Characteristics of participants to 'Start to Run' programme
Comparison between maintenance and drop out groups

Marc CLOES & Benoit PETRE
Department of Sport Sciences
University of Liege
Belgium

ICSEMIS 2012
Sport... Inspiring a Learning Legacy
Glasgow - July 19-24, 2012

Introduction
Physical activity in Europe

- % of active people (5×30 minutes of moderate PA or 3×20 minutes of vigorous PA)

Meusel (2008)
Introduction
Actions against sedentariness

- In 92’, the European Council proposed a PE-Sport charter emphasizing the key position of PA in the society
- The 96’s Report of the Surgeon General (US): First strong emphasis about the need of a fight against low level of PA
- Since that time, WHO underlines many times the priority to provide to PA promotion all over the world

Introduction
Adoption of an active lifestyle

- At the centre of a complex context justifying a multisectorial approach
- Ecological model
  - Booth et al. (2000)
  - Sallis et al. (2006)
  - Edwards & Tsouros (2006)
Introduction
Adoption of an active lifestyle

- Modifying a behaviour is a dynamic process
- Several steps in a spiral evolution
  - Procharska et al. (1994)
  - Sallis et Hovel (1990)

Introduction Adoption of an active lifestyle
An increasing number of projects aims to encourage people to start (again) PA
  - Walking, biking, swimming ...
  - Most traditional activity = running
  - Need of support = associations proposing progressive programs

'Start to run'
'Je cours pour ma forme'
'Running network'
Start to run

- 10 weeks
- 1 to 3 sessions/week
- 5 or 10km
- Club
- Coach

Factors that influence the success of such projects

- Scanlan et al. (1993)
  - Pleasure, personal involvement, expected benefits, social support
- Vallerand & Losier (1999)
  - Teaching process among social factors
Goals of the study

- To identify the general profile of the people who are beginning a running programme
- To compare the profile of the people who are finishing the programme and of those who do not

Methods

- Autumn session (2010)
- 20 out of 26 communities of Wallonia (French speaking part of Belgium) proposing STR
- At Week 0
  - Questionnaire: Lifestyle, physical environment, psycho-cognitive factors, social factors, bio demographic factors
  - Closed ended questions, Lickert scales
  - Validation + pilot study
  - 229 subjects attending to the first lesson
Methods

- At Week 10
  - Questionnaire
  - 128 maintenance
  - 52 drop out
  - 49 lost

- At Week 22
  - Questionnaire
  - 37 maintenance
  - 17 drop out
  - 74 lost

- Data processing
  - Statistica 8.0
  - t de Student

Findings

General profile of the participants (Week 0)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bio demographic factors</th>
<th>Woman, forty years, in couple, normal BMI, perception of high or average income, teacher or official</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>No smoker, drinking occasionally alcohol, good nutritional habits, few physical activity experience, self-perception as low or no sports, low or no experience of running</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of the physical environment</td>
<td>Fairly positive perception of their environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of the social environment</td>
<td>Perception of a social encouragement from friends and family, support from friends and social contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psycho-cognitive factors</td>
<td>Moderately high perceptions of free time and family burden, high perceived behavioral control but perception of running as moderately easy, high intention and positive attitude toward running, high self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation, relatively good perceived state of health, knowledge of health recommendations fairly close to reality, positive beliefs about the impact of physical activity on health, little attention to social norms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings At Week 10

Lifestyle
At least 1 glass/d: 58 Vs 75%

Phys env.
Safety (agree): 87.9 Vs 98%

Psy-cog
High intent
Health perc.
PA's advantages

Running maintenance

Bio dem
BMI: 22.7 Vs 23.5
Incomes (easy): 49.1 Vs 30.6%

Soc. fac.

Few differences

100 Vs 94%
82.7 Vs 74.5%
98.4 Vs 94%

Discussion W 10

✦ BMI (lower in MG)
  ✦ Strongly linked to PA (Sherwood & Jeffrey, 2000)
  ✦ Several injuries in DG → need of special care from the coaches

✦ Incomes (higher in MG)
  ✦ Like in the literature (Boutelle et al., 2004)

✦ Alcohol consumption (lower in MG)
  ✦ Low (1.2 Vs 1.8 glass/d)

✦ Safety environment (lower in MG)
  ✦ Not directly linked to the place where they are running
Findings At Week 22

Running maintenance

**Lifestyle**
- Vegetables
- Fat reduc.
- Self-percept as 'athlete'

**Bio dem**
- Women: 86.5 Vs 58.8%
- 73 Vs 40%
- 43.2 Vs 13.3%

**Phys env.**
- Stray dogs (ag: 66.7 Vs 93.8%)

**Soc. fac.**
- Support of: Family Children

**Psy-cog**
- Run = reassuring rewarding Motivation
- 82.9 Vs 56.3%
- 94.4 Vs 62.5%
- 8.4 Vs 11.7 (scale from -18 to +18)

**Discussion W 22**

- **Women better maintain**
  - Men in minority ➔ not really integrated in level's groups
- **Attention to alimentation (higher in MG)**
  - Running seems integrated into an overall interest for a healthy lifestyle (ISSP, 2004)
- **Self-perception as an 'athlete' and motivation**
  - Negatively linked to maintenance
  - Highest performers would be interested by other activities (higher requirements, other context)
Discussion W 22

- **Social support (higher in MG)**
  - At the end of the programme, group effect tends to disappear → need of other supports (Litt et al., 2002)

- **Representations about running (higher in MG)**
  - Reassuring, rewarding
  - Role of attitude (Sallis et al. 1996)

Findings

- **Limitations**
  - 40% of the DG subjects were injured
  - They would have been active without this situation
  - No control of the external factors (coaching process, inter-participants’ relationships …)
  - Risk of social desirability
  - Amount of the fees (means of 32.5€)
Conclusion

- Effective physical activity resumption seems to be linked to a general health climate without overestimation of one’s competences and expectations.
- Instructors should improve more the participants’ safety as well as focus more on motivational aspects than on performance itself (coaches as educators and motivators).
- They should emphasize more the positive effects of PA and offer other opportunities to their participants (coaches as counsellors).

Thank you for your attention.
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![Diagram showing the running programme and its associated factors.](http://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/sgr/pdf/sgrfull.pdf)