

1 **Title:** Are personal health literacy and school health literacy environment important to  
2 schoolteachers' health outcomes?

3

4 **Authors:** Rongmei Liu,<sup>1#</sup> Mingyang Yu,<sup>1#</sup> Qiuping Zhao,<sup>1\*</sup> Junfang Wang,<sup>1</sup> Yuxi Bai,<sup>1</sup>  
5 Hui Chen,<sup>1</sup> Xiaomo Yang,<sup>1</sup> Shuaibin Liu,<sup>2</sup> Orkan Okan,<sup>3</sup> Xinghan Chen,<sup>4</sup> Yuhan Xing,<sup>5</sup>  
6 Shuaijun Guo<sup>6,7\*</sup>

7

8 **Author affiliations:**

9 <sup>1</sup>Hypertension Prevention and Treatment Centre of Henan Province, Fuwai Central  
10 China Cardiovascular Hospital, Zhengzhou, China.

11 <sup>2</sup>Community Health Centre of Chaohe, Zhengzhou, China.

12 <sup>3</sup>School of Medicine and Health, Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany.

13 <sup>4</sup>College of Basic Medicine and Forensic Medicine, Henan University of Science and  
14 Technology, Luoyang, China.

15 <sup>5</sup>School of Public Health, Zhengzhou University, Zhengzhou, China.

16 <sup>6</sup>Centre for Community Child Health, Murdoch Children's Research Institute,  
17 Melbourne, Australia.

18 <sup>7</sup>Department of Pediatrics, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia.

19

20 **#Joint first author:** Rongmei Liu and Mingyang Yu contributed equally as first  
21 authors to this work.

22 **\*Joint corresponding authors:** Shuaijun Guo and Qiuping Zhao contributed equally

**NOTE:** This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

23 as corresponding authors to this work. [jun.guo@mcri.edu.au](mailto:jun.guo@mcri.edu.au) (SG) and

24 [qiupingzhao@zzu.edu.cn](mailto:qiupingzhao@zzu.edu.cn) (QZ)

25

26 **Short title:** Health literacy and health outcomes in schoolteachers

27 Abstract (max words: 300): 266

28 Main text: 4369

29 Tables: 4

30 References: 51

## 31 **ABSTRACT**

### 32 **Background**

33 While the relationship between an individual's personal health literacy and health  
34 outcomes is well-established, the role of the health literacy environment is often  
35 overlooked. This study aimed to examine the associations of personal health literacy  
36 and the school health literacy environment with health outcomes among schoolteachers.

37

### 38 **Methods**

39 A cross-sectional study was conducted in 11 schools in Zhengzhou, Henan, China.  
40 Using a self-administered questionnaire, teachers (N=7364) were surveyed collecting  
41 data on their sociodemographics, personal health literacy, the school health literacy  
42 environment, and four types of health outcomes (health status, health-compromising  
43 behaviours, health service use, and healthcare cost). Besides descriptive statistics, a  
44 series of logistic regression analyses were conducted.

45

### 46 **Results**

47 Overall, more than half of teachers (56.9%) had inadequate or problematic health  
48 literacy, while more than three-fifths (69.0%) perceived their school health literacy  
49 environment was less supportive. Teachers with inadequate health literacy had higher  
50 odds of poor health status (odds ratio (OR)=5.79, 95% CI=3.84, 8.73), at least one  
51 health-compromising behaviour (OR=2.90, 95% CI=2.29, 3.68), at least one health  
52 service use (OR=2.73, 95% CI=2.07, 3.61), and more healthcare cost (OR=2.51, 95%

53 CI=2.00, 3.16) than those with excellent health literacy, after adjusting for  
54 sociodemographics and school health literacy environment. Similarly, teachers who  
55 perceived low levels of supportive school health literacy environment had higher odds  
56 of poor health outcomes (ORs ranging from 1.13 to 1.78), after adjusting for  
57 sociodemographics and personal health literacy.

58

## 59 **Conclusion**

60 Both personal health literacy and school health literacy environment are important to  
61 schoolteachers' health outcomes. Educational programs and organisational change are  
62 needed to improve personal health literacy and school environments to improve  
63 teachers' health and well-being.

64

65 **Keywords:** personal health literacy, organisational health literacy, health outcomes,  
66 teachers, HLS<sub>19</sub>-Q12

## 67 INTRODUCTION

68 Health literacy is a fundamental determinant of health (1). Extant literature has shown  
69 that low health literacy is associated with a range of negative health outcomes,  
70 including poor health status, health-compromising behaviours, more health service use,  
71 and high healthcare costs (2, 3). In the global health promotion agenda of the World  
72 Health Organization (WHO) (4), addressing low health literacy is a part of the strategy  
73 to tackle health inequities (5). Many national governments and international  
74 organisations have integrated health literacy into their health agendas and initiatives  
75 and even developed national action plans to improve population health literacy and  
76 reduce health disparities (6, 7).

77

78 Health literacy is about how an individual manages health information in everyday life  
79 in order to make critical health judgments and inform healthy behaviours. Health  
80 literacy also includes communicating about health concerns and exchanging health  
81 knowledge and health information. However, health literacy goes beyond the individual  
82 and should be understood as an interactive outcome between personal health skills and  
83 the broad environment where an individual lives and with which it interacts concerning  
84 health and wellbeing (8). According to the Australian Commission on Safety and  
85 Quality in Health Care (ACSQHC) (9), health literacy has two components: personal  
86 health literacy and health literacy environment. Personal health literacy represents  
87 one's ability to access, understand, appraise, and apply health information to maintain  
88 and improve personal health, whereas health literacy environment refers to the system's

89 infrastructure, policies, processes, materials, people, and relationships that influence  
90 how people communicate with health information.

91

92 Currently, there have been a number of studies that examine the measures, levels,  
93 influencing factors, and impact of health literacy across populations (10-13). Findings  
94 from a recent European health literacy survey show that low health literacy is prevalent  
95 across countries, ranging from 25% in Slovakia to 72% in Germany (14). In China, the  
96 2021 national health literacy survey showed 74.6% of Chinese residents aged 15 to 69  
97 years had low health literacy. However, most existing studies focus on personal health  
98 literacy in adults, neglecting the role of health literacy environment, which is an integral  
99 part of understanding health literacy in its fullest sense. This is more so true when it  
100 comes to children and adolescents and settings relevant to their health and health  
101 literacy (15-17). Addressing this issue requires to take into account certain  
102 professionals working in school such as teachers.

103

104 Teachers play a crucial role in shaping the intellectual and emotional development of  
105 school-aged children, but also in the development of children's health literacy (18).  
106 They are uniquely positioned to deliver health education, equipping children with  
107 essential health knowledge, attitudes, and behaviours. In addition, they often engage  
108 with parents and communities (16), creating a holistic approach to developing  
109 children's health literacy that extends beyond the classroom. Understanding health  
110 literacy of teachers is of paramount importance as it not only influences their own health

111 and well-being, but also influences the way they provide health education and  
112 promotion programs, thus impacting children's health literacy (18).

