



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Health & Place

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/healthplace

Commentary

Connecting qualitative research on exercise and environment to public health agendas requires an equity lens

Stephanie E. Coen

Department of Geography, Social Science Centre, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada N6A 5C2

A B S T R A C T

In this commentary, I respond to the special section in *Health & Place* (vol. 46) on “Exercise and environment: new qualitative work to link popular practice and public health” edited by Hitchings and Latham. I argue that if qualitative research is to effectively inform public health policy and practice it cannot ignore the fact that physical activity participation is inequitable. Without building in a critical equity lens, geographers risk perpetuating the “inequality paradox”—that is, the potential for population health interventions to inadvertently exacerbate health inequalities. Related to this, I challenge the editors’ assumption that geographers’ critiques of public health approaches to physical activity and our applied efforts to foster physical activity participation are mutually exclusive endeavours. Rather, I argue they are mutually necessary within a social justice agenda. Finally, I close this commentary by offering ways forward for qualitative research on exercise and environment to connect with public health agendas and inform interventions.

1. Introduction

Writing in the pages of the critical geography journal *Antipode* almost thirty years ago, John Mohan (1989) reviewed four medical geography textbooks and arrived at the prognosis that “medical geography requires radical surgery” (p. 176). Although citing critical potential in two of the texts, Mohan concluded that they were substantively lacking in prescriptions for progressive change, constrained in their scope by their empiricist persuasion, privileging of aggregate data and large spatial units, and inattention to difference and first-hand experience. Some of the very limitations raised by Mohan—a dearth of qualitative methods and experiential data, inadequate consideration of gender and other axes of social difference, and narrow focus on conventional Western medicine—were cornerstones of the early medical geography sub-disciplinary identity debates of the 1990s which pushed the field toward a more inclusive medical and health geography (Dorn et al., 2010; Kearns, 1993; Kearns, 1995). Recent critiques have cautioned that geographies of physical activity may be falling into similarly determinist traps that characterized early medical geography (Andrews et al., 2012b; Blacksher and Lovasi, 2012; Colls and Evans, 2014; Rosenberg, 2016). The recent *Health & Place* special issue on qualitative research on exercise and environment, edited by

Hitchings and Latham, offers a potential antidote to this, but I contend it does not go far enough. Responding to this special issue, in this commentary I illustrate why.

In their introduction, Hitchings and Latham (2017a) offer five themes via which qualitative research on exercise and environment can connect with public health agendas: (1) varied nature of environments; (2) differentiation from sport; (3) sociality; (4) pleasure; and (5) changing practices; however, they overlook one cross-cutting ingredient to affecting change: equity. I argue that if qualitative research is to effectively inform public health policy and practice it cannot ignore the fact that physical activity participation is inequitable. I do not dispute the value of the areas Hitchings and Latham identify, but rather caution that without building in a critical equity lens, geographers risk perpetuating the “inequality paradox”¹—that is, the potential for population health interventions to inadvertently exacerbate health inequalities (Frohlich and Potvin, 2008). Related to this, I challenge the authors’ assumption that geographers’ critiques of public health approaches to physical activity and our applied efforts to foster physical activity participation are mutually exclusive endeavours. Rather, I argue they are mutually necessary within a social justice agenda. Finally, I close this commentary by offering ways forward for qualitative research on exercise and environment to connect with public health agendas and inform interventions.

E-mail address: stephanie.coen@queensu.ca.

¹ I wish to acknowledge Williams and Gibson's (2017) paper for sparking my thinking on this.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2017.09.005>

Received 28 August 2017/Received in revised form 13 September 2017/Accepted 13 September 2017
1353-8292/ © 2017 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

2. Putting an equity lens on exercise and environment

Being against (medicalised and individualised) exercise and appreciating the potential for it to become a poisoned elixir (rather than medicine) shifts priorities and opens up new possibilities. The solution is simple, but not easy; reducing inactivity and inequality. Refusing inequitable intervention enables the promotion of exercise to meaningfully influence the lives and health of marginalised and excluded people and reduce related inequalities. (Williams and Gibson, 2017, p. 13)

Physical activity participation is, quite simply, inequitable. Physical activity is highly gendered, with men more likely than women to meet the minimum levels for health benefits (Azevedo et al., 2007; Colley et al., 2011; Tucker et al., 2011)—and gender intersects with other aspects of social difference linked to physical activity disparities, including race/ethnicity (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2007), sexuality (Calzo et al., 2014), disability (Carroll et al., 2014), and socioeconomic position (Grzywacz and Marks, 2001). Qualitative research is especially well-placed to illuminate the socio-spatial processes implicated in inequities in physical activity participation (Coen et al., forthcoming; Gill, 2011), yet equity is substantively absent from Hitchings and Latham's (2017a) discussion. The authors acknowledge that equity issues are apparent, but situate these as seemingly inconsequential to their goal for “qualitative research to help inform efforts to increase activity” (p. 304, emphasis added). This is problematic because, as we know from the inequality paradox, *more* people being active is not necessarily better if inequalities remain the same or worsen at the same time. To avoid perpetuating this paradox, qualitative research on exercise and environment should aim for horizontal (equity) improvements as objects of study and targets of change, as opposed to uncritically favouring vertical increases. Indeed, voices in sports studies and public health have argued that qualitative research on physical activity *must* be part of a social justice agenda in physical activity promotion to meaningfully affect change (Gill, 2011; Williams and Gibson, 2017).

