

Patterns of physical activity among the students of an Indian university and their perceptions about the curricular content concerned with health

Arun Kumar Verma¹, Girish Singh², Kishor Patwardhan¹

1. Department of Kriya Sharir, Faculty of Ayurveda, Institute of Medical sciences, BHU, Varanasi,
2. Centre of Biostatistics, Institute of Medical sciences, BHU, Varanasi,

Corresponding Author: Kishor Patwardhan, Email: kpatwardhan@bhu.ac.in

Patterns of physical activity among the students of an Indian university and their perceptions about the curricular content concerned with health

Background

University students are at risk of losing their focus on maintaining healthy levels of physical activity because of their engagements with curricular and co-curricular activities. In India, the physical activity levels of adult population have been reported to be declining in the recent years. However, large studies focusing on university students pertaining to their physical activity are not there in Indian context. ‘Do the curricula in higher education promote physical activity?’ is another question that has not been addressed well.

Objectives

Our work aims at describing the physical activity levels of the students in a large public-funded central university located in northern India. The study also aims at capturing the student perceptions about the emphasis their curricular activities receive in connection with leading a physically active lifestyle.

Methods

This is a cross-sectional descriptive study and uses International Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ-Long form) to record physical activity among 4586 students. Stratified sampling method was used to enroll the students from each stream (faculty). About 15% of all enrolled students from each faculty were included in the study. The study was conducted in between 2016 and 2019. To capture the student perceptions, we have used a 5-item newly developed scale.

Results

2828 (61.7%) male and 1758 (38.3%) female students participated in the study. The mean age of our sample was 22.34 ± 3.12 years. Our results indicate that about 14.5% of all students in the study fall under 'Inactive' category. Further, the perception about the curricular content pertaining to physical activity varied widely between the students of different streams.

Discussion

Our sample reported a better physical activity pattern in comparison to the reported overall physical activity levels of adult population of India. Our results also suggest that health-related topics are inadequately represented in many of the streams of higher education in the university.

Key Words: Exercise, Physical Activity, Education, Epidemiology

Patterns of physical activity among the students of an Indian university and their perceptions about the curricular content concerned with health

Introduction:

Patterns of physical activity are undergoing significant change in the recent years among individuals of all age groups across the globe.¹⁻⁵ Literature suggests that these changes are mostly influenced by factors such as changing lifestyles, gender differences, economic status, socio-cultural influences, educational levels, occupational factors and other determinants.^{6,7} Many workers in the field have reported a declining trend in physical activity profile among children, young adults and adults across different societies including India.⁸⁻¹¹ An increased engagement with virtual games, cell phones, television, computers and social media are possibly some of the important contributing factors to this trend among youth. Increased use of vehicular mode of transportation and reduced involvement in outdoor activities also contribute to this outcome.¹²⁻¹⁵ Further, the incidence of health conditions such as overweight, obesity, coronary artery disease, hypertension, diabetes mellitus, depression etc. are known to have increased among young adults and a suboptimal physical activity has been recognized to be an important factor that is associated with these conditions.¹⁸⁻²³

In a study conducted by Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR), physical activity patterns in adults across India were studied. The study reported that, out of 14227 individuals studied, 54.4% were inactive, while 31.9% were active and 13.7% were highly active.⁹ This trend is a matter of concern as the percentage of inactive population appears to be very significant. There are several studies to show that the physical activity levels among youth are going down in comparison to the recommended levels in many countries.²⁴⁻²⁹ Several studies have focused on the physical activity patterns among university students.²³⁻²⁸

However, there are no large and methodically performed studies available to show if the overall physical activity levels are lower than the recommended ones among students of Indian Universities. This question becomes important considering the fact that Universities are the places where health awareness is supposed to be inculcated among the youth and these students are at the risk of losing focus on physical activity because of the burden of curricular activities. A few studies have thrown light on the perceptions of student population towards physical education and health-related information in the curriculum.²⁹⁻³³ However, such studies are not available in Indian context. This question becomes important keeping the diverse nature of Indian education system and the curricula.

Hence, we planned this study to understand the physical activity trends among the students of Banaras Hindu University (BHU) and also to capture their perceptions regarding the curricular content related to physical activity. BHU is a public central university located in Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh, established in 1916. It is one of the largest residential universities in Asia. BHU is organized into 6 institutes and 14 faculties (streams) and 144 departments. The total student enrolment at the university is around 30,000 and this number represents almost all states of India along with a few foreign countries.

Objectives of the study:

The primary objective of the study was to understand the proportion of students of Banaras Hindu University (BHU) who fall under different categories of physical activity, i.e., physically inactive, active and highly active. The study also aimed at comparing the physical activity profiles of students from different faculties of BHU. Throughout the study we aimed at understanding the differences in the physical activity profiles with respect to age and gender. Another objective of the study was to map views and opinions of the students regarding the information and motivation they receive in their respective faculties and

departments as a part of their routine curricular activities to keep themselves physically active.

Methods:

Study Design and Sampling

This is a cross-sectional survey study wherein a stratified sampling technique was employed. Individual stream (e.g., Humanities, Science, Social Science, Medicine, Ayurveda etc.) was considered as one stratum. We collected the details of the total number of students registered in each of the 16 streams from the offices the respective deans. It was decided to include about 15% of all the students from each stream considering the time and other limitations. This meant approximately 4600 students, which was thought to be sufficient enough to draw meaningful conclusions.

