Factors of risk behaviors for exposure to endocrine disruptors in female college students in Korea*

* This research was supported by Basic Science Research Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea(NRF) funded by the Ministry of Education(NRF-2015R1D1A3A01017746)

¹⁾ SoMi Park, ²⁾ ChaeWeon Chung

1) PhD, RN, Professor, Institute for Well Aging, Wonju College of Medicine, Yonsei University, Wonju, South Korea.

2) PhD, RN, Professor, College of Nursing, Research Institute of Nursing Science, Seoul National University, Seoul, South Korea.

Background & Purpose

Environmental hormones are known to affect women's health, inducing endocrine imbalances and reproductive health issues.

- As college students live more independently, they consume more fast food, disposable products, and convenient household items, which make them exposed to more \bullet environmental hormones. Protecting women's reproductive health is crucial for the succession of health to the next generation.
- > This study examined the factors associated with risk behaviors for exposure to endocrine disruptors in female college students in Korea.

Method

Design

Result

A cross-sectional correlative study \bullet

Conceptual Framework

Predisposing factors

Sample & Data collection procedure

- **Sample**: 199 female college students
- Sampling procedure: convenient sampling in campus of university from \bullet September to October in 2015
- **Data Collection method**: A questionnaire survey

	 Interest in concern of health Concern about endocrine disruptors Perception of endocrine disruptor related female reproductive health 	
Demographic	Reinforcing factors	Behaviors of
characteristics	History of illness	exposing to
• grade • major	 Menstrual problem Self-appraisal of exposure to endocrine disruptors 	endocrine disruptors
· economic level	Enable factors	
	 Participation in pro-environmental activity Informational necessity of endocrine disruptors Pro-environmental lifestyle 	

1. Distribution of study variables

(N=199))
---------	---

			n(%)		M±SD(Range)									
Interest in concern of health								6.35±2.14(1~10)						
Concern about endocrine disru	uptors				5.67±2.17(1~10)									
Perception of endocrine disrup					18.20±2.97(6~24)									
Menstrual problem						Yes		Q	94(47.2)				,	
•						No			05(52.8)					
self-appraisal of exposure to e	ors						17.55±4.07(8~32)							
nformational necessity of ende	· ·								18.08±4.37(6~24)					
articipation in pro-environme	•					Have d	one	1(05(52.8)			10.00±1.57(0 21))	
							one ot done		94(47.2)					
ro-environmental lifestyle								-	, ((,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			20.01±5.03(8~32))	
Endocrine disruptors endanger	ring behaviors										5	6.24±14.10(24~9	6)	
2. Differences in as	cocipting f	actors and	ondocrino	licruptore	ondona	oring hoh	aviors by p	articipant's	harac	torictics			(NL - 100)	
2. Differences in as	sociating to			listuptors	enuany	jering ben							(N=199)	
			Grade		Major					Economic level				
	1 st grade	2 ^{nd g} rade	3 rd grade	4 th grade	F/χ ²	Liberal art	Natural science	Physical education		highª	middle ^b	low ^c	F/χ2	
	(n=69)	(n=37)	(n=42)	(n=51)	(p)	(n=106)	(n=75)	(n=18)	(p)	(n=36)	(n=152)	(n=11)	(p)	
		N	1±SD/f(%)			M±SD/f(%)					M±SD/f(%)			
terest in concern of health	6.04±2.40	6.16±2.08	6.54±2.05	6.74±1.84	1.26 (.287)	6.16±2.21	6.60±1.95	6.38±2.42	0.88 (.414)	7.55±1.48	6.04±2.18	6.63±2.11	7.28 (.001) a>b	
oncern about endocrine	5.66±2.11	5.48±2.38	5.26±2.13	6.17±2.10	1.51	5.58±2.06	5.89±2.32	5.33±2.27	0.68	6.58±2.01	5.42±2.17	6.27±1.90	4.75	
sruptors rception of endocrine	18/36±2.52	17.70±3.25	17.92±3.12	18.58±3.18	(.214) 0.82	17.79±3.00	18.72±2.72	18.50±3.52	(.505) 2.26	18.33±2.62	18.21±3.04	17.72±3.19	(.010) a>b 0.17	
sruptor related female	10/50±2.52	17.70±3.25	17.32 - 3.12	10.50±5.10	(.485)	17.75±5.00	10.72 ± 2.72	10.50±5.52	(.106)	10.35±2.02	10.21 ± 3.04	17.72±3.13	(.840)	
productive health														
enstrual problem Yes(94)	37(18.6) 32(16.1)	16(8.0) 21(10.6)	16(8.0) 26(13.1)	25(12.6) 26(13.1)	2.83 (.417)	48(24.1) 58(29.1)	37(18.6) 38(19.1)	9(4.5) 9(4.5)	0.35 (.840)	20(10.1) 16(8.0)	69(34.7) 83(41.7)	5(2.5) 6(3.0)	1.21 (.543)	
No(105) If-appraisal of exposure to	17.89±3.98	16.81±3.25	18.61±5.45	17.21±4.25	1.40	17.62±4.58	17.48±3.94	18.77±4.65	.659	17.94±6.07	17.67±3.87	16.81±4.28	.28	
docrine disruptors					(.243)				(.519)				(.756)	
formational necessity of	18.47±4.55	17.70±3.25	17.38±3.88	18.33±4.64	0.66	18.03±4.83	18.12±3.71	18.16±4.28	0.01	19.41±2.98	17.80±4.59	17.54 ± 4.56	2.09	
					(.579)				(.989)				(.126)	
-		20(1/1)	18(9.2)	25(12.6)	3.04	52(26.1) 54(27.1)	41(20.6)	12(6.0)	2.08	29(14.6) 7(2.5)	73(36.7)	3(1.5)	15.39	
rticipation in pro-envir Yes(105)	41(20.6)	28(14.1)		2(121)		54(7/1)	34(17.1)	6(3.0)	(.352)	7(3.5)	79(39.7)	8(4.0)	(<.001)	
rticipation in pro-envir Yes(105) mental activity No(94)	28(14.1)	16(18.0)	24(12.1)	26(13.1)	(.333)			1010.400	0.01	10 41 . 2 22	1700.450		2.00	
formational necessity of				26(13.1) 18.33±4.64	0.66	18.03±4.83	18.12±3.71	18.16±4.28	0.01	19.41±2.98	17.80±4.59	17.54±4.56	2.09	
rticipation in pro-envir Yes(105) mental activity No(94) formational necessity of docrine disruptors	28(14.1) 18.47±4.55	16(18.0) 17.70±3.25	24(12.1) 17.38±3.88	18.33±4.64	0.66 (.579)	18.03±4.83	18.12±3.71		(.989)				(.126)	
ndocrine disruptors articipation in pro-envir mental activity formational necessity of ndocrine disruptors ro-environmental lifestyle	28(14.1)	16(18.0)	24(12.1)		0.66 (.579) 0.59			18.16±4.28 21.83±6.66	(.989) 2.26	19.41±2.98 23.66±4.63	17.80±4.59 19.25±4.81	17.54±4.56 18.45±4.27		
rticipation in pro-envir Yes(105) mental activity No(94) formational necessity of docrine disruptors	28(14.1) 18.47±4.55	16(18.0) 17.70±3.25	24(12.1) 17.38±3.88	18.33±4.64	0.66 (.579)	18.03±4.83	18.12±3.71		(.989)				(.126) 13.14	

