Promoting Physical Activity Among Seniors in Abu Dhabi: An Experimental Test of the "Forever Fit" Nudge

Nikos Nikiforakis,[a,b] Layla Abdulaziz Alhyas,[c] Uzma Afzal,[b,d]

Alex Agiostratitis,[b] Elyazyeh M. Alfalacy,[c] Aurelie Dariel,[a,b]

Melissa C. Monney,[c] Manuel Muñoz-Herrera,[b,e] Ernesto Reuben[a,b,e]

Abstract

Physical inactivity is a leading cause globally of noncommunicable diseases such as diabetes, heart attacks, and strokes. Here, we present the results from a 4-week-long experimental test of a nudge designed to promote physical activity among 206 seniors in Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates—a population with one of the highest rates of physical inactivity in the world. We find that the "Forever Fit" nudge—a booklet containing a simple exercise program and information about the health benefits of physical activity—has a large positive effect on 93 previously inactive seniors. The nudge increases the time previously inactive participants spend being physically active from about 5 to about 15 minutes per day.

This version: November 2024

Keywords: nudge, physical activity, experimental test, elderly, health

[a] Division of Social Science, New York University Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates
[b] Center for Behavioral Institutional Design, United Arab Emirates
[c] Abu Dhabi Department of Community Development, United Arab Emirates
[d] Department of Economics, Lahore University of Management Sciences, Pakistan
[e] Luxembourg Institute of Socio-Economic Research, Luxembourg

1   Introduction

Physical activity is associated with numerous health benefits (World Health Organization, 2021). Specifically, evidence from randomized controlled trials indicate that increases in physical activity lead to improvements in both physical (Valenzuela et al., 2023) and cognitive (Northey et al., 2018) function, as well as reductions in multiple health conditions (Powell et al., 2011; Warburton, 2006; Warburton and Bredin, 2017).[1] The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in the United States considers regular physical activity as one of the most effective measures senior adults can take to prevent or delay various age-related health issues (Physical Activity Guidelines Advisory Committee, 2008). Despite this, many senior adults do not engage in sufficient physical activity (Thøgersen-Ntoumani et al., 2010).

This paper examines the impact of the Forever Fit Program (FFP)—a low-cost, scalable intervention designed to increase physical activity among senior adults in Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates (UAE). This population is interesting for two reasons. First, the rate of physical inactivity in this population is alarming: a recent UAE report revealed that 93.8% of individuals aged 60 and above do not meet the minimum standards for moderate-intensity physical activity of the World Health Organization (WHO) (Qawas et al., 2019). This figure is in stark contrast to the global age-standardized prevalence of insufficient physical activity, which stands at 27.5% (Guthold et al., 2018). Since the benefits of physical activity are especially pronounced among individuals aged 60 and above (Blake et al., 2009; Carlson et al., 2018; Rai et al., 2019) and those who are inactive (Moore et al., 2012), the potential health benefits of increasing physical activity in this population are substantial. Second, due to the hot climate in the region and the fact that our study was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic, senior adults in Abu Dhabi have limited access to outdoor spaces, making it potentially more challenging to promote physical activity, as it must occur indoors, particularly at home.

The FFP is a booklet containing a simple exercise program and information about the health benefits of moderate physical activity (MPA), which the WHO defines as physical activity that requires moderate effort and makes individuals "breathe somewhat harder than normal" (World Health Organization, 2011). We focus on MPA because it offers more health benefits than milder forms of physical activity, such as normal walking (Nakagawa et al., 2020), while being suitable for the age of our target population. Guided by a diagnostic analysis of the underlying causes of inactivity among seniors in the UAE based on survey data, the FFP was designed to reduce the immediate costs of physical activity and enhance its perceived benefits. The FFP,

---

[1]The World Health Organization (2011) defines physical activity as any bodily movement produced by the skeletal muscles that requires energy expenditure. Regular physical activity helps prevent noncommunicable diseases such as heart disease, stroke, diabetes, and certain cancers, aids in weight management and maintaining healthy blood pressure, enhances mental health, and contributes to better sleep, bone and muscle health (World Health Organization, 2021; Xie et al., 2021).

therefore, is a "nudge" as it aims to improve individual well-being without affecting material incentives (Thaler and Sunstein, 2008). In designing the FFP, we consulted health experts to identify age-appropriate activities and collaborated with UAE nationals to ensure the cultural and contextual relevance of their description and presentation.

To test the effectiveness of the FFP in increasing MPA, we conducted a randomized control trial (RCT) over a four-week period. The RCT involved 206 senior adults aged 50 and above living in the Emirate of Abu Dhabi. Participants were randomly assigned either to a control group that did not receive the FFP or to a treatment group that received the booklet. We find that the FFP had a large positive effect on the MPA of senior adults identified as physically inactive before the start of the program. On average, inactive senior adults in the control group engaged in MPA for only 4.99 minutes per day, while those in the treatment group did so for 15.06 minutes per day. This result is consistent with the findings of a meta-analysis by Chase (2015), which reports that the average impact of interventions targeting physical activity in senior adults is around 10 minutes of increased physical activity.

Our study contributes to a literature exploring interventions for reducing physical inactivity (Clark et al., 2005; Chudyk and Petrella, 2011; Patnode et al., 2017; Anderson and Durstine, 2019). Given the health benefits of physical activity, the literature is extensive. In a review of 113 RCTs, Patnode et al. (2022) conclude that behavioral counseling interventions lead to improvements in physical activity and have a modest yet statistically significant impact on key health markers. The RCTs vary both in the type of intervention and the target population. Some interventions have specifically targeted senior adults, although these interventions tend to be more resource-intensive than the FFP (e.g., Hui and Rubenstein, 2006; Jancey et al., 2008; Morey et al., 2009a,b; Lachman et al., 2018; for reviews, see Van der Bij et al., 2002; Chase, 2015; Lewis et al., 2017). We design and test a nudge tailored to the needs of senior adults in a population with high levels of physical inactivity. Compared to most interventions, our nudge is low-cost. Importantly, it involves no interaction aimed at promoting MPA, making it easier to scale than other more resource-intensive interventions.

The study most similar to ours is Burke et al. (2013). These authors explored the impact of a booklet-based intervention and found that it significantly increased exercise, walking, and improved nutritional behaviors in a sample of seniors in Perth, Australia. An important difference to our study is that the intervention also involved personal communication between the researchers and the seniors, which was aimed to encourage the latter to engage in physical activity. This implies that the intervention of Burke et al. (2013) is not easily scalable and that the RCT cannot identify the net effect of using a booklet.[2] With regards to the population, although our study also targets senior adults, there are important differences. For one, the

---

[2]Testing an intervention with minimal personal contact as we do here may have the added benefit of limiting experimenter demand, and Hawthorne effects when measuring self-reported physical activity.

climate in Perth is conducive to outdoor activities throughout the year. This may help explain why Australians are among the most physically active populations in the world (Guthold et al., 2018). Not only is our target population one of the least physically active globally, but also the intervention took place at a time of the year when temperatures in the UAE prohibit people from spending considerable amounts of time outdoors. Furthermore, the FFP test happened during the COVID-19 pandemic when seniors were not allowed to public indoor places such as malls due to their health. These factors combined make for a difficult test of a low-cost intervention.

