



LIFESTYLE OF HEALTH AND SUSTAINABILITY (LOHAS) OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS OF PURULIA DISTRICT OF WEST BENGAL

Bishal Das¹, Prasanta Gayen², Dr. Subir Sen³

¹Student, Department of Education, Sidho-Kanho-Birsha University, Purulia, West Bengal, India

²Research Scholar, Department of Education, Sidho-Kanho-Birsha University, Purulia, West Bengal, India

³Associate Professor, Department of Education, Sidho-Kanho-Birsha University, Purulia, West Bengal, India

Corresponding Author: Prasanta Gayen

ABSTRACT

Sustainable lifestyle refers to the positive impact of humans on the environment, society and economy. This concept encourages the use of natural resources, while also supporting human well-being. A sustainable lifestyle has become increasingly prominent in linking people and the environment. Human health and environmental stability are inextricably linked, with one significantly influencing the other. Present work aims to compare lifestyle of health and sustainability (LOHAS), physical fitness, mental health, emotional health, spiritual health, environmentalism, and social consciousness of undergraduate students of Purulia District of West Bengal, India in regard to stream, location and gender. The researchers used descriptive survey method. "Lifestyles of Health and Sustainability Scale" by Choi and Feinberg (2021) has been used in this study to collect the data randomly from 151 undergraduate students of Purulia district of West Bengal. The collected data has been analysed by using appropriate descriptive and inferential statistics. The result revealed no significance differences in LOHAS, physical fitness, mental health, emotional health, spiritual health, environmentalism, and social consciousness between science and arts, rural and urban, & male and female undergraduate students of Purulia district of West Bengal, India.

KEYWORDS: Lifestyle of Health and Sustainability (LOHAS), Physical Fitness, Mental Health, Emotional Health, Spiritual Health, Environmentalism, Social Consciousness.

INTRODUCTION

In an era marked by rapid globalization and technological advancements, the world is facing multifaceted challenges that affect the health and well-being of individuals and the sustainability of our planet. Sustainable living is the key to securing a better future for our planet with practical steps towards waste reduction, renewable energy adoption, ethical consumption, and community involvement (Robinson & Patel, 2018). Sustainable lifestyle is a way of living that seeks to promote the impact of human activities on the environment, society and economy. This concept promotes the use of natural resources in a responsible and sustainable manner, while also supporting human well-being. Through the mindful embrace of sustainable living, urban dwellers can not only safeguard the environment from undue harm but also elevate their well-being to new heights (Brown, 2022). In recent years, the issue of environmental degradation and resource depletion has gained widespread recognition and concern. The growing awareness of the long-term effects of unsustainable practices has led to a growing interest in sustainable lifestyles. Sustainability as an attainable reality by unravelling its concepts and advocating for informed decisions and mindful consumption (Martinez, 2021). A sustainable lifestyle is not just about the environment, but also about promoting social justice, health, and well-being. Individuals to actively engage in eco-friendly practices and embrace a sustainable lifestyle for a greener future (Jackson, 2019). By making small changes in our daily lives, we can collectively have a positive impact on the planet and help ensure its resources are preserved for future generations. Additionally, a sustainable lifestyle often involves buying locally produced and organic food, reducing waste by composting, recycling, and reducing consumption, and supporting environmentally-friendly products and businesses. The power of everyday actions embraces eco-conscious living through small yet impactful changes, fostering a greener world for future generations (Johnson, 2020).



