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Session Objectives

1. Describe a framework for using qualitative data collection (i.e., focus groups) to elicit community-based perspectives about health in an underserved community.

2. Compare barriers and facilitators to healthy living across 3 neighborhood-level environments in South LA.

3. Discuss the integration of health promotion resources and policy strategies to eliminate health disparities in low-income urban communities.
Background: In 2012, Community Health Councils (CHC) received a three year CDC grant to increase evidence around programs that are effective in racial and ethnic communities to prevent obesity and hypertension in South Los Angeles.

- CHC is a non-profit, community-based health education and policy organization in South Los Angeles. Established in 1992, their mission is to promote social justice and to achieve equity in community and environmental resources to improve the health of underserved populations.

Project Description: to develop and to implement replicable and scalable policy, systems, and environmental changes

- Objective 1: To increase the number of access points for fresh fruits, vegetables, and physical activity options within a one-mile radius of targeted schools and FQHCs.
- Justification: Schools are well-positioned to serve as points of health promotion interventions to address the obesity epidemic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Profile of Adults (18+ years old in South Los Angeles)</th>
<th>% [95% C.I.]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ever Diagnosed with Hypertension</td>
<td>30.3% [19.2 – 41.4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obese</td>
<td>38.1% [26.2 – 50.5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overweight</td>
<td>32.2% [21.2 – 43.1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medi-Cal</td>
<td>30.3% [17.3 – 43.3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninsured</td>
<td>38.5% [25.6 – 51.5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported Fair/Poor Health Status</td>
<td>27.8% [17.7 – 37.9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported Medical Care is Somewhat or Very Difficult to Obtain when Needed</td>
<td>49.1% [36.6 – 61.6]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Health Atlas for the City of Los Angeles, June 2013.
Study Aims

- **Purpose:** To improve our understanding of neighborhood-level barriers and facilitators to access to healthy food and active living environments among adolescents and adults in South Los Angeles.

- **Intervention Sites:** Three high schools located in South Los Angeles with a School-Based Health Center (SBHC).
  - All of the schools offered after school programs for students, but not for adults (i.e., not "shared use").
  - 2 of the 3 schools had a school-based community garden.

Understanding student and community resident perceptions of barriers and facilitators to healthy eating and active living is important for designing and implementing successful school-based and policy interventions.

Social Ecological Framework

**Sources:**

Qualitative Research Design

- Focus groups have been used extensively in public health and health promotion for understanding the experiences of vulnerable or at-risk groups.

- **Data Collection Tools**
  - **Focus Group Script (Adults and Students)**
  - **Pre-Focus Group Questionnaire (Adults and Students)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Area</th>
<th>Selected Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Availability of Healthy Foods</strong></td>
<td>What kinds of healthy meals are available in your community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What do you like about school’s cafeteria? Not like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are ways to make your school’s cafeteria better?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(If applicable) What are ways to encourage or get more students to use the community garden on the way to and from school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Nutrition Resource Environment</strong></td>
<td>Do you participate in any physical activity activities or programs at your school? Why or why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you feel safe exercising during the day at parks and other places in your neighborhood? Why or why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Off-Campus Nutrition Resource Environment</strong></td>
<td>Do you feel safe exercising during the day at parks and other places in your neighborhood? Why or why not?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Procedures

- 60-90 minute focus groups led by a moderator (English or Spanish)
  - Setting: High school classroom or parent center room
  - Incentive: $20 gift card and refreshments
  - Participants provided assent and parental consent (students)

- Purposeful sampling strategy to identify those who would represent a "typical case" of people who would participate in the REACH project
  - Recruitment Challenge: Groups are often smaller than expected

- Data Analysis
  - Descriptive statistics were calculated from the questionnaires
  - Organized themes by constructs identified a priori
  - Grounded theory approach guided the analysis
  - Data analysis software NVivo 10 used to organize and review transcripts

Focus Group Participants

Four groups (n=28 HS students) and seven groups (n=47 adults) from three school sites between July and October 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STUDENTS (N=28)</th>
<th>ADULTS (N=47)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>15.9 (1.2)</td>
<td>47.2 (13.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American or Black</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Hawaiian Islander</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Ethnic</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Spoken at Home</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English (Only or Mostly)</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both English &amp; Spanish</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish (Only or Mostly)</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On-Campus Nutrition Resource Environment (Students)

- Cafeteria
  - 53.6% reported regularly eating in the school cafeteria
  - 14.2% reported regularly skipping lunch

- Barriers to Healthy Eating
  - Disliked waiting in long lines and frozen foods

- Facilitators to Healthy Eating
  - After-School Nutrition Education/Cooking Programs
    - Lack of available (or standalone) programs
    - "They break out the sports and they teach you everything you need to know to be healthy. It’s more physical activity but they incorporate food."

