



Bristol Girls Dance Project feasibility study: using a pilot economic evaluation to inform design of a full trial

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2013-003726
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	07-Aug-2013
Complete List of Authors:	Powell, Jane; University of the West of England, Bristol, Health and Social Sciences Carroll, Fran; University of Bristol, School of Social and Community Medicine Sebire, Simon; University of Bristol, Centre for Exercise Nutrition and Health Sciences Haase, Anne; University of Bristol, Centre for Exercise Nutrition and Health Sciences Jago, Russ; University of Bristol, Centre for Exercise, Nutrition and Health Sciences
Primary Subject Heading:	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health economics, Sports and exercise medicine
Keywords:	SPORTS MEDICINE, HEALTH ECONOMICS, PUBLIC HEALTH

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Only

RESEARCH PILOT STUDY

Bristol Girls Dance Project feasibility study: using a pilot economic evaluation to inform design of a full trial

Powell, J.^{1§} Carroll, FE.² Sebire SJ.³ Haase, AM.³ Jago, R.³

¹ Professor of Public Health Economics, Department of Health and Applied Social Sciences, University of the West of England, Glenside Campus, Stapleton, Bristol, BS16 1DD, UK.

² Dr Fran E Carroll, Research Assistant, School of Social and Community Medicine, University of Bristol, BS8 2PS, UK.

³ Dr Simon J Sebire, Post-Doctoral Researcher, Centre for Exercise Nutrition and Health Sciences, School for Policy Studies, University of Bristol, BS8 1TZ, UK.

³ Dr Anne M Haase, Senior Lecturer in Exercise, Nutrition & Health, Centre for Exercise, Nutrition and Health Sciences, School for Policy Studies, University of Bristol, BS8 1TZ, UK.

³ Professor Russell Jago, Professor of Paediatric Physical Activity & Public Health Exercise, Nutrition & Health Sciences, Centre for Exercise, Nutrition & Health Sciences, School for Policy Studies, University of Bristol, BS8 1TZ, UK.

[§] Corresponding author Professor Jane Powell - jane.powell@uwe.ac.uk, Department of Health and Applied Social Sciences, University of the West of England, Bristol, BS16 1DD, UK. 0044 117 3288752

ABSTRACT

Wider context: There is currently little guidance for pilot trial economic evaluation where health outcomes and costs are influenced by a range of wider determinants and factors.

Objectives: This paper presents the findings of a pilot economic evaluation study running alongside the Bristol Girls Dance Project (BGDP) feasibility study and describes how these have impacted the conduct and design of main trial economic evaluation.

Design: Three-arm, cluster randomised, controlled pilot trial and economic evaluation. Seven schools (n=210) from the Bristol and greater Bristol area, UK were randomly allocated to the intervention arm 3 schools (n= 90) and the control arms 4 schools (n=120).

Intervention: Girls aged 11-12 years with parental consent were provided with two, 90-minute dance sessions per week for 9-weeks at school facilities.

Economic measures: Programme costs, girls' preferences for attributes of dance and competing leisure time activities were measured. Primary outcome: accelerometer-derived moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (MVPA) minutes per day.

Results: After-school dance classes for girls aged 11-12 years are valued favourably in terms of other competing leisure choices compared with older adolescents. Discrete Choice Experiment methods are acceptable to girls of this age. The average cost of the BDGP programme per school not including developmental and research costs at mainstream implementation is \$2,555; £1,596; €1,870 and per participant \$85.17; £53.21; €62.32 in 2010-11 prices.

Conclusions: The feasibility of providing full cost data for a full trial of the BGDP programme has been established and an embryonic resource use checklist developed for this purpose. This pilot study has demonstrated resources used to develop, prepare and deliver the

1
2
3 programme should be categorised separately, so the cost of the mainstream programme can
4
5 be estimated accurately in a full trial. A social model of costing that reflects opportunity costs
6
7 of participants and parents could be considered.
8
9

10 11 12 **BACKGROUND** 13

14
15
16
17 Recent influential studies attach substantial economic and social costs to obesity prevalence
18
19 projections.^{1 2} These forecasts are based upon a body of research from long term cohort
20
21 studies which suggest that change in the prevalence of obesity in children and adolescents
22
23 born at the millennium is likely to lead to increased health risks in middle-age irrespective of
24
25 adult adiposity.^{3 4 5} Consequently, there is a need for new interventions that focus on
26
27 preventing obesity or changing diet or physical activity; the two behaviours that are central to
28
29 the accrual of body mass.
30
31

32
33 As well as being a health and wellbeing issue, children's obesity also has serious economic
34
35 impacts. Scarce resources with competing uses in all health systems and the need to decide
36
37 between new, 'efficacious' primary prevention physical activity programme interventions on
38
39 the grounds of cost-effectiveness, has increased the significance of economic evaluation as a
40
41 concept and methodology. Recent guidance from the UK Medical Research Council (MRC)
42
43 for the development and evaluation of complex behavioural interventions suggests that
44
45 efficacy and cost-effectiveness should be established before programmes are implemented at
46
47 the population level.^{6 7} However, the meaningful determination of these criteria is often
48
49 problematic in primary prevention and guidelines for the design and conduct of economic
50
51 evaluation of complex interventions are at an early stage of development.^{8 9 10 11} It is therefore
52
53 important to develop the conceptual and measurement process by which effectiveness and
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 cost-effectiveness of complex physical activity interventions can be evaluated in a full trial
4
5 using a pilot study.
6
7

8 The Bristol Girls Dance Project (BGDP) feasibility trial, examined the potential utility of an
9
10 after-school dance programme as a means of increasing moderate to vigorous physical
11
12 activity (MVPA) among 11-12 year old girls (school year 7) seeking to discover any
13
14 improvements that might need to be made to the programme prior to a main trial.¹² This
15
16 suggested that it is feasible to deliver the intervention and that participating in dance has the
17
18 potential to yield change in girls' physical activity, but a larger randomised controlled trial
19
20 (RCT) would be needed to fully evaluate its effectiveness and cost-effectiveness. In the
21
22 absence of other evidence for the outcome of dance interventions, another aim of the
23
24 feasibility pilot was to refine the information required to sufficiently power a full trial.
25
26
27

28
29 Preferences for competing after-school activities are potential determinants of the economic
30
31 benefit of dance intervention, as increased physical activity must be valued in order for it to
32
33 be maintained⁸ and to have potential for long-term impact on physical activity levels. In this
34
35 study, DCE and survey methods are applied to examine two separate, but complementary
36
37 aspects of value – preferences for the attributes of dance classes and preferences for dance
38
39 among other competing alternatives for spending leisure time respectively. Physical activity
40
41 levels decline during youth¹³ with the start of secondary school being a critical period of
42
43 change, so it was important to establish comparative preferences for after-school, leisure
44
45 activities on weekdays.
46
47
48

49 Value is a concept germane to recruitment and retention rates and linked to the outcome
50
51 dimension of the BGDP intervention and therefore important to examine in detail. Discrete
52
53 Choice Experiment (DCE) works on the premise that any 'product', for example a healthcare
54
55 treatment or physical activity programme, can be described by its characteristics, or
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 attributes, and the extent to which an individual values a 'product' is dependent on the level
4
5 of these characteristics.^{14 15 16}
6
7

8 Thus, this paper reports the learning from and findings of a pilot economic evaluation of the
9
10 Bristol Girls Dance Project for girls aged 11-12 years in a primary school setting in England
11
12 impact the design and conduct of a full trial economic evaluation. Other findings from the
13
14 Bristol Girls Dance Project Feasibility Trial concerning process evaluation, outcomes and
15
16 effectiveness have been reported elsewhere.¹²
17
18
19

20 ARTICLE SUMMARY

21 22 23 *Article focus*

24
25
26 To examine the feasibility of providing complete programme cost data from a funder
27
28 perspective.
29

30
31 To demonstrate the appropriateness of using DCE and survey methods to derive participants'
32
33 preferences for dance among other competing leisure activities.
34

35
36 To present learning from reflections on the findings of pilot economic evaluation to inform a
37
38 full trial economic evaluation
39

40 41 42 *Key messages*

43
44
45 A pilot economic evaluation has been applied to learn more about the feasibility of costing
46
47 the BGDGP complex intervention and categorising programme resources to identify the
48
49 mainstream cost of the intervention during a full trial.
50

51
52 Pilot data from seven schools has been analysed to understand girls' preferences for dance
53
54 versus other ways of spending their leisure time at age 11-12 years that can help to
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 conceptualise and measure the outcome dimensions of economic evaluation alongside a full
4
5 trial.
6
7

8 *Strengths and limitations of this study*

9

10
11 This pilot study used a systematic approach to consider how the conceptual and measurement
12
13 process of an economic evaluation might be enhanced in a full trial by learning more about
14
15 the cost and outcome dimensions of economic evaluation and has produced findings that can
16
17 be applied to design and conduct an economic evaluation alongside a full cluster RCT.
18

19
20
21 This feasibility and exploratory pilot study is powered to test the intervention concept, the
22
23 feasibility of obtaining programme cost data in categories and the evidence required to power
24
25 a full cluster RCT in the future. Consequently, the variation in programme costs at the school
26
27 level has not been captured and this is a limitation of the programme cost estimates presented.
28
29

30 31 32 33 **METHODS**

34 35 *Bristol Girls Dance Project (BGDP) feasibility study*

36

37
38 BGDP was a three-arm, parallel group, cluster randomised, controlled pilot trial with schools
39
40 as the unit of allocation. Seven schools from three school districts, Bristol, Bath and South
41
42 Gloucestershire (UK) were recruited to take part in the study from schools in these districts
43
44 with no current after school dance provision.¹² Stratifying by school district, three schools
45
46 were randomly allocated to the intervention arm (n= 90) and four schools to the two control
47
48 arms (n=120) and each school was assigned a dance teacher to lead the sessions.
49

50
51 Randomisation was conducted by an independent member of the clinical trials unit at Bristol
52
53 University using computer-generated random sequences and codes for school district and
54
55 school name.
56
57
58
59
60

Sample size

This feasibility study was powered to test the intervention concept and to provide the necessary information to calculate the sample size of a full cluster RCT and economic evaluation of an after school dance programme. The important parameters detection of 10 minutes difference in MVPA per weekday (50 minutes per week) between the intervention and control groups, intra-class correlation for weekday MVPA at time 2 and associated confidence intervals have been reported and profiled in another paper from this study.¹² For practical reasons the sample was limited to thirty girls aged 11-12 years per school. Girls were recruited from each school at random from those with parental consent.

