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Rationale

- Mobility + social participation = key determinants of health and quality of life

Neighborhood environment

1. Product and technology
2. Natural and human-made changes
3. Support and relationships
4. Attitudes
5. Services, systems and policies

(WHO, 2001)
Neighborhood environment

characteristics of the physical context including aspects of urban design (e.g., presence of sidewalks), traffic density and speed, distance to and design of venues for physical activity such as walking (e.g., parks and access to services), esthetics, crime, safety (Davison & Lawson, 2006), weather, support, etc. It considered both the physical and social attributes.

Mobility

Ability to move oneself (e.g., walking, using assistive devices, or taking transportation) within community environments that expand from one's home, to the neighborhood, and to regions beyond (Webber, Porter & Menec, 2010)

Social participation

Person’s involvement in social activities that provide social interactions within his/her community or society (Levasseur et al., 2010)
Rationale

• Mobility + social participation = key determinants of health and quality of life

Neighborhood environment

• Several investigations on mobility, social participation & neighborhood environment
• No clear integration of the results
• Social participation in Canada?
Objectives

1. Provide a comprehensive understanding regarding how neighborhood environment is associated with mobility and social participation in older adults
   a) Aspects of the neighborhood environment associated with mobility and social participation in older adults
   b) Aspects of the neighborhood environment not covered by previous research on mobility and social participation in older adults

2. Describe and compare social participation and barriers to community activities among older Canadians
Associations of neighborhood with mobility and social participation
Methods

• Scoping study framework (Arksey & O'Malley, 2005; Levack, 2009)

1. Identifying the research questions
2. Identifying relevant studies
3. Study selection
4. Charting the data
5. Collating, summarizing, and reporting results
6. Consulting (throughout the project)
7. Dissemination of results
Methods

• Scoping study framework (Arksey & O'Malley, 2005; Levack, 2009)
• 9 databases from different fields (public health, urban planning, rehabilitation and gerontology)

Medline, Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, CINAHL, Ageline, SocIndex, Psycinfo, Allied & Complementary Medicine Database (AMED), Academic Search Complete, Francis

§ French databases
Methods

• Scoping study framework (Arksey & O'Malley, 2005; Levack, 2009)
• 9 databases from different fields (public health, urban planning, rehabilitation and gerontology)
• 51 keywords [strategy: 1 AND 2 AND (3 OR 4)]

1. Built environment OR neighbourhood OR neighborhood OR environment* design* OR universal design* OR physical environment OR healthy environment OR living environment OR urban environment* OR suburban environment* OR rural environment* OR public transport* OR alternative transport* OR public transit OR paratransit OR bus OR buses OR urban design OR walkability OR walkable OR pedestrian OR social environment OR community design
2. Elder* OR seniors OR old* adult* OR geriatric OR aged OR ageing OR aging OR older people
3. Community participation OR social participation OR social involvement OR social engagement OR community involvement OR community engagement OR civic participation OR social isolation OR social integration OR social contact* OR social activity* OR social inclusion* OR social interaction* OR solitude OR loneliness OR lonely OR social exclusion*
4. Mobility OR walking OR active transport*
Methods

• Scoping study framework (Arksey & O'Malley, 2005; Levack, 2009)
• 9 databases from different fields (public health, urban planning, rehabilitation and gerontology)
• 51 keywords [strategy: 1 AND 2 AND (3 OR 4)]
• Data analyzed, organized and synthesized by 2 research assistants following PRISMA-guidelines (Moher, Liberati, Tetzlaff & Altman, 2009) and using the ICF (WHO, 2001)
• Knowledge users consulted
Results

- 50 articles selected
- **Cross-sectional** (29; 58%)
- **U.S.** (24; 48%); **Canada** (15; 30%)
- **Urban** (40; 80%); **rural** (7; 14%)
- Disadvantaged older adults $\rightarrow$ disabilities (6; 12%) or Low Neighborhood Socioeconomic Status (2; 4%)
- **Mobility** (39; 78%), social participation (19; 38%) or both (11; 22%)
Results (cont.)