Tools used in the study:

To record the physical activity profiles of the students, we used the International Physical Activity Questionnaire-Long Version (IPAQ-L).^{34,35} This tool has been developed by IPAQ group and is a widely used in large surveys. This tool employs an indirect method of measuring physical activity based on the recall of one's activities during last one week. The purpose of this tool is to provide a common instrument that can be used to obtain internationally comparable data on health-related physical activity. Further, a newly developed 5-item questionnaire was used to record the opinions and views of the student population. This tool was designed to capture the perceptions of the students regarding the encouragement they receive in their respective faculties and departments to keep themselves physically active.

Translation and Re-validation of IPAQ-L

The IPAQ-L is available in different languages (English, French, German, Greek etc.) but not in Hindi. Since Hindi is the common language of communication in this part of India, the

questionnaire was translated from English to Hindi by an expert. The questionnaire was then back-translated to English and was verified for its accuracy by another team of experts in the department. Suitable corrections were made before the tool was administered. Both the versions of the tool were used in the study to collect data based on student preference.

Development of a new tool to capture the views and opinions of the student population:

A short 5-item questionnaire was developed which was administered to all participants in the study. The statements (items) included in this questionnaire were as follows:

1. The curriculum of my course / courses addresses the topics related to ‘importance of day-to-day physical activity in maintaining health’.
2. My faculty/ department promotes physical activity / sports activities among the students in an organized manner regularly.
3. I consider the sports facilities (playgrounds / sports equipment / sports training) available in my faculty for the students are adequate in general.
4. I keep monitoring my body weight regularly and I am aware of the health consequences of overweight and obesity.
5. I consider that general health-related aspects (such as diet / nutrition / sports etc) are sufficiently addressed in my curriculum.

The options given for each of the questions were in the form of a 5-point Likert Scale:

1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3= Undecided, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly Disagree.

Validation of the new tool:

The 5-item scale was first administered to 100 students from the Institute of Agricultural Sciences for the purpose of validation. Cronbach’s Alpha for the scale was 0.725, which falls under the category of acceptable range. Hence, the questionnaire was considered as valid and reliable.

Data collection and data entry

Ethical clearance was obtained by Institutional Ethics Committee (Reference: No. 2014-15/EC/1323) before starting the study. Investigators collected the data regarding the total number of students registered from different faculties of BHU by writing to the Deans. Since the information contained only numbers and not the list of students, it was decided that the required number of classes be randomly selected and all students of those classes (batches) be administered with the tool. The first author of this paper visited different departments and got permission from concerned heads of the departments to collect the data in leisure hours from different classes. The specific classes were selected by computer generated random sequence method. A written consent was obtained from each of the participant. Though we collected the hard copies of the filled-in questionnaires from the volunteers, to ensure precision and uniformity, we prepared an online form to enter the data. Finally, the data was downloaded in the form of a spreadsheet. The data was collected in between 2016 and 2019. IPAQ-L and the 5-item questionnaire were filled simultaneously by all volunteers.

Data Analysis:

The data analysis to evaluate physical activity patterns was done according to the data processing rules of the IPAQ-L. The major steps involved in this process were data cleaning, excluding the outliers based on the maximum values allowed, ensuring the minimum values for duration of reported activity, truncation of data, calculating MET-minute/week scores for walking, moderate-Intensity and vigorous-Intensity activities and calculating the Total Physical Activity Scores. The final step was to classify the entire sample into categorical data in terms of Low (inactive), Moderate (active) and High (highly active) levels of physical activity.

Results

The total student strength of BHU was 30667 and upon calculation, 15% of this population is 4600. We collected a sample of 4733. However, after excluding the outliers and erratic entries, the sample that was analyzed included 4586 students. **Table 1** shows the distribution of participants as per their programs of study, gender and age-group. The total number of male and female students included in the study was 2828 (61.7%) and 1758 (38.3%) respectively. Mean age of the sample in the study was 22.34 ± 3.12 years (Males: 22.37 ± 3.13 years and females: 22.29 ± 3.12 years). Out of 4586 students, 3048 (66.4%) were from undergraduate programs, 1406 (30.7%) were from postgraduate programs and 132 (2.9%) were from doctoral level programs.

[Table-1 goes here]

Physical Activity Levels

Table-2 displays the overall distribution of subjects into Low (inactive), Moderate (active) and High (highly active) levels of Physical Activity. In our sample, we noted that about 14.5% of all students fell under Low category of Physical Activity (14.4% among all males and 14.7 among all females), whereas an almost equal proportion, i.e., 14.2% of all students (15.3% of all males and 13.5% of female) fell under Moderate physical activity category. Further, about 71.3% of all students (72.1% among all males and 70% among all females) fell under High level of Physical activity. The difference between physical activity levels for males and females was statistically not significant ($\chi^2 = 3.237$, $p = 0.198$). Further, the difference was not significant between males and females for any program of study too. **Table-2** also shows the distribution of volunteers into High, Moderate and low levels of physical activity based on their programs of study and gender. Among all PhD scholars 21.2% fall under Low category, 9.1% under Moderate and 69.7% under High category. Among all Postgraduate students, 15.3% fall under Low, 14.2% under Moderate and 70.6%

fall under High category. Among Undergraduate students, 13.9% fall under Low category, 14.4% under Moderate and 71.7% fall under High category. The difference between physical activity of students of various programs was not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 8.282$, $p = 0.082$).

[Table-2 goes here]

Table-3 depicts the distribution of volunteers into High, Moderate and Low categories based on age group. As the table suggests, the number of students in ‘Highly active’ category is highest among lower age groups and the number of students in ‘Inactive’ category is highest among higher age groups. The difference between physical activity of students of different age-groups was statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 35.387$, $p < 0.000$).