113

114 Schools are formal educational organisations and offer infrastructures, resources, and  
115 environments that can enable the success of health education and health promotion  
116 programs (16), and in particular regarding school health literacy (19, 20). According to  
117 the Health Promoting School (HPS) framework (21), there are five key action areas of  
118 health promotion in the school setting, which includes: 1) building healthy public policy,  
119 2) creating supportive environments for health, 3) strengthening community action for  
120 health, 4) developing personal skills, and 5) re-orienting health services. Empirical  
121 evidence shows that all these components have a unique and critical role in equipping  
122 both children's and teacher's health literacy (22, 23), and fostering their health and  
123 well-being (24). Understanding school health literacy environment should be regarded  
124 as part of understanding teachers' health literacy to provide an overall picture of health  
125 literacy and its impact on their health outcomes.

126

127 Although it has been raised more than two decades ago (18), teachers' health literacy  
128 has only gained increasing attention as part of school health promotion programs in the  
129 last decade (18, 25). There have been several national (26, 27) and international studies  
130 (28-30) that examine the levels and influencing factors of teachers' health literacy.  
131 Findings from these studies show that teacher's health literacy is generally low and  
132 there are health literacy disparities by sociodemographics such as age, gender, and

133 marital status. However, very few studies have examined the impact of teachers' health  
134 literacy on health outcomes (22). Furthermore, the role of school health literacy  
135 environment is often overlooked. To fill these gaps, the present study aimed to  
136 investigate the associations of personal health literacy and school health literacy  
137 environment with teachers' health outcomes.

138

## 139 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### 140 **Participants and settings**

141 A cross-sectional study was designed to recruit teachers from 11 schools (five urban  
142 and six rural) in Zhengzhou, Henan Province, China, using convenience cluster  
143 sampling. Zhengzhou is the capital of Henan, which has a population of 1.28 million in  
144 2022. In brief, two districts (Jingkai District/Zhongmou County) were selected  
145 according to their socioeconomic levels, one representing high and the other  
146 representing low. Based on previous successful collaborations with schools, we  
147 selected five or six schools in each district (Jingkai District: three primary schools and  
148 two middle schools; Zhongmou County: four primary schools and two middle schools)  
149 according to the appropriateness of survey timing (class time or class break time). At  
150 each school, all teaching staff were invited to complete an online self-administered  
151 questionnaire via Wenjuanxing. Participants received written online information about  
152 the study (e.g., study aim, data collection methods, data storage) in Chinese. Written  
153 informed consent was obtained from all respondents prior to filling out the  
154 questionnaire. Participants were also informed that they could discontinue their



155 participation at any time. The ethical approval was granted for the study by the  
156 Institutional Review Board of Fuwai Central China Cardiovascular Hospital (Ethics ID:  
157 2022-32). Based on previous prevalence studies in Chinese teachers (31) and sample  
158 size calculation formula ( $n = \left(\frac{z^2 \times p(1-p)}{e^2}\right)$ ) (32), we estimated a sample size of at least  
159 232 in each district (where  $p=0.185$ ,  $z=1.96$ ,  $e=0.05$ ). Considering the potential non-  
160 response rate of 30%, the final sample size should be at least 664. Data collection was  
161 undertaken between 20 September 2022 and 13 June 2023. We used the Strengthening  
162 the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) checklist (33) as  
163 guidelines to ensure the reporting quality of the present study (see S1 Table).

164

## 165 **Questionnaire**

166 A Chinese version questionnaire was designed based on the research purpose to collect  
167 information on key sociodemographics, personal health literacy, school health literacy  
168 environment, and health outcomes. In total, there were four parts in this questionnaire  
169 (Part 1: You and Your Family; Part 2: Your Health Literacy; Part 3: Your School; Part  
170 4: Your Personal Health), with each part having 8 to 12 questions. The average time to  
171 complete the survey was 10 minutes.

172

## 173 ***Sociodemographics***

174 We collected socio-demographic information on geographic location (Jingkai  
175 District/Zhongmou County), school type (primary/secondary), participants' sex  
176 (male/female), age group (30 years or below/31-39 years/40 years or above), ethnicity

177 (Han/ethnic minorities), marital status (unmarried/married/divorced or widowed),  
178 highest educational level (Bachelor or above/Diploma or below), duration of teaching  
179 (1-4 years/5-9 years/10-14 years/15-19 years/20-24 years/25 years or more), subject of  
180 teaching (literacy/math/English/physics/chemistry/biology/history/geography/politics/  
181 Physical education/music/art/health/other/more than one subject), chronic health  
182 conditions (yes/no), health awareness in daily life (very important/not very important),  
183 and medical insurance (medical insurance for urban workers/medical insurance for  
184 urban and rural residents/rural cooperative medical insurance/commercial medical  
185 insurance) (34).

186

### 187 ***Personal health Literacy***

188 The European Health Literacy Population Survey 2019-2021 (HLS<sub>19</sub> -Q12) was used  
189 to measure teachers' personal health literacy (14). The HLS<sub>19</sub> -Q12 is a 12-item  
190 instrument to assess personal health literacy and was developed by the WHO Action  
191 Network on Measuring Population and Organizational Health Literacy (M-POHL)  
192 working group. The HLS<sub>19</sub> -Q12 is based on a matrix with 12 dimensions, which  
193 comprises of three health domains (health care, disease prevention, and health  
194 promotion) and four aspects of health information management (access, understand,  
195 evaluate, and use). Respondents answered each item (e.g., "*On a scale from very easy*  
196 *to very difficult, how easy would you say it is: to find out where to get professional help*  
197 *when you are ill?*") on a four-point Likert scale (1=very difficult, 4=very easy)  
198 concerning the experienced difficulty of each task. The Chinese version the HLS<sub>19</sub>-Q12

199 has shown excellent reliability and strong validity in the general population of Chinese  
200 adults (35). In the present study, our sample had Cronbach's alpha values of 0.92.

201

202 The total score of the HLS<sub>19</sub>-Q12 was calculated as the percentage (ranging from 0 to  
203 100) of items with valid responses that were answered with "very easy" or "easy"  
204 provided that at least 80% of the items contain valid responses (14). If less than 80% of  
205 the items contain valid responses, the score was coded as "missing." Higher scores of  
206 the HLS<sub>19</sub>-Q12 indicate higher levels of health literacy. A categorical variable of the  
207 HLS<sub>19</sub>-Q12 was also calculated based on the recommended cut-off points by WHO M-  
208 POHL working group (14) to show the population distribution of health literacy.

209

### 210 ***School health literacy environment***

211 School health literacy environment was assessed by the short form of the organisational  
212 health literacy of school questionnaire (OHLS-Q-SF) (20), which was developed based  
213 on the school organizational health literacy standards and indicators (36). The OHLS-  
214 Q-SF is the short form of the OHLS-Q (37) and consists of eight items that measure  
215 health literacy indicators across the whole school environment, including associated  
216 processes and structures regarding the promotion of health literacy. Participants  
217 answered each item (e.g., "*The design of everyday school life contributes to promoting*  
218 *health literacy at our school*") on a four-point scale (1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 =  
219 disagree, 4 = strongly disagree). The OHLS-Q-SF showed high reliability (Cronbach's  
220 alpha=0.97) and strong validity (comparative fit index=0.985, Tucker and Lewis's

221 index of fit=0.978, root mean square error of approximation=0.093 (95% CI=0.088,  
222 0.097) in our sample.