2   The Forever Fit Program

To increase the chances of designing an effective intervention to promote physical activity, we conducted an online survey with a sample of 422 individuals aged 55 and above residing in Abu Dhabi. The Abu Dhabi Department of Community Development recruited the participants via text messages. The survey included measures of physical activity and collected information on participants' backgrounds, living conditions, personality traits (like self-control), and perceptions of factors limiting their physical activity, such as hot weather, lack of money, lack of time, and health reasons (Schutzer, 2004).[3]

The analysis of the survey data revealed that lack of self-control and motivation are the primary drivers of physical inactivity among senior adults without severe mobility and health problems.[4] These findings suggest that a nudge targeting these factors can potentially increase physical activity in our population of interest. The survey also confirmed that senior adults in Abu Dhabi face high mobility costs due to extreme temperatures and COVID-19 exposure and highlighted a relatively high level of digital illiteracy among this demographic.

Based on our survey results, we decided to nudge seniors in their homes using a low-tech approach. Inspired by Burke et al. (2013), we designed a booklet describing a purpose-built physical activity program titled *Forever Fit*. The result is a compact 17-page booklet with colorful images and large fonts, making it easy for senior adults to read (see Figure 1A).

The booklet's design is informed by the theoretical literature on self-control. In particular, O'Donoghue and Rabin (1999, 2001) show that present-biased individuals will procrastinate on beneficial activities for them, such as exercising, when they involve immediate costs and

---

[3]Although this paper focuses on the FFP and not the diagnostic survey, for completeness, the complete survey can be found in Appendix A.

[4]For example, when answering the question "How much do the following factors limit your moderate physical activity?" the two most important factors for both men and women were 'lack of discipline' and 'lack of motivation.' The other options were: 'lack of personal time,' 'lack of appropriate space nearby,' 'lack of support from family and friends,' 'poor health (other than disability),' 'physical disability,' 'concern about being injured,' 'weather conditions,' and 'financial constraints.'

A. The booklet's cover   **B. The three activity streams**   **C. Examples of exercises**

Figure 1. Excerpts from the Forever Fit booklet

the benefits accrue in the future. This theory was tested by Charness and Gneezy (2009), who found that lowering immediate costs through exogenous incentives effectively motivates students to engage in physical activity. Inspired by these insights, the FFP is designed to reduce the perceived immediate costs of physical activity and magnify its benefits. For example, to alleviate concerns and unease about exercising among senior adults, the booklet describes easy-to-do exercises with fun names to encourage participation. To ensure the exercises are age-appropriate, they were designed in collaboration with health experts from the Wellness Center of NYU Abu Dhabi. Recognizing the diversity in individual fitness levels, the booklet contains three fitness tiers of increasing intensity (see Figure 1B), allowing individuals to select exercises that neither overburden nor underwhelm them (see Figure 1C).

The booklet also provides customizable exercise plans to encourage goal setting, ideas on how to be physically active through everyday activities, and easily digestible information on the health benefits of physical activity. Importantly, while the booklet mentions the long-term benefits of physical activity, it also emphasizes its immediate benefits, which should be more motivating for present-biased individuals. Additionally, the booklet includes a series of motivating messages identified as effective for this population (Notthoff and Carstensen, 2014). Lastly, the booklet includes links to a YouTube channel created to complement its exercise programs. The channel features a three-minute video explaining the FFP program and videos accessible through QR codes demonstrating each exercise.[5]

---

[5]The video explaining the FFP can be found at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LWimE2XH2Bc. The exercise videos are also still available at https://www.youtube.com/@foreverfit3109/videos.

3   The Randomized Control Trial

To evaluate the effectiveness of the FFP at increasing physical activity, we conducted a randomized control trial (RCT) during May and June 2021.[6] We recruited a sample of individuals aged 50 and above via text messages sent on our behalf by the Abu Dhabi Department of Community Development. In total, 206 senior adults residing in the Emirate of Abu Dhabi agreed to participate in the RCT.[7]

The low digital literacy of our sample and the COVID-19 restrictions at the time meant that the only viable option for measuring physical activity was through phone surveys. Specifically, we use questions from the International Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ), a widely accepted survey instrument designed for this purpose (Craig et al., 2003). We measured the number of daily minutes spent on MPA, described to participants according to WTO guidelines as "activities that take moderate physical effort and make you breathe somewhat harder than normal, but you are still able to talk." We focus on MPA because our online survey indicated that senior adults in Abu Dhabi rarely engage in vigorous physical activity. In addition to physical activity, we measured time spent sitting, sleeping, and walking (see Appendix B for details). To reduce measurement error and mitigate recall bias, we modified the IPAQ to ask participants to report their behavior from the previous day, provided it was a typical day, rather than recalling their MPA over an entire week. The survey was administered over the phone by trained independent enumerators, with real-time monitoring to ensure data quality.[8] To account for enumerator effects, participants were randomly assigned to a different enumerator each week. Moreover, participants were called on different weekdays to reduce the impact of day effects. Enumerators were blinded to our hypotheses and treatment assignment.

To establish baseline levels of MPA, all participants were surveyed once between May 16 and 18. Measuring initial MPA levels is essential because the benefits of increased physical activity appear to be much bigger for physically inactive individuals. For example, Moore et al. (2012) show that increasing daily physical activity from 0 to 10 minutes is associated with a similar improvement in life expectancy as increasing daily physical activity from 10 to 70 minutes. Hence, we would expect a smaller treatment effect on previously active participants.

After the initial survey, participants were randomly assigned to one of two groups. Those in the FFP treatment group received the FFP materials at home between May 19 and 20. To ensure delivery, we sent the materials via courier and required their signature. Participants in

---

[6]The RCT evaluating the FFP was approved by the NYU Abu Dhabi IRB (protocol HRPP-2021-54).

[7]Of the 206 participants, 59% reported being 60 years old or older. Compared to the population in this age group, we have a higher fraction of men (78% vs. 59%), UAE citizens (42% vs. 30%), and residents of the city of Abu Dhabi (78% vs. 61%).

[8]We included confederates in the call lists to ensure enumerators called at the scheduled times, followed the correct script, and accurately recorded data. Enumerators knew they would be monitored.

the control group did not receive any materials. We assigned 134 (65%) of participants to FFP treatment group and 72 (35%) to the control group.[9] By using a larger treatment group, we can examine whether the treatment effect varies based on initial MPA levels and specific participant characteristics such as gender and nationality.

We evaluated the impact of the FFP over a four-week period, from May 22 to June 17. During this time, participants were surveyed once a week to measure their MPA, providing up to four measures per participant. One of our primary concerns when designing the RCT was sample attrition. In particular, we worried that participants might drop out depending on their MPA levels. To reduce attrition, we incentivized participants to answer the phone surveys. Participants who completed a survey in a given week had a 1 in 10 chance of winning a prize (either a Fitbit smartwatch or a JBL wireless speaker). Additionally, those who answered all the RCT's surveys had a 1 in 10 chance of winning an iPad. The participation incentives had the desired effect, as participants answered an average of 3.9 out of 4 weekly calls in both the treatment and control groups. Moreover, 91% and 90% of participants in the treatment and control groups, respectively, answered all surveys. The very high participation rate and the fact that it is statistically indistinguishable across conditions means that our estimates are unlikely to be biased due to attrition.