[Table-3 goes here]

Total Physical Activity MET distribution

Table-4 depicts the distribution of MET minutes per week under different categories in the form of total walking, total moderate activity, total vigorous activity and total physical activity MET minutes per week. The mean total physical activity MET minutes per week for males was 4678.5 ± 3037.01 , and 4321.4 ± 2874.09 for females. Overall mean total physical activity MET minutes per week was 4541.6 ± 2980.35 . The difference between the MET min/week among males and females was statistically significant for all categories of physical activity domains reported as suggested by p values.

[Table-4 goes here]

Faculties with Least Active Students

As the **Table-5** suggests, among all the faculties, the Faculty of Ayurveda had a maximum number of least active students, i.e., 41.3%. The following faculties were next in the rank: Education (26.5%), Law (24.6%), Medicine (18.6%), Performing Arts (16.9%), Environmental Science (16.7%), Management (15.9%), Science (14.4%), Arts (13.5%), Social Sciences (12.6%), Agriculture (12.3%), Commerce (12.2%), Women's College (12.3%), Visual arts (10.9%), Sanskrit Studies (6.7%) and Dental Sciences (2.9%). The difference between physical activity levels in different streams was statistically significant as suggested by p values.

[Table-5 goes here]

Domains of Physical Activity reported

Our sample reported activities for transportation using bicycle (49.18%), walking (91.37%), vigorous housework outside home (26.10%), moderate housework outside home (57.46%), moderate housework inside home (69.97%), vigorous leisure physical activity (40.97%), moderate leisure physical activity (43.46%) and leisure time walking (75.36%). Since all the volunteers were students, they did not report any work-related physical activity.

Views and Opinions of the Students

Table-6 shows the responses of the students to each option to the 5-item questionnaire based on gender. The statistically significant difference was observed in the responses for item numbers 1, 3 and 4 among males and females, whereas no statistically significant response was found for the item number 2 and 5.

[Table-6 goes here]

Table-7 shows the responses of students to 5-item questionnaire based on the programs in which they are registered. A statistically significant difference between the responses based on the courses registered (UG/PG/PhD) is observed for all 5 items.

[Table-7 goes here]

Table-8 shows the mean scores for each item in each faculty. A mean score lesser than 3 for any item was considered to be indicating a positive perception about the curricular activities leading to an encouraging environment to lead a physically active and healthy lifestyle. A mean score of more than 3 for any item was considered as indicating dissatisfaction towards the curriculum of the faculty with respect to leading a physically active lifestyle. From the table it becomes clear that the faculties of Agriculture Sciences, Arts, Ayurveda, Dental Sciences, Medicine, Performing arts and Science – were the faculties where the mean scores for any of the questions did not exceed 3 or more. Hence, it can be presumed that the students in these faculties get some or the other kind of motivation to lead a physically active lifestyle as a part of their curricular activities.

[Table-8 goes here]

Discussion

Physical Activity Profiles compared with other studies:

This is possibly one of the first studies from India that looks at physical activity levels in a focused way among a large number of university students. According to ICMR study (2014), the total percentage of inactive adults was 54.4% in India.⁹ The percentage of highly active adults was 13.7%. However, the mean age group of this study sample was around 40 years. Since our study sample belongs to a mean age of around 22 years, a true comparison of the results is not possible. However, our results are much encouraging than the ones reported in this study. A study based on the pooled data from 358 population-based surveys from across

168 countries, including 1.9 million participants, reported that the global age-standardized prevalence of insufficient physical activity was 27.5% in 2016, with a difference between sexes of more than 8 percentage points.² In comparison to this, our sample gives a better picture. We report only about 14.5% of inactive student population. Another study conducted among university students in Romania included a total of 333 students, with an age average of 21.05 ± 1.98 years.²⁷ According to the results of this study, mean Total Physical Activity MET (TPA-MET) minutes per week are almost comparable with those of our study, especially among female students. The average TPA-MET minutes per week among males was better in their study than in ours. Another study determined the physical activity performed by undergraduate students from 20 to 22 years of age, its frequency and intensity.²⁸ The sample consisted of 297 students from the University of Maribor. Their results indicate that 79.8 % students were inactive and hence, our situation in BHU appears to be much better where 71% of students are highly active. In yet another study the investigators investigated the physical activity and quality of life of sports department students and other department students attending university.²⁹ A total of 300 university students participated in this study. In comparison with the genders, the total average physical activity score of men was found to be 4938.86 ± 3919.33 MET-minute/week while that of women was found to be 2592.44 ± 2276.82 MET-minute/week. In comparison to these results, female students in our study are much more physically active. According to the results of a study consisting of 200 study subjects, 59% were having a sedentary lifestyle, 27% were moderately active and 14% had vigorously active lifestyle. The study was conducted among the patients attending health training centers in Nagpur and participants' age ranged from 40 to more than 70 years.⁵ This study reported a significantly increasing trend for sedentary lifestyle with age a finding that is consistent with our results too, though the age range of the subjects in our study was different. A study conducted in urban and rural Vellore city, Tamil Nadu, assessed the

prevalence and factors associated with insufficient physical activity among adults aged 30–64 years.¹¹ The prevalence of insufficient physical activity was 63.3% in the urban area and 40.6% in the rural area. Though our results cannot be meaningfully compared with this study as the sample characters are different, we report a better physical activity profile.