223

224 The OHLS-Q-SF total score (ranging 0 to 32) was summed by reversing the code of  
225 each item, with higher scores indicating higher levels of organisational health literacy  
226 in schools. In keeping with previous studies (38), we used the top 25% as a cut-off to  
227 indicate supportive school health literacy environment.

228

### 229 ***Health Outcomes***

230 *Health status*: Health status was assessed using a widely-used general self-report health  
231 question (*‘In general, would you say your health is?’* 1 = poor, 5 = excellent), which  
232 has demonstrated strong predictive validity with objective indicators of health and  
233 mortality (39). Poor health status was defined if participants answered “poor” or “fair”.

234

235 *Health-compromising behaviours*: Health-compromising behaviours were measured by  
236 three items derived from previously well-established surveys (40), which included  
237 cigarette smoking (*‘Are you smoking?’*; 1 = currently; 2 = ever; 3 = never), alcohol  
238 drinking (*‘Have you had any alcohol in the past 30 days? (more than half a bottle or a  
239 can of beer, a small cup of spirit, a glass of wine or yellow wine)’*; 1 = yes; 2 = no), and  
240 physical inactivity (*‘How many times have you exercised for 30 minutes or more in the  
241 past 30 days, such as running, walking, cycling, etc?’*; 1 = almost every day; 2 = several  
242 times a week; 3 = several times a month; 4 = almost not at all). Each item was first

243 dichotomised (cigarette smoking: yes = currently or ever/no = never); alcohol drinking:  
244 yes/no; physical inactivity: yes = several times a month or almost not at all /no = almost  
245 every day or several times a week)) and then a composite measure of health-  
246 compromising behaviours was created if participants had at least one health-  
247 compromising behaviour.

248

249 *Health service use:* Health service use was assessed by four items derived from  
250 previously well-established surveys (40), which included emergency service use (“*How*  
251 *many times have you used the emergency service in the last 12 months?*”), general  
252 practitioner service use (“*How many times have you been to see a doctor in the last 12*  
253 *months?*”), hospitalisation (“*How many times have you stayed in a hospital for*  
254 *treatment in the last 12 months?*”), and patient-provider communication (“*How many*  
255 *times have you raised a question during your doctor’s appointment in the last 12*  
256 *months?*”). Participants answered each item on a four-point scale (1 = 0 times; 2 = 1~2  
257 times; 3 = 3~5 times; 4 = 6 or more times). Each item was first dichotomised (yes =  
258 1~2 times or 3~5 times or 6 or more times) /no = 0 times) and then a composite measure  
259 of health service use was created if participants had used at least one service.

260

261 *Healthcare cost:* Healthcare cost was self-reported by participants about the amount of  
262 out-of-pocket health expenditure (“*What was your out-of-pocket cost for healthcare*  
263 *(e.g., consultations, medicines, and tests) in the last year?*”) (41). Participants were  
264 coded as having high healthcare cost if they spent RMB 1000 or more (41).

265

## 266 **Statistical Analysis**

267 All statistical analyses were performed using Stata 18.0 (StataCorp, Texas, USA).  
268 Descriptive statistics were conducted to show the distribution of participants'  
269 characteristics, personal health literacy (continuous and categorical), school health  
270 literacy environment (continuous and categorical), and each health outcome. Univariate  
271 analysis was used to examine the relationship between participants' characteristics and  
272 levels of personal health literacy and school health literacy environment. Next, a series  
273 of logistic regression analyses were conducted to examine the associations between  
274 personal health literacy/school health literacy environment and each health outcome.  
275 Model 1 was unadjusted. Model 2 was adjusted for all participants' characteristics (i.e.,  
276 geographic location, school type, sex, age group, ethnicity, marital status, highest  
277 educational level, duration of teaching, subject of teaching, chronic health conditions,  
278 health awareness in daily life, and medical insurance). Model 3 was additionally  
279 adjusted for school health literacy environment/personal health literacy when  
280 examining the association between personal health literacy/school health literacy  
281 environment and each health outcome.

282

## 283 ***Missing data***

284 The proportion of respondents with complete data across all study variables was 89.9%  
285 (see S1 Appendix 1). To examine the potential impact of missing data, we used multiple  
286 imputation by chained equations to reduce the potential bias due to incomplete records

287 (42). The imputation model included all study variables. Based on the percentage of  
288 missing data (42), we produced ten imputed datasets and used Rubin's rules to obtain  
289 the final imputed estimates of the parameters of interest. Results using multiply imputed  
290 data were reported for all association analyses in the main text.

291

### 292 *Sensitivity analyses*

293 We also conducted sensitivity analyses to check the robustness of our findings using  
294 each indicator of health-compromising behaviours (i.e., cigarette smoking, alcohol  
295 drinking, and physical inactivity) and health service use (i.e., emergency service use,  
296 general practitioner service use, hospitalisation, and patient-provider communication).

297

## 298 **RESULTS**

### 299 **Participants' sociodemographics**

300 In total, 7264 teaching staffs completed the survey, with a response rate of 93.9%  
301 (7264/7738). The average age of participants was 35.7±8.3 years (age range: 18 to 68).  
302 The majority of participants were recruited from Zhongmou County (82.7%) and  
303 primary schools (66.6%). Most participants were female (83.8%), from Han ethnicity  
304 (98.4%), and from married families (74.0%). Most teachers had taught more than five  
305 years (67.7%). The top three subjects of teaching were literacy (26.2%), math (25.8%)  
306 and English (11.1%). The majority (98.7%) of teachers had high health awareness in  
307 daily life and had no chronic health conditions (83.3%). The most common type of  
308 medical insurance was medical insurance for urban workers (74.8%) (see Table 1).

309

310 **Table 1.** Summary of participants' characteristics. Observed data are shown (n=7264).

Participants' characteristics	Frequency (%)	Participants' characteristics	Frequency (%)
Geographic location		Subject of teaching	
Jingkai District	1257 (17.3)	Literacy	2029 (26.2)
Zhongmou County	6007 (82.7)	Math	1994 (25.8)
School type		English	859 (11.1)
Primary school	4836 (66.6)	Physics	183 (2.4)
Secondary school	2428 (33.4)	Chemistry	107 (1.4)
Sex		Biology	131 (1.7)
Female	6086 (83.8)	History	193 (2.5)
Male	1178 (16.2)	Geography	117 (1.5)
Age group		Politics	252 (3.3)
30 years or below	2448 (33.8)	Physical education	438 (5.7)
31-39 years	2609 (36.1)	Music	264 (3.4)
40 years or above	2178 (30.1)	Art	256 (3.3)
Ethnicity		Health	38 (0.5)
Han	7150 (98.4)	Other	226 (2.9)
Ethnic minorities	114 (1.6)	More than one subject	651 (8.4)
Marital status		Health awareness in daily life	
Unmarried	1686 (23.2)	Very important	7168 (98.7)
Married	5378 (74.0)	Not very important	96 (1.3)
Other*	200 (2.8)	Chronic health conditions	
Education level		No	6050 (83.3)
Bachelor or above	6338 (87.3)	Yes	1214 (16.7)
Diploma or below	926 (12.7)	Medical insurance	
Duration of teaching		Medical insurance for urban workers	5365 (74.8)
1-4 years	2343 (32.3)	Medical insurance for urban and rural residents	456 (6.4)
5-9 years	1891 (26.1)	Rural cooperative medical insurance	1272 (17.7)
10-14 years	731 (10.1)	Commercial medical insurance	80 (1.1)
15-19 years	534 (7.4)		
20-24 years	816 (11.2)		
25 years or more	939 (12.9)		