4   Results

4.1   Baseline levels of physical activity

We begin by looking at the baseline levels of MPA. As shown in Figure 2, our sample exhibits high levels of physical inactivity. Specifically, 93 out of 206 senior adults were almost entirely inactive, engaging in 0 to 9 minutes of daily MPA.[10] From here on, we will refer to these participants as *inactive* senior adults and the rest as *active*. Overall, 45% of participants are classified as inactive (44% in the treatment group and 46% in the control group), while the remaining 55% are classified as active. Given that inactive senior adults account for nearly half of our sample and stand to gain the most from increased MPA, we consider the impact of the FFP separately for them. Note that the high fraction of physically inactive individuals in our sample is in line with the prevalence of physical inactivity among senior adults in other countries, underlining the significance of the problem (Al-Tannir et al., 2009; Mabry et al., 2012; Sibai et al., 2013).

---

[9]Table A1 in Appendix C, presents the baseline means of our variables across both groups.

[10]Remarkably, 90% of inactive participants reported precisely zero minutes of MPA. For comparison, the WHO recommends that individuals engage in 150 minutes of MPA per week, implying around 21 minutes per day (World Health Organization, 2011).

Figure 2. Distribution of baseline levels of moderate physical activity among senior adults

4.2 Impact of the Forever Fit Program

Table 1 presents the estimated impact of the FFP on participants' MPA. Columns I through VI use the number of minutes of daily MPA as the dependent variable, while columns VII through IX use a binary variable indicating whether participants engaged in more than 10 minutes of daily MPA. Columns IV through IX include controls for individual characteristics, namely, gender, UAE citizenship, age, self-reported disabilities, region within the Emirate of Abu Dhabi, and the participants' baseline level of MPA. Panel A reports the estimated sample average treatment effect for initially inactive and active senior adults as well as the pooled sample. Panel B shows the estimated mean levels of MPA for participants in the FPP treatment and control groups. All estimates are based on linear regressions with robust standard errors clustered on individuals and include week, weekday, and enumerator fixed effects. We use post-stratification weights so that our sample is representative of the senior adult population in Abu Dhabi in terms of gender, citizenship (UAE nationals or expats), and regional distribution within the Emirate (Kalton and Flores-Cervantes, 2003). Applying post-stratification weights is common in the literature (Kulas et al., 2018). However, our results remain robust to using both non-clustered standard errors and unweighted estimates (see Table A2 in Appendix C).

The FFP had a noticeable and statistically significant positive effect on the MPA of inactive senior adults. Column I shows that, on average, inactive senior adults in the control group engaged in only 4.99 minutes of daily MPA. By contrast, inactive senior adults in the FFP treatment group engaged in 15.06 minutes of MPA per day, an increase of 10.07 minutes ($t = 3.36$, $p = 0.001$). This effect is comparable to the 10.43-minute average treatment effect reported

Table 1. Impact of the Forever Fit Program on daily moderate physical activity for initially inactive and active senior adults

	Daily MPA (no controls)			Daily MPA (controls)			MPA > 10 min (controls)		
	Inactive	Active	All	Inactive	Active	All	Inactive	Active	All
	(I)	(II)	(III)	(IV)	(V)	(VI)	(VII)	(VIII)	(IX)
	Panel A: Sample average treatment effect								
FFP treatment	10.07***	0.69	3.29	11.53***	2.77	5.24	0.23***	0.03	0.10*
	(3.00)	(6.59)	(4.70)	(2.96)	(6.37)	(4.38)	(0.07)	(0.06)	(0.06)
	Panel B: Estimated means								
Control group	4.99	34.40	22.80	3.98	33.07	21.51	0.19	0.66	0.47
	(1.50)	(4.76)	(3.56)	(1.68)	(4.43)	(3.10)	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.05)
FFP treatment	15.06	35.09	26.09	15.51	35.84	26.75	0.42	0.69	0.57
	(2.54)	(4.80)	(3.12)	(2.33)	(4.38)	(2.89)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.03)
Demographic controls	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Control group observations	124	156	280	124	156	280	124	156	280
FFP treatment observations	237	279	516	237	279	516	237	279	516
Control group participants	32	40	72	32	40	72	32	40	72
FFP treatment participants	61	73	134	61	73	134	61	73	134
R^2	0.06	0.12	0.09	0.09	0.24	0.21	0.18	0.19	0.17

Note: Estimated sample average treatment effect (Panel A) and means for the FFP treatment and control groups (Panel B). The dependent variable is the number of minutes of daily MPA in columns I through VI, and a binary variable indicating whether participants engaged in more than 10 minutes of daily MPA in columns VII through IX. Inactive participants correspond to those who reported less than 10 minutes of daily MPA in the baseline survey, while active participants reported more than 10 minutes of daily MPA. Estimates are based on linear regressions. Robust standard errors clustered on individuals are in parentheses. All regressions use post-stratification weights so that our sample is representative of the senior adult population in Abu Dhabi in terms of gender, citizenship, and region within the Emirate. All regressions use week, weekday, and enumerator fixed effects. Demographic controls correspond to gender, UAE citizenship, age, self-reported disabilities, region within Abu Dhabi, and baseline level of MPA. ***, **, and * indicate statistical significance at 0.01, 0.05, and 0.10.

by Chase (2015) in their meta-analysis. Column II shows that, as anticipated, the FFP had a much smaller effect on the MPA of active senior adults, with an estimated increase of only 0.69 minutes of daily MPA. This effect is far from being statistically significant ($t = 0.11$, $p = 0.917$), although we note that the standard standard error is fairly large. When pooling inactive and active participants, the FFP is estimated to increase daily MPA by 3.29 minutes (column III, $t = 0.70$, $p = 0.485$). The size of the overall effect is comparable to that in similar interventions. For example, Chase (2015) report that interventions that use only cognitive or behavioral components increase daily physical activity by 1.74 and 5.21 minutes, respectively— smaller effects than other more involved interventions.[11] When controlling for participants' demographic characteristics and baseline MPA levels (columns IV through VI), the estimated impact of the FFP increases slightly to 11.53 more minutes of daily MPA among inactive participants ($t = 3.89$, $p < 0.001$), 2.77 more minutes among active participants ($t = 0.43$, $p = 0.665$), and 5.24 more minutes for the pooled sample ($t = 1.20$, $p = 0.233$).

Columns VII through XI examine the prevalence of being physically active by looking at the fraction of participants who engaged in at least 10 min of daily MPA. Notably, the FFP's positive impact on MPA is not confined to a few overenthusiastic participants. While only 19% of inactive senior adults in the control group engaged in 10 minutes or more of MPA per day, this fraction more than doubled to 42% in the treatment group, an increase of 23 percentage points ($t = 3.37$, $p = 0.001$). For active senior adults, the effect was a much smaller increase of 3 percentage points ($t = 0.52$, $p = 0.604$). For the pooled sample, the FFP increased the fraction of seniors being physically active by 10 percentage points ($t = 1.70$, $p = 0.091$). For comparison, the closest study to ours, Burke et al. (2013), reports that their intervention increased the fraction of seniors doing at least 10 min of MPA by 6.4 percentage points compared to their baseline treatment.[12]

Next, we decompose the impact of the FFP on different demographic categories. We focus on inactive senior adults as this sample showed a clearly positive response to the intervention. Specifically, we reran the regression in column II of Table 1, including interactions between the

---

[11] The fact that the overall treatment effect is not significant can be attributed to the observed variability in MPA between active and inactive participants. If we use the control group means and standard deviations to conduct a power analysis, we find that the minimum detectable effect size with a power of 80% is 15.51 minutes in the pooled sample, 7.42 minutes in the sample of inactive participants, and 24.33 minutes in the sample of active participants. Hence, while we are well-powered to detect the observed effect among inactive senior adults, this is not the case for the pooled sample.