Student Perceptions

Our study suggests that the student perceptions vary significantly from one stream of study to another indicating that the curricular activities of all streams do not encourage physically active lifestyle equally. The curricular activities of Agriculture Sciences, Arts, Ayurveda, Dental Sciences, Medicine, Performing arts and Science appear to be encouraging physical activity in one or the other form. This heterogenous perception indicates that there is a need for having a relook at all curricula to see if sufficient emphasis is placed in health-related aspects.

Growing healthcare burden of India is mainly due to increasing prevalence of lifestyle related diseases such as hypertension, obesity, diabetes, depression, metabolic syndrome etc. Increasing use of sugars, fats and other high calorie fast foods among the youth is compounding the situation. Most of these diseases are preventable if right intervention in terms of dietary pattern and regular physical activities are incorporated at the right age.³⁵⁻⁴⁰

There have been several studies where the student perceptions about various aspects pertaining to their physical activities have been evaluated. Different approaches of inculcating the habit of leading a physically active lifestyle among the student community have also been suggested.⁴¹⁻⁴⁵ However, the situation in India is complex owing to the presence of a variety of regulations and norms of developing curricula in higher education institutions. Similarly, there are different types of universities including deemed universities,

private universities, state universities and central universities. The education policies so far have mostly emphasized on the importance of physical education in schools.⁴⁶

Our study suggests that various curricula of higher education have several lapses when it comes to health-related topics. Universities need to take up the initiative in making the students aware of the correct ways of leading a healthy lifestyle. Irrespective of the stream of education, keeping oneself physically and psychologically fit is essential to lead a healthy life. Our results seem to suggest that health education must become a part of all streams of higher education irrespective of the stream.

Conclusion

In our sample, we report that about 14.5% of all students fall under 'Inactive' category (14.4% among all males and 14.7% among all females), about 71.3% of all students (72.1% among all males and 70% among all females) fall under 'Highly active' category and about 14.2% of all students (13.5% of all males and 15.3% of female) fall under 'active' category. In our study we found that physical activity levels go on decreasing as the age increases, i.e., lowest physically active students belong to higher age group and highly active students are in lower age group. Our study also suggests that physical education and other aspects of health are inadequately and heterogeneously represented in university curricula. These topics are required to be incorporated into regular curricula in all streams of higher education in Indian universities.

References

1. Guthold R, Ono T, Strong KL, Chatterji S, Morabia A. Worldwide Variability in Physical Inactivity. A 51-Country Survey. *Am J Prev Med.* 2008;34(6):486-494. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2008.02.013

2. Guthold R, Stevens GA, Riley LM, Bull FC. Worldwide trends in insufficient physical activity from 2001 to 2016: a pooled analysis of 358 population-based surveys with 1.9 million participants. *Lancet Glob Heal*. 2018;6(10):e1077-e1086. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30357-7
3. Hallal PC, Andersen LB, Bull FC, et al. Global physical activity levels: Surveillance progress, pitfalls, and prospects. *Lancet*. 2012;380(9838):247-257. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60646-1
4. Bauman A, Bull F, Chey T, et al. The international prevalence study on physical activity: Results from 20 countries. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*. 2009;6. doi:10.1186/1479-5868-6-21
5. Patil C, Dhoble M, Kaware A. A study of physical activity levels and its correlates among adults: a cross-sectional study. *Int J Community Med Public Heal*. 2017;4(4):1154. doi:10.18203/2394-6040.ijcmph20171341
6. Jurj AL, Wen W, Gao YT, et al. Patterns and correlates of physical activity: A cross-sectional study in urban Chinese women. *BMC Public Health*. 2007;7. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-7-213
7. Bergman P, Grjibovski AM, Hagströmer M, Bauman A, Sjöström M. Adherence to physical activity recommendations and the influence of socio-demographic correlates - A population-based cross-sectional study. *BMC Public Health*. 2008;8. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-8-367
8. Sjöström M, Oja P, Hagströmer M, Smith BJ, Bauman A. Health-enhancing physical activity across European Union countries: The Eurobarometer study. In: *Journal of Public Health*. Vol 14. ; 2006:291-300. doi:10.1007/s10389-006-0031-y

9. Anjana RM, Pradeepa R, Das AK, et al. Physical activity and inactivity patterns in India - results from the ICMR-INDIAB study (Phase-1) [ICMR-INDIAB-5]. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act.* 2014;11(1). doi:10.1186/1479-5868-11-26
10. Ranasinghe CD, Ranasinghe P, Jayawardena R, Misra A. Physical activity patterns among South-Asian adults: A systematic review. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act.* 2013;10. doi:10.1186/1479-5868-10-116
11. Devamani C, Oommen A, Mini G, Abraham V, George K. Levels of physical inactivity in rural and urban Tamil Nadu, India: A cross-sectional study. *J Clin Prev Cardiol.* 2019;8(1):13. doi:10.4103/jcpc.jcpc_32_18
12. Bauman AE, Sallis JF, Dzawaltowski DA, Owen N. Toward a better understanding of the influences on physical activity. *Am J Prev Med.* 2002;23(2):5-14. doi:10.1016/S0749-3797(02)00469-5
13. Hartz B, Winters E, Grim ML, Petosa RL. Prospective Relationship Between Social Cognitive Variables and Leisure Time Physical Activity, *Am J Health Educ.* 2017; 48(2):129-135, DOI: 10.1080/19325037.2016.1271372
14. Dias-da-Costa JS, Hallal PC, Wells JCK, et al. Epidemiology of leisure-time physical activity: a population-based study in southern Brazil. *Cad saúde pública / Ministério da Saúde, Fundação Oswaldo Cruz, Esc Nac Saúde Pública.* 2005;21(1):275-282. doi:10.1590/s0102-311x2005000100030
15. Montag C, Lachmann B, Herrlich M, Zweig K. Addictive features of social media/messenger platforms and freemium games against the background of psychological and economic theories. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2019;16(14). doi:10.3390/ijerph16142612