311 Note: The category of “other” includes those who are divorced or widowed.

312



## 313 **Distribution of health literacy and health outcomes**

314 Overall, teachers had an average score of  $75.17 \pm 25.97$  in their personal health literacy  
315 and scored the school health literacy environment with  $25.30 \pm 6.35$  (Table 2).  
316 According to the pre-defined cut-offs in the methods section, we found 13.2% and 30.0%  
317 of teachers had excellent and sufficient health literacy respectively. On the other hand,  
318 43.1% and 13.8% of teachers had problematic and inadequate health literacy  
319 respectively. Almost one third (31.0%) of teachers perceived their school had a  
320 supportive school health literacy environment. Regarding the distribution of health  
321 outcomes, we found that 15.0% of teachers had poor health status, 75.2% had at least  
322 one health-compromising behaviour, 82.4% had at least one health service use, and  
323 60.7% spent 1000 RMB or more for the out-of-pocket health expenditure.

324

325 **Table 2.** Distribution of health literacy and health outcomes. Observed data are shown  
326 (n=7264).

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Frequency (%) / Mean(<math>\pm</math>SD)</b>
Personal health literacy (0-100)	75.17 (25.97)
Personal health literacy (categorical)	
Excellent	901 (13.2)
Sufficient	2046 (30.0)
Problematic	2942 (43.1)
Inadequate	942 (13.8)
School health literacy environment (8-32)	25.30 (6.35)
School health literacy environment (categorical)	
Supportive	2217 (31.0)
Not supportive	4931 (69.0)
Health status	
Good	6178 (85.0)
Poor	1086 (15.0)
Cigarette smoking	
Never	6959 (95.8)
Ever or current	305 (4.2)
Alcohol drinking	

Variable	Frequency (%) / Mean( $\pm$ SD)
No	5751 (79.2)
Yes	1513 (20.8)
Physical inactivity	
No	2481 (34.2)
Yes	4783 (65.8)
At least one health-compromising behaviour	
No	1799 (24.8)
Yes	5465 (75.2)
Emergency service	
No	5862 (81.8)
Yes	1302 (18.2)
General practitioner service	
No	1548 (21.5)
Yes	5641 (78.5)
Hospitalisation	
No	5387 (74.9)
Yes	1807 (25.1)
Patient-provider communication	
No	1799 (25.1)
Yes	5370 (74.9)
At least one health service use	
No	1271 (17.6)
Yes	5949 (82.4)
Healthcare cost	
<1000 RMB	2847 (39.3)
$\geq$ 1000 RMB	4396 (60.7)

327 SD, standard deviation.

328

### 329 **Distribution of health literacy by participants' characteristics**

330 Table 3 shows the relationship between personal health literacy/school health literacy  
331 environment and participants' characteristics. Teachers had high personal health  
332 literacy scores if they were from primary schools, female, younger, unmarried, taught  
333 physical education, had high health awareness in daily life, no chronic health conditions,  
334 and medical insurance for urban and rural residents. Similarly, teachers perceived high  
335 levels of school health literacy environment if they were from primary schools, younger,

336 from Han ethnicity backgrounds, unmarried, taught physical education, had high health  
337 awareness in daily life, no chronic health conditions, and medical insurance for urban  
338 and rural residents.

339

340 **Table 3.** Distribution of health literacy by participants' characteristics, using imputed  
341 samples (n=7264).

Participants' characteristics	Mean( $\pm$ SD)	
	Personal health literacy	School health literacy environment
Geographic location		
Jingkai District	73.47 (72.00, 74.93) <sup>a</sup>	25.50 (25.15, 25.85) <sup>a</sup>
Zhongmou County	74.67 (73.98, 75.35) <sup>a</sup>	25.21 (25.05, 25.38) <sup>a</sup>
School type		
Primary school	75.49 (74.75, 76.22) <sup>a</sup>	25.73 (25.56, 25.90) <sup>a</sup>
Secondary school	72.42 (71.30, 73.54) <sup>b</sup>	24.33 (24.06, 24.60) <sup>b</sup>
Sex		
Female	74.61 (73.96, 75.25) <sup>a</sup>	25.29 (25.13, 25.45) <sup>a</sup>
Male	73.70 (71.96, 75.44) <sup>a</sup>	25.14 (24.77, 25.52) <sup>a</sup>
Age group		
30 years or below	80.48 (79.55, 81.42) <sup>a</sup>	26.34 (26.10, 26.57) <sup>a</sup>
31-39 years	74.48 (73.47, 75.49) <sup>b</sup>	25.40 (25.15, 25.64) <sup>b</sup>
40 years or above	67.69 (66.45, 68.92) <sup>c</sup>	23.90 (23.62, 24.19) <sup>c</sup>
Ethnicity		
Han	74.51 (73.89, 75.13) <sup>a</sup>	25.28 (25.14, 25.43) <sup>a</sup>
Ethnic minorities	71.24 (65.84, 76.64) <sup>a</sup>	23.96 (22.56, 25.35) <sup>b</sup>
Marital status		
Unmarried	79.23 (78.04, 80.42) <sup>a</sup>	25.97 (25.69, 26.26) <sup>a</sup>
Married	73.11 (72.38, 73.83) <sup>b</sup>	25.05 (24.87, 25.22) <sup>b</sup>
Other*	70.66 (66.67, 74.66) <sup>b</sup>	25.08 (24.12, 26.04) <sup>ab</sup>
Education level		
Bachelor or above	74.43 (73.77, 75.09) <sup>a</sup>	25.20 (25.04, 25.36) <sup>a</sup>
Diploma or below	74.67 (72.86, 76.49) <sup>a</sup>	25.70 (25.31, 26.09) <sup>a</sup>
Duration of teaching		
1-4 years	79.98 (79.01, 80.94) <sup>a</sup>	26.57 (26.34, 26.79) <sup>a</sup>
5-9 years	76.13 (74.93, 77.33) <sup>b</sup>	25.37 (25.07, 25.66) <sup>b</sup>
10-14 years	73.29 (71.31, 75.26) <sup>c</sup>	24.80 (24.32, 25.29) <sup>c</sup>
15-19 years	71.57 (69.12, 74.02) <sup>c</sup>	24.23 (23.65, 24.81) <sup>cd</sup>
20-24 years	68.58 (66.61, 70.54) <sup>d</sup>	24.36 (23.91, 24.82) <sup>cd</sup>
25 years or more	65.06 (63.19, 66.93) <sup>e</sup>	23.54 (23.10, 23.98) <sup>e</sup>
Subject of teaching		