The intervention

Intervention participants were provided with two, 90-minute dance sessions per week for 9-weeks at school facilities. The hip-hop and street dance style of dance to popular music was facilitated by a professional dance teacher.

Primary outcome measure

All participants were asked to wear an Actigraph accelerometer for seven days at baseline (week 0) during the last two weeks of the intervention (weeks 8 or 9) and 3 months after the intervention ended (Week 20).

Economic measures

1) Resource use-cost

Resources used at each stage of the BGDG programme were recorded retrospectively by the project team on time-sheets and expense sheets from a public sector perspective. Costing followed a method applied in a study of complex intervention with children in a school

1
2
3 setting (A Stop Smoking in Schools Trial) ASSIST.¹⁷ Stage 0 intervention planning and
4
5 development costs or costs associated with running the scientific study (e.g., control group
6
7 incentives for data collection, control school dance workshops or recruitment events) would
8
9 not recur during mainstream implementation, but these costs are included for completeness.
10

11
12
13
14 Expenses including entry incentives, postage and Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) checking
15
16 were gathered. Travel time was estimated for all staff inputs at the school locations. Girls in
17
18 the control schools received incremental thank you gifts at each data collection they attended.
19
20 Space hire did not incur costs, but estimates of the cost of space hire for dance class delivery
21
22 are included because costs connected with alternative use of space in schools. School
23
24 overhead and capital costs are not included.
25
26
27
28

29
30 2) *Discrete Choice Experiment (DCE) and survey of preference ranking and use of*
31
32 *leisure time*
33
34
35

36 BGDG formative qualitative work indicated the frequency of after-school dance classes per
37
38 week; cost per session and how much leisure time is left over on dance class days for other
39
40 leisure activities are important considerations for girls.¹⁸ Participants were asked to select the
41
42 ‘dance class scenario’ they preferred from a pair of options. Table I presents the 4 paired
43
44 scenarios (1A:1B, 2A:2B, 3A:3B, 4A:4B) consisting of a randomly determined combination
45
46 of three attributes, each with two levels.
47
48

49
50 Table I
51
52
53
54

55 Four paired choice scenarios were administered to 210 girls in seven schools - 3 intervention
56
57 schools (n=90) and 4 control schools (n=120). Measures were taken at baseline (time 0) and
58
59
60

1
2
3 at 9 weeks (time 1) using large cards, and girls' preferred choice for each pair of scenarios
4
5 was recorded by the project team. Two time points were needed to establish change in
6
7 preferences before and after the intervention. Participants were asked to give preference
8
9 ratings for ten leisure activities on weekdays using a ten-point scale (1 = favourite; 10 = least
10
11 favourite). Participant responses were collected on Personal Digital Assistants (PDAs) and
12
13 downloaded to a customised database.
14
15

16 17 18 *Ethics* 19

20 Potential participants in all seven schools were told that there was a maximum of 30
21
22 randomly assigned spaces at the dance classes. The study was approved by a University of
23
24 Bristol ethics committee and informed parental consent was obtained for all participants.
25
26
27

28 29 *Analyses* 30

31
32 Proportions of the sample ranking ten weekday leisure activities as first choice activity (rank
33
34 = 1) were calculated after participants had rated all ten leisure activities from 1 to 10.
35
36

37 Responses from participants with repetition of ratings for one or more leisure activities or
38
39 missing ratings for leisure activities were excluded. Overall, where the proportion of the
40
41 sample rating activities as their first choice was the same, these activities were assigned the
42
43 same rank across all ten activities. Valid responses as a proportion of total responses for the
44
45 survey ranking leisure activities were $t_2=178/210$, $t_1=130/210$, $t_0=68/210$ across all group
46
47 allocations.
48
49

50
51 DCE data was 'effects-coded'¹⁹ using STATA²⁰ and analysed using conditional logistic
52
53 regression. Effects coding is similar to dummy variable coding, but is preferable in this
54
55 instance because interaction or trade-off between the attributes is likely to take place as well
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 as a main effect. The coefficients for each attribute are a measure of the influence of that
4
5 attribute level on choice. Positive values represent a positive influence on choice, or in other
6
7 words, a preference for that level of an attribute. These results can be used to establish girls'
8
9 overall preferences for attributes, as well as the order of their preferences (i.e. which attribute
10
11 is most and least important). Participants with missing data were excluded from the DCE
12
13 analysis.
14

15
16
17 Total and average cost estimates from a funder perspective were identified and derived for
18
19 BGDG based on staged timing, quantity, frequency and price of resource use in 2010-11
20
21 prices.
22
23

24 25 26 **RESULTS**

27 28 *Identification and timing of resources used*

29
30
31 Table II identifies and describes at four stages the resources use of the BGDG programme and
32
33 presents total cost estimates. The proportion of total costs incurred were 42% at stage 0, 5%
34
35 at stage 1, 47% at stage 2 and 6% at stage 3. BGDG required at least 286 hours of staff input.
36
37 Eighteen BGDG dance classes (2 classes per week for 9 weeks) of 90 minutes duration were
38
39 delivered to 90 girls in three intervention schools (30 per school) for 81 hours (27 hours per
40
41 school) at a total estimated cost of \$7,666; £4,789; €5,609 in 2010-11 prices.^{21 22} Removing
42
43 stage 0 programme development and stage 1-3 research costs revealed an average cost of
44
45 repeating a BGDG programme in its mainstream form per school of \$2,555; £1,596; €1,870
46
47 and per participant of \$85.17; £53.21; €62.32 in 2010-11 prices. There are no confidence
48
49 intervals for these average programme cost or participant estimates (see limitations of this
50
51 pilot study).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Table II here
4
5
6

7
8 The BGDG programme compares favourably in terms of average cost per user with the only
9
10 other evidence for costing an after-school dance class programme in England - estimated by
11
12 Fordham and Barton²³ and included in NICE guidance²⁴ on the promotion of physical
13
14 activity in children. These estimates^{23,24} were based on a report of the NRG dance
15
16 programme²⁵ which was delivered at a total cost of \$32,975; £20,600; €24,129 at 2010-11
17
18 prices. Assumptions were made²³ to derive costs for NICE guidance from the NRG report.²⁵
19
20 The shorter and less intensive NRG programme comprised 10 dance classes of 60 minutes
21
22 duration for an assumed number of 24 girls in 14 groups or schools (n=336 girls) for 140
23
24 hours with a cost per participant of \$98.14; £61.31; €71.81, in 2010-11 prices. This includes
25
26 140 hours of teacher time sourced from national pay scales for England at £23.57 per hour at
27
28 2010-11 prices.²⁶
29
30
31
32
33

34 *Preferences for leisure activities*

35
36

37 All girls were asked to rank ten after-school leisure activities by first preference activity.
38
39 Table III presents proportions across the participants (n=210) for preference ranks for after-
40
41 school leisure activities for all group allocations at each time point demonstrating consistency
42
43 in preference ranks indicating girls' selection of first choice leisure activities at each time
44
45 point. The after-school leisure activities indicating the highest proportion of first choice
46
47 preference rankings at each time point include 'hanging out with friends away from home just
48
49 for fun' (Ranking at t2=1, t1=1, t0=2); 'take part in sports, athletics or physical activity'
50
51 (Ranking at t2=2, t1=2, t0=1) and 'using the internet for fun: chats, YouTube, Facebook,
52
53 Bebo, Myspace, looking for music' (Ranking at t0=3, t1=3, t2=2).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Table III here
4
5

6 *DCE results*
7
8

9 Table IV indicates girls in this sample have a preference for “time left for other leisure
10 activities on dance class days”, over the “cost of” and “frequency of dance classes per week”.
11
12 Analysis of preference levels within each attribute suggests 2 hours is preferred to 3 hours
13 remaining for other leisure activities on dance class days. Girls were least concerned with the
14 frequency of dance classes per week with preference proportions suggesting 2 classes were
15 preferred to 1 dance class per week. This pattern was consistent in all groups at t0 and t1.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Table IV here
26
27
28

29 **DISCUSSION**
30

31 *What is already known on this topic*
32
33

34 There is minimal guidance to support how economic evaluations of complex public health
35 interventions should be designed and conducted in school and community settings.
36
37

38 There are no checklists or tools available to support costing dance programmes and minimal
39 knowledge of how to categorise resources to identify the mainstream cost of delivery
40
41
42

43 Discrete Choice Experiment (DCE) methods to elicit the relative preferences and choices of
44 girls aged 11-12 years are untried and untested, but it is important to capture how girls value
45 dance among other competing leisure activities using a robust and acceptable method.
46
47
48
49
50

51 *What this study adds*
52
53

54 Providing programme cost data for a full trial of the BGDG programme is feasible. Around
55 two-fifths of resources are development and research costs, so resources used to develop,
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 prepare and deliver the programme should be categorised separately, so the cost of the
4
5 mainstream programme can be estimated accurately in a full trial.
6
7

8 Discrete Choice Experiment is an acceptable method to elicit preferences of girls aged 11-12
9
10 years.
11

12
13 At this point in their lives dance is popular choice when offered within the context of other
14
15 competing choices for spending leisure time predicts positive recruitment and retention rates
16
17 in after-school dance activities.
18