16. Barik D, Arokiasamy P. Rising health expenditure due to non-communicable diseases in India: An outlook. *Front Public Heal.* 2016;4(NOV). doi:10.3389/FPUBH.2016.00268
17. Tremblay MS, Colley RC, Saunders TJ, Healy GN, Owen N. Physiological and health implications of a sedentary lifestyle. *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab.* 2010;35(6):725-740. doi:10.1139/H10-079
18. Allender S, Lacey B, Webster P, et al. Level of urbanization and noncommunicable disease risk factors in Tamil Nadu, India. *Bull World Health Organ.* 2010;88(4):297-304. doi:10.2471/BLT.09.065847
19. Booth FW, Roberts CK, Laye MJ. Lack of exercise is a major cause of chronic diseases. *Compr Physiol.* 2012;2(2):1143-1211. doi:10.1002/cphy.c110025
20. Gill DL, Hammond CC, Reifsteck EJ, et al. Physical activity and quality of life. *J Prev Med Public Heal.* 2013;46(SUPPL.1). doi:10.3961/jpmph.2013.46.S.S28
21. Prabhakaran D, Jeemon P, Sharma M, et al. The changing patterns of cardiovascular diseases and their risk factors in the states of India: the Global Burden of Disease Study 1990–2016. *Lancet Glob Heal.* 2018;6(12):e1339-e1351. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30407-8
22. Daniels SR, Arnett DK, Eckel RH, et al. Overweight in children and adolescents: Pathophysiology, consequences, prevention, and treatment. *Circulation.* 2005;111(15):1999-2012. doi:10.1161/01.CIR.0000161369.71722.10
23. Singh M, Sharma P, Raj D, Sharma S, Kaushal A, Raina S. Leisure time physical activity and risk of developing depression among the youth of Kangra district,

- Himachal Pradesh, India. *Indian J Psychol Med.* 2018;40(5):426-432.
doi:10.4103/IJPSYM.IJPSYM_85_18
24. Steptoe A, Wardle J, Cui W, et al. Trends in smoking, diet, physical exercise, and attitudes toward health in European university students from 13 countries, 1990-2000. *Prev Med (Baltim).* 2002;35(2):97-104. doi:10.1006/pmed.2002.1048
25. Padmapriya K, Krishna P, Rasu T. Prevalence and patterns of physical activity among medical students in Bangalore, India. *Electron physician.* 2013;5(1):606-60610. doi:10.14661/2013.606-610
26. Assaf I, Brieteh F, Tfaily M, El-Baida M, Kadry S, Balusamy B. Students university healthy lifestyle practice: quantitative analysis. *Heal Inf Sci Syst.* 2019;7(1). doi:10.1007/s13755-019-0068-2
27. Fagaras S-P, Radu L-E, Vanvu G. The Level of Physical Activity of University Students. *Procedia - Soc Behav Sci.* 2015;197(February):1454-1457. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.094
28. Lipošek S, Planinšec J, Leskošek B, Pajtler A. Physical Activity of University Students and Its Relation To Physical Fitness and Academic Success. *Ann Kinesiol.* 2019;9(2):89-104. doi:10.35469/ak.2018.171
29. Çiçek G. Quality of life and physical activity among university students. *Univers J Educ Res.* 2018;6(6):1141-1148. doi:10.13189/ujer.2018.060602
30. Anderssen N. Perception of physical education classes among young adolescents: Do physical education classes provide equal opportunities to all students? *Health Educ Res.* 1993;8(2):167-179. doi:10.1093/her/8.2.167

31. Doyle CB, Khan A, Burton NW. Knowledge of physical activity guidelines and mental health benefits among Emirati university students. *Perspect Public Health*. 2019;139(6):316-319. doi:10.1177/1757913919834060
32. Haas J, Baber M, Byrom N, Meade L, Nouri-Aria K. Changes in student physical health behaviour: an opportunity to turn the concept of a Healthy University into a reality. *Perspect Public Health*. 2018;138(6):316-324. doi:10.1177/1757913918792580
33. Kabir A, Miah S, Islam A. Factors influencing eating behavior and dietary intake among resident students in a public university in Bangladesh: A qualitative study. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(6). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0198801
34. Craig CL, Marshall AL, Sjöström M, et al. International physical activity questionnaire: 12-Country reliability and validity. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2003;35(8):1381-1395. doi:10.1249/01.MSS.0000078924.61453.FB
35. International Physical Activity Questionnaire. <https://sites.google.com/site/theipaq/home>. Accessed December 19, 2019.
36. Mathur P, Shah B. Research priorities for prevention and control of noncommunicable diseases in India. *Indian J Community Med*. 2011;36(SUPPL.). doi:10.4103/0970-0218.94713
37. Mohan V, Williams OD, Chella S, et al. Clinical research training and capacity building for prevention and control of non-communicable diseases: A programme in India. *Natl Med J India*. 2017;30(6):340-344. doi:10.4103/0970-258x.239078
38. Pate RR, Davis MG, Robinson TN, Stone EJ, McKenzie TL, Young JC. Promoting

