Different Strategies Contribute to Community Physical Activity Program Participation in Rural versus Metropolitan Settings
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Organizational context
Program context

- Developed through research-practice partnership
- Delivered through county extension agents
- Team-building approach
- Goal-setting and tracking
- 8 weeks with social-cognitive newsletters
- Demonstrated effectiveness

2008 Estabrooks, et al.
Design

Recruitment Strategies
• Task Force
• Promo Mat’ls

Communities/Settings

Individuals

Participation Rate

Metro/urban counties

Participation Rate

Rural counties

Delivery Agents
Methods & Measures

- Cross sectional study
- 94 agents (102 counties)
- Task force activity
- Promotional score
- Years of delivery
- Rural vs metro/urban (USDA data)
- Participation Rates - % of target population
Analysis and Findings

• Mann-Whitney

• Significant difference in participation rates by setting type

• \( z = -4.5, \ p < .001 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Participation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metro/Urban</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Metro/Urban Regression Model

- Promotion Score was the only significant contributor to participation rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promo Score</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.003**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Force Activity</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-1.55</td>
<td>0.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Delivered</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rural Regression Model

- Task Force Activity and Years Delivered significantly contributed to the prediction of participation rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promo Score</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Force Activity</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Delivered</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.017**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Prediction of Participation Rate

- Rural: F=6.64, p=.001
Summary & Discussion

1. Different recruitment strategies contributed to participation rate in metro/urban vs. rural

- In metro ----promotion score
- In rural----task force activity

2002 Glanz, Rimer, Lewis; 1996 Viswanath & Finnegan
2. Higher participation rates were found in rural counties.

3. Rural model explained more of the variance in participation rate.
Limitations

- Cannot determine causation

- Lack of information on resources available to agents in rural vs metro settings

- Lack of information on availability of physical activity programs in rural vs metro settings
Significance

• Demonstrates need for more studies of this type
• Results lead to practical advice
• Implications for staff and resource distribution
Questions?

Promotion Score
Task Force Activity

% of target population reached

Promotion Score
Task Force Activity

% of target population reached