19
20 Participation in dance has opportunity costs for participants and parents extending beyond the
21
22 funder that suggest a social model of cost should be considered for a full trial.
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Robust evidence for the cost-effectiveness of physical activity complex interventions is
30
31 important for knowing where to invest scarce resources and commission programmes to
32
33 maximise health outcomes in primary prevention.^{27 28 29} However, gathering robust evidence
34
35 to support investment in public health interventions is a challenge.^{30 31} Significant barriers
36
37 remain and there is currently little guidance in how to conduct economic evaluation where
38
39 behaviour change is associated with health outcomes determined beyond genetic inheritance
40
41 by family, social and physical environments.^{32 33}
42
43
44

45 Indicative programme cost data from the pilot economic evaluation indicated a substantial
46
47 proportion of the intervention programme costs 42% occur at Stage 0 – the pre-programme
48
49 planning and development stage. This is an important finding because it suggests provided
50
51 BGDG is effective and cost-effective in a full trial, it would be substantially less costly to roll
52
53 out in its mainstream form. All complex interventions in primary prevention are likely to
54
55 generate a high proportion of upfront development costs that will not reoccur once a
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 programme is mainstreamed – an aspect of investment in public health interventions often
4 overlooked by decision makers.
5

6
7 Application of DCE is an established technique in adult populations, but to our knowledge
8 has not been applied previously in populations of children aged 11-12 years to establish
9 values for the attributes of physical activities. This study has demonstrated application of
10 DCE methods is feasible and acceptable to girls of this age. This is important because it
11 suggests DCE could be applied in other studies with children to understand the concept of
12 ‘value’ of an activity which plays an important role in recruitment, participation and
13 maintenance which are all linked to intervention outcome. In addition to its acceptability the
14 DCE method produced more complete data than the direct survey method in eliciting
15 preference ranks for after-school leisure activities. These findings support a previous
16 contention that DCE techniques may have merit over more ‘traditional’ survey methods³⁴ in
17 eliciting preferences. However, more evidence would be required to fully support this
18 finding.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 Taken together, findings of the DCE and survey of leisure activity preference in this study
36 indicate dance is a valued leisure activity among competing alternatives and reveals more
37 about the attributes of dance classes in girls of this age that can be taken forward to maximise
38 recruitment and retention in the BGDGP programme. The findings of this study suggest that
39 dance has immediate appeal as an after-school leisure activity among a range of strongly
40 competing alternatives in girls of this age compared with older adolescents.³⁵ Girls in this
41 study have a first rank preference for the attribute ‘time remaining for other leisure activities
42 on dance class days’, over the ‘cost of’ and ‘frequency of dance classes per week’. The
43 finding that in the intervention group two hours is preferred to three hours remaining for
44 other leisure activities on dance class days is significant. Overall these findings could suggest
45 that at this point in their lives dance is popular choice in girls of this age when offered within
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the context of other competing choices for spending leisure time. These are important
4
5 findings because they predict positive recruitment rates and participation of girls aged 11-12
6
7 years in dance as a physical leisure time activity and in a full trial.³⁶
8
9

10 Delivery of after-school dance classes is dependent upon substantial commitment from the
11
12 girls giving up their after-school leisure time to participate in dancing. In turn, participation
13
14 is dependent upon the willingness of parents and carers to support attendance and to provide
15
16 encouragement and a means of travelling back home after school hours when school buses
17
18 are not available. This pilot study suggests development of a social model of costing that
19
20 reflects the cost of participants' and parents' time and opportunity costs are substantial
21
22 elements of the intervention cost that could be captured if practical in a full trial.
23
24

25
26
27 However, methods and tools to capture 'hidden' cost items that facilitate the success of the
28
29 intervention, but are not incurred by funders are not yet fully established.¹⁷ How
30
31 identification of costs falling outside the public sector that are relevant to programme
32
33 implementation can be captured at a full trial stage needs to be considered carefully.³⁷ In a
34
35 full trial resources used should be captured prospectively³⁸ and this pilot study has
36
37 established categories of resource use are also important to consider to establish accurate
38
39 mainstream programme costs.
40
41
42
43
44

45 **CONCLUSIONS**

46
47 The feasibility of providing costing data for full trial of the BGDGP programme in is
48
49 established and an embryonic resource use checklist has been developed. Resources used to
50
51 develop and run the BGDGP programme should be categorised separately in order for the
52
53 mainstream delivery cost of BGDGP to be estimated accurately in a full trial. A social model of
54
55 costing that reflects participants and parents opportunity costs should be considered. BGDGP
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 after-school dance classes have potential for sustained participation and cost-effective
4
5 delivery, but a full trial using methodological learning from this study is required.
6
7
8
9

10 **Competing interests**

11
12 There are no competing interests.
13
14

15 **Authors' Contributions**

16
17 The quantitative analysis plan was conceived by JP, FC, RJ and SJS. Analyses were
18
19 performed by JP and FC and interpretation by JP, FC, RJ, SJS and AMH. JP drafted the first
20
21 version of the manuscript with additional sections provided by FC. All authors provided
22
23 critical edits and revisions to the paper and have reviewed and approved the final version of
24
25 the paper.
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **Data sharing statement** No additional data are available
33
34
35
36

37 **Funding**

38
39 This research was funded by the National Prevention Research Initiative (<http://npri.org.uk>),
40
41 consisting of the following funding partners: Alzheimer's Research Trust; Alzheimer's
42
43 Society; Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council, British Heart Foundation;
44
45 Cancer Research UK; Chief Scientist Office; Scottish Government Health Directorate;
46
47 Department of Health; Diabetes UK; Economic and Social Research Council; Engineering
48
49 and Physical Sciences Research Council; Health & Social Care Research & Development
50
51 Office for Northern Ireland; Medical Research Council; The Stroke Association; Welsh
52
53 Assembly Government and World Cancer Research Fund [grant number G090084].
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank all the participants, dance teachers, school teachers and schools who participated in or assisted with this research. Professor Powell acknowledges discussion of and feedback from a draft version of this paper presented at the Health Economists Bristol (HEB) journal club <http://www.bris.ac.uk/social-community-medicine/centres/healthecon> in November 2011. Laura Davis project manager BGDG and Jade McNeil research associate are acknowledged for data collection leading to this paper. Fran Carroll's contemporaneous PhD research was supervised by Dr Alan A Montgomery at the time of DCE design and data analysis. Dr Jago is supported by a National Institute for Health Research career development fellowship. This work was also supported by DECIPHer, a UKCRC Public Health Research: Centre of Excellence. Funding from the specific funders under the auspices of the UK Clinical Research Collaboration is gratefully acknowledged. The other co-applicants of the main BGDG study, Professor Ashley R Cooper and Dr Alan A Montgomery are acknowledged. The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the National Institute for Health Research or the Department of Health.

References

1. Foresight. *Tackling obesity: future choices*. London: Government Office for Science, 2007.
2. Stamatakis E, Zaninotto P, Falaschetti E, Mindell, J. Head J. Time trends in childhood and adolescent obesity in England from 1995 to 2007 and projections of prevalence to 2015. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2010; **64**:167-174.
3. Gunnell D, Frankel S, Nanchahal K, et al Childhood obesity and adult cardiovascular mortality: a 57 year follow-up study based on the Boyd Orr cohort. *Am J Clin Nutr* 1998; **67**:1111-18.
4. Must A, Jacques PF, Dallal GE, et al. Long term morbidity and mortality of overweight adolescents – a follow-up of the Havard growth study of 1922 to 1935. *N Engl J Med* 1992; **327**:1350-5.
5. Engeland A, Bjorge T, Sogaard AJ, et al. Body mass index in adolescence in relation to total mortality: 32-year Follow-up of 227,000 Norwegian boys and girls. *Am J Epidemiol* 2003;**157**:517-23.
6. Lancaster GA, Dodd S, Williamson P. Design and analysis of pilot studies: recommendations for good practice. *J Eval Clin Pract* 2004, **10**, 2:307-312.