3. Hierarchical regression analysis for factors associated endocrine disruptors endangering behaviors															(N=199)		
Factors		Model1			Model2				Model3				Model4				
	β	t	р	VIF	β	t	p	VIF	β	t	р	VIF	β	t	р	VIF	
Demographic																	
D1	349	-5.224	<.001	1.000	222	-3.589	<.001	1.092	218	-4.386	<.001	1.099	146	-3.028	.003	1.207	

Predisposing

P1		258	-4.028	<.001	1.171	165	-3.107	.002	1.257	091	-1.770	.078	1.351	
P2		314	-4.988	<.001	1.131	006	097	.923	1.547	112	-1.933	.055	1.724	
P3		117	-1.968	.051	1.013	120	-2.497	.013	1.032	120	-2.687	.008	1.034	
Reinforcing														
R1						-0.78	-1.606	.110	1.052	070	-1.541	.125	1.055	
R2						001	026	.979	1.025	012	276	.783	1.036	
R3						603	-10.192	<.001	1.556	446	-7.279	<.001	1.940	
Enable														
E1										019	396	.693	1.213	
E2										382	-5.576	<.001	1.989	
F(<i>p</i>)	27.289(<.001_)	23.072(<.001)					36.120	(<.001)		36.373(<.001)				
R ²	.117	.308				.554				.617				
R ² change		.201					.24	17			.064			

D1=economic level (high=1), P1= Interest in concern of health, P2= Concern about endocrine disruptors, P3= Perception of endocrine disruptor related female reproductive health R1= Menstrual problem (yes=1), R2= Self-appraisal of exposure to endocrine disruptors R3= Informational necessity of endocrine disruptors E1= Participation in pro-environmental activity, E2= Pro-environmental lifestyle

Conclusion

> Women with less sense of need for information about endocrine disruptors and a poor pro-environmental lifestyle engage in more risk behaviors for exposure to endocrine disruptors. > Education should include practical information about endocrine disruptors and should focus on leading young women to a pro-environmental lifestyle.