Knowledge and Practice of Physical Activity among National Cancer **Institute workers, Cairo University**

Shaimaa A Abd Al Geleel, Manar M Moneer, Maissa K Noaman, Inas A Elattar

Biostatistics and Cancer Epidemiology Department, National Cancer Institute, Cairo University

Abstract

Background: Physical activity (PA) is hypothesized to reduce the risk of several chronic diseases and enhance longevity. Low levels of activity have been associated with some but not all types of cancers. We expected that work experience at National Cancer Institute (NCI) might have a positive effect on knowledge about and practice of physical activity among its workers. Aim: To describe physical activity practice among workers (medical & nonmedical) in National Cancer Institute (NCI), Cairo University and to measure knowledge about different health benefits of physical activity and its role in cancer prevention and treatment. Participants & method: This is a cross-sectional survey with anonymous self-administered questionnaire for workers (medical and nonmedical). Their level and pattern of physical activity were assessed using modified International Physical Activity Questionnaire version 8, their knowledge about health benefits of PA and its relation to cancer prevention and treatment were studied. The PA level was estimated as metabolic equivalent task (MET minutes/week). Results: The medical group of workers was significantly more knowledgeable about different health benefits of regular physical activity (PA), however the whole group were lacking adequate knowledge about role of PA in cancer prevention and treatment. No significant difference was found between the medical and non medical workers as regard the activity level. The most common barrier to participate in regular PA among the whole studied group was insufficient time. Significant variables affecting total score MET minute were age groups, work type, job hours per week, education level (years), presence or absence of children, sitting minutes/day. Only 23.5% of the whole studied groups participate in recreation and sport PA. Conclusion: There was lack of adequate knowledge about relation between PA and cancer prevention and its role in cancer treatment. **Recommendations:** Development and implementation of a health-related physical education program about benefits of PA practice. Additionally, suitable place and equipments should be made available at the NCI to stimulate workers for PA participation.

Keywords: Physical activity, Knowledge, Practice

Corresponding Author: Maissa K Noaman, MD E-mail: maissa_noaman@yahoo.com

Introduction

Physical activity (PA) is defined as any bodily movement produced by skeletal muscles that require energy expenditure. Regular, adequate physical activities are major factors in the promotion and

maintenance of good health throughout the entire life course.

Overall, 2 million deaths are attributable to physical inactivity. At least 30 minutes of moderate-intensity physical activity 5 days per week reduces the risk

of several common non-communicable diseases adults. cardiovascular in II disease. stroke, type diabetes. insomnia, depression, colon cancer and breast cancer. (1,2)

Scientific evidence indicates that PA may reduce the risk of several types of cancer, including cancers of breast (3), colon (4), prostate and endometrium.(5)

Physically active people tend to have better mental health. (6) Compared with inactive people, the physically active had higher scores for positive self-concept, more self-esteem and more positive "moods" and "affects. These findings seem similar in both young people and adults. PA has also been used to treat health problems depression, in both the short and long term.(7)

Physical exercise is important for maintaining physical fitness and can contribute positively to maintaining a healthy weight, building and maintaining healthy bone density, muscle strength, and joint mobility, promoting physiological well-being, reducing surgical risks, reducing the risk of premature death⁽⁶⁾ and strengthening the immune system.(8)

The most definitive epidemiological evidence for an association between PA and cancer exists for colon or colorectal cancer. (9,10) An estimated risk reduction has been found to be at least 20-30%, and up to 57% reduction in risk for colorectal cancer for both men and women. (10) There is also some evidence of an average risk reduction of 20-30% for endometrial cancer for women and 20-40% for breast cancer among postmenopausal women who participate in recreational activity. In addition, some research suggests an estimated average risk reduction of 10-30% for prostate cancer in physically active men. (10)

Preliminary evidence that PA may have a role in the prevention of lung, pancreatic, testicular and ovarian cancer also exists, however, the evidence is limited and more research is needed for a convincing association between these cancers and PA. (9,10)

Exercise significantly lowers insulin, glucose, triglycerides, and raises HDL cholesterol (11) which may also be associated with decreased cancer risk.(12) Public health awareness of cancer and the potential of its risk reduction including PA continue to rise in the community. We believed that workers at NCI (National Cancer Institute) might be more active and knowledgeable about this issue being working at a place dealing with such a lethal health problem and might be influenced by their work experience. So we conducted this study aiming to describe PA practice and measure the knowledge about its health benefits and role in cancer prevention and treatment among workers National Cancer Institute (NCI), Cairo University.