- 1
2
3 7. Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, Michie S, Nazareth I, Petticrew M. Developing and
4
5 evaluating complex interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance. *BMJ*
6
7 2008, 337:a1655.
8
9
- 10
11 8. Wolfenstetter SB. Conceptual framework for standard economic evaluation of
12
13 physical activity programmes in primary prevention. *Prev Sci.* 2011; 12(4):435-51.
14
15
- 16
17 9. Sheill, A. Hawe, P. Gold, L. Complex interventions or complex systems? Implications
18
19 for health economic evaluation. *BMJ*, 2008; 336:1281-1283.
20
21
- 22
23 10. Weatherly H, Drummond M, Claxton K, et al. *Assessing the challenges of applying*
24
25 *standard methods of economic evaluation to public health interventions*. York: Centre
26
27 for Health Economics, 2009.
28
29
- 30
31 11. Anderson R. Systematic reviews of economic evaluations: utility or futility. *Health*
32
33 *Econ*, 2010;19:350-364.
34
35
- 36
37 12. Jago R. Sebire S, Cooper AR, et al. Bristol Girls Dance Project Feasibility Trial:
38
39 Outcome and process evaluation results. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*, 2012; 9, 83.
40
41
42
- 43
44 13. Gorely T, Marshall S, Biddle SJH, Cameron N. The prevalence of leisure time
45
46 sedentary behaviour and physical activity in adolescent girls: An ecological
47
48 momentary assessment approach. *Int J Pediatr Obes*, 2007; 2:227-234.
49
50
- 51
52 14. Cheraghi-Sohi S, Bower P, Mead N, McDonald R, Whalley D, Roland M. Making
53
54 sense of patient priorities: applying discrete choice methods in primary care using
55
56 'think aloud' technique. *Fam Pract*, 2007; 24: 276-282.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 15. Green C, Gerard K. Exploring the social value of health-care interventions: a stated
4 preference discrete choice experiment. *Health Econ*, 2009; 18:951-976.
5
6
7
8
9
10 16. Petrou S, McIntosh E. (2009) Women's Preferences for Attributes of First-Trimester
11 Miscarriage Management: A Stated Preference Discrete-Choice Experiment. *Value*
12 *Health*, 12,4:551-559.
13
14
15
16
17 17. Hollingworth W, Cohen D, Hawkins J, et al. Reducing smoking in adolescents: cost-
18 effectiveness results from the cluster randomised ASSIST (A Stop Smoking in
19 Schools Trial). *Nicotine & Tob Res*, 2011; 14, 2:161-168.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26 18. Jago, R. Davis, L. McNeil, J. et al. Adolescent girls' and parents' views on recruiting
27 and retaining girls into an after-school dance intervention: implications for extra-
28 curricular physical activity provision. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*, 2011, 8, 91.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35 19. Bech, M. Gyrd-Hansen, D.. Effects coding in discrete choice experiments. *Health*
36 *Econ*, 2005; 14,10.
37
38
39
40
41
42 20. STATA CORP LP (2009) *STATA user's guide release 11*. Texas, USA: STATA CORP
43 LP.
44
45
46
47
48 21. Safalra [online] 2012. *Historical UK Inflation and price conversion rates*. Accessed
49 on May 3rd 2012 at:- <http://safalra.com/other/historical-uk-inflation-price-conversion/>.
50
51
52
53 22. Oanda [online] 2012. *Historical exchange rates*. Accessed on May 3rd 2012 at:-
54 <http://www.oanda.com/currency/historical-rates/>.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 23. Fordham R, Barton GP. *Promotion of physical activity in children programme*
4
5 *guidance: a cost-effectiveness scenario analysis*. London:NICE, 2008.
6
7
8
9
10 24. NICE public health guidance 17. *Promoting physical activity, active play and sport*
11 *for pre-school and school-age children and young people in family, pre-school,*
12 *school and community settings*. NICE:London, 2009.
13
14
15
16
17 25. Hampshire Dance and Laban (2007)[online] Accessed on December 7th 2012. *NRG*
18 *Youth Dance and Health Report 2005-6*.
19
20 <http://www.hampshiredance.org.uk/documents/NRGEvaluationReport.pdf>
21
22
23
24
25 26. TES [online] 2011 *Teacher's pay scales from September 2011 unchanged from 2010*.
26
27 <http://www.tes.co.uk/article.aspx?storycode=6000186>
28
29
30
31
32 27. Rush B, Sheill A, Hawe P. A census of economic evaluations in health promotion.
33
34 *Health Educ Res*, 2004; 19:707-719.
35
36
37
38 28. Kelly MP, McDaid D, Ludbrook A, Powell JE. *Economic appraisal of public health*
39 *interventions*. London:Health Development Agency, 2005.
40
41
42
43
44 29. Anderson R. New MRC guidance on evaluating complex interventions. *BMJ*,
45
46 2008;337:944-5.
47
48
49
50
51 30. Buchanan J, Wolstenholme J, Foster C. *A rapid review of economic literature related*
52 *to the promotion of physical activity, play and sport for pre-school and school-age*
53 *children in family, pre-school, school and community settings*. London:NICE, 2008.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 31. Richardson AK. Investing in public health: barriers and possible solutions. *J Public*
4
5 *Health* 2012; 34:322-7.
6
7
8
9
10 32. Ogilvie D, Bull F, Powell J, et al. An applied ecological framework for evaluating
11
12 infrastructure to promote walking and cycling: the iConnect study. *Am J Public*
13
14 *Health*. 2011;101:473-481.
15
16
17
18 33. Powell J. Compression of morbidity outcomes key to investment in public health. *J*
19
20 *Public Health* 2012; 34:329.
21
22
23
24
25 34. Alvarez-Farizo B, Hanley N, Barberan R. The value of leisure time: a contingent
26
27 rating approach, *J Environ Plan Man*, 2001; 44(5):681-699.
28
29
30
31 35. O'Neill, J. Pate, R. Hooker, SP. The contribution of dance to daily physical activity
32
33 among adolescent girls. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*, 2011; 8:87.
34
35
36
37 36. Nader PR, Bradley RH, Houts RM, McRitchie SL, O'Brien M: Moderate-to-vigorous
38
39 physical activity from ages 9 to 15 years. *JAMA* 2008, 300:295-305.
40
41
42
43 37. Alvarez-Farizo B, Hanley N, Barberan R. The value of leisure time: a contingent
44
45 rating approach, *J Environ Plan Man*, 2001; 44,5:681-699.
46
47
48
49 38. Ridyard C, Hughes D. Methods for the collection of resource use data within clinical
50
51 trials: a systematic review of the studies funded by the UK Health Technology
52
53 Assessment Programme. *Value Health*, 2010; 13, 8:867-872.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

TABLES

Table I. Attributes and levels of the Discrete Choice Experiment and the four choice sets given to participants

Level of attributes	Attributes		
	Frequency of dance classes per week	Cost per session	Hours left for other leisure activities on that day
Upper	2 dance classes per week	£1 per session	Leaving 3 hours for other leisure activities on the evening of the dance session
Lower	1 dance class per week	50p per session	Leaving 2 hours for other leisure activities on the evening of the dance session
<p style="text-align: center;">1A ←</p> <p>You take one after school dance class each week at a cost of £1 per class leaving you 3 hours on that evening for other leisure activities</p>		<p style="text-align: center;">→ 1B</p> <p>You take two after school dance classes each week at a cost of 50p per class leaving you 2 hours on those evenings for other leisure activities</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">2A ←</p> <p>You take two after school dance classes each week at a cost of £1 per class leaving you 2 hours on those evenings for other leisure activities</p>		<p style="text-align: center;">→ 2B</p> <p>You take one after school dance class each week at a cost of 50p per class leaving you 3 hours on that evening for other leisure activities</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">3A ←</p> <p>You take one after school dance class each week at a cost of 50p per class leaving you 2 hours on that evening for other leisure activities</p>		<p style="text-align: center;">→ 3B</p> <p>You take two after school dance classes each week at a cost of £1 per class leaving you 3 hours on those evenings for other leisure activities</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">4A ←</p> <p>You take two after school dance classes each week at a cost of 50p per class leaving you 3 hours on those evenings for other leisure activities</p>		<p style="text-align: center;">→ 4B</p> <p>You take one after school dance class each week at a cost of £1 per class leaving you 2 hours on that evening for other leisure activities</p>	

Table II. Resources, estimated total costs and average cost per participant 2010-11 prices

<i>Stage of BGD</i>	<i>Description of resources used</i>	<i>Total cost \$ (£, €) 2010-11 prices</i>
Stage 0 Pre-Programme planning development	Nine hours to adapt training programme for hip hop genre, two 3 hour sessions to prepare dance teachers for 9 week intervention delivery by lead dance teacher, 20 hours preparation by 3 dance teachers, disclosures CRB forms	\$8,525 £5,326 €6,238
Stage 1 Programme preparation	Space hire for two 3 hour dance taster sessions, dance teacher's delivery of two 3 hour taster sessions, 2 control recruitment presentations (90 minutes), postage costs	\$936 £585 €685
Stage 2 Programme delivery	Delivery of 18 dance classes at 90 minutes per class over 9 weeks in three schools, incentives for intervention schools, incentives for control schools data collection, refreshments	\$9,575 £5,982 €7,007
Stage 3 Programme reinforcement	Three dance workshops for two control schools at 90 minutes per workshop, three 6 hour end of intervention performance events for parents	\$1,153 £720 €843
BGD Stages 0-3	Total cost	\$20,189 £12,613 €14,773
BGD Stages 1-3	Total cost	\$11,664 £7,287 €8,535
BGD Stages 1-3	Total cost minus research costs	\$7,666 £4,789 €5,609
	BGD Cost per participant (N = 90)	\$85.17 £53.21 €62.32

Table III. Preference rankings of first choice leisure activities at each time point N (%)

After-school leisure activity	Time 2		Time 1		Baseline Time 0	
	Ranking	N (%)	Ranking	N (%)	Ranking	N (%)
Go around with friends to shopping centres, streets, parks just for fun	1	46 (26)	1	33 (25)	2	12 (18)
Use the internet for fun: chats, YouTube, Facebook, Bebo, Myspace, looking for music (do not include school homework)	2	31 (17)	3	20 (15)	3	8 (12)
Take part in sports, athletics or physical activity	2	31 (17)	2	22 (17)	1	13 (20)
Play with or see friends at your home or their homes	3	21 (12)	4	11 (9)	5	5 (7)
Read books for enjoyment (do not include school books)	4	13 (7)	5	10 (8)	4	6 (9)
Go to discos or dance classes	5	11 (6)	8	5 (4)	5	5 (7)
Play a musical instrument, sing, draw, paint or write	6	9 (5)	4	11 (9)	3	8 (12)
Send text messages or use Twitter on your mobile phone	7	8 (5)	7	6 (5)	5	5 (7)
Play computer games	8	4 (2)	6	8 (6)	6	4 (6)
Watch TV DVDs or playbacks of programmes	8	4 (2)	9	4 (3)	7	2 (3)
Total of valid* responses/total responses		178/210		130/210		68/210

*A valid response = each after-school leisure activity is ranked by a separate number between 1 and 10 by individual participant

Table IV. Order of preferences and preference proportions of levels indicating the value of dance classes at t0 (week 0) and t1 (week 9) by group allocation

Ranking of Attributes	<i>Level preferences</i> <i>Preference proportions</i> ¹			
	<i>Control time 0</i> <i>(n=104/120*)</i>	<i>Control time 1</i> <i>(n=104/120*)</i>	<i>Intervention time 0</i> <i>(n=80/90*)</i>	<i>Intervention time 1</i> <i>(n=80/90*)</i>
1. Time for other activities on dance class days <i>2 hrs/day v 3hrs /day</i>	Having 2 hours remaining for other leisure activities on dance class days 67% v 33%	Having 3 hours remaining for other leisure activities on dance class days 35% v 65%	Having 2 hours remaining for other leisure activities on dance class days 82% v 18%	Having 2 hours remaining for other leisure activities on dance class days 68% v 32%
2. Cost <i>50p v £1</i>	£1 cost 39% v 61%	50p cost 58% v 42%	£1 cost 28% v 72%	£1 cost 37% v 63%
3. Frequency of dance classes per week <i>1 p/wk v 2 p/wk</i>	2 classes per week 41% v 59%	2 classes per week 36% v 64%	2 classes per week 38% v 62%	2 classes per week 44% v 56%

