

RUN FOR HEALTH



EDUCATIONAL MATERIAL:

Policy implications

Kobe Helsén

&

Jeroen Scheerder

TOPICS

- Health impact of running events
- Policy recommendations for governments
- Policy recommendations for event organizers
- Policy recommendations for event stakeholders in general



OBJECTIVES

LEARNING OUTCOMES

By the end of this module, trainees should be able:

- 1) To have insight into health impacts of running events**
- 2) To understand and formulate policy recommendations for different stakeholders**
- 3) To convert recommendations into concrete guidelines**



EXAMINATION MATERIALS

Formative

- Multiple Choice Questions and class discussions

Summative

- Essay Questions

HEALTH IMPACTS

- Positive health impact PRE event
 - Train to get physically ready
 - Combined with healthy behavior (diet, alcohol, etc.)
- Health legacy POST event (?)
 - Intentions \neq actual behavior
 - Short term \neq long term
 - Depends on motivation

Based on Coleman & Sebire (2017); Derom et al. (2015); Funk et al. (2011); Lane et al. (2010); Murphy et al. (2015); Schoemaker et al. (2019); Van Dyck et al. (2017); Willem et al. (2017)



POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

FOR GOVERNMENTS (besides logistic and financial role, also)

- City planning: exercise-friendly environment and maximum use of existing infrastructure
- Government's policy: promote events all year round
- Sports club management: ideal environment to promote running (e.g. subsidization system)
- Campaigns sustainable transport

Based on results of R4H-project



POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

FOR EVENT ORGANIZERS

- Broaden the event: address broader group
- Organize side events (Hover et al., 2014): attract other group

Based on results of R4H-project



POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

FOR EVENT STAKEHOLDERS IN GENERAL

- Athletics federations missed the boat (Van Bottenburg et al., 2010)
- Need for uniform research
 - Combined database race results
 - European research projects (e.g. R4H; Scheerder et al., 2011)
- Strive to coopetition

Based on results of R4H-project



QUIZ! Let's test.

1. Which of the following statements is not true?
 - a) Event stakeholders should strive for coopetition
 - b) Running events are often accompanied with large positive health benefits among participants after the event
 - c) Based on questionnaires, it is possible to create profiles of runners
 - d) Side events are important to improve the health impact of events

QUIZ! Let's test.

2. Who seems to have mainly missed the boat to attract unregistered road runners?

- a) Local governments
- b) Event organizers
- c) Athletics federations and clubs
- d) All of the above

QUIZ! Let's test.

3. What does coopetition mean?

- a) Event stakeholders should strive for cooperation instead of competition
- b) Event stakeholders should strive for competition instead of cooperation
- c) Event stakeholders should strive for a healthy balance between competition and cooperation
- d) None of the above

QUIZ! Let's test.

4. Which of the following is not a recommendation for governments?
- a) City planning
 - b) Policy of events all year round
 - c) Campaigns for sustainable transport
 - d) Create combined databases with race results

QUIZ! Let's test.

5. Which of the following statements is not true?

- a) Governments should organize running events by themselves
- b) Governments should provide financial and logistic support for event organizers
- c) Governments should strive for a maximum use of public sports infrastructures
- d) Governments should have a good club management (e.g. by having a subsidization system)

ESSAY QUESTIONS



WHAT ARE OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EVENT ORGANIZERS TO REALIZE A HEALTH IMPACT WITH THE RUNNING EVENT?



IMAGINE BEING A PARTICIPANT OF A RUNNING EVENT: WHAT ACTIONS DO YOU THINK WOULD HELP TO IMPROVE YOUR PHYSICAL ACTIVITY POST-EVENT?



WHAT ACTIONS WOULD YOU UNDERTAKE TO IMPROVE THE HEALTH IMPACT OF EVENTS AS DELEGATE OF (1) THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT; (2) THE ATHLETICS FEDERATION; (3) THE EVENT ORGANIZER?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAHPY

- Coleman, S. J., & Sebire, S. J. (2017). Do people's goals for mass participation sporting events matter? A self-determination theory perspective. *Journal of Public Health, 39*(4), e202–e208.
- Derom, I., VanWynsberghe, R., & Scheerder, J. (2015). Maintaining physical activity post-event? Case of the Tour of Flanders Cyclo in Belgium. *Annals of Leisure Research, 18* (1), 25-47.
- Funk, D., Jordan, J., Ridinger, L., & Kaplanidou, K. (2011). Capacity of mass participant sport events for the development of activity commitment and future exercise intention. *Leisure Sciences, 33*, 250-268.
- Hover, P., Straatmeijer, J., Breedveld, K., & Cevaal, A. (2014). *Sportevenementen in Nederland: Over sportevenementen en hun maatschappelijke betekenis [Sport events in the Netherlands: Sport events and their societal meaning]*. Utrecht: Arko Sports Media.
- Lane, A., Murphy, N., Bauman, A., & Chey, T. (2010). Randomized controlled trial to increase physical activity among insufficiently active women following their participation in a mass event. *Health Education Journal, 69*(3), 287–296.
- Murphy, N., Lane, A., & Bauman, A. (2015). Leveraging mass participation events for sustainable health legacy. *Leisure Studies, 34*(6), 758-766.
- Scheerder, J., Vandermeerschen, H., Van Tuyckom, C., Hoekman, R., Breedveld, K. & Vos, S. (2011). *Understanding the game: sport participation in Europe. Facts, reflections and recommendations* (Sport Policy & Management Studies 10). Leuven: University of Leuven/Research Unit of Social Kinesiology & Sport Management.
- Schoemaker, J., van Genderen, S., & de Boer, W.I.J. (2019). Increased Physical Activity in Preparation for a Women-Only Mass Participation Sport Event: A Framework for Estimating the Health Impact. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17*(1), 98.
- Van Bottenburg, M., Scheerder, J., & Hover, P. (2010). Don't miss the next boat: Europe's opportunities and challenges in the second wave of running. *New Studies in Athletics, 3*(4), 125-143.
- Van Dyck, D., Cardon, G., de Bourdeaudhuij, I., de Ridder, L., & Willem, A. (2017). Who Participates in Running Events? Socio-Demographic Characteristics, Psychosocial Factors and Barriers as Correlates of Non-Participation – A Pilot Study in Belgium. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 14*(11), 1315.
- Willem, A., De Rycke, J., & Theeboom, M. (2017). The role of autonomous and controlled motivation in exercise intentions of participants in a mass cycling event. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8*, 354.

CONTACTS

Project Manager at University of Leuven

- Jeroen Scheerder: jeroen.scheerder@kuleuven.be

Project researcher at University of Leuven

- Kobe Helsen: kobe.helsen@kuleuven.be