• Type of mobility
  – Walking (38; 94.4%)
  – Driving (10; 59%)
  – Active and alternative transportation (13; 33.3%)

• Mainly subjective measures
  – Neighborhood environment (34; 68%)
  – Social participation (19; 100%)
  – Mobility (32; 82.1%)
Results (cont.)

1) Product and technology (43; 86%)
2) Natural and human-made changes (27; 54%)
3) Support and relationships (21; 42%)
4) Attitudes (4; 8%)
5) Services, systems and policies (37; 74%)

Observable consequences of customs, practices, ideologies, values, norms, factual beliefs and religious beliefs. These attitudes influence individual behaviour and social life at all levels, from interpersonal relationships and community associations to political, economic and legal structures.
Chapter 4: Attitudes
  e410: Individual attitudes of immediate family members
  e415: Individual attitudes of extended family members
  e420: Individual attitudes of friends
  e425: Individual attitudes of acquaintances, peers, colleagues, neighbors and community members
  e430: Individual attitudes of people in positions of authority
  e435: Individual attitudes of people in subordinate positions
  e440: Individual attitudes of personal care providers and personal assistants
  e450: Individual attitudes of health professionals
  e455: Individual attitudes of health-related professionals

Chapter 5: Services, systems and policies
  e510: Services, systems and policies for the production of consumer goods
  e520: Open space planning services, systems and policies
  e530: Utilities services, systems and policies
  e535: Communication services, systems and policies
  e550: Legal services, systems and policies
  e565: Economic services, systems and policies
  e570: Social security services, systems and policies
  e575: General social support services, systems and policies
  e585: Education and training services, systems and policies
  e590: Labour and employment services, systems and policies
  e595: Political services, systems and policies
Results (cont.)

• **Type of association**
  - Positive (209; 54%)
  - Negative (86; 22.2%)
  - Non-existent (92; 23.8%)

• 22 divergent associations found in the same studies
  → specific contexts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 3: Support and relationships</th>
<th>Mobility</th>
<th>Social participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>e310: Immediate family</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from family</td>
<td>+[85], +[86]</td>
<td>+[85], +[86], 0[133]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e320: Friends</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from friends</td>
<td>+[85]</td>
<td>+[85], 0[133]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e325: Acquaintances, peers, colleagues, neighbors and community members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children living in the neighborhood</td>
<td>-[115]</td>
<td>0[125]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of social support</td>
<td>-[88]</td>
<td>-[88]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>0[100], +[93], +[94], +[98], +[103], +[105]</td>
<td>+[92], +[126]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social cohesion</td>
<td>+[117], +[121], 0[134]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support/network</td>
<td>+[92], +[122], 0[90], 0[115]</td>
<td>+[87], +[125], +[126], +[71]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking partner</td>
<td>+[93]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e345: Stranger</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowdedness</td>
<td>0[100], -[98]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e350: Domesticated animals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having or not walking a dog</td>
<td>-[90]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results (cont.)

• Proximity to resources and recreational facilities
• Social support
• Having a car or driver’s license
• Public transportation
• Neighborhood security
• Poor user-friendliness of the walking environment
• Neighborhood insecurity
Discussion

• Comprehensive understanding of neighborhood environment associations
• + Proximity to resources and to recreational facilities, Social support, Car or driver’s license, Public transportation and Neighborhood security
• - Poor user-friendliness of the walking environment and Neighborhood insecurity
Discussion

• Comprehensive understanding of neighborhood environment associations

• + Proximity to resources and to recreational facilities, Social support, Car or driver’s license, Public transportation and Neighborhood security

• - Poor user-friendliness of the walking environment and Neighborhood insecurity

Access to food shopping, health services, public transportation, banking and social clubs & initiating and maintaining social links with community members (Lindström, 2004)
Discussion

• Comprehensive understanding of neighborhood environment associations

• + Proximity to resources and to recreational facilities, Social support, Car or driver’s license, Public transportation and Neighborhood insecurity

• - Poor user-friendliness of the walking environment and Neighborhood insecurity

Access to food shopping, health services, public transportation, banking and social clubs & initiating and maintaining social links with community members (Lindström, 2004)