¹Preference proportions holding all else equal, the proportion of the sample that would choose particular level over the other within that attribute
*Number of valid responses from total possible responses



Bristol Girls Dance Project feasibility study: using a pilot economic evaluation to inform design of a full trial

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2013-003726.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	22-Oct-2013
Complete List of Authors:	Powell, Jane; University of the West of England, Bristol, Health and Social Sciences Carroll, Fran; University of Bristol, School of Social and Community Medicine Sebire, Simon; University of Bristol, Centre for Exercise Nutrition and Health Sciences Haase, Anne; University of Bristol, Centre for Exercise Nutrition and Health Sciences Jago, Russ; University of Bristol, Centre for Exercise, Nutrition and Health Sciences
Primary Subject Heading:	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health economics, Sports and exercise medicine
Keywords:	SPORTS MEDICINE, HEALTH ECONOMICS, PUBLIC HEALTH

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Only

RESEARCH PILOT STUDY**Bristol Girls Dance Project feasibility study: using a pilot economic evaluation to inform design of a full trial**

Powell, J.^{1§} Carroll, FE.² Sebire SJ.³ Haase, AM.³ Jago, R.³

¹ Professor of Public Health Economics, Department of Health and Social Sciences, University of the West of England, Glenside Campus, Stapleton, Bristol, BS16 1DD, UK.

² Dr Fran E Carroll, Research Assistant, School of Social and Community Medicine, University of Bristol, BS8 2PS, UK.

³ Dr Simon J Sebire, Post-Doctoral Researcher, Centre for Exercise Nutrition and Health Sciences, School for Policy Studies, University of Bristol, BS8 1TZ, UK.

³ Dr Anne M Haase, Senior Lecturer in Exercise, Nutrition & Health, Centre for Exercise, Nutrition and Health Sciences, School for Policy Studies, University of Bristol, BS8 1TZ, UK.

³ Professor Russell Jago, Professor of Paediatric Physical Activity & Public Health Exercise, Nutrition & Health Sciences, Centre for Exercise, Nutrition & Health Sciences, School for Policy Studies, University of Bristol, BS8 1TZ, UK.

[§] Corresponding author Professor Jane Powell, Department of Health and Social Sciences, University of the West of England, Bristol, BS16 1DD, UK. 0044 117 3288752

ABSTRACT

Wider context: There is currently little guidance for pilot trial economic evaluation where health outcomes and costs are influenced by a range of wider determinants and factors.

Objectives: This paper presents the findings of a pilot economic evaluation study running alongside the Bristol Girls Dance Project (BGDP) feasibility study.

Design: Three-arm, cluster randomised, controlled pilot trial and economic evaluation. Seven schools (n=210) from the Bristol and greater Bristol area, UK were randomly allocated to the intervention arm 3 schools (n= 90) and the control arms 4 schools (n=120).

Intervention: Girls aged 11-12 years with parental consent were provided with two, 90-minute dance sessions per week for 9-weeks at school facilities.

Economic outcome measures: Programme costs and girls' preferences for attributes of dance and preferences for competing leisure time activities were measured.

Results: The mainstream average cost of the BDGP programme (not including research, control and dance teacher training costs) per school was \$2,126.40; £1,329; €1,555 and per participant \$70.90; £44.31; €51.84 in 2010-11 prices. Discrete Choice Experiment (DCE) methods are acceptable to girls of this age indicating time available for other leisure activities on dance class days is the attribute girls valued most and 2 hours leisure time remaining preferred to 3 hours.

Conclusions: This pilot study indicates providing full cost data for a future trial of the BGDP programme is feasible and practical. There is no evidence from preference data to support adjustment to intervention design. A future economic evaluation is likely to be successful utilising the resource use checklist developed. The importance of categorising separately

1
2
3 resources used to develop, prepare, deliver and maintain the programme to estimate
4
5 mainstream costs accurately is demonstrated.
6
7

8 *Strengths and limitations of this study*

9

10
11 This pilot study used a systematic approach where there is currently minimal evidence to
12
13 determine the costs of implementing a pilot dance intervention in girls 11-12 years old. The
14
15 study has produced findings about girls' preferences for dance and an embryonic costing tool
16
17 that can be applied to design and conduct an economic evaluation alongside a full cluster
18
19 RCT. This feasibility and exploratory pilot study is powered to test the intervention concept,
20
21 the feasibility of obtaining programme cost data in categories and the evidence required to
22
23 power a full cluster RCT in the future. Consequently, the variation in programme costs at the
24
25 school level has not been captured and this is a limitation of the cost estimates presented.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **BACKGROUND**

34
35
36

37 Recent influential studies attach substantial economic and social costs to obesity prevalence
38
39 projections.^{1 2} These forecasts are based upon a body of research from long term cohort
40
41 studies which suggest that change in the prevalence of obesity in children and adolescents
42
43 born at the millennium is likely to lead to increased health risks in middle-age irrespective of
44
45 adult adiposity.^{3 4 5} Consequently, there is a need for new interventions that focus on
46
47 preventing obesity or changing diet or physical activity; the two behaviours that are central to
48
49 the accrual of body mass.
50
51

52
53 As well as being a health and wellbeing issue, children's obesity also has serious economic
54
55 impacts. Scarce resources with competing uses in all health systems and the need to decide
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 between new, 'efficacious' primary prevention physical activity programme interventions on
4
5 the grounds of cost-effectiveness, has increased the significance of economic evaluation as a
6
7 concept and methodology. Recent guidance from the UK Medical Research Council (MRC)
8
9 for the development and evaluation of complex behavioural interventions suggests that
10
11 efficacy and cost-effectiveness should be established before programmes are implemented at
12
13 the population level.^{6 7} However, the meaningful determination of these criteria is often
14
15 problematic in primary prevention and guidelines for the design and conduct of economic
16
17 evaluation of complex interventions are at an early stage of development.^{8 9 10 11} It is therefore
18
19 important to develop the conceptual and measurement process by which effectiveness and
20
21 cost-effectiveness of complex physical activity interventions can be evaluated in a full trial
22
23 using a pilot study.
24
25
26

27
28 The main findings of the Bristol Girls Dance Project (BGDP) feasibility trial concerning
29
30 process evaluation, outcomes and effectiveness have been published elsewhere.¹² This part
31
32 of the study suggested that it is feasible to deliver the intervention and that participating in
33
34 dance has the potential to yield change in moderate to vigorous physical activity (MVPA)
35
36 among 11-12 year old girls (school year 7), but a larger randomised controlled trial (RCT)
37
38 would be needed to fully evaluate its effectiveness and cost-effectiveness.¹² In the absence
39
40 of robust evidence for the cost and outcome of dance interventions, other aims of the
41
42 feasibility pilot were to refine the information required to sufficiently power a full trial and to
43
44 use the preference data to inform potential refinements to intervention design.
45
46
47

48
49 Preferences for competing after-school activities are potential determinants of the economic
50
51 benefit of dance intervention, as increased physical activity must be valued in order for it to
52
53 be maintained⁸ and to have potential for long-term impact on physical activity levels. In this
54
55 study, Discrete Choice Experiment (DCE) and survey methods are applied to examine two
56
57 separate, but complementary aspects of value – preferences for the attributes of dance classes
58
59
60

1
2
3 and preferences for dance among other competing alternatives for spending leisure time
4 respectively. Physical activity levels decline during youth¹³ with the start of secondary
5 school being a critical period of change, so it was important to establish comparative
6 preferences for after-school, leisure activities on weekdays.
7
8
9
10

11
12 Value is a concept germane to recruitment and retention rates and linked to the outcome
13 dimension of the BGD intervention and therefore important to examine in detail. DCE
14 works on the premise that any 'product', for example a healthcare treatment or physical
15 activity programme, can be described by its characteristics, or attributes, and the extent to
16 which an individual values a 'product' is dependent on the level of these characteristics.^{14 15}
17
18
19
20
21
22

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

16
Thus, this paper reports the findings of a pilot economic evaluation of the Bristol Girls Dance
Project for girls aged 11-12 years in a primary school setting in England that can be applied
to design and conduct a future full trial and economic evaluation.

ARTICLE SUMMARY

Article focus

To examine whether the proposed methods for collection of resource use data for estimating
the costs are feasible, practical and likely to be successful in full trial economic evaluation.

To understand preferences for after-school dance classes in the context of weekday leisure
time at age 11-12 years that can be applied to inform intervention design.

Key messages

Time available for other leisure activities on dance class days is an attribute of after school dance classes girls aged 10-11 years valued most - followed by cost and frequency of dance classes per week.

2 hours available for other leisure activities on dance class days was preferred to 3 hours suggesting after-school dance classes are valued compared with other ways to spend leisure time after school on weekdays

Resources used in the development, preparation, delivery and maintenance of dance classes should be categorised separately in stages in order to identify the mainstream cost of the programme intervention to commissioners

METHODS

Bristol Girls Dance Project (BGDP) feasibility study

BGDP was a three-arm, parallel group, cluster randomised, controlled pilot trial with schools as the unit of allocation. Seven schools from three school districts, Bristol, Bath and South Gloucestershire (UK) were recruited to take part in the study from schools in these districts with no current after school dance provision.¹² The hip-hop and street dance style of dance to popular music was facilitated by a professional dance teacher.