[12] To more accurately compare these estimates, it is important to consider that the fraction of initially inactive participants differed between the two studies (45% in ours vs. 29% in Burke et al., 2013). Assuming that the impact of both interventions is driven solely by initially inactive participants, we can adjust Burke et al.'s estimate to a population with 45% inactive individuals, yielding an increase of 9.6 percentage points in the fraction of moderately active participants. Unfortunately, Burke et al. (2013) do not report MPA in minutes, so a direct comparison of our other estimates is not possible.

Table 2. Impact of the Forever Fit Program on daily moderate physical activity for initially inactive senior adults depending on various demographic categories

	Age		Gender		Citizenship	
	< 60	≥ 60	Male	Female	Emirati	Expat
	Panel A: Sample average treatment effect					
FFP treatment	10.41*	11.72***	10.84***	11.75**	9.31**	14.86***
	(5.72)	(3.68)	(3.61)	(5.40)	(3.63)	(5.16)
	Panel B: Estimated means					
Control group	4.87	4.15	5.43	2.50	4.38	4.67
	(3.87)	(2.05)	(2.00)	(4.12)	(2.65)	(3.43)
FFP treatment	15.28	15.87	16.27	14.25	13.68	19.53
	(3.48)	(3.36)	(2.94)	(4.88)	(2.68)	(3.99)
Demographic controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	144	217	301	60	200	161
Participants	37	56	77	16	52	41

Note: Estimated sample average treatment effect (Panel A) and means for FFP and CONTROL (Panel B). Estimates are based on a linear regression with the number of minutes of daily MPA as the dependent variable. The sample is restricted to the 93 initially inactive senior adults. Treatment effects are estimated by interacting with the FFP treatment with age (above or below 60 years old), gender (male or female), and citizenship (UAE nationals or expats). Robust standard errors clustered on individuals are in parentheses. The regression uses post-stratification weights so that our sample is representative of the senior adult population in Abu Dhabi in terms of gender, citizenship, and region within the Emirate, and week, weekday, and enumerator fixed effects. Demographic controls correspond to self-reported disabilities, region within Abu Dhabi, baseline levels of MPA, and gender (in columns 1-2 and 5-6), UAE citizenship (in columns 1-4), and age (in columns 3-6). ***, **, and * indicate statistical significance at 0.01, 0.05, and 0.10.

FFP treatment and age (whether a participant is older or younger than 60 years old), gender (male or female), and citizenship (UAE nationals or expats). These estimates are reported in Table 2. By and large, the FFP successfully increased the MPA of inactive senior adults regardless of their demographic category.

Lastly, we analyze the impact of the FFP over time. Figure 3 depicts the sample average treatment effect of the FFP for inactive senior adults, estimated separately for each week. As anticipated, there is no statistically significant difference in MPA prior to the program's initiation (Week 0). After that, we see that the effect of FFP is statistically significant and stable from the first to the last week of the intervention.

Although our primary focus was on MPA due to its health benefits, we also measured the time participants spent sitting, sleeping, and walking. For completeness, we explored the impact of the FFP on these variables, as seen in Table A3 of Appendix C. Consistent with our results for MPA, we find that the FFP increased the time spent walking for inactive senior adults

Figure 3. Impact of the FFP on daily MPA over time for inactive senior adults (in minutes)

($t = 2.09$, $p = 0.040$) but not for active senior adults ($t = 0.07$, $p = 0.947$). Directionally, the FFP also decreased the time spent sitting by around 30 minutes and increased the time spent sleeping by around 10 minutes, but these effects are not statistically significant ($t < 1.05$, $p > 0.296$).

5 Conclusion

This paper presents the evaluation of the Forever Fit Program, a nudge aimed at encouraging physical activity among senior adults in Abu Dhabi. The experimental results reveal that a booklet containing a simple, culturally and age-appropriate exercise program can effectively increase physical activity levels among previously inactive senior adults, even when confined to their homes. These findings are particularly encouraging for regions where outdoor activities are limited for extended periods due to environmental conditions.

Our findings underscore the potential of nudges to yield significant benefits, especially when the underlying causes of a problem are carefully diagnosed and addressed. That being said, we acknowledge the existence of limitations to our study that call for some caution when interpreting our results. First, due to COVID-19 restrictions at the time of the intervention, we measured physical activity using the International Physical Activity Questionnaire. This method is well-accepted, but since it is self-reported, it may be susceptible to experimenter demand and Hawthorne effects. Although we cannot completely rule out these biases, we believe they are unlikely to be the main drivers behind our results. Both treatment and control groups

were aware of their participation in the study and received the same number of survey calls. Moreover, if participants in the treatment group felt compelled to report higher levels of MPA due to experimenter demand effects, we would expect to see significantly higher levels of MPA for both active and inactive senior adults.

Another limitation of our study is that due to cost considerations, we evaluated the FFP's impact over a relatively short time period. Although we did not observe a time trend in the program's impact during the four weeks of the intervention (see Figure 3), the long-term effects remain unknown. Despite this, the relatively low costs of the program and the immediate benefits of increased physical activity (such as better sleep) suggest that implementing this type of nudge can be welfare-enhancing, even if the increase in physical activity is short-lived.[13]

Lastly, while we tried to minimize selection into the sample during the recruitment process by providing incentives for participation, shipping all materials to people's homes, and using a very accessible, low-tech intervention, we cannot rule out that self-selection biases our estimated treatment effect. Our sample was recruited by the Abu Dhabi Department of Community Development from a proprietary database of phone numbers, which prevents us from testing whether our sample differs from the general population of senior adults in ways that would make the population average treatment effect differ from the sample average treatment effect (Imai et al., 2008). We do reweigh our estimates based on observable demographic characteristics to approximate representativeness in these dimensions. However, as in most studies of this kind, there can always be non-observable characteristics driving selection. Having said that, once recruited, participants were highly engaged, answering almost every survey call. Hence, we can rule out that self-selection biases our sample average treatment effect.

Based on the findings reported in this paper, the Abu Dhabi government decided to roll out the Forever Fit program across the entire Emirate of Abu Dhabi. This decision highlights the program's potential to make a significant impact on public health, particularly among senior adults who face barriers to outdoor physical activity.

References

Al-Tannir, M., Kobrosly, S., Itani, T., El-Rajab, M., and Tannir, S. (2009). Prevalence of physical activity among lebanese adults: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*, 6(3):315–320.