Methods

This cross-sectional survey involved all workers attending the day of interview and accepting participation in the study in all departments of the NCI during the vear 2013 using anonymous self-administered interviewer questionnaire adopted from international physical activity questionnaire (IPAQ) long form 8th version including personal data and assessment of physical activity through domains: work-related. four transportation, leisure-time activity and housework/gardening. In each of the four domains the number of days per week and time per day spent in both moderate and vigorous activity were

recorded, the prior week was considered as reference. Walking time was recorded for the first three domains. Sitting time was recorded as an indicator sedentary Assessment of behavior. Knowledge about different benefits of regular PA was added, as well as, its relation to cancer prevention and treatment and Barriers preventing participation in PA. Last. anthropometric measurements: body mass index (kg/m²) and fat percentage were discussed.

A pilot study was conducted on 20 workers to assess the questionnaire (clarity, time consumption and different responses) and some questions (those about domains of PA and knowledge of different health benefits) were modified accordingly by writing them in a more simplified manner to be understood by all workers especially house keepers.

The IPAO allows continuous assessment of PA. The continuous score allows the estimation of the energy expenditure expressed in Metabolic Equivalent Task (MET) minutes/weeks. One **MET** rate represents the of oxygen consumption (VO_2) of a seated individual at rest, equivalent approximately 3.5 ml·kg⁻¹·min⁻¹. Those with MET minute of zero were considered not active.

- Walking MET-minutes/week = 3.3 xwalking minutes x walking days
- Moderate MET-minutes/week = 4.0 x moderate-intensity activity minutes x moderate days
- Vigorous MET-minutes/week = 8.0 x vigorous-intensity activity minutes x vigorous-intensity days
- physical Total activity METminutes/week = sum of Walking + Moderate Vigorous **MET** minutes/week scores.

Participant with low level of PA was defined as those practicing < 300 min/week of at least moderate physical activity. Those with high level of PA are practicing ≥ 300 min/week of at least moderate physical activity based on recommendations of physical activity thresholds that result in health benefits described by Craig et al.(13)

Least moderate PA was defined as having either of the following criteria:

- Three or more days of vigorous activity of at least 20 min/day or
- Five or more days of moderate intensity activity and/or walking of at least 30 min/day or
- Five more days or of any combination of walking, moderate or intensity activities vigorous achieving a minimum of at least 600 MET-minutes/week.(13)

The studied group was classified into medical and non-medical groups according to their occupation. The medical group involved physicians, nurses and pharmacists, while the nonmedical group involved other workers.

The anthropometric measurements were carried out at the end of the interview. The body weight was measured using a weighing machine, model ZT-120. Height was measured using a portable plastic tape measure, with a mill metric scale, placed on a smooth and flat surface, with the individuals wearing light clothes and barefoot. Body mass index (BMI) (measured by dividing the weight in kilograms by the square of the height in meters) and classified as: normal with BMI $< 25 \text{ kg/ m}^2$; overweight, with BMI 25-29.9 kg/m²; and obese, with BMI $\geq 30 \text{ kg/m}^2$. The fat percentage was also assessed as an obesity measurement, using fat loss monitor (Omron). The fat loss monitor sends an extremely weak electrical current through the body to determine the amount of fat tissue.

Statistical Analysis:

Data were analyzed using SPSS win statistical package version 17. Numerical data were described as means and standard deviations (SD) or medians and ranges whenever appropriate. While qualitative data were described as frequencies and percentages. Numerical data were explored for normality using Kolmogrov-Smirnov test and Shapiro-Wilk test. Comparisons between the two for normally distributed groups numerical variables were done using the Student's t-test while for non-parametric numeric variables Mann-Whitney test used. Associations between was qualitative data were done using Chisquare test or Fisher's exact test as appropriate. Stepwise logistic regression was applied to the significant variables within the univariate analysis using the forward likelihood ratio method. The odds ratio (OR) and its confidence intervals (CI) were calculated to estimate the risk. Probability (p-value) equal or less than 0.05 is considered significant.