  - School-Based Gardens (at 2 schools)
    - High levels of awareness and interest
    - Perceived as an asset
    - "We planted cabbage, broccoli, and lots of vegetables... teams in the Sierra Club, and not only did we learn about the upper stories, and the problems, but also to garden and what else you can do."

  - Institutional barriers to utilization
Recommendations to Improve the On-Campus Nutrition Resource Environment

- "Fresh foods."
- "Actually cook the food, not microwave food."
- "Better food selection."

- "They go and get the food and then throw it away because we don’t like it... They should make a calendar so we know."
- "If they had more lines, sometimes they close lines."
- "Yeah, it’s slow, a lot of kids in line... so many kids don’t know their numbers to the thing..."
- "Let everyone go. Not every gets to go. Have a sign up so it isn’t chaotic. Then everyone has a chance to go."

Off-Campus Nutrition Resource Environment

- Preference for Fast Food and Junk Food (Students)
  - A majority of students consumed off-campus food
  - Popular junk food included chips, soda, energy drinks, and blended caffeinated drinks
  - 39% of student participants reporting drinking ≥2 sodas in the past 24 hours

- Availability of Fast Food (Students and Adults)
  - Participants agreed "a lot" of fast food restaurants were located close to their schools and homes

- "We all eat fast food. That is all we eat. Especially around the school because there’s junk food restaurants across the street."

Off-Campus Nutrition Resource Environment

- Food Resources
  - Mostly shopped at supermarket chains and ethnic grocery stores
  - Price as key factor
  - Liquor/corner stores used for emergency purchases (i.e., eggs or milk)
  - Non-traditional or alternative food resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grocery Store Chains</th>
<th>Site 1</th>
<th>Site 2</th>
<th>Site 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Food Sources</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Physical Activity Resource Environment

- Student PA Behaviors
  - 42.9% said they received enough PA on a regular basis, yet only 25% reported engaging in the recommended 60 minutes per day
  - 78.6% exceeded the AAP’s screen time guidelines of ≤1-2 hours per day

- Access to PA Resources
  - High level of awareness of local parks, senior centers, pools, gyms, and programs, but low rates of utilization among adults and students
  - Most popular PA programs among students were school sports programs or teams
  - 78.5% reported having access to places in their communities to exercise (21.5% did not know)

Barriers to Active Living

- Primary Barrier for Students: Intrapersonal
  - “If you have the time for it, like it’s hard if you are a lazy person.”

- Primary Barriers for Adults
  - Cost, Distance from Home, and Safety

- Safety Barriers
  - 42.86% of students reported feeling it was somewhat unsafe to use local PA resources
  - Park as a site for unsafe activities (”there’s no safe park”) including gang activity
  - It’s unfortunate that these kids is scared. They would rather be in the house playing video games than going to the park because they don’t feel safe.
  - Students mentioned feeling uncomfortable walking to and from school
  - Fears of unwanted attention
  - Witnessed friends or peers get hit by a car or a bike
  - Popular coping strategy (adults and students): Walking Groups

Shared Used Perspectives (Adults)

- Participants thought it was generally a good idea to keep the schools open for the community to use for exercise or nutrition activities
  - Interest in using the schools’ exercise equipment and track
  - Local gyms or private programs are expensive or too far

- Shared safety and security concerns
  - Many believed someone would vandalize the schools or commit theft

"Are we going to have security if the vandals do come? Unfortunately they are coming."
Key Takeaways

- Healthy living resources may be underutilized in low-income urban communities for numerous reasons (institutional, environmental, and individual barriers).

- Findings may be useful to public health and medical professionals committed to addressing obesity disparities among at-risk minorities in low-income communities.

Recommendations

- Healthy eating behaviors may be promoted through policy or institutional changes (i.e., increased lunch time, reduced queues, Farm-to-School, increased garden access) and nutrition education programs for students/parents.
- More difficult to address competing unhealthy food outside of school.
- Active living may be promoted through programs that leverage interpersonal facilitators (e.g., walking clubs) or policy changes to encourage shared use if safety/security issues are addressed (i.e., programming, safety personnel).
- Offering non-competitive PA programs (kick-boxing or dance) or making programs more appealing could help to address the lack of motivation issue.
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