



Effectiveness of a free exercise program in a neighborhood park

Bing Han^{a,*}, Deborah A. Cohen^a, Kathryn P. Derosé^a, Terry Marsh^a, Stephanie Williamson^a, Steven Loy^b

^a RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, CA 90401, USA

^b Department of Kinesiology, California State University, Northridge, Northridge, CA 91330, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Available online 29 March 2015

Keywords:

Physical activity

Health promotion

Community intervention

ABSTRACT

Background. Faculty, students, and alumni in a university-based kinesiology program developed an innovative model for health promotion practice by partnering with the local park administration in San Fernando, California to offer these exercise classes for free in a low-income, predominantly Latino neighborhood park. The classes were taught by students as practical training for academic credit.

Purpose. The aim of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of this pilot program in promoting moderate-to-vigorous physical activity.

Methods. We used the System for Observing Play and Recreation in Communities (SOPARC) to assess physical activity in the park during the summer of 2013. We evaluated the effectiveness of the free classes by a within-park comparison and by comparing findings with 50 other parks.

Results. The classes substantially increased moderate-to-vigorous physical activities, in particular, for female park users. However, when classes were not offered there were no differences in park-based physical activity across parks.

Conclusions. Active programming can increase park-based moderate-to-vigorous physical activity, but without programming, people may lack the motivation to exercise on their own. Creating a partnership between parks and kinesiology programs is a promising health promotion model. Replicating this type of program could yield important health dividends.

© 2015 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Inc. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Introduction

Few American adults achieve the national physical activity guidelines (Troiano et al., 2008), which call for 150 min of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (MVPA) per week (USDHHS, 2008). This is of great concern, particularly because of the well-known association between physical inactivity, chronic diseases, and higher health costs (Blair, 2009; Colditz, 1999; Oldridge, 2008). Much of the existing national physical activity promotion has not been directed at physical activity programming but instead on motivational campaigns like “Verb” (Huhman et al., 2007) and now the “Let’s Move” campaign, both of which have targeted youth rather than adults. Physical inactivity, however, increases with age, as do the negative health consequences (USDHHS, 2008).

Finding scalable interventions that increase physical activity among adults is very important and public parks offer great potential in this area, particularly for low-income populations (Reed et al., 2012). Most jobs are sedentary and few worksites offer opportunities for workers to exercise on the job, so the majority of Americans must use their

leisure time for this pursuit. Only a small percentage of Americans join health clubs for physical activity (IHRSA, 2011). Other venues for leisure time physical activity are at home, in the streets, or in public parks. Most people live within 2–5 miles of a park (ICMA and NaCO, 2006). However, in multiple studies of park-based physical activities we have conducted, most areas in parks were vacant or nearly so over 50% of the time throughout a year. Furthermore, park users were largely sedentary and comprised disproportionately fewer females and seniors compared to their presence in the local population (Cohen et al., 2010, 2011; Han et al., 2013, in press). Physical activity programming in parks is often necessary, particularly for populations that typically underutilize parks (Tester and Baker, 2009). Because park use is free, there is great potential in promoting physical activity through local parks, particularly for low-income populations.

In the midst of this huge gap between the actual and the recommended level of exercise, the field of kinesiology, the study of human movement, is a large and growing college major with over 700 departments in colleges and universities across the country (AKA, 2012). Graduates from kinesiology programs have the necessary knowledge and skills to instruct, guide, and facilitate various leisure time MVPA, as well as to promote health awareness.

Dr. Loy, a professor of kinesiology in California State University, Northridge, and a co-author of this paper, developed a partnership

* Corresponding author at: RAND Corporation, 1776 Main St., Santa Monica, CA 90401, USA.

E-mail address: bhan@rand.org (B. Han).

Table 1
Park and neighborhood characteristics.^a

Parks	Acres	Population ^b	% Latino residents ^b	% households in poverty ^b
Study park	11	30,800	90.4%	20.3%
Two parks in the vicinity	12.9	30,000	77.2%	20.4%
Fifty parks in the metropolitan area	13.0	39,300	47.7%	23.6%

^a Averages for comparison parks.^b Within a 1-mile radius to park addresses and based on the 2010 U.S. Decennial Census.

with the Recreation and Parks Department in the City of San Fernando, California, in the summer of 2011 to deliver a series of free exercise classes targeting minorities and physically inactive subpopulations in low-income neighborhood parks. The initiative, called “100 Citizens,” is a progressive fitness program designed to increase muscle strength and endurance, cardiovascular capacity, and flexibility. They offer three levels of fitness instructions: introductory beginner, intermediate, and senior, where the senior level places a greater emphasis on strength and balance exercises and cardiovascular fast-paced walking. Participants rotate through multiple stations where exercise activities target different muscle groups. Strength training includes primarily the use of resistance bands and body weight exercises. Aerobic training is sufficient to elevate heart rate continuously during the bouts of exercise, (e.g., jogging around the park for 15 min) and most attendees can accomplish more than one mile during that time. A general description of the program and pictures and video clips taken during the classes can be found online at <http://www.100citizens.org>, a website jointly sponsored by the City of San Fernando and California State University, Northridge. All participants have signed a consent form with a standard liability waiver and the approval for the use of photographs and videos in traditional and electronic publications sponsored by the city without notification.