Results

Number of participants was 450; only 400 (207 medical workers and 193 nonmedical workers) responded to the questionnaire (89.0%). The mean age of the studied workers was 35.1±9.2 years. About 55.0% of the studied groups were between 16 to 34 years. Females represented 61.5%, 66.8% were married and 60.0% had more than 12 years of education. Most of the participants, 80.3%, worked on average 21-40 Job hours per week (Table 1). The medical workers were significantly more knowledgeable (p < 0.05) about different health benefits of regular physical

activity that non-medical workers. Only 42.0% of the medical workers, 17.1 % of the non-medical workers knew the benefit of PA for cancer prevention. Almost 24.0 % of the medical workers and 8.3 % of the non-medical workers knew the role of PA in cancer treatment (Table 2). Seventy one percent of the participants were active. No significant difference between the medical and nonmedical workers as regard the activity level was detected, p = 0.511 (Table 3). Insufficient time was the most common cause hindering physical activity among the whole studied group (57.5%). Medical workers spent significantly more time to study than non-medical workers (P < 0.001). The most common barrier among non-medical workers was unavailability of suitable places, 59.1%, which was significantly more common than medical workers, 28.5%, (p<0.001). Significant variables affecting total score MET minute were age groups, working type, job hours per week, education level (years), presence or absence of children, sitting minutes/day.

Stepwise logistic regression revealed that the factors independently affecting the total physical activity were sex, BMI, and sitting time. Females were 5.74 (95% CI: 2.43-13.52) times more active than males. Normal body mass index participants were 3.59 (95% CI: 1.09-11.81) times more likely to be active than those who were overweight and 4.63 (95% CI: 1.38-15.55) times more than obese participants. Participants sitting less than or equal to 360 minutes per day are 5.28 (95% CI: 2.42-11.51) times more likely to be active than more than 360 minutes per day (Table 4).

Discussion

No. 1

As public awareness of cancer and the potential for risk reduction continues to rise, we must structure policies that effectively utilize our current knowledge of cancer prevention and that reinforce healthy behavior changes. The current study was conducted on 400 workers in the NCI. We believe that this work-place might have an effect on PA practice and knowledge of the workers in this this institute. Because institute responsible for management of cancer, a lethal health problem, that may be modified by practicing PA.

In our study few respondents 15.3% knew that PA may reduce colon cancer risk. Awareness was especially low among the non-medical group. This is consistent with an American study conducted by Elliot et al.(14) who found that 15.0% of studied adults knew that PA may reduce colon cancer risk. Awareness was especially low among less educated groups. Keighley et al.(15) found that 30.0% of their studied groups knew that PA may reduce colon cancer risk. Among the medical group in the current study, few respondents (18.4%) knew that PA may reduce breast cancer risk. This is slightly higher than the study conducted by Lawlor et al.(16) who found only a minority (14.0%) of general practitioners knew that PA may reduce breast cancer risk. In this study 32.0% of the whole group believes that PA reduces some types of cancer, however 52.5% of this group don't know what type of cancer physical activity helps to prevent.

The results of the Health Information National Trend Survey indicate that more than two-thirds (69.9%) of U.S. adults believe that PA can help reduce the risk of getting some types of cancer. However, 68.2% of adults holding this belief do not know which specific types of cancer PA helps to prevent.(17) Combined with the results of the current

study, these findings suggest that although many individuals are aware that PA helps to prevent cancer, there is poor awareness of the type of cancers for which PA provides a protective effect.