LITERATURE REVIEW

Mishra (2022) conducted a study on health-related lifestyle and health risk behaviour among college going adolescents in Bhubaneswar and found that most of the adolescents exhibited healthy lifestyle habits by following strict dietary routine, doing regular physical activity, having a minimal screen time and in not engaging much in substance abuse habits. Choudhary & Kar (2022) made a study on promotion of school health education in tribal area of Maharashtra and found that although the current status of School Health Education (SHE) in tribal schools is not satisfactory, in order to make progress on par with developed countries, special attention needs to be paid to SHE to increase per capita income and overall national income. A study by Dikshit & Pandey (2022) on impact of media convergence on socio economic status and lifestyle and found that media convergence has positively transformed rural lifestyle through enhanced access to authentic information, digital banking, and government schemes via smartphones and other converging media forms. Panda & Sangle (2021) performed a study to investigate the relationship between sustainable development strategies and social license and it is found that practices pollution prevention strategies, product stewardship strategies and sustainability vision strategies are in a better position to gain and maintain social license to operate and social license to innovate. De & Sain (2021) directed a study on lifestyle diseases in contemporary Kolkata and found that there is balance between traditional concepts and present-day challenges in maintaining a proper lifestyle in the city. A study conducted by Bade & Pote (2020) on health-related physical fitness, mental health and lifestyle status of different professionals and found Panchayat Samiti professionals display superior physical fitness and mental health, whereas Nagarpalica professionals surpass Tahasil professionals in terms of both physical fitness and mental health. Matharu, Jain & Bulsara (2020) conducted a study on sustainable marketing with special reference to lifestyle of health and sustainability in Delhi NCR and found positive relationship between consumers' attitudes and intentions towards sustainable product consumption. Kumari & Garg (2020) conducted a study on lifestyle, mental health and quality of life amongst team and combative sports players of Haryana and found a statistically significant difference in the health-conscious lifestyle of hockey players compared to football and wrestling players, with hockey players exhibiting a higher level of health consciousness. Yadav, Juneja & Chauhan (2020) conducted a study on sustainable utilization of floral waste from some temples of Jaipur Rajasthan and found that popular temples in Jaipur city primarily generated biodegradable waste. Reetu and Joshi (2019) conducted a study on Sustainable Lifestyle and Development Issues in Uttarakhand and found that the current state of development in Uttarakhand falls short in providing sustainable lifestyles and a good quality of life for its people.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Following objectives are taken into consideration to carry out the research work:

1. To compare LOHAS, physical fitness, mental health, emotional health, spiritual health, environmentalism, and social consciousness of undergraduate students in regard to stream.
2. To compare LOHAS, physical fitness, mental health, emotional health, spiritual health, environmentalism, and social consciousness of undergraduate students in regard to location.
3. To compare LOHAS, physical fitness, mental health, emotional health, spiritual health, environmentalism, and social consciousness of undergraduate students in regard to gender.

HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

To reach the above-mentioned objectives following hypotheses are framed:

H₀₁: There is no significant difference in LOHAS, physical fitness, mental health, emotional health, spiritual health, environmentalism, and social consciousness between science and arts undergraduate students.

H₀₂: There is no significant difference in LOHAS, physical fitness, mental health, emotional health, spiritual health, environmentalism, and social consciousness between rural and urban undergraduate students.

H₀₃: There is no significant difference in LOHAS, physical fitness, mental health, emotional health, spiritual health, environmentalism, and social consciousness between male and female undergraduate students.

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

- i. Method:** Descriptive Survey method has been used in this study. This is a quantitative as well as qualitative study conducted in Purulia district of West Bengal.
- ii. Population:** The population of this study includes all the undergraduate students studying in colleges and universities in Purulia district of West Bengal.
- iii. Sample and Sampling Technique:** A sum of 151 undergraduate students has been selected through a random sampling technique.
- iv. Tools used:** "*Lifestyles of Health and Sustainability Scale*" by Choi and Feinberg (2021) has been used to collect the data from samples of undergraduate students.



- v. **Statistics Used:** Descriptive statistics like central tendency, measure of dispersion and inferential statistics like t-test have been used in this study to analyse the data. Descriptive and inferential statistics were computed using SPSS version 26.0.
- vi. **Variables:**
 - a. **Independent Variables:** Stream (arts and science), location (rural and urban) and gender (male and female) have been considered as independent variables in this present study.
 - b. **Dependent variables:** LOHAS, Physical Fitness, Mental Health, Emotional Health, Spiritual Health, Environmentalism, Social Consciousness have been considered as dependent variables in this present study.