Participants' characteristics	Mean( $\pm$ SD)	
	Personal health literacy	School health literacy environment
Literacy	75.02 (73.84, 76.21) <sup>ac</sup>	25.28 (25.00, 25.56) <sup>ace</sup>
Math	73.36 (72.16, 74.56) <sup>ad</sup>	25.39 (25.12, 25.66) <sup>c</sup>
English	73.92 (72.07, 75.76) <sup>ad</sup>	24.82 (24.35, 25.29) <sup>ab</sup>
Physics	66.50 (62.12, 70.88) <sup>b</sup>	23.81 (22.82, 24.80) <sup>bgf</sup>
Chemistry	68.39 (62.81, 73.98) <sup>bdf</sup>	23.00 (21.58, 24.43) <sup>g</sup>
Biology	76.13 (71.46, 80.80) <sup>ag</sup>	26.04 (25.15, 26.93) <sup>ceh</sup>
History	72.35 (68.12, 76.59) <sup>af</sup>	24.02 (23.03, 25.01) <sup>bg</sup>
Geography	74.80 (70.23, 79.38) <sup>afi</sup>	24.33 (23.07, 25.59) <sup>acfg</sup>
Politics	73.18 (69.53, 76.83) <sup>afj</sup>	25.03 (24.16, 25.90) <sup>acf</sup>
Physical education	82.47 (79.98, 84.96) <sup>ek</sup>	27.05 (26.50, 27.61) <sup>dh</sup>
Music	79.24 (76.00, 82.49) <sup>gikl</sup>	26.53 (25.68, 27.39) <sup>dhi</sup>
Art	76.41 (72.89, 79.93) <sup>hijm</sup>	25.83 (24.98, 26.67) <sup>cei</sup>
Health	72.38 (61.05, 83.70) <sup>ablm</sup>	24.56 (21.87, 27.25) <sup>acfgi</sup>
Other	74.05 (70.02, 78.08) <sup>afim</sup>	25.51 (24.49, 26.53) <sup>aci</sup>
More than one subject	73.40 (71.25, 75.55) <sup>afm</sup>	24.80 (24.27, 25.32) <sup>acf</sup>
Health awareness in daily life		
Very important	74.67 (74.05, 75.28) <sup>a</sup>	25.30 (25.16, 25.45) <sup>a</sup>
Not very important	59.03 (52.30, 65.76) <sup>b</sup>	22.23 (20.74, 23.71) <sup>b</sup>
Chronic health conditions		
No	76.96 (76.33, 77.58) <sup>a</sup>	25.79 (25.64, 25.95) <sup>a</sup>
Yes	62.02 (60.25, 63.78) <sup>b</sup>	22.63 (22.24, 23.03) <sup>b</sup>
Medical insurance		
Medical insurance for urban workers	73.77 (73.06, 74.48) <sup>a</sup>	24.98 (24.80, 25.15) <sup>a</sup>
Medical insurance for urban and rural residents	79.28 (76.79, 81.77) <sup>b</sup>	26.55 (26.03, 27.07) <sup>b</sup>
Rural cooperative medical insurance	75.49 (73.99, 76.99) <sup>c</sup>	26.01 (25.68, 26.34) <sup>bc</sup>
Commercial medical insurance	76.64 (70.87, 82.42) <sup>abc</sup>	25.15 (23.62, 26.68) <sup>abc</sup>

342 SD, standard deviation. Note: The category of “other” includes those who are divorced or widowed.

343 Distribution of health literacy with the same character indicates no statistical difference between groups.

344

## 345 **Associations between health literacy with health outcomes**

346 Compared with those who had excellent health literacy, teachers with inadequate health

347 literacy had higher odds of poor health status (odds ratio (OR)=5.79, 95% CI=3.84,

348 8.73), at least one health-compromising behaviour (OR=2.90, 95% CI=2.29, 3.68), at  
 349 least one health service use (OR=2.73, 95% CI=2.07, 3.61), and more healthcare cost  
 350 (OR=2.51, 95% CI=2.00, 3.16), after adjusting for all covariates and school health  
 351 literacy environment (see Table 4). Similarly, teachers who perceived their school to  
 352 have low levels of supportive school health literacy environment had higher odds of  
 353 poor health status (OR=1.62, 95% CI=1.32, 1.99), at least one health-compromising  
 354 behaviour (OR=1.39, 95% CI=1.22, 1.58), at least one health service use (OR=1.78, 95%  
 355 CI=1.54, 2.06), and more healthcare cost (OR=1.13, 95% CI=1.00, 1.27), after  
 356 adjusting for all covariates and personal health literacy.

357

358 **Table 4.** Associations between health literacy and health outcomes, using imputed  
 359 samples (n=7264).

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<b><i>Association with poor health status</i></b>			
Personal health literacy			
Excellent	Ref	Ref	Ref
Sufficient	1.94 (1.30, 2.91)	1.69 (1.12, 2.54)	1.39 (0.91, 2.11)
Problematic	5.30 (3.67, 7.64)	3.93 (2.71, 5.69)	3.07 (2.08, 4.51)
Inadequate	12.36 (8.46, 18.07)	7.73 (5.21, 11.46)	5.79 (3.84, 8.73)
School health literacy environment			
Supportive	Ref	Ref	Ref
Not supportive	3.11 (2.59, 3.73)	2.36 (1.95, 2.86)	1.62 (1.32, 1.99)
<b><i>Association with at least one health-compromising behaviour</i></b>			
Personal health literacy			
Excellent	Ref	Ref	Ref
Sufficient	1.87 (1.59, 2.20)	1.93 (1.63, 2.28)	1.71 (1.43, 2.04)
Problematic	2.50 (2.13, 2.93)	2.81 (2.38, 3.32)	2.38 (1.99, 2.85)
Inadequate	3.08 (2.50, 3.79)	3.55 (2.84, 4.43)	2.90 (2.29, 3.68)
School health literacy environment			
Supportive	Ref	Ref	Ref
Not supportive	1.71 (1.53, 1.91)	1.80 (1.61, 2.03)	1.39 (1.22, 1.58)
<b><i>Association with at least one health service use</i></b>			
Personal health literacy			
Excellent	Ref	Ref	Ref

Sufficient	2.25 (1.88, 2.68)	2.12 (1.77, 2.54)	1.72 (1.42, 2.08)
Problematic	3.58 (3.01, 4.25)	3.07 (2.57, 3.67)	2.30 (1.90, 2.80)
Inadequate	5.00 (3.90, 6.42)	3.93 (3.02, 5.10)	2.73 (2.07, 3.61)
School health literacy environment			
Supportive	Ref	Ref	Ref
Not supportive	2.55 (2.25, 2.89)	2.31 (2.02, 2.63)	1.78 (1.54, 2.06)
<b>Association with healthcare cost more than 1000 RMB</b>			
Personal health literacy			
Excellent	Ref	Ref	Ref
Sufficient	1.41 (1.20, 1.65)	1.31 (1.11, 1.55)	1.25 (1.05, 1.49)
Problematic	2.04 (1.75, 2.37)	1.64 (1.40, 1.93)	1.55 (1.30, 1.84)
Inadequate	3.67 (3.00, 4.49)	2.71 (2.18, 3.36)	2.51 (2.00, 3.16)
School health literacy environment			
Supportive	Ref	Ref	Ref
Not supportive	1.58 (1.43, 1.75)	1.35 (1.21, 1.50)	1.13 (1.00, 1.27)

360 Model 1: Unadjusted; Model 2: Adjusted for geographic location, school type, sex, age group, ethnicity,  
 361 marital status, education level, duration of teaching, subject of teaching, health awareness in daily life,  
 362 chronic health conditions, and medical insurance; Model 3: Additionally adjusted for school health  
 363 literacy environment when examining the impact of personal health literacy or additionally adjusted for  
 364 personal health literacy when examining the impact of school health literacy environment.