Among the entire group in the current study about 71.0 % were active. Inactivity increases with age. This result is consistent with a study conducted by Søgaard et al.(18), who found that approximately 70.0% of their studied group in Norway, where inactivity increased with increasing age. In the current study PA decreased in the older age group. The most active age group was 16-34 years and least active group was 55 or more, p=0.03. The finding that physical inactivity increased in the older age group is not surprising; it goes in concordance with other studies. (19,20,21)

In our study, females were 5.7 times more active than males (95% CI: 2.4-13.5). On the contrary Li et al.(22) and Pedro et al.(23) found that PA is more frequent among males, probably due to higher activity at work outside the household and participation competitive sports in Chinese and Brazilian young adults respectively. The finding in the present study reported that females were more moderately active than males may be due to the used IPAO instrument which assesses components of PA, including moderateintensity activities done at home, such as carrying loads (e.g. babies), scrubbing floors, sweeping and vacuuming. These types of PA are more likely to be performed by female respondents.

In our study, time spent sitting was an independent factor affecting total level of PA. Those sitting ≤ 360 minutes/day were more active than those sitting > 360 minutes/day, p=0.030. This finding disagrees with Suija et al.(24) who didn't found significant relationship between

the level of PA and time spent sitting. The association between high BMI and lower levels of total PA found in our data was expected, since the total PA levels are associated with higher total energy expenditure. The normal body mass index of participants were 3.6 times more likely to be active than overweight (95% CI: 1.1-11.8) and 4.6 times more than obese participants (95% This CI: 1.4-15.6). result is in concordance with other studies. (25, 26, 27) In the current study the perceived barriers to increase PA were: insufficient time (57.5%), extra job (51.0 %), caring of children (15.8%), spending time to study (15.5%), caring of parents (3%), unavailability of suitable places (43.3%), PA not important (4.5%), not used to do PA (1.3%). Booth et al. (28) found that the most frequently cited barriers to moreregular participation in the youngest age group were insufficient time, lack of motivation and child responsibilities. Among those aged 60 to 78 years, injury or poor health were the most frequently cited barriers to activity in Australian population. Many studies have shown that time constraint was one of the reasons for adolescents to avoid physical activity. (29,30,31)

References

- Stampfer MJ, Hu FB, Manson JE, al. Primary Prevention of Coronary Heart Disease in Women through Diet and Lifestyle. New England Journal of Medicine 2000; 343 (1): 16.
- 2) Hu F, Manson J, Stampfer M, et al. Physical activity and risk for cardiovascular events in diabetic women. Annals of Internal Medicine 2001; 134(2): 96-105.
- 3) Friedenreich CM, Woolcott CG, McTiernan A, et al. Physical

- Activity Cancer and Breast Prevention Trial: Sex hormone changes in a year-long exercise intervention among postmenopausal women. J Clin Oncol 2010: 28: 1458-66.
- 4) Wolin KY, Patel AV, Peter PT, et (2010): Change in Physical Activity and Colon Cancer Incidence and Mortality. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 2010; 19(12): 3000-4.
- 5) Moore SC, Gierach GL, Schatzkin **A, et al.** Physical activity, sedentary behaviours, and the prevention of endometrial cancer. Br J Cancer 2010; 103(7):933-8.
- 6) U.S. Department of Health and **Human Services:** Physical activity and health: a report of the Surgeon General. Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion 1996. Available www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/sgr/pdf/sgrful l.pdf.
- 7) Biddle SJ & Asare M. Physical activity and mental health in children and adolescents: Br J Sports Med. 2011; 45(11): 886-95.
- 8) Gleeson M. Immune function in sport and exercise". J.Appl.Physiol. 2007; 103(2): 693-9.
- 9) International Agency for Research Cancer (IARC). **IARC** on Handbooks of Cancer Prevention, Vol 6. Weight control and physical activity. Lyon, France, IARC Press 2002.
- 10) World Cancer Research Fund (WCRF)/American Institute for Cancer Research (AICR). Food, nutrition, physical activity, and the