RESULTS & DISCUSSIONS

Hypothesis Testing 1: Here the null hypothesis (H_{01}) “There is no significant difference in LOHAS, physical fitness, mental health, emotional health, spiritual health, environmentalism, and social consciousness between science and arts undergraduate students” can be divided into 7 sub null hypotheses as follows:

- H_{01a} : “There is no significant difference in LOHAS between science and arts undergraduate students”.
- H_{01b} : “There is no significant difference in physical fitness between science and arts undergraduate students”.
- H_{01c} : “There is no significant difference in mental health between science and arts undergraduate students”.
- H_{01d} : “There is no significant difference in emotional health between science and arts undergraduate students”.
- H_{01e} : “There is no significant difference in spiritual health between science and arts undergraduate students”.
- H_{01f} : “There is no significant difference in environmentalism between science and arts undergraduate students”.
- H_{01g} : “There is no significant difference in social consciousness between science and arts undergraduate students”.

Independent Sample t test (Science vs Arts)

| | Stream | Mean | SD | MD | df | Calculated t-value | Sig. (2 tailed) | Remarks |
|----------------------|---------|--------|--------|------|-----|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| LOHAS | Science | 105.94 | 11.590 | 1.41 | 149 | .445 | .657 | Not Significant |
| | Arts | 104.53 | 16.632 | | | | | |
| Physical Fitness | Science | 18.55 | 3.501 | .78 | 149 | .919 | .359 | Not Significant |
| | Arts | 17.77 | 4.382 | | | | | |
| Mental Health | Science | 11.42 | 1.893 | .12 | 149 | .246 | .806 | Not Significant |
| | Arts | 11.30 | 2.526 | | | | | |
| Emotional Health | Science | 15.13 | 2.742 | .05 | 149 | -.074 | .941 | Not Significant |
| | Arts | 15.18 | 3.159 | | | | | |
| Spiritual Health | Science | 9.35 | 3.611 | 1.03 | 149 | -1.849 | .066 | Not Significant |
| | Arts | 10.38 | 2.501 | | | | | |
| Environmentalism | Science | 39.39 | 4.609 | 1.01 | 149 | .763 | .447 | Not Significant |
| | Arts | 38.38 | 6.934 | | | | | |
| Social Consciousness | Science | 12.10 | 2.241 | .58 | 149 | 1.231 | .220 | Not Significant |
| | Arts | 11.52 | 2.362 | | | | | |

N=151 (Science=31 & Arts=120)

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics along with ‘t’ value of LOHAS, and its components between science and arts undergraduate students of Purulia District of West Bengal

Table 1 shows the mean scores, standard deviation, and mean difference of LOHAS, physical fitness, mental health, emotional health, spiritual health, environmentalism, and social consciousness of science and arts undergraduate students of Purulia district of West Bengal.

(a) The calculated t-value (.445) of LOHAS between science and arts undergraduate students is less than the critical value (Sig. 0.657) for the degree of freedom 149. So, the null hypothesis (H_{01a}) “There is no significant difference in LOHAS between science and arts undergraduate students” is accepted.

(b) The calculated t-value (.919) of physical fitness between science and arts undergraduate students is less than the critical value (Sig. 0.359) for the degree of freedom 149. So, the null hypothesis (H_{01b}) “There is no significant difference in physical fitness between science and arts undergraduate students” is accepted.



- (c) The calculated t-value (.246) of mental health between science and arts undergraduate students is less than the critical value (Sig. 0.806) for the degree of freedom 149. So, the null hypothesis (H_{01c}) “There is no significant difference in mental health between science and arts undergraduate students” is accepted.
- (d) The calculated t-value (-.074) of emotional health between science and arts undergraduate students is less than the critical value (Sig. 0.941) for the degree of freedom 149. So, the null hypothesis (H_{01d}) “There is no significant difference in emotional health between science and arts undergraduate students” is accepted.
- (e) The calculated t-value (-1.849) of spiritual health between science and arts undergraduate students is less than the critical value (Sig. 0.066) for the degree of freedom 149. So, the null hypothesis (H_{01e}) “There is no significant difference in spiritual health between science and arts undergraduate students” is accepted.
- (f) The calculated t-value (.763) of environmentalism between science and arts undergraduate students is less than the critical value (Sig. 0.447) for the degree of freedom 149. So, the null hypothesis (H_{01f}) “There is no significant difference in environmentalism between science and arts undergraduate students” is accepted.
- (g) The calculated t-value (1.231) of social consciousness between science and arts undergraduate students is less than the critical value (Sig. 0.220) for the degree of freedom 149. So, the null hypothesis (H_{01g}) “There is no significant difference in social consciousness between science and arts undergraduate students” is accepted.