365

366 We also found similar results when examining the associations of personal health  
 367 literacy and school health literacy environment with each indicator of health-  
 368 compromising behaviours (see S2 Appendix 2) and health service use (see S3 Appendix  
 369 3).

370

## 371 **DISCUSSION**

### 372 **Summary of key findings in the present study**

373 Using a cross-sectional study design, we examined the relationships between personal  
 374 health literacy, school health literacy environment, and a range of health outcomes  
 375 among Chinese schoolteachers. This was also the first study in Asia to assess  
 376 organizational health literacy in school settings. Specifically, there were three main

377 findings in the present study: (1) there was a high proportion (56.9%) of schoolteachers  
378 with inadequate or problematic health literacy; (2) the study found sociodemographic  
379 differences (e.g., age, marital status, teaching school type) in teacher's personal health  
380 literacy and within the school health literacy environment; (3) Both personal health  
381 literacy and school health literacy environment were associated with health status,  
382 health-compromising behaviours, health service use, and healthcare cost.

383

384 Consistent with findings from previous research (28, 30), we found that low health  
385 literacy was prevalent (56.9%) in our sample when using the HLS<sub>19</sub>-Q12. As shown in  
386 the 2012 Chinese national health literacy survey (31), 81.5% of Chinese teachers had  
387 low health literacy. Internationally, in a study conducted in Turkey, Yilmazel and  
388 Cetinkaya (28) used the 6-item Newest Vital Sign (NVS) to measure 500 primary and  
389 secondary teachers' health literacy and found 73.8% of teachers had low health literacy.  
390 Denuwara and Gunawardena (30) found that 32.5% of secondary teachers had low  
391 health literacy in Sri Lanka when using the 47-item European Health Literacy Survey  
392 Questionnaire (HLS-EU-Q47), whereas Rahimi and Tavassoli found 48.3% to 60% of  
393 primary teachers had low health literacy in Iran using the 36-item Test of Functional  
394 Health Literacy in Adults (TOFHLA). While these studies use different instruments to  
395 measure health literacy, there is consistent evidence showing the pressing need to  
396 improve schoolteachers' health literacy.

397

398 Measuring health literacy and its influencing factors are important to provide insights

399 for and inform intervention development. We found that teachers' health literacy levels  
400 varied by school type, age group, marital status, duration of teaching, subject of  
401 teaching, health awareness in daily life, chronic health condition status, and medical  
402 insurance type. Most of these findings align with previous similar studies (28, 30),  
403 showing that teachers tended to have low levels of health literacy if they were older,  
404 had longer duration of teaching, and chronic health conditions. Future intervention  
405 studies may consider these characteristics when targeting schoolteachers' health  
406 literacy. However, we did not find differences of health literacy by geographic location,  
407 sex, and highest educational level, which was contrary to previous research (28, 29).  
408 One possible reason could be the convenience sampling approach, which we recruited  
409 teachers from two districts in one city, thus contributing to homogeneity of our samples  
410 (i.e., 82.7% was from Zhongmou County, 83.8% were female, and 87.3% had  
411 Bachelor's degree or above). Further research is needed to use more representative  
412 samples to investigate these influencing factors of teachers' health literacy, given their  
413 potential roles as social determinants of health.

414

415 Compared to previous studies that examined teachers' health literacy (28-30, 43), we  
416 added evidence on the impact of health literacy on teachers' health outcomes. We found  
417 teachers with lower health literacy were likely to have poorer health status, more health-  
418 compromising behaviours, more health service use, and more healthcare costs. These  
419 findings are consistent with previous systematic reviews (3, 44) and population-based  
420 studies (41, 45). The potential pathways linking health literacy with health outcomes



421 include both personal factors (e.g., self-efficacy, health knowledge, health awareness)  
422 and system factors (e.g., complexity of healthcare systems, social support, provider  
423 competence). Our findings suggest promoting teachers' health literacy skills may have  
424 the potential to improve their health outcomes. As shown in the recent evidence base  
425 (46, 47), health literacy interventions can lead to improved health outcomes in the  
426 general population. However, evidence is scarce regarding health literacy interventions  
427 targeting teachers. Future experimental research is needed to support the protective role  
428 of health literacy in predicting teachers' health and wellbeing, and what role teachers'  
429 health literacy plays in context of enhancing school-aged children's health literacy and  
430 health outcomes.

431

432 The present study also extends current literature by examining the levels, influencing  
433 factors, and impacts of the school health literacy environment. In keeping with the  
434 distribution of personal health literacy among teachers, we found similar patterning of  
435 school health literacy environment. Teachers perceived lower levels of supportive  
436 school health literacy environment if they were older, from ethnic minority  
437 backgrounds, married, had longer duration of teaching, taught subjects other than  
438 physical education and biology, had low health awareness, had chronic health  
439 conditions, and had medical insurance for urban workers. We also found lower levels  
440 of supportive school health literacy environment were associated with poor health status,  
441 more health-compromising behaviours, more health service use, and more healthcare  
442 costs among teachers. Consistent with previous research (22, 23), our findings show

443 that school health literacy environment is an important situational factor to influence  
444 teachers' health and well-being, with potential direct and indirect pathways through  
445 personal health literacy (48), social support (22), and mental health (49). Also, echoing  
446 the HPS framework and other similar concepts (e.g., HeLit-Schools in Germany (20),  
447 HealthLit4Kids in Australia (50)), our findings suggest that school health literacy  
448 environment should be included as an essential part of health literacy interventions to  
449 improve teachers' health and well-being.

450

## 451 **Limitations**

452 There were several limitations that should be noted. First, we used the convenience  
453 sampling to recruit schoolteachers from two districts of Zhengzhou, Henan Province.  
454 Our findings may not generalise to other geographic regions or populations. There is a  
455 need for future research to recruit more representative samples to replicate our findings.  
456 Second, measurement errors may exist for self-report instruments. In the present study,  
457 we used previously validated items or instruments where possible to enhance the  
458 validity and reliability of our measures, thus minimising the self-report bias. Third, our  
459 findings are based on the cross-sectional study design, therefore we could not establish  
460 causality. Further research using longitudinal or experimental designs is needed to  
461 confirm our findings. Finally, we did not consider other social environments (e.g., mass  
462 media, healthcare, family) that may contribute to teachers' health outcomes, given our  
463 focus was on schools where they work. Given that health literacy is a context-specific  
464 and relational concept, future research may explore other health literacy environments

465 and their impacts on health outcomes.

466

## 467 **Implications for future research and practice**

468 Findings from the present study shed light on the critical intersections between personal  
469 health literacy, the school health literacy environment, and various health outcomes  
470 among Chinese schoolteachers. Future research may consider using similar approaches  
471 to examining the role of personal health literacy and health literacy environment in  
472 other populations (e.g., children, elderly, patients) or settings (e.g., workplace, hospitals,  
473 markets). Also, it would be valuable to explore these relationships from a more precise  
474 perspective. For example, the HLS<sub>19</sub>-Q12 used to measure personal health literacy has  
475 three health domains (health care, disease prevention, and health promotion) and four  
476 aspects of health information management (access, understand, evaluate, and use).  
477 Variations may exist between these sub-components for the relationships with health  
478 outcomes.