---

[13]The total cost of testing the FFP was $17,514.50 (AED 62,989), which included expenses for the booklet's graphical design ($9,226.00), printing ($1,150.00; $8.58 per unit), shipping ($364.50; $2.72 per unit) and incentives for the participants ($6,774.00). If the FFP was to be administered to the entire population of individuals aged 65 and above in the Abu Dhabi emirate, which according to the 2023 Census comprises of 69,540 individuals, the per-unit printing cost would drop to $4.36 per unit (estimate provided by the printing company). The total cost per unit (including design, printing and shipping costs), therefore, would be $7.21.

Anderson, E. and Durstine, J. L. (2019). Physical activity, exercise, and chronic diseases: A brief review. *Sports Medicine and Health Science*, 1(1):3–10.

Blake, H., Mo, P., Malik, S., and Thomas, S. (2009). How effective are physical activity interventions for alleviating depressive symptoms in older people? A systematic review. *Clinical Rehabilitation*, 23(10):873–887.

Burke, L., Lee, A. H., Jancey, J., Xiang, L., Kerr, D. A., Howat, P. A., Hills, A. P., and Anderson, A. S. (2013). Physical activity and nutrition behavioral outcomes of a home-based intervention program for seniors: A randomized controlled trial. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 10(1):14.

Carlson, S. A., Adams, E. K., Yang, Z., and Fulton, J. E. (2018). Percentage of deaths associated with inadequate physical activity in the United States. *Preventing Chronic Disease*, 15:170354.

Charness, G. and Gneezy, U. (2009). Incentives to exercise. *Econometrica*, 77(3):909–931.

Chase, J. A. D. (2015). Interventions to increase physical activity among older adults: A meta-analysis. *The Gerontologist*, 55(4):706–718.

Chudyk, A. and Petrella, R. J. (2011). Effects of exercise on cardiovascular risk factors in type 2 diabetes: A meta-analysis. *Diabetes Care*, 34(5):1228–1237.

Clark, A. M., Hartling, L., Vandermeer, B., and McAlister, F. A. (2005). Meta-analysis: Secondary prevention programs for patients with coronary artery disease. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 143(9):659–672.

Craig, C. L., Marshall, A. L., Sjostrom, M., Bauman, A. E., Booth, M. L., Ainsworth, B. E., Pratt, M., Ekelund, U., Yngve, A., Sallis, J. F., and Oja, P. (2003). International Physical Activity Questionnaire: 12-country reliability and validity. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 35(8):1381–1395.

Guthold, R., Stevens, G. A., Riley, L. M., and Bull, F. C. (2018). Worldwide trends in insufficient physical activity from 2001 to 2016: A pooled analysis of 358 population-based surveys with 1.9 million participants. *The Lancet Global Health*, 6(10):e1077–e1086.

Hui, E. K. H. and Rubenstein, L. Z. (2006). Promoting physical activity and exercise in older adults. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association*, 7(5):310–314.

Imai, K., King, G., and Stuart, E. A. (2008). Misunderstandings between experimentalists and observationalists about causal inference. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society*, 171(2):481–502.

Jancey, J. M., Clarke, A., Howat, P. A., Lee, A. H., Shilton, T., and Fisher, J. (2008). A physical activity program to mobilize older people: a practical and sustainable approach. *The Gerontologist*, 48(2):251–257.

Kalton, G. and Flores-Cervantes, I. (2003). Weighting methods. *Journal of Official Statistics*, 19(2):81–97.

Kulas, J. T., Robinson, D. H., Smith, J. A., and Kellar, D. Z. (2018). Post-stratification weighting in organizational surveys: A cross-disciplinary tutorial. *Human Resource Management*, 57(2):419–436.

Lachman, M. E., Lipsitz, L., Lubben, J., Castaneda-Sceppa, C., and Jette, A. M. (2018). When adults don't exercise: Behavioral strategies to increase physical activity in sedentary middle-aged and older adults. *Innovation in Aging*, 2(1):igy007.

Lewis, B. A., Napolitano, M. A., Buman, M. P., Williams, D. M., and Nigg, C. R. (2017). Future directions in physical activity intervention research: expanding our focus to sedentary behaviors, technology, and dissemination. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 40(1):112–126.

Mabry, R. M., Winkler, E. A., Reeves, M. M., Eakin, E. G., and Owen, N. (2012). Correlates of Omani adults' physical inactivity and sitting time – corrigendum. *Public Health Nutrition*, 15(11):2164–2164.

Moore, S. C., Patel, A. V., Matthews, C. E., Berrington De Gonzalez, A., Park, Y., Katki, H. A., Linet, M. S., Weiderpass, E., Visvanathan, K., Helzlsouer, K. J., Thun, M., Gapstur, S. M., Hartge, P., and Lee, I.-M. (2012). Leisure time physical activity of moderate to vigorous intensity and mortality: A large pooled cohort analysis. *PLoS Medicine*, 9(11):e1001335.

Morey, M. C., Peterson, M. J., Pieper, C. F., Sloane, R., Crowley, G. M., Cowper, P. A., McConnell, E. S., Bosworth, H. B., Ekelund, C. C., and Pearson, M. P. (2009a). The Veterans Learning to Improve Fitness and Function in Elders Study: A Randomized Trial of Primary Care–Based Physical Activity Counseling For Older Men. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 57(7):1166–1174.

Morey, M. C., Snyder, D. C., Sloane, R., Cohen, H. J., Peterson, B., Hartman, T. J., Miller, P., Mitchell, D. C., and Demark-Wahnefried, W. (2009b). Effects of Home-Based Diet and Exercise on Functional Outcomes Among Older, Overweight Long-term Cancer Survivors: RENEW: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *JAMA*, 301(18):1883.

Nakagawa, T., Koan, I., Chen, C., Matsubara, T., Hagiwara, K., Lei, H., Hirotsu, M., Yamagata, H., and Nakagawa, S. (2020). Regular moderate- to vigorous-intensity physical activity rather than walking is associated with enhanced cognitive functions and mental health in young adults. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(2):614.

Northey, J. M., Cherbuin, N., Pumpa, K. L., Smee, D. J., and Rattray, B. (2018). Exercise interventions for cognitive function in adults older than 50: a systematic review with meta-analysis. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 52(3):154–160.

Notthoff, N. and Carstensen, L. L. (2014). Positive messaging promotes walking in older adults. *Psychology and Aging*, 29(2):329–341.

O'Donoghue, T. and Rabin, M. (1999). Doing it now or later. *American Economic Review*, 89(1):103–124.

O'Donoghue, T. and Rabin, M. (2001). Choice and procrastination. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116(1):121–160.

Patnode, C. D., Evans, C. V., Senger, C. A., Redmond, N., and Lin, J. S. (2017). Behavioral counseling to promote a healthful diet and physical activity for cardiovascular disease prevention in adults without

known cardiovascular disease risk factors: Updated evidence report and systematic review for the US Preventive Services Task Force. *JAMA*, 318(2):175–193.

Patnode, C. D., Redmond, N., Iacocca, M. O., and Henninger, M. (2022). Behavioral counseling interventions to promote a healthy diet and physical activity for cardiovascular disease prevention in adults without known cardiovascular disease risk factors: Updated evidence report and systematic review for the US Preventive Services Task Force. *JAMA*, 328(4):375–388.