Stratifying by school district, three schools were randomly allocated to the intervention arm (n= 90) and four schools to the two control arms (n=120) and each school was assigned a dance teacher to lead the sessions. Randomisation was conducted by an independent member of the clinical trials unit at Bristol University using computer-generated random sequences and codes for school district and school name. The three intervention schools received two,

1
2
3 90-minute after-school dance classes per week for 9 weeks selected to allow the entire
4 programme to be delivered within a school term. Pilot work had suggested that dance is a
5 very attractive form of PA for girls, so the control element was designed to ascertain whether
6 offering a dance workshop at the end of the research process (i.e., after the last data
7 collection), would affect either retention or the quality of data provided by participants. We
8 therefore utilized a three-arm design with two different control groups. In two schools,
9 participants were provided with small thank you gifts for each wave of data collection. In the
10 other two control schools participants were provided with the same small thank you gifts, as
11 well as a half-day dance workshop at the end of the study.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 *Sample size*

26
27 This feasibility study was powered to test the intervention concept and to provide the
28 necessary information to calculate the sample size of a full cluster RCT and economic
29 evaluation of an after school dance programme. The important parameters detection of 10
30 minutes difference in MVPA per weekday (50 minutes per week) between the intervention
31 and control groups, intra-class correlation for weekday MVPA at time 2 and associated
32 confidence intervals have been reported and profiled in another paper from this study.¹² For
33 practical reasons the sample was limited to thirty girls aged 11-12 years per school. Girls
34 were recruited from each school at random from those with parental consent.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *Economic measures*
4

5
6 1) *Discrete Choice Experiment (DCE) and survey of preference ranking and use of*
7
8 *leisure time*
9

10
11
12 BGDG formative qualitative work indicated the frequency of after-school dance classes per
13 week, cost per session and how much leisure time is left over on dance class days for other
14 leisure activities are important considerations for girls in deciding whether to participate.¹⁷
15
16 Participants were asked to select the 'dance class scenario' they preferred from a pair of
17 options. Table I presents the 4 paired scenarios (1A:1B, 2A:2B, 3A:3B, 4A:4B) consisting of
18 a randomly determined combination of three attributes, each with two levels.
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26
27 Table I
28

29
30
31 Four paired choice scenarios were administered to 210 girls in seven schools - 3 intervention
32 schools (n=90) and 4 control schools (n=120). Measures were taken at baseline (time 0) and
33 at 9 weeks (time 1) using large cards, and girls' preferred choice for each pair of scenarios
34 was recorded by the project team. Two time points were needed to establish change in
35 preferences before and after the intervention. Participants were also asked to give preference
36 ratings for ten leisure activities on weekdays by survey using a ten-point scale (1 = favourite;
37 10 = least favourite). Participant responses were collected on Personal Digital Assistants
38 (PDAs) and downloaded to a customised database.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49
50
51 2) *Resource use-cost*
52

53
54 At commencement of this pilot study there was minimal evidence on which to draw in
55 identifying costs that might be included in a resource use checklist. One report from the
56 National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) had modelled the cost of
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 delivering dance classes to young children and produced some ball park cost estimates.^{18 19}
4
5 These were based on an account of the resources used in delivery of a dance programme for
6
7 girls by Hampshire Dance and Laban²⁰ in which resources had been identified, but not
8
9 costed. These uncontrolled studies provided a starting point and an opportunity to produce
10
11 more complete and accurate costing data from the Bristol Girls Dance Project feasibility pilot
12
13 trial in which the volume of resources used and prices could be treated separately. The cost
14
15 items identified by NICE were entered into a database and data collected using time-sheets
16
17 and expense sheets were collected by the project team. These cost estimates and some
18
19 estimates for teacher time to manage behaviour derived by the first author of this paper are
20
21 detailed in Table II.^{18 19 20} Table II was used as a template for identifying and costing
22
23 resources in the BGDG feasibility study.
24
25
26
27
28

29 TABLE II here
30
31
32

33 *Ethics*

34
35
36 Potential participants in all seven schools were told that there was a maximum of 30
37
38 randomly assigned spaces at the dance classes. The study was approved by a University of
39
40 Bristol ethics committee and informed parental consent was obtained for all participants.
41
42
43

44 *Analyses*

45
46
47
48 Proportions of the sample ranking ten weekday leisure activities as first choice activity (rank
49
50 = 1) were calculated after participants had rated all ten leisure activities from 1 to 10.
51

52
53 Responses from participants with repetition of ratings for one or more leisure activities or
54
55 missing ratings for leisure activities were excluded. Overall, where the proportion of the
56
57 sample rating activities as their first choice was the same, these activities were assigned the
58
59
60

1
2
3 same rank across all ten activities. DCE data was ‘effects-coded’²¹ using STATA²² and
4
5 analysed using conditional logistic regression. Effects coding is similar to dummy variable
6
7 coding, but is preferable in this instance because interaction or trade-off between the
8
9 attributes is likely to take place as well as a main effect. The coefficients for each attribute are
10
11 a measure of the influence of that attribute level on choice. Positive values represent a
12
13 positive influence on choice, or in other words, a preference for that level of an attribute.
14
15 These results can be used to establish girls’ overall preferences for attributes, as well as the
16
17 order of their preferences (i.e. which attribute is most and least important). Participants with
18
19 missing data were excluded from the DCE analysis.
20
21
22
23
24

25 Total and average cost estimates from a funder perspective were identified and derived for
26
27 BGDG based on staged timing, quantity, frequency and price of resource use in 2010-11
28
29 prices. Expenses including travel, intervention programme entry incentives, postage,
30
31 Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) applications were accessed from the database kept by the
32
33 project team. Girls in the control schools received small thank you gifts at each data
34
35 collection they attended. Space hire did not incur costs, but estimates of the cost of space
36
37 hire for dance class delivery are included because they are costs connected with alternative
38
39 use of space in schools. School overhead and capital costs are not included.
40
41
42
43
44

45 Grouping costs to enable estimation of the mainstream cost adopted the categories used in (A
46
47 Stop Smoking in Schools Trial) ASSIST.²³ Stage 0 intervention planning, development and
48
49 training costs, stage 1 intervention preparation, stage 2 intervention delivery and stage 3
50
51 intervention maintenance costs were separately identified. Training costs for dance teachers
52
53 are identified separately. Costs associated with running the research study, control group
54
55 incentives for data collection, control school dance workshops and recruitment events) would
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 not recur during mainstream implementation, but these costs are included for clarity and
4
5 completeness. All costs connected with tasks undertaken by the research team are not
6
7 included.
8
9

10 11 12 **RESULTS**

13 *Identification and timing of resources used*

14
15
16
17 Table III identifies and describes at four stages the resources use of the BGDG programme
18
19 and presents total cost estimates. The proportion of total costs incurred were 41% at stage 0,
20
21 7% at stage 1, 46% at stage 2 and 6% at stage 3. At stage 0 half of the costs are dance
22
23 teacher preparation and training time which arguably would be incurred in part in delivery of
24
25 a mainstream form of the programme. Eighteen BGDG dance classes (2 classes per week for
26
27 9 weeks) of 90 minutes duration were delivered to 90 girls in three intervention schools (30
28
29 per school) for 81 hours (27 hours per school) at a total estimated cost \$6,380, £3, 988,
30
31 €4,666 in 2010-11 prices.^{24 25} The average cost of the BDGP programme in its mainstream
32
33 form per school was \$2,126.40; £1,329; €1,555 and per participant \$70.90; £44.31; €51.84 in
34
35 2010-11 prices. If training costs for dance teachers on the BGDG were included to the
36
37 mainstream cost this would add \$1280; £800; €928 to the cost per school and \$43; £27;
38
39 €31.60 to the cost per pupil. These are not insubstantial additions, but are at the high end of
40
41 training costs because this new dance programme was properly prepared for delivery.
42
43
44 Training costs for the delivery of an established dance programme are likely to be lower. It
45
46 was not possible to calculate confidence intervals for average programme costs per school or
47
48 per participant (see limitations of this pilot study).
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 Table III here
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The shorter and less intensive NRG programme costed in the NICE report ¹⁹ comprised 10
4 dance classes of 60 minutes duration for 24 girls (an assumed number) in 14 groups or
5 schools (n=336 girls) for 140 hours with a cost per participant of \$98.14; £61.31; €71.81, in
6
7
8
9
10 2010-11 prices. This includes 140 hours of teacher time sourced from national pay scales for
11
12 England at £23.57 per hour at 2010-11 prices.²⁶
13

14 15 16 *Preferences for leisure activities* 17

18
19 All girls were asked to rank ten after-school leisure activities by first preference activity.
20
21 Table III presents proportions across the participants (n=210) for preference ranks for after-
22 school leisure activities for all group allocations at each time point demonstrating consistency
23 in preference ranks indicating girls' selection of first choice leisure activities at each time
24 point. The after-school leisure activities indicating the highest proportion of first choice
25 preference rankings at each time point include 'hanging out with friends away from home just
26 for fun' (Ranking at t2=1, t1=1, t0=2); 'take part in sports, athletics or physical activity'
27 (Ranking at t2=2, t1=2, t0=1) and 'using the internet for fun: chats, YouTube, Facebook,
28 Bebo, Myspace, looking for music' (Ranking at t0=3, t1=3, t2=2). Valid responses were
29 included in the analyses. Valid responses as a proportion of total responses for the survey
30 ranking leisure activities were t2=178/210, t1=130/210, t0=68/210 across all group
31 allocations indicating particularly at baseline the participants experienced some problems
32 using a hand held PDA to rank and rate the weekday after-school leisure activities.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Table IV here
50
51
52
53
54

55 *DCE results* 56 57 58 59 60

1
2
3 The p values for the regression coefficients in Table IV indicate girls in this sample have a
4 preference for “time left for other leisure activities on dance class days”, over the “cost of”
5 and “frequency of dance classes per week”. Analysis of preference levels within each
6
7 attribute suggests 2 hours is preferred to 3 hours remaining for other leisure activities on
8
9 dance class days. This pattern was consistent in all intervention and control groups at t0 and
10
11 t1. Girls were least concerned with the frequency of dance classes per week with preference
12
13 proportions suggesting 2 classes were preferred to 1 dance class per week in both intervention
14
15 groups and the baseline control group.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 Table V here
24
25
26