- physical activity in children and youth: A leadership role for schools - A scientific statement from the American Heart Association Council on Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Metabolism (Physical Activity Committee) in collaboration with the C. Circulation. 2006;114(11):1214-1224. doi:10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.106.177052
39. Prieto Rodríguez A. [A model of health promotion with emphasis on physical activity for university students]. *Rev Salud Publica (Bogota)*. 5(3):284-300. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14968909>. Accessed December 21, 2019.
40. Shah B, Mathur P. Surveillance of cardiovascular disease risk factors in India: The need & scope. *Indian J Med Res*. 2010;132(11):634-642. doi:10.4103/0971-5916.73420
41. Tripathy JP, Thakur JS, Jeet G, Chawla S, Jain S, Prasad R. Urban rural differences in diet, physical activity and obesity in India: Are we witnessing the great Indian equalisation? Results from a cross-sectional STEPS survey. *BMC Public Health*. 2016;16(1). doi:10.1186/s12889-016-3489-8
42. Uddin R, Khan A, Burton NW. Prevalence and sociodemographic patterns of physical activity among Bangladeshi young adults. *J Health Popul Nutr*. 2017;36(1):31. doi:10.1186/s41043-017-0108-y
43. Yahia N, Wang D, Rapley M, Dey R. Assessment of weight status, dietary habits and beliefs, physical activity, and nutritional knowledge among university students. *Perspect Public Health*. 2016;136(4):231-244. doi:10.1177/1757913915609945
44. Yusainy C, Chan DKC, Hikmiah Z, Anggono CO. Physical activity in Indonesian University students: the contradictory roles of dispositional mindfulness and self-control. *Psychol Heal Med*. 2019;24(4):446-455.

doi:10.1080/13548506.2018.1546015

45. Lyzwinski LN, Caffery L, Bambling M, Edirippulige S. The Relationship Between Stress and Maladaptive Weight-Related Behaviors in College Students: A Review of the Literature. *Am J Health Educ*, 2018; 49(3); 166-178, DOI: 10.1080/19325037.2018.1449683

46. Patwardhan B, Patwardhan K. Contesting Predators: Cleaning Up Trash in Science. *The Journal of Alternative and Complementary Medicine* 2019; 25:10, 979-982. DOI: 10.1089/acm.2019.0339

Table-1

Table-1 Distribution of volunteers as per age-group, gender and program of study. (Percentage expressed is according to rows).						
Age Group	Gender	Program of study			Total (based on gender in each age group)	Total (in each age group)
		PhD	Postgraduate	Undergraduate		
16-20	Female	-	7 (1.2%)	553 (98.8%)	560	1445
	Male	-	20 (2.3%)	865 (97.7%)	885	
21-25	Female	5 (0.5%)	434 (44.0%)	547 (55.5%)	986	2539
	Male	14 (0.9%)	633 (40.8%)	906 (58.3%)	1553	
26-30	Female	17 (9.7%)	107 (60.8%)	52 (29.5%)	176	503
	Male	52 (15.9%)	163 (49.8%)	112 (34.3%)	327	
31-35	Female	11(36.7%)	16 (53.3%)	3 (10.0%)	30	82
	Male	21 (40.4%)	22 (42.3%)	9 (17.3%)	52	
36 and above	Female	4 (66.7%)	2 (33.3%)	0 (.0%)	6	17
	Male	8 (72.7%)	2 (18.2%)	1 (9.1%)	11	
Total	Female	37	840	1155	1758	4586
	Male	95	566	1893	2828	

Table-2

Table-2 Distribution of volunteers into High, Moderate and low levels of physical activity based on programs of study and gender. (Percentage expressed is according to rows)						Comparison between gender and category
Program of study	Gender	Category			Total	
		Highly Active	Active	Inactive		
Ph. D.	Female	23 (62.2 %)	5 (13.5 %)	9 (24.3 %)	37 (100 %)	$X^2 = 1.760$ $P=0.415$
	Male	69 (72.6 %)	7 (7.4 %)	19 (20.0 %)	95 (100 %)	
	Total	92 (69.7 %)	12 (9.1 %)	28 (21.2 %)	132 (100 %)	
Postgraduate	Female	380 (67.2 %)	88 (15.5 %)	98 (17.3 %)	566 (100 %)	$X^2 = 5.404$ $P=0.067$
	Male	612(72.9 %)	111 (13.2 %)	117 (13.9 %)	840 (100 %)	
	Total	992 (70.5 %)	199 (14.2 %)	215 (15.3 %)	1406 (100 %)	
Undergraduate	Female	827 (71.6 %)	176 (15.2 %)	152 (13.2 %)	1155 (100 %)	$X^2 = 1.522$ $P=0.467$
	Male	1358 (71.8 %)	264 (13.9 %)	271 (14.3 %)	1893 (100 %)	
	Total	2185 (71.7 %)	440 (14.4 %)	423 (13.9 %)	3048 (100 %)	
Total	Male	2039 (72.1%)	382 (13.5%)	407 (14.4%)	2828 (100 %)	$X^2 = 3.237$ p = 0.198
	Female	1230 (70.0%)	269(15.3%)	259 (14.7%)	1758 (100 %)	
Grand Total		3269 (71.3%)	651 (14.2%)	666 (14.5%)	4586 (100 %)	

