

.   ,

Lee   Han(1996), Lee(1997)   .

,   ,   Jun(1997)   D   350

.   Lee   ,

,   .
                        . Lee(1997)   , Lee   ,
   Han(1996)   (Kim, 1995)

.

                                                                                                                         .
                                                                                                                     ,   ,
(Burton, Steinwachs & German, 1995)   ,
   Pender
                              Ryu   (2001)   K   282
                                                                                                                   .

                        .   (Huh et al.,
                                                                                 1998)
                    .

                                                              .
        Kim   (2001), Im(1999), Jun   (2002)   Lee(1996)
                                                                                                          .
            ,   ,   ,   ,
   ,   ,
                                                                                                  .
   .   Im(1999),
Kim   (2001)   Lee(1996)   ,   ,

                                                                    .
                                                          .   ,

            ,   ,   ,
                                    ,   .
   36%,   12%,   4%,
3%   2%   5   .
                              57%   .
Kim   (2001)   ,   ,   ,
            ,   Pender
        45.1%   , Im(1999)
            ,   ,   ,
   ,   59.0%   ,   ,   ,   ,
                                    . Park   (2000)   ,   ,   ,
                                                            ,   ,   ,
                                                            ,   ,   ,
            Ware(1976)

Pender(1996)

2.56
(t=3.92, p<.001),   (F=3.27, p<.05)

36%,   12%,

4%,   3%   2%

57%

References

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundation of thought and action: A social cognitive theory.* Englewood Cliff: Prentice-Hall.

Burton, L. C., Steinwachs, D. M., & German, P. S. (1995). Preventive services for the elderly: Would coverage affect utilization and costs under medicare? *American J Pub Health, 85*, 378-391.

Duffy, M. E. (1993). Determinants of health-promoting lifestyles in order persons. *Image: J Nurs Scholarship. 25*(1), 23-28.

Huh, E. H., Chung, Y. K., & Yeoum, S. G. (1998). A study on the relations between a health promoting daily lifestyle and self-efficiency in university students. *J Korean Soc School Health, 11*(2), 203-215.

Im, M. Y. (1999). *Determinants of health promoting behavior of college students in Korea.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yonsei University, Seoul.

Jun, M. Y., Kim, M. H., & Cho, J. M. (2002). Predicts of health promoting lifestyles in Korean undergraduate students. *J Korean Soc Health Edu Prom, 19*(2), 1-13.

Jun, J. Y. (1997). A study on the performance of health promoting behavior in college students. *J Korea Comm Health Nurs Acad Society, 11*(1), 26-38.

Kahn, R. L., & Antonucci, T. C. (1980). *Convoys over the life-course: Attachment, roles and social support. In P. B. Baltes & G. Brim(eds). Life-span development and behavior(253-83).* NY: Academic Press.

Kim, A. K. (1995). An inquiry into subjectivity of health behavior among young Korean adults. *Korean Nurs, 34*(1), 50-54.

Kim, J. H., Kim, S. J., & Park, Y. H. (2001). Factors influencing health promoting behavior of women college students. *J Korean Acad Adult Nurs, 13*(3), 431-440.

Laffrey, S. C. (1986). Development of a health conception scale. *Res Nurs Health, 9*, 107-113.

Lee, H. J. (1997). Relationship between the health promoting behavior and social support of college students. *J Kyungdong College, 6*, 587-606.

Lee, J. K., & Han, A. K. (1996). A study on the relationship between social support, self-esteem and health promoting behavior among nursing students. *J Korean Acad Adult Nurs, 8*(1), 55-68.

Lee, S. H. (1996). A study of influencing variables of health promotion behaviors of college students. *Korean Central J*

Med, 61(12), 981-994.

Lee, S. J., Park, E. S., & Park, Y. J. (1996). Determinants of health promoting behavior of middle aged women in Korea. *J Korean Acad Nurs, 26*(2), 320-336.

Park, J. W. (1985). *A study to development a scale of social support*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yonsei University, Seoul.

Park, Y. J., Lee, S. J., Park, E. S., Ryu, H. S., Lee, J. W., & Chang, S. O. (2000). A meta-analysis of explanatory variables of health promotion behavior. *J Korean Acad Nurs, 30*(4), 836-846.

Park, Y. J., Lee, S. J., Park, E. S., & Chang, S. O. (1999). A prediction model for health promoting behavior of the Korean Elderly. *J Korean Acad Nurs, 29*(2), 281-292.

Pender, N. J. (1996). *Health promotion in nursing practice(3rd ed)*. Standford: Appleton & Lange.

Pender, N. J. (1999, June). *Health promotion and nursing*. Paper presented at Korea University Institute of Nursing Research, International Nursing Conference, Seoul.

Regina, L. T. Lee, & Alice, J. T. Yuen Loke (2005).

Health-promoting behaviors and psychosocial well-being of university students in Hong-Kong. *Public Health Nurs, 22*(3), 209-220.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self image*. Princeton: Princeton University press.

Ryu, E. J., Kwon, Y. M., & Lee, K. S. (2001). A study on psychosocial well-being and health promoting lifestyle practices of university students. *J Korean Soc Health Educ Prom, 18*(1), 49-60.

Sherer, M. S., Maddux, J. E., Mercadante, B., Prentice-Dunn, S., Jacobs, B., & Rogers, R. W. (1982). The self-efficacy scale: Construction and validation. *Psychol rep, 51*, 663-671.

Taft, L. B. (1985). Self-esteem in later life: A nursing perspective. *Adv Nurs Sci, 8*(1), 77-84.

Ware, J. E. Jr. (1976). Scales for measuring general health perceptions. *Health Serv Res, 11*, 396-415.

World Health Organization (1997). *Coming of age: From facts to action for adolescent sexual and reproductive health*. Geneva: Author.