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Physical activity, habit & affective judgement

• Most adults don’t do enough physical activity \( (HSE, 2013) \)

• Making a behaviour a habit \( \rightarrow \) long-term change

• Physical activity predicted by expectations of affect \( (Ekkekakis, 2008, Rhodes, 2009) \)

• Apps show promise in increasing physical activity \( (Foster, 2013) \); current apps don’t target pleasure one might experience

• Co-developed app over 3 focus groups

Aimed to assess app acceptability & preliminary evaluation of efficacy
Method

- Acceptability focus groups
- Questionnaire completed before & after testing the app assessing:
  - Physical activity & psychological correlates
- Analysis: individual/mean change scores, descriptive summary of acceptability
Acceptability

• Sharing photos encouraged future motivation
• Reminders were helpful
• Photo fatigue
• Some used it lots / others preferred Facebook
• Desire to quantify activity in some way
• Affective judgement?

“The reminders reminded me to do something... I actually felt like, because it’s come up I need to do it.”

“I found the photos a bit mundane… including my own”

“When the app expired I kind of missed it and relieved when I was back on… I found myself looking to see who have given me motivation”
Preliminary evidence of efficacy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Overall mean (range)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Δ vigorous activity (minutes per week)</td>
<td>-7.1 (-720.0 to 690.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ moderate activity (minutes per week)</td>
<td>-40.8 (-140.0 to 15.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ walking (minutes per week)</td>
<td>25.0 (-135.0 to 275.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ habit (Range 1-5)</td>
<td>0.1 (-0.3 to 0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ social support (Range 1-5)</td>
<td>0.1 (-0.7 to 1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ descriptive norms (Range 1-5)</td>
<td>-0.1 (-1.0 to 0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ self-efficacy (Range 1-5)</td>
<td>0.2 (-0.8 to 1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ outcome expectation (Range 1-5)</td>
<td>0.2 (-0.2 to 1.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

• Concept acceptable, with modifications
• Small improvements (and reductions)
  – Justification for further testing
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