Physical Activity Guidelines Advisory Committee (2008). Physical activity guidelines advisory committee report, 2008. Technical report, Department of Health and Human Services.

Powell, K. E., Paluch, A. E., and Blair, S. N. (2011). Physical activity for health: What kind? How much? How intense? On top of what? *Annual Review of Public Health*, 32(1):349–365.

Qawas, A., Ahli, S., Madi, H., and Mahagaonkar, S. B. (2019). UAE National Health Survey Report 2017-2018. Technical report, United Arab Emirates Ministry of Health & Prevention.

Rai, R., Jongenelis, M. I., Jackson, B., Newton, R. U., and Pettigrew, S. (2019). Exploring factors associated with physical activity in older adults: An ecological approach. *Journal of Aging and Physical Activity*, 27(3):343–353.

Schutzer, K. (2004). Barriers and motivations to exercise in older adults. *Preventive Medicine*, 39(5):1056–1061.

Sibai, A. M., Costanian, C., Tohme, R., Assaad, S., and Hwalla, N. (2013). Physical activity in adults with and without diabetes: From the 'high-risk' approach to the 'population-based' approach of prevention. *BMC Public Health*, 13(1):1002.

Thaler, R. H. and Sunstein, C. R. (2008). *Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health, Wealth, and Happiness*. Yale University Press.

Thøgersen-Ntoumani, C., Loughren, E. A., Duda, J. L., Fox, K. R., and Kinnafick, F. E. (2010). Step by step. A feasibility study of a lunchtime walking intervention designed to increase walking, improve mental well-being and work performance in sedentary employees: Rationale and study design. *BMC Public Health*, 10:1–9.

Valenzuela, P. L., Saco-Ledo, G., Morales, J. S., Gallardo-Gómez, D., Morales-Palomo, F., López-Ortiz, S., Rivas-Baeza, B., Castillo-García, A., Jiménez-Pavón, D., Santos-Lozano, A., Del Pozo Cruz, B., and Lucia, A. (2023). Effects of physical exercise on physical function in older adults in residential care: A systematic review and network meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *The Lancet Healthy Longevity*, 4(6):e247–e256.

Van der Bij, A. K., Laurant, M. G., and Wensing, M. (2002). Effectiveness of physical activity interventions for older adults: A review. *American journal of preventive medicine*, 22(2):120–133.

Warburton, D. E. (2006). Health benefits of physical activity: The evidence. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 174(6):801–809.

Warburton, D. E. and Bredin, S. S. (2017). Health benefits of physical activity: A systematic review of current systematic reviews. *Current Opinion in Cardiology*, 32(5):541–556.

World Health Organization (2011). Global recommendations on physical activity for health. Technical report, World Health Organization.

World Health Organization (2021). Physical activity fact sheet. Technical report, World Health Organization.

Xie, Y., Liu, S., Chen, X. J., Yu, H. H., Yang, Y., and Wang, W. (2021). Effects of exercise on sleep quality and insomnia in adults: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 12:664499.

Online Appendix

A ADPAS: Abu Dhabi Physical Activity Survey

1. What is your gender?
   - Male
   - Female

2. What is your nationality?
   - List of countries

3. Where is your current place of residence?
   - Abu Dhabi
   - Al Ain
   - Al Dhafra
   - Other (Please specify)

4. What year were you born in?
   - List of years from 1920 to 2002

5. What is your relationship status?
   - Single (never married)
   - Married
   - Separated
   - Divorced
   - Widowed

6. How many family members, not including yourself, live with you in your current place of residence?
   - List of numbers from '0' to '20 or more'

7. How many non-family members live with you in your current place of residence?
   - List of numbers from '0' to '20 or more'

8. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
   - No formal schooling
   - Primary school
   - Secondary school (High school)
   - University degree (Bachelor or higher)
   - Other (Please specify)

9. What is your current work status?
   - Full-time employment
   - Part-time employment
   - None of the above

10. During the last 7 days, how much time did you spend on a typical day doing things for

yourself (including leisure activities, watching TV, time with friends, or family)

- Hours:
- Minutes:

The next questions are about the time you spent being physically active in the last 7 days. They include questions about activities you do at work, as part of your house and yard work, to get from place to place, and in your spare time for recreation, exercise, or sport. Please answer each question even if you do not consider yourself to be an active person. In answering the following questions, keep in mind that:

- Moderate physical activity refers to activities that take moderate physical effort and make you breathe somewhat harder than normal.
- Vigorous physical activity refers to activities that take hard physical effort and make you breathe much harder than normal.

11. During the last 7 days, how much time did you spend sitting on one of those days? Sitting includes time spent at work, at home, while doing course work and during leisure time. This may include time spent sitting at a desk, visiting friends, reading, or sitting or lying down to watch television.

    - Hours:
    - Minutes:

12. During the last 7 days, on how many days did you walk for at least 10 minutes at a time? Walking includes walking at a regular pace (less than two steps per second) at work and at home, to travel from place to place, and any other walking that you did solely for recreation or leisure.

    - List of days from '0' to '7'

13. How much time in total did you usually spend walking on one of those days?

    - Hours:
    - Minutes:

14. During the last 7 days, on how many days did you do moderate physical activities? Moderate physical activities include among others, gardening, cleaning, fast walking (approximately two steps per second or more), bicycling at less than 15 km per hour, and other similar activities. Think only about those physical activities that you did for at least 10 minutes at a time.

    - List of days from '0' to '7'

15. How much time in total did you usually spend doing moderate physical activities on one of those days?

    - Hours:
    - Minutes:

16. During the last 7 days, on how many days did you do vigorous physical activities? Vigorous physical activities include among others, heavy lifting, heavy garden or construction work, chopping wood, aerobics, running, and bicycling at 15 km per hour or more, and other similar activities. Think only about those physical activities that you did for at least 10 minutes at a time.

    - List of days from '0' to '7'

17. How much time in total did you usually spend doing vigorous rate physical activities on one of those days?

    - Hours:
    - Minutes:

18. To what extent are you satisfied with the time you spend walking during a typical week?

    - Very unsatisfied
    - Somewhat unsatisfied
    - Neither satisfied nor unsatisfied
    - Somewhat satisfied
    - Very satisfied

19. How much do the following factors limit your walking on a regular basis? [For each factor, respondents could answer 'Not at all', 'To some extent', or 'To a large extent']

    - Lack of personal time
    - Lack of appropriate space nearby (for example, parks, malls)
    - Lack of support from family and friends
    - Poor health (other than disability)
    - Physical disability
    - Lack of discipline
    - Lack of motivation
    - Concern about being injured
    - Weather conditions
    - Financial constraints

20. To what extent are you satisfied with the time you spend engaging in moderate physical activity during a typical week?

    - Very unsatisfied
    - Somewhat unsatisfied
    - Neither satisfied nor unsatisfied
    - Somewhat satisfied
    - Very satisfied

21. In your opinion, how much moderate physical activity per week is necessary to stay healthy? If you are not sure, please give your best estimate.

- Minutes:

22. How much do the following factors limit your moderate physical activity? [For each factor, respondents could answer 'Not at all', 'To some extent', or 'To a large extent']

    - Lack of personal time
    - Lack of appropriate space nearby (for example, parks, malls)
    - Lack of support from family and friends
    - Poor health (other than disability)
    - Physical disability
    - Lack of discipline
    - Lack of motivation
    - Concern about being injured
    - Weather conditions
    - Financial constraints

23. How often do you postpone performing necessary tasks that require effort (for example, exercising, going on a diet, etc.)?