Hypothesis Testing 2: Here the null hypothesis (H_{02}) “There is no significant difference in LOHAS, physical fitness, mental health, emotional health, spiritual health, environmentalism, and social consciousness between rural and urban undergraduate students” can be divided into 7 sub null hypotheses as follows:

- H_{02a} : “There is no significant difference in LOHAS between rural and urban undergraduate students”.
- H_{02b} : “There is no significant difference in physical fitness between rural and urban undergraduate students”.
- H_{02c} : “There is no significant difference in mental health between rural and urban undergraduate students”.
- H_{02d} : “There is no significant difference in emotional health between rural and urban undergraduate students”.
- H_{02e} : “There is no significant difference in spiritual health between rural and urban undergraduate students”.
- H_{02f} : “There is no significant difference in environmentalism between rural and urban undergraduate students”.
- H_{02g} : “There is no significant difference in social consciousness between rural and urban undergraduate students”.

Independent Sample t test (Rural vs Urban)

| | Locality | Mean | SD | MD | df | Calculated t-value | Sig. (2 tailed) | Remarks |
|----------------------|----------|--------|--------|------|-----|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| LOHAS | Rural | 103.98 | 16.893 | 3.00 | 149 | -1.050 | .295 | Not Significant |
| | Urban | 106.98 | 12.001 | | | | | |
| Physical Fitness | Rural | 17.94 | 4.379 | .04 | 149 | .040 | .968 | Not Significant |
| | Urban | 17.90 | 3.818 | | | | | |
| Mental Health | Rural | 11.23 | 2.591 | .34 | 149 | -.782 | .435 | Not Significant |
| | Urban | 11.57 | 1.837 | | | | | |
| Emotional Health | Rural | 15.06 | 3.201 | .37 | 149 | -.652 | .515 | Not Significant |
| | Urban | 15.43 | 2.715 | | | | | |
| Spiritual Health | Rural | 10.06 | 2.652 | .42 | 149 | -.832 | .406 | Not Significant |
| | Urban | 10.48 | 3.110 | | | | | |
| Environmentalism | Rural | 38.19 | 6.757 | 1.43 | 149 | -1.206 | .230 | Not Significant |
| | Urban | 39.62 | 5.827 | | | | | |
| Social Consciousness | Rural | 11.50 | 2.433 | .48 | 149 | -1.109 | .269 | Not Significant |
| | Urban | 11.98 | 2.078 | | | | | |

N=151 (Rural=109 & Urban=42)

Table 2 Descriptive Statistics along with ‘t’ value of LOHAS, and its components between rural and urban undergraduate students of Purulia District of West Bengal

Table 2 shows the mean scores, standard deviation and mean difference of LOHAS, physical fitness, mental health, emotional health, spiritual health, environmentalism, and social consciousness of rural and urban undergraduate students of Purulia district of West Bengal.

- (a) The calculated t-value (-1.050) of LOHAS between rural and urban undergraduate students is less than the critical value (.295). So, the null hypothesis (H_{02a}) “There is no significant difference in LOHAS between rural and urban undergraduate students” is accepted.



- (b) The calculated t-value (.040) of physical fitness between rural and urban undergraduate students is less than the critical value (.968). So, the null hypothesis (H_{02b}) "There is no significant difference in physical fitness between rural and urban undergraduate students" is accepted.
- (c) The calculated t-value (-.782) of mental health between rural and urban undergraduate students is less than the critical value (Sig. 0.435). So, the null hypothesis (H_{02c}) "There is no significant difference in mental health between rural and urban undergraduate students" is accepted.
- (d) The calculated t-value (-.652) of emotional health between rural and urban undergraduate students is less than the critical value (Sig. 0.515). So, the null hypothesis (H_{02d}) "There is no significant difference in emotional health between rural and urban undergraduate students" is accepted.
- (e) The calculated t-value (-.832) of spiritual health between rural and urban undergraduate students is less than the critical value (Sig. 0.406). So, the null hypothesis (H_{02e}) "There is no significant difference in spiritual health between rural and urban undergraduate students" is accepted.
- (f) The calculated t-value (-1.206) of environmentalism between rural and urban undergraduate students is less than the critical value (Sig. 0.230). So, the null hypothesis (H_{02f}) "There is no significant difference in environmentalism between rural and urban undergraduate students" is accepted.
- (g) The calculated t-value (-1.109) of social consciousness between rural and urban undergraduate students is less than the critical value (Sig. 0.269). So, the null hypothesis (H_{02g}) "There is no significant difference in social consciousness between rural and urban undergraduate students" is accepted.