479

480 Given that more than half of teachers have inadequate or problematic health literacy, it  
481 is imperative for governments and schools to design and implement interventions to  
482 improve teachers' health literacy. Future research could explore the feasibility and  
483 effectiveness of incorporating health literacy education into pre-service and in-service  
484 teacher training to equip educators with sufficient health knowledge and skills (51). The  
485 identified sociodemographic differences in personal health literacy and school health  
486 literacy environment also can provide insights into specific demographic groups to

487 whom the intervention should target. To improve health outcomes for schoolteachers,  
488 both educational programs and organisational change are needed to improve personal  
489 health literacy and school environments. There is increasing attention to programs that  
490 use a whole-of-school approach to promoting teachers' health literacy and improving  
491 their health outcomes. For example, the HeLit-Schols project (20) and the  
492 HealthLit4Kids project (50) both highlight the need of organisational change to  
493 sustainably promote health literacy for children and all staff in school settings.

494

## 495 **CONCLUSIONS**

496 This study examined the relationship between health literacy and teachers' health  
497 outcomes from two aspects: personal health literacy and school health literacy  
498 environment. We found that low health literacy was common in Chinese schoolteachers.  
499 The sociodemographic differences observed in both personal health literacy and school  
500 health literacy environment highlight the importance of tailoring interventions to  
501 address specific needs for subgroups of the diverse teacher population. Our findings  
502 also show that both personal health literacy and school health literacy environment are  
503 important to teachers' health status, health behaviours, health service use and healthcare  
504 cost. Promoting health literacy at both individual and organizational levels has the  
505 potential to improve population health and reduce health disparities.

506 **Supporting information**

507 S1 Table. STROBE checklist.

508 S1 Appendix 1. Missing data.

509 S2 Appendix 2. Associations between health literacy and each indicator of health  
510 behaviours.

511 S3 Appendix 3. Associations between health literacy and each indicator of health  
512 service use.

513

514 **Acknowledgments:** We thank all the schools and teachers who participated in the study.

515

516 **Authors' contributions:** QZ, RL, MY and SG contributed to the study design, drafted  
517 the initial manuscript, critically reviewed the manuscript for important intellectual  
518 content. RL and MY was responsible for the field work, data collection and quality  
519 control. SG performed statistical analysis and interpreted results. JW, YB, HC, XY, SL,  
520 XC, YX and OO contributed to the study design and critically reviewed the manuscript  
521 for important intellectual content. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

522

523 **Funding:** This research is supported by c (SB201903022) and Henan Province Science  
524 and Technology Research Program Soft Science Project (RKX202201002).

525

526 **Availability of data and materials:** The datasets used during the current study are  
527 available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

528

529 **Completing interests:** The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

## 530 **REFERENCES**

- 531 1. Nutbeam D, Lloyd JE. Understanding and Responding to Health Literacy as a Social  
532 Determinant of Health. *Annual Review of Public Health*. 2021;42(1):159-73.
- 533 2. Yusoff HAM, Hamzah MR, Manaf ARA, Ismail A, Ahmad Y, Hussin H, editors. The  
534 influence of health literacy on health outcomes: A systematic literature review perspective2021:  
535 AIP Publishing.
- 536 3. Berkman ND, Sheridan SL, Donahue KE, Halpern DJ, Crotty K. Low health literacy and  
537 health outcomes: an updated systematic review. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 2011;155(2):97-  
538 107.
- 539 4. World Health Organisation. Shanghai Declaration on promoting health in the 2030 Agenda  
540 for Sustainable Development. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO; 2016.
- 541 5. Logan RA, Wong WF, Villaire M, Daus G, Parnell TA, Willis E, et al. Health literacy: A  
542 necessary element for achieving health equity. *NAM perspectives*. 2015.
- 543 6. Guo S, Yu X, Davis E, Armstrong R, Naccarella L. Comparison of Health Literacy  
544 Assessment Tools among Beijing School-Aged Children. *Children (Basel)*. 2022;9(8).
- 545 7. Rowlands G, Russell S, O'Donnell A, Kaner E, Trezona A, Rademakers J, et al. What is  
546 the evidence on existing policies and linked activities and their effectiveness for improving  
547 health literacy at national, regional and organizational levels in the WHO European region?:  
548 World Health Organization. Regional Office for Europe; 2018.
- 549 8. Parker R, Ratzan SC. Health literacy: a second decade of distinction for Americans. *J*  
550 *Health Commun*. 2010;15(S2):20-33.
- 551 9. Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care. National Statement on

- 552 Health Literacy. Taking action to improve safety and quality. Sydney, NSW: Australian  
553 Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care; 2014.
- 554 10. Tavousi M, Mohammadi S, Sadighi J, Zarei F, Kermani RM, Rostami R, et al. Measuring  
555 health literacy: A systematic review and bibliometric analysis of instruments from 1993 to  
556 2021. *PloS one*. 2022;17(7):e0271524.
- 557 11. Li Y, Lv X, Liang J, Dong H, Chen C. The development and progress of health literacy in  
558 China. *Frontiers in public health*. 2022;10:1034907.
- 559 12. Kanejima Y, Shimogai T, Kitamura M, Ishihara K, Izawa KP. Impact of health literacy in  
560 patients with cardiovascular diseases: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Patient  
561 Education and Counseling*. 2022;105(7):1793-800.
- 562 13. Bánfai-Csonka H, Betlehem J, Deutsch K, Derzsi-Horváth M, Bánfai B, Fináncz J, et al.  
563 Health literacy in early childhood: A systematic review of empirical studies. *Children*.  
564 2022;9(8):1131.
- 565 14. Pelikan JM, Link T, Straßmayr C, Waldherr K, Alferts T, Bøggild H, et al. Measuring  
566 Comprehensive, General Health Literacy in the General Adult Population: The Development  
567 and Validation of the HLS(19)-Q12 Instrument in Seventeen Countries. *Int J Environ Res  
568 Public Health*. 2022;19(21).
- 569 15. World Health Organization. Health literacy in the context of health, well-being and  
570 learning outcomes the case of children and adolescents in schools: the case of children and  
571 adolescents in schools. Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe; 2021.
- 572 16. Okan O, Paakkari L, Dadaczynski K. Health literacy in schools. State of the art. Haderslev,  
573 Denmark: Schools for Health in Europe Network Foundation; 2020.