    - List of numbers from 0 to 10 where 0 is 'Never' and 10 is 'Always'

24. Please indicate the extent to which the statements below are true. [For each statement, respondents could answer 'Not at all true', 'Hardly true', 'Moderately true', or 'Exactly true']

    - I can always manage to overcome challenges if I try hard enough
    - It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals
    - I am confident that I can deal efficiently with unexpected events
    - When I am confronted with a challenge, I can usually overcome it by myself
    - I can usually handle whatever comes my way
    - I always see challenges as an opportunity to improve myself
    - Competition usually brings out the best in me

25. How often is each of the following kinds of support available to you from your family? [For each kind of support, respondents could answer on a Likert scale ranging from 'None of the time' to 'All of the time']

    - To pursue your personal goals/desires
    - To have a good time
    - To help if you were sick
    - To listen to you and understand your problems
    - To love you and make you feel important

26. How often is each of the following kinds of support available to you from your friends? [For each kind of support, respondents could answer on a Likert scale ranging from 'None of the time' to 'All of the time']

- To pursue your personal goals/desires
- To have a good time
- To help if you were sick
- To listen to you and understand your problems
- To love you and make you feel important

27. How often do you have to rush to complete a task because you did not start as early as you could?

    - List of numbers from '0' to '10'

28. In answering the following question, recall that moderate physical activity refers to activities that take moderate physical effort and make you breathe somewhat harder than normal. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements. [For each statement, respondents could answer 'Strongly disagree', 'Disagree', 'Neither agree nor disagree', 'Agree', or 'Strongly agree']

    - Men in my age group should regularly engage in moderate physical activity. [shown only to men]
    - Most men in my age group regularly engage in moderate physical activity. [shown only to men]
    - Men in my age group that regularly engage in moderate physical activity are appreciated by others. [shown only to men]
    - Women in my age group should regularly engage in moderate physical activity. [shown only to women]
    - Most women in my age group regularly engage in moderate physical activity. [shown only to women]
    - Women in my age group that regularly engage in moderate physical activity are appreciated by others. [shown only to women]
    - Women engaging in physical activity alone outdoors could negatively impact the reputation of their family. [shown only to women]
    - Most people in my neighborhood trust the advice of the government.
    - Most people in my neighborhood trust the advice of medical experts.
    - Exercising with company is more enjoyable than exercising alone.

29. My current place of residence is:

    - A house
    - An apartment
    - Other (Please specify)

30. How many bedrooms are there in your place of residence?

    - List of numbers from '0' to '7+'

31. Do you own any of the following devices? Select all that apply:

- Smart phone
- Tablet/iPad
- Smart watch/wearable (for example, Apple Watch, Fitbit)
- Personal computer
- Smart TV (Television with internet connectivity)
- None of the above

32. How frequently do you use apps (for example, WhatsApp, Facebook, Zoom, Google Meet, BOTIM, UAE Pass, Smiles, SHARE, MOI) on your smart devices?
- Never
- No more than once a week
- At least once a week
- Daily

33. For what purposes do you use apps? Please select all that apply:
- To pay bills
- To monitor physical activity
- Entertainment/games
- Education
- Social media
- Email/messaging
- Video calling
- Other (Please specify)

34. What was your household's monthly income in 2019? This should include income from pension, salary, business income, property income, and investment income of all household members. If you are not sure, please give us your best estimate.
- 5,000 AED or less
- 5,001 – 10,000 AED
- 10,001 – 15,000 AED
- 15,001 – 20,000 AED
- 20,001 – 30,000 AED
- 30,001 – 50,000 AED
- 50,001 – 75,000 AED
- 75,001 – 100,000 AED
- 100,001 AED and above

35. Thinking of your household's monthly income in 2019, to what extent do you agree that it covered the household's necessary expenses?
- Strongly disagree
- Disagree

- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

B   Script for weekly phone survey

Below is the English version of the script used by the enumerators. The Arabic version of the script is available upon request.

Hi (Participant name). This is (Enumerator name) from the Department of Community Development pilot intervention, and I am calling you for our weekly interview. Today's call should only take about 4 minutes of your time. How are you doing today? Is this a good time to talk?

1. Yes [If yes, continue]

2. No [If no, arrange for a day and time that week to call back]

   Great, I will begin the survey now. I will ask you some questions about your daily routine. If you are unsure about the exact answer, please give me your best guess.

1. How many hours in total did you sleep yesterday, meaning last night, and any naps during the day?
    - Hours: [text entry: 0-16]
    - Minutes: [text entry: 0-59]

2. Did you walk for at least 10 consecutive minutes yesterday? Think about walking while you are at home, at work, to travel from place to place, or any other walking you did for recreation.
    - Yes [If yes, continue to question 3]
    - No [If no, skip to question 4]

3. How many minutes in total did you spend walking yesterday? Please give me your best guess.
    - Hours: [text entry: 0-12]
    - Minutes: [text entry: 0-59]
    - Note: if more than 5 hours, follow up with "Are you sure you walked for (number of hours mentioned by respondent) hours yesterday?"

4. Physical activity refers to activities that take moderate physical effort and make you breathe somewhat harder than normal. Think about activities such as cycling, gardening, climbing stairs, swimming, yoga, dancing, or other activities. How many minutes in total did you spend engaging in physical activity yesterday?
    - Hours: [text entry: 0-12]
    - Minutes: [text entry: 0-59]

- Note: if more than 5 hours, follow up with "Are you sure you engaged in physical activity for (number of hours mentioned by respondent) hours yesterday?"

5. How much time did you spend sitting yesterday? Think about the time you spent sitting at a desk, visiting friends, reading, watching TV, or other instances. Please give me your best guess.

   - Hours: [text entry: 0-16]
   - Minutes: [text entry: 0-59]

6. In terms of being physically active, would you say that yesterday was a typical day in the last week or not?

   - Yes [If yes, skip to question 8]
   - No [If no, continue to question 7]

7. Then, how many minutes in total did you spend being physically active on a typical day in the last week?

   - Hours: [text entry: 0-12]
   - Minutes: [text entry: 0-59]
   - Note: if more than 5 hours, follow up with "Are you sure you engaged in physical activity for (number of hours mentioned by respondent) hours yesterday?"

8. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being very unsatisfied and 5 being very satisfied, to what extent are you satisfied or unsatisfied with the time you spent being physically active in the last week?

   - (Very unsatisfied) 1 2 3 4 5 (Very satisfied)

9. Compared to our last call, would you say you spent more time being active this week (for example, walking or exercising)?

   - More than last week
   - Same as last week
   - Less than last week

Thank you for your time. Your name has now been entered into the weekly draw. Each week you complete the survey, you will have a 10% chance to win a smartwatch or headphones. Even if you win this week, you will still be eligible to win again next week. If you complete all the weekly phone surveys, you will be able to enter a final draw for bigger and more exciting prizes, such as iPads!

[Arrange for a day and time next week to call back.]