- prevention of cancer: a global perspective. Washington DC: WCRF/AICR 2007.
- 11) Raastad T, Bjøro T& Hallén J. Hormonal responses to high- and moderate-intensity strength exercise. Eur. J. Appl. Physiol. 2000; 82: 121-8.
- 12) Yu H & Rohan T. Role of insulinlike growth factor family in cancer development and progression. J. Natl. Cancer Inst. 2000; 92: 1472-89.
- 13) Craig CL, Marshall AL, Sjostrom M, et al. The international physical activity questionnaire - IPAQ: 12country reliability and validity. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2003; 35(8):1381-95.
- 14) Elliot JC, Jennifer H & Jennifer SF. Awareness of the role of physical activity in colon cancer prevention, Patient Educ Couns. 2008; 72(2): 246-51.
- 15) Keighley MR, O'Morain Giacosa A. Public awareness of risk factors and screening for colorectal cancer in Europe. Eur J Cancer Prev. 2004; 13: 257-62.
- 16) Lawlor DA, Keena A & Nealb **RD**. Increasing population levels of physical activity through primary care: GPs' knowledge, attitudes and self-reported practice. Family Practice 1999; 16 (3): 250-4.
- 17) National Cancer Institute Health Information. **National Trends** Survey, HINTS Brief Number 4. 2007. Available at http://hints.cancer.gov/docs/ HINTS Brief121306.pdf.
- 18) Søgaard AJ, Bø K, Klungland M, et al. (2000): a review of Norwegian studies--how much do we exercise during our leisure time. Tidsskr Nor Laegeforen.; 120(28): 3439-46.

- 19) Booth M. Assessment of physical international activity: An perspective. Res Q Exerc Sport 2000; 71(2 Suppl): S114-20.
- 20) Caspersen CJ, Pereira MA & Curran KM. Changes in physical activity patterns in the United States, by sex and crosssectional age. Med Sci Sports Exerc 2000; 32(9): 1601-
- 21) Trost SG, Owen N, Bauman AE, et al. Correlates of adults' participation in physical activity: review and update. Med Sci Sports Exerc 2002; 34(12): 1996-2001.
- 22) Li M, Dibley MJ, Sibbritt D, et al. Factors associated with adolescents' physical activity in Xi'an City, China. Medical Science and Sport Exercise 2006; 38(12): 2075-85.
- 23) Pedro C. Hallal, Sandra M. Matsudo, Victor K. R. et al. (2005): Physical activity in adults from two Brazilian areas: similarities and differences. Cad. Saúde Pública; 21(2): 573-80.
- 24) Suija K, Pechter U, Maaroos J, et al. Physical activity of Estonian family doctors and their counselling for a healthy lifestyle: a crosssectional study. **BMC** Family Practice 2010; 11: 48.
- 25) Andersen RE, Crespo CJ, Bartlett SJ, et al. Relationship of physical activity and television watching with body weight and level of fatness among children. JAMA 1998; 279: 938-42.
- 26) Must A & Tybor D J. Physical activity and sedentary behavior: a review of longitudinal studies of weight and adiposity in youth. Int. J. Obes. (Lond.) 2005; 29(Suppl. 2): S84-S96
- 27) Carlson SA, Fulton JE, Galuska DA, et al. Prevalence of self-

No. 1

- reported physically active adults -Unites States, 2007. MMWR 2007; 57: 1297-9.
- 28) Booth ML, Bauman A, Owen N, et al. Physical Activity Preferences, Preferred Sources of Assistance, and Perceived Barriers to Increased Activity among Physically Inactive Australians. Preventive Medicine 1997; 26(1): 131-7.
- 29) O'Dea JA. Why do kids eat healthy food? Perceived benefits and barriers to healthful and physical activity among children and adolescents. of American Journal Association 2003; 103: 497-501.
- 30) Kubik MY, Lytle L & Fulkerson **JA.** Fruits, vegetables and football: Findings from focus groups with alternative high school students regarding eating and physical activity. Journal Adolescent of Health 2005; 36(6): 494-500.
- **31) Kimm** SYS, Glynn NW, RP. Macmohan et Selfal. Perceived Barriers to Activity Participation among Sedentary Adolescents Girls. Medical Science and Sports Exercise 2006; 38(3): 534-40.