Hypothesis Testing 3: Here the null hypothesis (H_{03}) "There is no significant difference in LOHAS, physical fitness, mental health, emotional health, spiritual health, environmentalism, and social consciousness between male and female undergraduate students" can be divided into 7 sub null hypotheses as follows:

- (H_{03a}) "There is no significant difference in LOHAS between male and female undergraduate students".
- (H_{03b}) "There is no significant difference in physical fitness between male and female undergraduate students".
- (H_{03c}) "There is no significant difference in mental health between male and female undergraduate students".
- (H_{03d}) "There is no significant difference in emotional health between male and female undergraduate students".
- (H_{03e}) "There is no significant difference in spiritual health between male and female undergraduate students".
- (H_{03f}) "There is no significant difference in environmentalism between male and female undergraduate students".
- (H_{03g}) "There is no significant difference in social consciousness between male and female undergraduate students".

Independent Sample t test (Male vs Female)

| | Gender | Mean | SD | MD | df | Calculated t-value | Sig. (2 tailed) | Remarks |
|----------------------|--------|--------|--------|------|-----|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| LOHAS | Male | 103.92 | 17.920 | 2.51 | 149 | -.940 | .349 | Not Significant |
| | Female | 106.43 | 10.597 | | | | | |
| Physical Fitness | Male | 17.91 | 4.395 | .05 | 149 | -.078 | .938 | Not Significant |
| | Female | 17.96 | 3.919 | | | | | |
| Mental Health | Male | 11.25 | 2.658 | .21 | 149 | -.527 | .599 | Not Significant |
| | Female | 11.46 | 1.881 | | | | | |
| Emotional Health | Male | 15.18 | 3.416 | .03 | 149 | .052 | .959 | Not Significant |
| | Female | 15.15 | 2.350 | | | | | |
| Spiritual Health | Male | 9.99 | 2.793 | .51 | 149 | -1.081 | .282 | Not Significant |
| | Female | 10.50 | 2.759 | | | | | |
| Environmentalism | Male | 38.14 | 7.324 | 1.25 | 149 | -1.125 | .263 | Not Significant |
| | Female | 39.39 | 4.720 | | | | | |
| Social Consciousness | Male | 11.45 | 2.598 | .51 | 149 | -1.284 | .201 | Not Significant |
| | Female | 11.96 | 1.769 | | | | | |

N=151 (Male=97 & Female=54)

Table 3 Descriptive Statistics along with 't' value of LOHAS, and its components between male and female undergraduate students of Purulia District of West Bengal

Table 3 shows the mean scores, standard deviation and mean difference of LOHAS, physical fitness, mental health, emotional health, spiritual health, environmentalism, and social consciousness of male and female undergraduate students of Purulia district of West Bengal.



(a) The calculated t-value (-.940) of LOHAS between male and female undergraduate students is less than the critical value (sig. 0.349). So, the null hypothesis (H_{03a}) "There is no significant difference in LOHAS between male and female undergraduate students" is accepted.

(b) The calculated t-value (-.078) of physical fitness between male and female undergraduate students is less than the critical value (sig. 0.938). So, the null hypothesis (H_{03b}) "There is no significant difference in physical fitness between male and female undergraduate students" is accepted.

(c) The calculated t-value (-.527) of mental health between male and female undergraduate students is less than the critical value (sig. 0.599). So, the null hypothesis (H_{03c}) "There is no significant difference in mental health between male and female undergraduate students" is accepted.

(d) The calculated t-value (.052) of emotional health between male and female undergraduate students is less than the critical value (sig. 0.959). So, the null hypothesis (H_{03d}) "There is no significant difference in emotional health between male and female undergraduate students" is accepted.