Resource affluent areas → less likely to have low levels of social functioning, independently of individual demographic and socioeconomic characteristics (Bowling, 2007)
Discussion

• Comprehensive understanding of neighborhood environment associations

• + Proximity to resources and to recreational facilities. Social support, Car or driver's license, Public transportation

- Poor user-friendliness of the walking environment and Neighborhood insecurity

Access to food shopping, health services, public transportation, banking and social clubs & initiating and maintaining social links with community members (Lindström, 2004)

Resource affluent areas \(\rightarrow\) less likely to have low levels of social functioning, independently of individual demographic and socioeconomic characteristics (Bowling, 2007)

Absence or disappearance of local businesses \(\rightarrow\) concern (Van Cauwenberg, 2012), especially when they prefer or are restricted to the immediate neighborhood (Hovbrandt, 2007)
Discussion (cont.)

• Urban planning interventions
  – neighborhood revitalization
  – survival of proximity resources
  – limitation of the creation of large supermarkets far from people’s homes

• Resources available, but get to them easily and safely → public + alternatives transportations issues
Discussion (cont.)

Limitations

- Articles between January 1980 and September 2013 selected with specific keywords in specific databases
- Did not include other sources such as reports, conferences, theses, etc.
- Did not systematically combine empirical results of previous studies or provide a detailed appraisal of the quality of the evidence
Conclusion (1/4)

• To foster mobility & social participation → Proximity to resources and to recreational facilities, Social support, Transportation, Neighborhood security and User-friendliness of the walking environment

• Future studies should
  – include both mobility and social participation
  – investigate how they are associated with Attitudes, and Services, Systems and Policies in older adults, including disadvantaged older adults
Social participation of older adults in Canada?
Methods

• Secondary analysis
• Cross-sectional 2008-2009 Canadian Community Health Survey
• 30,865 Canadians aged 45 and over
• Frequency of monthly involvement in 8 community activities
• 10 potential barriers (e.g. not wanting to go alone, cost and transportation problems)
Results

Monthly participation:
- 13.5 - 14.9
- 15.0 - 15.8
- 15.9 - 16.2
- 16.3 - 17.0
- N/D
Results (cont’d)

- Women > men (15.2 vs 14.5 community activities/month)
- Older Canadians → religious activities VS younger → physical activities
- Environmental barriers restricted women > men
- Residents of the Prairies > Quebecers (13.8 and 11.9)
- More Canadians aged 45-64 wanted to participate more in community activities than those aged 65 and over (36.8% vs. 23.9%), and women > men (34.3% vs. 30.9%)
Results (cont’d)
Results (cont’d)

• Environmental barriers restricted women > men
• For women aged 65 and over, location inaccessibility (1.7% vs. 0.7%) and the unavailability of activities (8.0% vs. 5.4%) restricted their participation
• Canadians who had a driver’s license participated on average in more community activities
• The unavailability of activities was a barrier for 10% of women in the Atlantic region and Prairies, and also restricted older Canadians who lived in rural areas more than in metropolitan (8.0% vs. 4.8%)
Conclusion (2/4)

- Women participated slightly more than men, and older Canadians participated more than younger.
- In both age groups, environmental barriers restricted women more than men.
- Driving and other transportation options should be addressed to foster social participation of older adults.
- Further research examining older Canadians’ locations in greater details and their social participation is needed to foster the creation of favorable environments.
What next to foster social participation of older adults?
Conclusion (3/4)

- Importance of offering new opportunities to increase community integration and optimize resources to address the global ‘Ageing well’ priority in efforts to overcome major universal public health challenges, such as increased prevalence of chronic diseases.

- A personalized assistance for social participation (APIC), i.e. weekly three-hour personalized stimulation sessions over a six-month period, targeting significant social and leisure activities that are difficult to accomplish.
Conclusion (4/4)

• Social participation index


• Optimization of transportation ➔ driving (OSCAR & 55 Alive+)
and use of public transit

• Lifestyle redesign® ➔ an intervention to foster a significant and healthy lifestyle
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