Following through on Hitchings and Latham's proposition that “studies concerned with how particular environments are inhabited by particular groups of exercisers could play a more central part in public health promotion” (p. 300) requires critical qualitative evidence that challenges taken-for-granted categories and reveals processes of inequity to inform interventions for inclusive participation. The special issue, however, does not fully realize this goal. Who these “particular groups” are remains conspicuously blank. Hitchings and Latham (2017a) point to paying attention to “the everyman and everywoman of exercise” (p. 302), but bodies remain decontextualized and disembodied. While most studies describe participants in terms of their exercise identities, including runners (Hitchings and Latham, 2017b; Little, 2017), walkers and mountain bikers (Brown, 2017), cyclists (Barratt, 2017), swimmers (Ward, 2017), physically inactive students (Olafsdottir, Cloke, and Vögele, 2017), or mixed-martial arts practitioners, only four of the seven papers using human subjects clearly report the gender mix of their samples (Barratt, 2017; Hitchings and Latham, 2017b; Little, 2017; Olafsdottir et al., 2017). Of these, only Barratt (2017) explicitly considers gender equity, noting evidence for gamified fitness apps to exacerbate existing gendered inequities and the need to ensure “policies and schemes that promote engagement with them are not intrinsically gendered further disadvantaging women's fitness or broader position in the home and society” (p. 334). Little's (2017) study focuses on women's experiences with running and fitness technologies, but it remains unclear how these findings can be directed to intervene in the gendered context of physical activity participation. There is little attention to diversity throughout the issue, with no mention of ethnicity/race, sexuality, or other axes of difference; socioeconomic position was accounted for only by Hitchings and Latham (2017b) in their sample description of runners.

We cannot ignore how social identities intersect with and are mutually constitutive of and by place, and what this means for physical activity participation. Exercise is prescribed ‘as medicine,’ but I suggest it is very the task of qualitative health geographers is to *situate these prescriptions in context*. Take the case of the gym, for instance. A recent systematic review by Morgan et al. (2016) showed that a significant reason for failure of exercise adherence schemes was perceptions of gym environments as uncomfortable or intimidating. Richardson and colleagues' (2017) qualitative study found that disability intersected with gender in ways that could be a barrier to participation for men in the gym; disabled men felt incongruent with dominant gym masculinities. My own research has shown that micro-level socio-spatial processes within gyms can contribute to normalizing gender differences in physical activity participation (Coen et al., forthcoming). Research on African-American women's experiences of physical activity in the US is a prime example of the importance of centring participant perspectives and qualitative research in developing physical activity interventions (Versey, 2014). Hall et al. (2013) found that African-American women's concerns about hair resulted in about 29% of women avoiding aerobics and gyms, and that those who avoided exercise for hair-related reasons were less likely to meet physical activity guidelines. By showing the socio-spatial processes of in/exclusion that impede participation in a variety of exercise environments, geographers are particularly well-placed to speak directly to public health agendas.

3. Critique versus critical praxis

To excavate these aspects of inequities requires critique; yet, Hitchings and Latham (2017a) claim that “efforts to increase activity” are somehow at odds with how “so much social science activity is taken up in critique” (p. 304). This draws an unhelpful line between the roles of critique and critical praxis, which I argue undercuts the aim of connecting qualitative evidence with public health agendas. Parr (2004) distinguishes between critical thinking, which can *reveal* channels to praxis, and praxis, which comprises direct action. There is certainly an argument to be made that critical thinking does not always translate into change, and it has been noted that there is “an enduring tension between analysis and action” in health geography (Kearns and Moon, 2002, p. 616). Hitchings and Latham (2017a) call for “further conversation with public health practitioners instead of taking a stance of comparative indifference or skeptical critique” (p. 304) does not break free of this tension. Indifference is certainly counterproductive, but I contend that avoiding a critical stance is misplaced because we need *both* critique and critical praxis to connect qualitative research on exercise and environment with public health agendas. To illustrate this, I turn to Guthman's (2012) critical political ecology of fat.

According to Guthman (2012), a critical political ecology “encourages examination beyond common sense” (p. 956) and involves interrogating dominant knowledge—or ‘environmental orthodoxies’—to consider how they may ‘foreclose’ other possible explanations. This approach sees scientific explanations not as neutral, but rather as situated within the social and political contexts in which they are produced and sustained. In particular, critical political ecology provides a framework to address potential ‘problem closure;’ that is, “when a specific definition of a problem is used to frame subsequent study of the problem's causes and consequences” (Guthman, 2012, p. 954). Critique in this way may yield insights into aspects of exercise experience that can otherwise be overlooked if research questions are based uncritically on particular types of knowledge, particularly biomedical knowledge related to body weight (e.g., Body Mass Index or BMI). Indeed, this is precisely why Williams and Gibson (2017) have argued that “ubiquitous knowledge of [exercise's] elixir-like qualities has not resolved the issue of inactivity” (p. 5). Rather than shying away from critique in qualitative work on exercise and environment, I hold

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/11005238>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/11005238>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)