(e) The calculated t-value (-1.081) of spiritual health between male and female undergraduate students is less than the critical value (sig. 0.282). So, the null hypothesis (H_{03e}) "There is no significant difference in spiritual health between male and female undergraduate students" is accepted.

(f) The calculated t-value (-1.125) of environmentalism between male and female undergraduate students is less than the critical value (sig. 0.263). So, the null hypothesis (H_{03f}) "There is no significant difference in environmentalism between male and female undergraduate students" is accepted.

(g) The calculated t-value (-1.284) of social consciousness between male and female undergraduate students is less than the critical value (sig. 0.201). So, the null hypothesis (H_{03g}) "There is no significant difference in social consciousness between male and female undergraduate students" is accepted.

MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The findings of the study revealed that in terms of LOHAS, physical fitness, mental health, emotional health, spiritual health, environmentalism, and social consciousness, no statistically significant differences have been observed between science and arts, rural and urban, and male and female undergraduate students of Purulia district of West Bengal, India. It means both science and arts, rural and urban, and male and female undergraduate students have possessed same kind of LOHAS, physical fitness, mental health, emotional health, spiritual health, environmentalism, and social consciousness.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this research indicates that students who embrace LOHAS principles have satisfactory levels of physical fitness, mental health, emotional well-being, spiritual health, and environmental and social awareness. Further research can explore the factors that influence LOHAS adoption among students, as well as the potential impact of LOHAS education on their behaviours and attitudes towards health and sustainability.

REFERENCES

1. Bade, A. K., & Pote, B. S. (2020). A critical study of health-related physical fitness mental health and lifestyle status of different professionals. *Savitribai Phule Pune University, Maharashtra*.
2. Brown, S. L. (2022). Sustainable living in urban environments: Challenges and opportunities. *Urban Ecology Journal*, 19(5), 741-758.
3. Choi, S., & Feinberg, R. A. (2021). The LOHAS (Lifestyle of health and sustainability) scale development and validation. *Sustainability*, 13(4), 1598. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13041598>
4. Choudhary, S. S., & Kar, M. (2022). Promotion of school health education in tribal area Maharashtra sustainability approach. *Savitribai Phule Pune University, Maharashtra*.
5. De, N., & Sain, R. (2021). *The perceptions of lifestyle diseases in contemporary Kolkata: A sociological study*. Jadavpur University, Kolkata.
6. Dikshit, S., & Pandey, A. C. (2022). *Impact of Media Convergence on Socio Economic Status and Lifestyle*. University of Allahabad, Uttar Pradesh.
7. Jackson, E. (2019). *The green revolution: A comprehensive guide to sustainable living*. Harper Collins, New York.
8. Johnson, M. (2020). *Sustainable choices: A roadmap to eco-conscious living*. Green Press, San Francisco.
9. Kumari, P., & Garg, R. P. (2020). *A research report on a comparative study of lifestyle mental health and quality of life amongst team and combative sports players of Haryana*. Maharshi Dayanand University, Haryana.
10. Martinez, S. (2021). *Sustainable living made simple*. Greenway Books, Boston.
11. Matharu, M., Jain, R., & Bulsara, H. P. (2020). *Opportunities of sustainable marketing with special reference to lifestyle of health and sustainability LOHAS in Delhi NCR*. Amity University, Noida, Uttar Pradesh.
12. Mishra, A. (2022). *A study on the health-related lifestyle and health risk behaviour among college going adolescents in Bhubaneswar*. KIIT University, Bhubaneswar.



13. Panda, S. S., & Sangle, S. (2021). *A study to investigate the relationship between sustainable development strategies and social license to operate and innovate*. National Institute of Industrial Engineering (NITIE), Mumbai.
14. Reetu & Joshi, A. (2019). *Sustainable lifestyle and development issues in Uttarakhand*. Kumaun University, Uttarakhand.
15. Robinson, S., & Patel, R. (2018). *One earth, one chance: A handbook for sustainable living*. Earth Publishers, London, UK.
16. Yadav, I., Juneja, S. K., & Chauhan, S. (2020). *Sustainable utilization of floral waste from some temples of Jaipur Rajasthan*. IIS (Deemed to be University), Jaipur.