C Supplementary tables and figures

Table A1. Baseline means of variables for all participants

	All participants			Inactive			Active		
	Control	FFP	d	Control	FFP	d	Control	FFP	d
Inactive	0.44	0.46	−0.02						
	(0.50)	(0.50)							
Minutes MPA	32.06	26.51	0.13	0.56	0.30	0.21	48.42	48.82	0.20
	(49.37)	(36.85)		(1.54)	(1.12)		(54.50)	(37.93)	
Hours sleeping	6.40	6.67	−0.19	6.59	6.81	−0.13	6.24	6.55	−0.25
	(1.29)	(1.49)		(1.23)	(1.77)		(1.33)	(1.20)	
Hours sitting	4.87	6.01	−0.41**	5.27	6.39	−0.42	4.55	5.70	−0.40
	(2.63)	(2.85)		(2.43)	(2.79)		(2.77)	(2.88)	
Minutes walking	42.49	44.54	−0.05	36.16	43.00	−0.18	47.55	45.82	0.05
	(38.09)	(38.19)		(42.84)	(36.66)		(33.51)	(39.63)	
Disability	0.04	0.05	−0.05	0.06	0.07	−0.01	0.03	0.04	−0.09
	(0.20)	(0.22)		(0.25)	(0.25)		(0.16)	(0.20)	
Age	62.81	61.16	0.31	63.56	61.18	0.44	62.20	61.14	0.21
	(5.76)	(4.83)		(6.48)	(4.81)		(5.12)	(4.88)	
Female	0.22	0.22	0.01	0.12	0.20	−0.19	0.30	0.23	0.15
	(0.42)	(0.41)		(0.34)	(0.40)		(0.46)	(0.43)	
Fraction in AD	0.68	0.77	−0.20	0.66	0.74	−0.18	0.70	0.79	−0.22
	(0.47)	(0.42)		(0.48)	(0.44)		(0.46)	(0.41)	
Emirati	0.58	0.33	0.53***	0.59	0.36	0.48	0.57	0.30	0.57**
	(0.50)	(0.47)		(0.50)	(0.48)		(0.50)	(0.46)	
Day of call	1.93	1.99	−0.06	2.12	2.08	0.05	1.77	1.90	−0.15
	(0.83)	(0.86)		(0.83)	(0.84)		(0.80)	(0.87)	
Male enumerator	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.28	0.36	−0.17	0.68	0.62	0.12
	(0.50)	(0.50)		(0.46)	(0.48)		(0.47)	(0.49)	

Note: Means and standard deviations in parenthesis for participants in the control and FFP treatment groups. The difference between means is shown as Cohen's d with ***, **, and * indicating a statistically significant difference at 0.01, 0.05, and 0.10 levels, respectively. Statistical comparisons are done with t-tests for continuous variables and χ^2 tests for binary variables, correcting p-values for multiple comparisons using the Benjamini–Hochberg method. All statistics are unweighted.

Table A2. Impact of the Forever Fit Program on daily moderate physical activity for initially inactive and active senior adults—without post-stratification weights and clustering of standard errors

	Daily MPA (no controls)			Daily MPA (controls)			MPA > 10 min (controls)		
	Inactive	Active	All	Inactive	Active	All	Inactive	Active	All
	(I)	(II)	(III)	(IV)	(V)	(VI)	(VII)	(VIII)	(IX)
	Panel A: Average treatment effect								
FFP treatment	8.96***	−2.94	1.70	11.31***	−0.07	4.23	0.25***	−0.03	0.09**
	(2.36)	(4.10)	(2.65)	(2.54)	(4.38)	(2.68)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.04)
	Panel B: Estimated means								
Control group	6.34	33.22	21.56	4.80	31.37	19.92	0.20	0.69	0.48
	(1.32)	(3.25)	(2.06)	(1.35)	(3.28)	(1.97)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.03)
FFP treatment	15.30	30.28	23.26	16.11	31.31	24.15	0.45	0.67	0.57
	(2.02)	(2.57)	(1.71)	(2.08)	(2.56)	(1.67)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)
Demographic controls	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Control group observations	124	156	280	124	156	280	124	156	280
FFP treatment observations	237	279	516	237	279	516	237	279	516
Control group participants	32	40	72	32	40	72	32	40	72
FFP treatment participants	61	73	134	61	73	134	61	73	134
R^2	0.05	0.10	0.06	0.08	0.22	0.20	0.13	0.11	0.13

Note: Estimated average treatment effect (Panel A) and means for the FFP treatment and control groups (Panel B). The dependent variable is the number of minutes of daily MPA in columns I through VI, and a binary variable indicating whether participants engaged in more than 10 minutes of daily MPA in columns VII through IX. Inactive participants correspond to those who reported less than 10 minutes of daily MPA in the baseline survey, while active participants reported more than 10 minutes of daily MPA. Estimates are based on linear regressions. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. None of the regressions use post-stratification weights. All regressions use week, weekday, and enumerator fixed effects. Demographic controls correspond to gender, UAE citizenship, age, self-reported disabilities, region within Abu Dhabi, and baseline level of MPA. ***, **, and * indicate statistical significance at 0.01, 0.05, and 0.10.

Table A3. Impact of the Forever Fit Program on time spent walking, sitting, and sleeping for initially inactive and active senior adults

	Walking (minutes)			Sitting (hours)			Sleeping (hours)		
	Inactive	Active	All	Inactive	Active	All	Inactive	Active	All
	(I)	(II)	(III)	(IV)	(V)	(VI)	(VII)	(VIII)	(IX)
	Panel A: Average treatment effect								
FFP treatment	12.72**	−0.39	4.62	−0.55	−0.53	−0.56	0.46	0.02	0.15
	(6.09)	(5.92)	(4.66)	(0.67)	(0.50)	(0.57)	(0.47)	(0.28)	(0.38)
	Panel B: Estimated means								
Control group	28.31	46.00	38.98	6.63	5.46	5.98	6.10	6.93	6.62
	(4.04)	(4.05)	(3.19)	(0.53)	(0.41)	(0.49)	(0.41)	(0.20)	(0.33)
FFP treatment	41.03	45.61	43.59	6.09	4.93	5.42	6.56	6.95	6.77
	(3.63)	(3.55)	(2.69)	(0.33)	(0.24)	(0.22)	(0.15)	(0.17)	(0.12)
Demographic controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	361	435	796	361	435	796	361	435	796
Participants	93	113	206	93	113	206	93	113	206
R^2	0.07	0.17	0.10	0.21	0.10	0.06	0.26	0.09	0.06

Note: Estimated average treatment effect (Panel A) and means for the FFP treatment and control groups (Panel B). The dependent variable is the number of minutes of daily MPA in columns I through VI, and a binary variable indicating whether participants engaged in more than 10 minutes of daily MPA in columns VII through IX. Inactive participants correspond to those who reported less than 10 minutes of daily MPA in the baseline survey, while active participants reported more than 10 minutes of daily MPA. Estimates are based on linear regressions. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. None of the regressions use post-stratification weights. All regressions use week, weekday, and enumerator fixed effects. Demographic controls correspond to gender, UAE citizenship, age, self-reported disabilities, region within Abu Dhabi, and baseline level of MPA. ***, **, and * indicate statistical significance at 0.01, 0.05, and 0.10.