27 **DISCUSSION**

28 *What is already known on this topic*

29
30
31
32 There is minimal guidance to support how economic evaluations of complex public health
33
34 interventions should be designed and conducted in school and community settings.
35
36

37
38 There are no checklists or tools available to support costing dance programmes and minimal
39
40 knowledge of how to categorise resources to identify the mainstream cost of delivery.
41
42

43 Discrete Choice Experiment (DCE) methods to elicit the relative preferences and choices of
44
45 girls aged 11-12 years are untried and untested, but it is important to capture how girls value
46
47 dance among other competing leisure activities using a robust and acceptable method.
48
49

50 *What this study adds*

51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Providing programme cost data for a full trial of the BGDG programme is feasible, practical
4 and likely to be successful. Around two-thirds of resources are development and research
5 control costs, so resources used to develop, prepare and deliver these programmes should be
6 categorised separately, so the cost of the mainstream programme can be estimated accurately.
7
8

9
10
11
12 Discrete Choice Experiment is an acceptable method to elicit preferences of girls aged 11-12
13 years.
14

15
16
17
18 At this point in their lives after-school dance is an activity valued by girls when offered
19 within the context of other competing choices and parental support for activities for spending
20 leisure time after school on weekdays.
21
22

23
24
25 Participation in after-school dance classes has opportunity costs for participants and parents
26 extending beyond the funder that suggest a social model of cost should be considered for to
27 capture the costs associated with intervention outcome.
28
29

30
31
32
33 Robust evidence for the cost-effectiveness of physical activity complex interventions is
34 important for knowing where to invest scarce resources and commission programmes to
35 maximise health outcomes in primary prevention.^{27 28 29} However, gathering robust evidence
36 to support investment in public health interventions is a challenge.^{30 31} Significant barriers
37 remain and there is currently little guidance in how to conduct economic evaluation where
38 behaviour change is associated with health outcomes determined beyond genetic inheritance
39 by family, social and physical environments.^{32 33}
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49
50 Indicative programme cost data from the pilot economic evaluation indicated a substantial
51 proportion of the intervention programme costs 41% occur at Stage 0 – the pre-programme
52 development stage. This is an important finding because it suggests provided BGDG is
53 effective and cost-effective in a full trial, it would be substantially less costly to roll out in its
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 mainstream form. All complex interventions in primary prevention are likely to generate a
4
5 high proportion of upfront development costs that will not reoccur once a programme is
6
7 mainstreamed – an aspect of investment in public health interventions often overlooked by
8
9 decision makers.
10

11
12
13
14 Application of DCE is an established technique in adult populations, but to our knowledge
15
16 has not been applied previously in populations of children aged 11-12 years to establish
17
18 values for the attributes of physical activities. This study has demonstrated application of
19
20 DCE methods is feasible and acceptable to girls of this age. This is important because it
21
22 suggests DCE could be applied in other studies with children to understand the concept of
23
24 ‘value’ of an activity which plays an important role in recruitment, participation and
25
26 maintenance of participants which are all linked to intervention outcome. In addition to its
27
28 acceptability in this study the DCE method has produced more complete and valid data than
29
30 the direct survey method in eliciting preference ranks for after-school leisure activities. These
31
32 findings support a previous contention that DCE techniques may have merit over more
33
34 ‘traditional’ survey methods³⁴ in eliciting preferences. However, more evidence would be
35
36 required to fully support this finding.
37
38
39
40
41

42 Taken together, findings of the DCE and survey of leisure activity preference in this study
43
44 indicate dance is a valued leisure activity among competing alternatives and reveals more
45
46 about the attributes of dance classes in girls of this age that can be taken forward to maximise
47
48 recruitment and retention in the BGDG programme. The findings of this study suggest that
49
50 dance has immediate appeal as an after-school leisure activity among a range of strongly
51
52 competing alternatives in girls of this age compared with older adolescents.³⁵ Girls in this
53
54 study have a first rank preference for the attribute ‘time remaining for other leisure activities
55
56 on dance class days’, over the ‘cost of’ and ‘frequency of dance classes per week’. The
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 finding that in the intervention group two hours is preferred to three hours remaining for
4 other leisure activities on dance class days is significant. Overall these findings could suggest
5 that at this point in their lives dance is valued by girls as a physical and social activity when
6 offered within the context of competing and constrained choices for spending leisure time at
7 this age. For example, at this age girls are not likely to be able to go to 'discos or dance
8 classes' without parents or carers or to 'hang around on street corners with friends' and these
9 issues may have affected their responses in the survey. These are important findings because
10 they predict positive recruitment rates and participation of girls aged 11-12 years in dance as
11 a physical leisure time activity and in a full trial.³⁶
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Delivery of after-school dance classes is dependent upon substantial commitment from the
25 girls giving up their after-school leisure time to participate in dancing. In turn, participation
26 is dependent upon the willingness of parents and carers to support attendance and to provide
27 encouragement and a means of travelling back home after school hours when school buses
28 are not available. This pilot study suggests development of a social model of costing that
29 reflects the cost of participants' and parents' time and opportunity costs are substantial
30 elements of the intervention cost that could be captured, if practical, in a full trial.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 However, methods and tools to capture 'hidden' cost items that facilitate the success of the
41 intervention, but are not incurred by funders are not yet fully established.²³ Where to
42 include training costs in these metrics is a question that remains for a future trial as they
43 should arguably be included in mainstream cost estimation despite their categorisation as
44 development costs. How identification of costs falling outside the public sector that are
45 relevant to programme implementation can be captured at a full trial stage also needs to be
46 considered carefully.³⁷ In a full trial resources used should be captured prospectively³⁸ and
47 this pilot study has established categories of resource use are also important to consider to
48 establish accurate mainstream programme costs.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

CONCLUSIONS

The feasibility of providing costing data for full trial of the BGDG programme in is established and an embryonic resource use checklist has been developed. Resources used to develop and run the BGDG programme should be categorised separately in order for the mainstream delivery cost of BGDG to be estimated accurately in a full trial. A social model of costing that reflects participants and parents opportunity costs should be considered. BGDG after-school dance classes have potential for sustained participation and cost-effective delivery, but a full trial using methodological learning from this study is required.

Competing interests

There are no competing interests.

Authors' Contributions

The quantitative analysis plan was conceived by JP, FC, RJ and SJS. Analyses were performed by JP and FC and interpretation by JP, FC, RJ, SJS and AMH. JP drafted the first version of the manuscript with additional sections provided by FC. All authors provided critical edits and revisions to the paper and have reviewed and approved the final version of the paper.

Data sharing statement No additional data are available

Funding

This research was funded by the National Prevention Research Initiative (<http://npri.org.uk>), consisting of the following funding partners: Alzheimer's Research Trust; Alzheimer's Society; Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council, British Heart Foundation; Cancer Research UK; Chief Scientist Office; Scottish Government Health Directorate; Department of Health; Diabetes UK; Economic and Social Research Council; Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council; Health & Social Care Research & Development Office for Northern Ireland; Medical Research Council; The Stroke Association; Welsh Assembly Government and World Cancer Research Fund [grant number G090084].

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank all the participants, dance teachers, school teachers and schools who participated in or assisted with this research. Professor Powell acknowledges discussion of and feedback from a draft version of this paper presented at the Health Economists Bristol (HEB) journal club <http://www.bris.ac.uk/social-community-medicine/centres/healthecon> in November 2011. Laura Davis project manager BGDG and Jade McNeil research associate are acknowledged for data collection leading to this paper. Fran Carroll's contemporaneous PhD research was supervised by Dr Alan A Montgomery at the time of DCE design and data analysis. Dr Jago is supported by a National Institute for Health Research career development fellowship. This work was also supported by DECIPHer, a UKCRC Public Health Research: Centre of Excellence. Funding from the specific funders under the auspices of the UK Clinical Research Collaboration is gratefully acknowledged. The other co-applicants of the main BGDG study, Professor Ashley R Cooper and Dr Alan A Montgomery are acknowledged. The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

necessarily those of the NHS, the National Institute for Health Research or the Department of Health.

For peer review only

References

1. Foresight. *Tackling obesities: future choices*. London: Government Office for Science, 2007.
2. Stamatakis E, Zaninotto P, Falaschetti E, Mindell, J. Head J. Time trends in childhood and adolescent obesity in England from 1995 to 2007 and projections of prevalence to 2015. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2010; **64**:167-174.
3. Gunnell D, Frankel S, Nanchahal K, et al Childhood obesity and adult cardiovascular mortality: a 57 year follow-up study based on the Boyd Orr cohort. *Am J Clin Nutr* 1998; **67**:1111-18.
4. Must A, Jacques PF, Dallal GE, et al. Long term morbidity and mortality of overweight adolescents – a follow-up of the Havard growth study of 1922 to 1935. *N Engl J Med* 1992; **327**:1350-5.
5. Engeland A, Bjorge T, Sogaard AJ, et al. Body mass index in adolescence in relation to total mortality: 32-year Follow-up of 227,000 Norwegian boys and girls. *Am J Epidemiol* 2003; **157**:517-23.
6. Lancaster GA, Dodd S, Williamson P. Design and analysis of pilot studies: recommendations for good practice. *J Eval Clin Pract* 2004, **10**, 2:307-312.