- 574 17. Okan O, Paakkari L, Jourdan D, Barnekow V, Weber MW. The urgent need to address  
575 health literacy in schools. *The Lancet*. 2023;401(10374):344.
- 576 18. Peterson FL, Cooper RJ, Laird JM. Enhancing teacher health literacy in school health  
577 promotion: a vision for the new millennium. *J Sch Health*. 2001;71(4):138-44.
- 578 19. Schulenkorf T, Sørensen K, Okan O. International understandings of health literacy in  
579 childhood and adolescence—a qualitative-explorative analysis of global expert interviews.  
580 *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2022;19(3):1591.
- 581 20. Kirchhoff S, Dadaczynski K, Pelikan JM, Zelinka-Roitner I, Dietscher C, Bittlingmayer  
582 UH, et al. Organizational Health Literacy in Schools: Concept Development for Health-Literate  
583 Schools. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2022;19(14).
- 584 21. St Leger L. Schools, health literacy and public health: possibilities and challenges. *Health  
585 Promot Int*. 2001;16(2):197-205.
- 586 22. Bae EJ, Yoon JY. Health Literacy as a Major Contributor to Health-Promoting Behaviors  
587 among Korean Teachers. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18(6).
- 588 23. Lee A. Health-promoting schools. *Appl Health Econ Health Policy*. 2009;7(1):11-7.
- 589 24. Lemerle KA. Evaluating the impact of the school environment on teachers' health and job  
590 commitment: Is the health promoting school a healthier workplace? 2005.
- 591 25. Otten C, Nash R, Patterson K. HealthLit4Kids: teacher experiences of health literacy  
592 professional development in an Australian primary school setting. *Health Promotion  
593 International*. 2023;38(3):daac053.
- 594 26. Shangguan L, Chen S, Cao L. Research on the current situation, causes, and  
595 countermeasures of primary school physical education teachers' health literacy. *Journal of*



- 596 Healthcare Engineering. 2022;2022.
- 597 27. Chen S, Chen K, Wang S, Wang W, Li Y. Initial validation of a Chinese version of the  
598 Mental Health Literacy Scale among Chinese teachers in Henan Province. *Frontiers in*  
599 *Psychiatry*. 2021;12:661903.
- 600 28. Yilmazel G, Çetinkaya F. Health literacy among schoolteachers in Çorum, Turkey. *EMHJ-*  
601 *Eastern Mediterranean Health Journal*. 2015;21(8):598-605.
- 602 29. Ahmadi F, Montazeri A. Health literacy of pre-service teachers from Farhangian  
603 University: A cross-sectional survey. *International Journal of School Health*. 2019;6(2):1-5.
- 604 30. Denuwara H, Gunawardena NS. Level of health literacy and factors associated with it  
605 among school teachers in an education zone in Colombo, Sri Lanka. *BMC Public Health*.  
606 2017;17(1):631.
- 607 31. Li L, Li Y, Nie X, Huang X, Shi M. Analysis on the status of teachers' health literacy in  
608 Chinese residents' health literacy monitoring in 2012. *Chinese Journal of Health Education*.  
609 2015(2):141-6.
- 610 32. Naing L, Nordin RB, Abdul Rahman H, Naing YT. Sample size calculation for prevalence  
611 studies using Scalex and ScalaR calculators. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*.  
612 2022;22(1):1-8.
- 613 33. Von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The  
614 Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology [STROBE] statement:  
615 guidelines for reporting observational studies. *Lancet*. 2007;370(9596):1453-7.
- 616 34. Sun X, Lv K, Wang F, Ge P, Niu Y, Yu W, et al. Validity and reliability of the Chinese  
617 version of the Health Literacy Scale Short-Form in the Chinese population. *BMC Public Health*.

618 2023;23(1):385.

619 35. Liu R, Zhao Q, Yu M, Chen H, Yang X, Liu S, et al. Measuring General Health Literacy  
620 in Chinese Adults: Validation of the HLS19-Q12 Instrument. BMC Public Health. 2023. Doi:  
621 10.21203/rs.3.rs-3588757/v1

622 36. Kirchhoff S, Krudewig C, Okan O. Organizational health literacy of schools questionnaire  
623 – short form (OHLS-Q-SF). Funded by the Federal Ministry of Health. Germany: Technical  
624 University of Munich; 2022.

625 37. Okan O, Kirchhoff S, Krudewig C. Organizational health literacy of schools (OHLS-Q)<sup>©</sup>.  
626 Questionnaire Long Form English. HeLit-Schools. Funded by the Federal Ministry of Health.  
627 Germany: Technical University of Munich. ; 2022.

628 38. Guo S, O'Connor M, Mensah F, Olsson CA, Goldfeld S, Lacey RE, et al. Measuring  
629 Positive Childhood Experiences: Testing the structural and predictive validity of the Health  
630 Outcomes from Positive Experiences (HOPE) framework. Academic Pediatrics.  
631 2022;22(6):942-51.

632 39. Haddock CK, Poston WS, Pyle SA, Klesges RC, Vander Weg MW, Peterson A, et al. The  
633 validity of self-rated health as a measure of health status among young military personnel:  
634 evidence from a cross-sectional survey. Health Qual Life Outcomes. 2006;4:57.

635 40. The HLS-Asia Consortium. HLS-Asia-Q: Measurement of health literacy in Asia. Taipei,  
636 Taiwan: The HLS-Asia Consortium; 2013.

637 41. Li L, Li Y, Nie X, Wang L, Zhang G. The association between health literacy and medical  
638 out-of-pocket expenses among residents in China. Journal of Public Health. 2023:1-9.

639 42. White IR, Royston P, Wood AM. Multiple imputation using chained equations: issues and

- 640 guidance for practice. *Statistics in medicine*. 2011;30(4):377-99.
- 641 43. Rahimi B, Tavassoli E. Measuring health literacy of elementary school teachers in  
642 Shahrekord. *Journal of Health Literacy*. 2019;4(1):25-32.
- 643 44. Fleary SA, Joseph P, Pappagianopoulos JE. Adolescent health literacy and health  
644 behaviors: a systematic review. *Journal of Adolescence*. 2018;62:116-27.
- 645 45. Svendsen MT, Bak CK, Sørensen K, Pelikan J, Riddersholm SJ, Skals RK, et al.  
646 Associations of health literacy with socioeconomic position, health risk behavior, and health  
647 status: a large national population-based survey among Danish adults. *BMC public health*.  
648 2020;20(1):1-12.
- 649 46. Walters R, Leslie SJ, Polson R, Cusack T, Gorely T. Establishing the efficacy of  
650 interventions to improve health literacy and health behaviours: a systematic review. *BMC*  
651 *Public Health*. 2020;20(1):1-17.
- 652 47. Meherali S, Punjani NS, Mevawala A. Health Literacy Interventions to Improve Health  
653 Outcomes in Low- and Middle-Income Countries. *Health Literacy Research and Practice*.  
654 2020;4(4):e251-e66.
- 655 48. Sørensen K, Van den Broucke S, Fullam J, Doyle G, Pelikan J, Slonska Z, et al. Health  
656 literacy and public health: a systematic review and integration of definitions and models. *BMC*  
657 *Public Health*. 2012;12:80.
- 658 49. Spratt J, Shucksmith J, Philip K, Watson C. ‘Part of Who we are as a School Should  
659 Include Responsibility for Well-Being’: Links between the School Environment, Mental  
660 Health and Behaviour. *Pastoral Care in Education*. 2006;24(3):14-21.
- 661 50. Nash R, Elmer S, Thomas K, Osborne R, MacIntyre K, Shelley B, et al. HealthLit4Kids

662 study protocol; crossing boundaries for positive health literacy outcomes. BMC Public Health.  
663 2018;18(1):690.

664 51. Sider S. Health Literacy Education in Pre-Service and in-Service Teacher Education in  
665 Sub-Saharan African: Gaps and Opportunities. International Journal of Humanities Social  
666 Sciences and Education. 2022;9(4):322-9.