Table (1): Sociodemographic characteristics of medical and non-medical workers

Characteristic	Total (N= 400)	Medical (N=207)	Non-Medical (N=193)	p-value	
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)		
Age (years)					
Mean ± SD	35.1 ± 9.2	33.7 ± 8.2	36.5 ± 9.9	0.003	
Age groups					
16 to 34	218 (54.5)	129 (59.2)	89 (40.8)	0.005	
35 to 54	169 (42.3)	72 (42.6)	97 (57.4)		
55 or more	13 (3.3)	6 (46.2)	7 (53.8)		
Sex					
Male	154 (38.5)	82 (53.2)	72 (46.8)	0.525	
Female	246 (61.5)	125 (50.8)	121 (49.2)	0.636	
Marital status					
Single	124 (31.1)	68 (54.8)	56 (45.2)		
Divorced	5 (1.5)	2 (40.0)	3 (60.0)		
Widow	4 (1.0)	2 (50.0)	2 (50.0)	0.500	
Not married	133 (33.8)	72 (45.9)	61 (54.1)		
Married	267 (66.8)	135 (50.6)	132 (49.4)		
Education level (years)					
<u>≤12</u>	160 (40.0)	51 (31.9)	109 (68.1)	< 0.001	
>12	240 (60.0)	156 (65.0)	84 (35.0)		
Working type		, ,			
No PA	237 (59.3)	107 (45.1)	130 (54.9)	0.001	
PA	163 (40.8)	100 (61.3)	63 (38.7)	0.001	
Working hours per		, , ,			
week					
≤ 20	38 (9.5)	33 (86.8)	5 (13.2)	<0.001	
21–40	321 (80.3)	150 (46.7)	171 (53.2)		
≥41	41 (10.3)	24 (58.5)	17 (41.5)		

SD: standard deviation, PA: physical activity

Table (2): Knowledge about value of regular physical activity in cancer prevention and treatment among medical and non-medical workers

Characteristic	Medical	Non- medical	p-value
	(N=207)	(N=193)	_
	N (%)	N (%)	
Cancer prevention	87 (42.0)	33 (17.1)	< 0.001
Type of cancer which decrease by regular			
physical activity			
Breast	38 (18.4)	5 (2.0)	
Colon	32 (15.3)	3 (1.6)	
Prostate	15 (7.2)	2 (1.6)	
Lung	12 (2.8)	5 (2.6)	
Stomach	11 (5.3)	3 (2.1)	
Bone	11 (5.3)	4 (2.1)	
Bladder	10 (4.8)	3 (1.6)	
Brain	8 (3.9)	2 (1.0)	
Liver	8 (3.9)	2 (1.0)	
Other cancer	2 (1.0)	0 (0.0)	
Pancreas	1 (0.5)	0 (0.0)	
Leukemia and lymphoma	1 (0.5)	0 (0.0)	
No cancer effect	5 (2.4)	4 (2.1)	
Role on cancer treatment	49 (23.7)	16 (8.3)	< 0.001
Type of cancer at which physical activity			
play role in treatment			
All cancer	39 (18.8)	15 (7.8)	
Breast	8 (3.9)	1 (0.5)	
Lung	1 (0.5)	0 (0.0)	
Colon	1 (0.5)	0 (0.0)	

January

Table (3): Level of physical activity among medical and non medical workers

Level of physical activity	Total (N= 400) N (%)	Medical (N=207) N (%)	Non-Medical (N=193) N (%)	p-value
Not active (< 300 min/week)	116 (29.0)	57 (27.5)	59 (30.6)	0.511
Active (≥ 300 min/week)	284 (71.0)	150 (72.5)	134 (69.4)	

Table (4): Multivariate analysis of factors affecting total activity

					95% CI for OR	
	В	SE	P-value	OR	Lower	Upper
Sex	1.747	0.438	< 0.001	5.74	2.43	13.52
BMI			0.044			
Overweight	1.279	0.607	0.035	3.59	1.09	11.81
Obese	1.532	0.619	0.013	4.63	1.38	15.55
Sitting minutes/day	1.664	0.398	< 0.001	5.28	2.42	11.51
Constant	-5.185	0.696	< 0.001	0.01		

PA: physical activity, BMI: body mass index, B: regression coefficient, SE: standard error, OR; odds ratio, CI: confidence interval