Table-3

Table-3. Distribution of volunteers into High, Moderate and Low categories based on age group. Percentage expressed is according to rows.						
Age Group	Gender	Category			Total	Comparison between males and females
		Highly Active	Active	Inactive		
16-20	Male	659 (74.5%)	126 (14.2%)	100 (11.3%)	1445 (100 %)	$\chi^2=1.327$, p=0.515
	Female	402 (71.7%)	86 (15.4%)	72 (12.9%)		
21-25	Male	1123 (72.3%)	208 (13.4%)	222 (14.3%)	2539 (100 %)	$\chi^2=2.988$, p=0.224
	Female	686 (69.6%)	155 (15.7%)	145 (14.7%)		
26-30	Male	218 (66.7%)	42 (12.8%)	67 (20.5%)	503 (100 %)	$\chi^2=0.976$, p=0.614
	Female	124 (70.5%)	18 (10.2%)	34 (19.3%)		
31-35	Male	29 (55.8%)	6 (11.5%)	17 (32.7 %)	82 (100 %)	$\chi^2=3.663$, p=0.160
	Female	16 (53.3%)	8 (26.7%)	6 (20%)		
36 and above	Male	10 (90.9%)	0 (0%)	1 (9.1%)	17 (100 %)	$\chi^2=6.783$, p=0.034
	Female	2 (33.4%)	2 (33.3%)	2 (33.3%)		
Overall comparison of physical activity levels among different age groups: $\chi^2 = 35.387$, p < 0.00						

Table-4

Table-4. Distribution of MET minutes per week under different domains				
MET	Gender		Total (N=4586) Mean (SD)	Mann Whitney Test P value
	Female (N=1758) Mean (SD)	Male (N=2828) Mean (SD)		
Total Walking MET	2107.2 (1334.39)	2201.2 (1380.27)	2165.2 (1363.49)	0.022
Total Moderate MET	1387.47 (1198.08)	1498.81 (1258.63)	1456.13 (1236.81)	0.004
Total Vigorous MET	826.76 (1665.84)	978.46 (1760.39)	920.31 (1726.15)	0.000
Total physical activity MET	4321.4 (2874.09)	4678.5 (3037.01)	4541.6 (2980.35)	0.000

Table-5

Faculty	Category			Total
	Highly Active	Active	Inactive	
Agriculture	226 (75.1%)	38 (12.6%)	37 (12.3%)	301(100.0%)
Arts	739 (70.9%)	163 (15.6%)	140 (13.5%)	1042 (100.0%)
Ayurveda	33 (41.2%)	14 (17.5%)	33 (41.3%)	80 (100.0%)
Commerce	236 (77.6%)	31 (10.2%)	37 (12.2%)	304 (100.0%)
Dental Sciences	26 (76.5%)	7 (20.6%)	1 (2.9%)	34 (100.0%)
Education	38 (55.9%)	12 (17.6%)	18 (26.5%)	68 (100.0%)
Environmental Sciences	15 (83.3%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (16.7%)	18 (100.0%)
Law	133 (66.8%)	17 (8.6%)	49 (24.6%)	199 (100.0%)
Women's College	333 (75.3%)	55 (12.4%)	54 (12.3%)	442 (100.0%)
Management	42 (66.6%)	11 (17.5%)	10 (15.9%)	63 (100.0%)
Medicine	142 (61.5%)	46 (19.9%)	43 (18.6%)	231 (100.0%)
Performing Arts	127 (67.2%)	30 (15.9%)	32 (16.9%)	189 (100.0%)
Sanskrit Studies	120 (81.1%)	18 (12.2%)	10 (6.7%)	148 (100.0%)
Science	626 (71.1%)	128 (14.5%)	127 (14.4%)	881 (100.0%)
Social Sciences	347 (74.3%)	61 (13.1%)	59 (12.6%)	467 (100.0%)
Visual Arts	86 (72.3%)	20 (16.8%)	13 (10.9%)	119 (100.0%)
Total	3269 (71.3%)	651 (14.2%)	666 (14.5%)	4586 (100.0%)
$\chi^2=126.2, p=0.000$				

Table-6 shows the number and percentage responses of the students to each option to the 5-item questionnaire based on gender.							
Item	Gender	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Chi Square Test
1	Female (1758)	451 (25.7%)	373 (21.2%)	146 (8.3%)	503 (28.6%)	285 (16.2%)	$\chi^2 = 32.68$ p < 0.000
	Male (2828)	914 (32.4%)	626 (22.1%)	205 (7.2%)	648 (22.9%)	435 (15.4%)	
2	Female (1758)	291 (16.5%)	780 (44.4%)	204(11.6%)	314 (17.9%)	169 (9.6%)	$\chi^2 = 3.55$ p = 0.470
	Male (2828)	475 (16.8%)	1201(42.5%)	329(11.6%)	506 (17.9%)	317 (11.2%)	
3	Female (1758)	392 (22.3%)	606 (34.5%)	272 (15.5%)	326 (18.5%)	162 (9.2%)	$\chi^2 = 27.36$ p < 0.000
	Male (2828)	808 (28.6%)	879 (31.1%)	383 (13.5%)	464 (16.4%)	294 (10.4%)	
4	Female (1758)	549 (31.1%)	792 (45.1%)	128 (7.3%)	170 (9.7%)	119 (6.8%)	$\chi^2 = 16.53$ p = 0.002
	Male (2828)	997 (35.4%)	1189(42.0%)	236 (8.3%)	270 (9.5%)	136 (4.8%)	
5	Female (1758)	420 (23.8%)	501 (28.5%)	225 (12.8%)	386 (22.0%)	226 (12.9%)	$\chi^2 = 6.26$ p = 0.122
	Male (2828)	749 (26.5%)	796 (28.1%)	319 (11.3%)	573 (20.3%)	391 (13.8%)	