All exercise courses were taught by college students pursuing a degree in kinesiology with completed course work in anatomy, physiology, biomechanics, and exercise physiology. Leaders are comprised of senior level students or those who have experience in conducting personal and group exercise training programs. Leadership opportunities are only given to those with sufficient education and experience to supervise other undergraduate students. The student instructors were supervised by Dr. Loy and the park staff. Kinesiology student instructors can earn academic credits for leading these exercise classes as curriculum practical training.

To determine the program's impact on promoting park-based MVPA, we examined park use and physical activity in the neighborhood park where it is offered in San Fernando, CA. We used both a within-park comparison and between-park comparisons with two similar parks in the vicinity as well as 50 parks in the City of Los Angeles for the evaluation. Most comparison parks had fee-based classes but none had free classes of this type.

Methods

We employed the System for Observing Play and Recreation in Communities (SOPARC), a widely used tool for observing physical activity in parks (McKenzie et al., 2006a, 2006b). We briefly review the SOPARC tool below. Before field measurements, a park is mapped and divided into several target areas, each of which usually has a unique functionality (e.g., playground, an indoor basketball court) and can be observed without visual obstruction. In each field measurement, a team of two observers go over all target areas in a pre-specified order. In each target area, an observer sweeps from left to right and counts the number of individuals present by demographic characteristics (gender, race/ethnicity, and age groups) and momentary physical

activity status: sedentary (i.e., lying down, sitting), moderate (e.g., walking), or vigorous (e.g., jogging). The other observer facilitates the counting and is responsible for recording the counts by a hand-held device. Due to the limitation of human being's short term working memory (Sewell et al., 2014), observations in a target area are split to four rounds of scans where each scan focuses on a subset of variables. Males and females are scanned separately. For each gender, an observer first scans physical activity level by age group, and next scans race/ethnicity. The SOPARC protocol has a high inter-rater reliability and its validity has been verified by comparison with snapshot pictures taken at observations (Han et al., under review; McKenzie et al., 2006a, 2006b). Because this method consists of observation of individuals in public settings, the study was deemed exempt from human subjects review by the institutional review board in the authors' organization.

Given that the free physical activity classes were offered Monday, Wednesday, and Friday mornings from 8:30 to 9:30, we visited the park on five occasions in one week (8:30 am on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, and 1:30 pm and 5 pm on Monday); during two of the free physical activity classes and three times when the classes were not in session in September, 2013. Trained community health workers (“promotoras”) measured park use by the SOPARC protocol. We measured two outcomes: the number of park users and the level of intensity of physical activity, expressed as metabolic equivalents (METs), where METs were estimated by the following conversion rule in the literature: 1.5 METs for sedentary activity (sitting or standing), 3.0 METs for walking or moderate activity, and 6 METs for vigorous activity (Ainsworth et al., 2000). Each outcome was measured independently by two teams of observers to reduce the potential observer's bias.

To evaluate the magnitude of the impact of the program on physical activity in parks, we conducted three comparisons. We first compared the observed outcomes in the study park at the early morning hour (8:30–9:30) with and without classes by sample means. Second, we identified two parks in the vicinity that are similar in size and neighborhood race/ethnicity profile as the study park (see Table 1). We used the mean outcomes during two weeks in 2010 and 2012 on the same weekdays and during roughly the same hours from these two similar parks for comparisons. Third, we used a longitudinal model developed based on historical park use data from 50 neighborhood parks in the great Los Angeles area (Cohen et al., 2013). This model can predict the mean number of park users and users' levels of physical activity (METs) for parks that have the same size and facilities and serve the same population as the study park. The model provided the 95% prediction intervals, i.e., the low and high bounds that cover 95% of possible outcomes in parks similar to our study park. We compared the observed park use and physical activities to these prediction benchmarks

Results

The within-park comparison suggested that the free classes increased physical activities of park users by two to three times during

Table 2

Within-park comparison of outcomes observed during 8:30–9:30 am on weekdays with and without free classes.

Gender	Age-group	# users		METs	
		With classes	Without classes	With classes	Without classes
Female	Child	4.5	0	7.9	0
	Teenager	0.5	0	1.5	0
	Adult	75.5	31	231.8	73.5
	Senior	17.8	9.5	44.3	19.5
Male	Child	7.5	3.5	14.6	8.3
	Teenager	3.3	0	6.3	0
	Adult	24	4.5	59.6	16.5
	Senior	2.8	3	6.8	15.0
Total		135.8	51.5	372.8	132.8

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/4202430>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/4202430>

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