Table-7

Table-7 shows the number and percentage responses of students to 5-item questionnaire based on the programs in which they are registered							
Item Number	Program	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Chi Square Test
1	PhD (132)	30 (22.7%)	38 (28.8%)	13 (9.9%)	42 (31.8%)	9 (6.8%)	$\chi^2 = 72.44$ p < 0.000
	Postgraduate (1406)	372 (26.5%)	248 (17.6%)	98 (7.0%)	419 (29.8%)	269 (19.1%)	
	Undergraduate (3048)	963 (31.6%)	713 (23.4%)	240 (7.9%)	690 (22.6%)	442 (14.5%)	
2	PhD (132)	19 (14.4%)	55 (41.7%)	23 (17.4%)	26 (19.7%)	9 (6.8%)	$\chi^2 = 104.2$ p < 0.000
	Postgraduate (1406)	172 (12.3%)	537 (38.2%)	172 (12.2%)	314 (22.3%)	211 (15.0%)	
	Undergraduate (3048)	575 (18.9%)	1389 (45.6%)	338 (11.1%)	480 (15.7%)	266 (8.7%)	
3	PhD (132)	24 (18.2%)	51 (38.6%)	29 (22.0%)	21 (15.9%)	7 (5.3%)	$\chi^2 = 54.73$ p < 0.000
	Postgraduate (1406)	326 (23.2%)	422 (30.0%)	187 (13.3%)	303 (21.6%)	168 (11.9%)	
	Undergraduate (3048)	850 (27.9%)	1012 (33.2%)	439 (14.4%)	466 (15.3%)	281 (9.2%)	
4	PhD (132)	52 (39.4%)	58 (43.9%)	9 (6.8%)	10 (7.6%)	3 (2.3%)	$\chi^2 = 35.60$ p < 0.000
	Postgraduate (1406)	425 (30.3%)	612 (43.5%)	105 (7.5%)	151 (10.7%)	113 (8.0%)	
	Undergraduate (3048)	1069 (35.1%)	1311 (43.0%)	250 (8.2%)	279 (9.2%)	139 (4.5%)	
5	PhD (132)	28 (21.2%)	38 (28.8%)	21 (15.9%)	30 (22.7%)	15 (11.4%)	$\chi^2 = 44.38$ p < 0.000
	Postgraduate (1406)	364 (25.8%)	336 (23.9%)	140 (10.0%)	336 (23.9%)	230 (16.4%)	
	Undergraduate (3048)	777 (25.4%)	923 (30.3%)	383 (12.6%)	593 (19.5%)	372 (12.2%)	

Table-8. Mean scores for each of the five items in the 5-item questionnaire for different faculties.

Faculty	Number of students	Q1 Mean (SD)	Q2 Mean (SD)	Q3 Mean (SD)	Q4 Mean (SD)	Q5 Mean (SD)
Agriculture	301	2.61 (1.446)	2.29 (1.222)	2.40 (1.220)	1.88 (.981)	2.55 (1.314)
Arts	1042	2.66 (1.569)	2.71 (1.335)	2.43 (1.360)	2.15 (1.177)	2.71(1.497)
Ayurveda	80	2.21 (1.144)	2.75 (0.921)	2.51 (1.055)	2.08 (0.823)	1.96 (0.878)
Commerce	304	3.45 (1.425)	2.82 (1.316)	3.07 (1.489)	1.90 (1.055)	3.09 (1.417)
Dental Sciences	34	2.32 (1.224)	2.68 (1.121)	2.68 (1.224)	1.91 (0.866)	2.29 (1.142)
Education	68	2.93 (1.308)	2.79 (1.140)	2.94 (1.170)	2.09 (1.168)	3.43 (1.262)
Environmental Sciences	18	3.28 (1.364)	3.22 (1.215)	3.17 (1.150)	1.89 (1.132)	2.72 (1.364)
Law	199	3.20 (1.337)	3.34 (1.203)	3.31 (1.223)	2.37 (1.143)	3.22 (1.238)
Women's College	442	3.02 (1.363)	2.27 (1.096)	2.30 (1.118)	2.07 (1.135)	2.58 (1.276)
Management	63	3.56 (1.254)	2.21 (0.970)	2.63 (1.140)	1.95 (0.974)	2.81 (1.203)
Medicine	231	2.19 (1.249)	2.49 (1.219)	2.73 (1.361)	2.03 (1.067)	2.26 (1.266)
Performing Arts	189	1.31 (0.821)	2.15 (0.686)	2.26 (1.234)	2.11 (0.978)	2.08(1.471)
Sanskrit Studies	148	2.58 (1.498)	2.60 (1.165)	2.45 (1.039)	2.30 (1.292)	2.70 (1.532)
Science	881	2.81 (1.439)	2.48 (1.180)	2.25 (1.180)	1.90 (0.964)	2.51 (1.240)
Social Sciences	467	2.93 (1.559)	3.04 (1.300)	2.67 (1.394)	2.57 (1.390)	3.11 (1.477)
Visual Arts	119	2.71 (1.485)	2.74 (1.374)	2.96 (1.440)	2.08 (1.222)	2.77 (1.362)
Total	4586	2.75 (1.492)	2.62 (1.250)	2.52 (1.309)	2.10 (1.136)	2.69 (1.397)