- 1
2
3
4
5 7. Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, Michie S, Nazareth I, Petticrew M. Developing and
6
7 evaluating complex interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance. *BMJ*
8
9 2008, 337:a1655.
10
11
- 12
13
14 8. Wolfenstetter SB. Conceptual framework for standard economic evaluation of
15
16 physical activity programmes in primary prevention. *Prev Sci.*2011; 12(4):435-51.
17
18
19
- 20
21 9. Sheill, A. Hawe, P. Gold, L. Complex interventions or complex systems? Implications
22
23 for health economic evaluation. *BMJ*, 2008; 336:1281-1283.
24
25
- 26
27 10. Weatherly H, Drummond M, Claxton K, et al. *Assessing the challenges of applying*
28
29 *standard methods of economic evaluation to public health interventions*. York: Centre
30
31 for Health Economics, 2009.
32
33
- 34
35 11. Anderson R. Systematic reviews of economic evaluations: utility or futility. *Health*
36
37 *Econ*, 2010;19:350-364.
38
39
- 40
41 12. Jago R. Sebire S, Cooper AR, et al. Bristol Girls Dance Project Feasibility Trial:
42
43 Outcome and process evaluation results. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*, 2012; 9, 83.
44
45
- 46
47 13. Gorely T, Marshall S, Biddle SJH, Cameron N. The prevalence of leisure time
48
49 sedentary behaviour and physical activity in adolescent girls: An ecological
50
51 momentary assessment approach. *Int J Pediatr Obes*, 2007; 2:227-234.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
14. Cheraghi-Sohi S, Bower P, Mead N, McDonald R, Whalley D, Roland M. Making sense of patient priorities: applying discrete choice methods in primary care using 'think aloud' technique. *Fam Pract*, 2007; 24: 276-282.
15. Green C, Gerard K. Exploring the social value of health-care interventions: a stated preference discrete choice experiment. *Health Econ*, 2009; 18:951-976.
16. Petrou S, McIntosh E. (2009) Women's Preferences for Attributes of First-Trimester Miscarriage Management: A Stated Preference Discrete-Choice Experiment. *Value Health*, 12,4:551-559.
17. Jago, R. Davis, L. McNeil, J. et al. Adolescent girls' and parents' views on recruiting and retaining girls into an after-school dance intervention: implications for extra-curricular physical activity provision. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*, 2011, 8, 91.
18. Fordham R, Barton GP. *Promotion of physical activity in children programme guidance: a cost-effectiveness scenario analysis*. London:NICE, 2008.
19. NICE public health guidance 17. *Promoting physical activity, active play and sport for pre-school and school-age children and young people in family, pre-school, school and community settings*. NICE:London, 2009.
20. Hampshire Dance and Laban (2007)[online] Accessed on December 7th 2012. *NRG Youth Dance and Health Report 2005-6*.
<http://www.hampshiredance.org.uk/documents/NRGEvaluationReport.pdf>

- 1
2
3 21. Bech, M. Gyrd-Hansen, D.. Effects coding in discrete choice experiments. *Health*
4
5 *Econ*, 2005; 14,10.
6
7
8
9
10 22. STATA CORP LP (2009) *STATA user's guide release 11*. Texas, USA: STATA CORP
11 LP.
12
13
14
15 23. Hollingworth W, Cohen D, Hawkins J, et al. Reducing smoking in adolescents: cost-
16 effectiveness results from the cluster randomised ASSIST (A Stop Smoking in
17 Schools Trial). *Nicotine & Tob Res*, 2011; 14, 2:161-168.
18
19
20 24. Safalra [online] 2012. *Historical UK Inflation and price conversion rates*. Accessed
21 on May 3rd 2012 at:- <http://safalra.com/other/historical-uk-inflation-price-conversion/>.
22
23
24
25
26
27 25. Oanda [online] 2012. *Historical exchange rates*. Accessed on May 3rd 2012 at:-
28 <http://www.oanda.com/currency/historical-rates/>.
29
30
31
32
33 26. TES [online] 2011 *Teacher's pay scales from September 2011 unchanged from 2010*.
34 <http://www.tes.co.uk/article.aspx?storycode=6000186>
35
36
37
38
39
40 27. Rush B, Sheill A, Hawe P. A census of economic evaluations in health promotion.
41 *Health Educ Res*, 2004; 19:707-719.
42
43
44
45
46 28. Kelly MP, McDaid D, Ludbrook A, Powell JE. *Economic appraisal of public health*
47 *interventions*. London:Health Development Agency, 2005.
48
49
50
51
52 29. Anderson R. New MRC guidance on evaluating complex interventions. *BMJ*,
53 2008;337:944-5.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 30. Buchanan J, Wolstenholme J, Foster C. *A rapid review of economic literature related*
4
5 *to the promotion of physical activity, play and sport for pre-school and school-age*
6
7 *children in family, pre-school, school and community settings*. London:NICE, 2008.
8
9
10 31. Richardson AK. Investing in public health: barriers and possible solutions. *J Public*
11
12 *Health* 2012; 34:322-7.
13
14
15
16 32. Ogilvie D, Bull F, Powell J, et al. An applied ecological framework for evaluating
17
18 infrastructure to promote walking and cycling: the iConnect study. *Am J Public*
19
20 *Health*. 2011;101:473-481.
21
22
23
24
25 33. Powell J. Compression of morbidity outcomes key to investment in public health. *J*
26
27 *Public Health* 2012; 34:329.
28
29
30
31
32 34. Alvarez-Farizo B, Hanley N, Barberan R. The value of leisure time: a contingent
33
34 rating approach, *J Environ Plan Man*, 2001; 44(5):681-699.
35
36
37 35. O'Neill, J. Pate, R. Hooker, SP. The contribution of dance to daily physical activity
38
39 among adolescent girls. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*, 2011; 8:87.
40
41
42
43 36. Nader PR, Bradley RH, Houts RM, McRitchie SL, O'Brien M: Moderate-to-vigorous
44
45 physical activity from ages 9 to 15 years. *JAMA* 2008, 300:295-305.
46
47
48
49 37. Alvarez-Farizo B, Hanley N, Barberan R. The value of leisure time: a contingent
50
51 rating approach, *J Environ Plan Man*, 2001; 44,5:681-699.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 38. Ridyard C, Hughes D. Methods for the collection of resource use data within clinical
4 trials: a systematic review of the studies funded by the UK Health Technology
5 Assessment Programme. *Value Health*, 2010; 13, 8:867-872.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

14 **TABLES**

15 **Table 1. Attributes and levels of the Discrete Choice Experiment and the four choice sets**
16 **given to participants**

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Level of attributes	Attributes		
	Frequency of dance classes per week	Cost per session	Hours left for other leisure activities on that day
Upper	2 dance classes per week	£1 per session	Leaving 3 hours for other leisure activities on the evening of the dance session
Lower	1 dance class per week	50p per session	Leaving 2 hours for other leisure activities on the evening of the dance session
1A You take one after school dance class each week at a cost of £1 per class leaving you 3 hours on that evening for other leisure activities		1B You take two after school dance classes each week at a cost of 50p per class leaving you 2 hours on those evenings for other leisure activities	
2A You take two after school dance classes each week at a cost of £1 per class leaving you 2 hours on those evenings for other leisure activities		2B You take one after school dance class each week at a cost of 50p per class leaving you 3 hours on that evening for other leisure activities	
3A You take one after school dance class each week at a cost of 50p per class leaving you 2 hours on that evening for other leisure activities		3B You take two after school dance classes each week at a cost of £1 per class leaving you 3 hours on those evenings for other leisure activities	
4A You take two after school dance classes each week at a cost of 50p per class leaving you 3 hours on those evenings for other leisure activities		4B You take one after school dance class each week at a cost of £1 per class leaving you 2 hours on that evening for other leisure activities	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Table II. Resources use identification template used to inform BGDG feasibility study

NRG Youth Dance & Health Project ¹	
	² Total Cost £
Project planning work: initial research into existing action research projects	500.00
Lead artist fee -programme design/artist training	800.00
Artists' travel fees – attending training/planning sessions	637.35
	5,806.00
Artists' fee	1,515.44
	562.88
Artists' travel costs	254.70
	77.98
Coach hire – school group for pilot session	64.03
	4,000.00
Space hire	443.65
	269.70
Disclosures/refreshments	562.88
	151.80
Postage	15,203.53
	3,300.00
Management fee	19,427.76
	20,600.00
Staff travel	
Documentation (dissemination advocacy)	
Road-show event – end of project	
Additional schools workshop	
Total 2005-6 prices £	
Teacher time for behaviour management (not included in NRG report) ³	
Total 2007-8 prices £ with teacher management	
Total 2010-11 prices £	
¹ resource use items identified by Hampshire Dance and Laban, NRG Youth Dance and Health Project Evaluation report ²⁰ ² assumptions and costing profile produced by Fordham & Barton (2008) ¹⁸ for NICE Guidance 17 (NICE,2009) ¹⁹ ³ This item was identified in the NICE report ²⁰ but not costed ^{18 19}	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Table III. Description of resources used, unit volumes, prices and estimated costs* by category by school by pupil in 2010-11 prices

Stage of BGDG	Description of resources used	Number of units ¹	Price per unit ²	Cost £ 2010-11 prices	Cost stage
Pre-Programme planning development stage 0	Lead dance artist consultation and development work	2 days	£500 per day	1000	<u>4726</u>
	Lead dance artist time, to adapt training programme for hip hop genre	1 day	£500 per day	500	
	Lead dance artist time, to prepare dance teachers for 9 week intervention	1 day	£500 per day	500	
	3 dance teachers preparation/training time	7.5 days	£27 per hour	2400	
	Travel expenses			288 ³	
	Disclosures CRB forms			38 ³	
Programme preparation stage 1	Space hire for dance taster sessions in intervention schools	6 hours	£15 per hour	90	<u>819</u>
	Dance teacher delivery of taster sessions in intervention schools	6 hours	£27 per hour	162	
	Control schools (n=4) recruitment presentations	1 day	500 per day	500	
	Postage costs			25 ³	
	Travel expenses			42 ³	
Programme delivery stage 2	Delivery 18 dance classes at 90 minutes per class over 9 weeks x 3 schools	81 hours	£27 per hour	2187	<u>5375</u>
	T-shirts for 3 intervention schools	90 girls	£5 per T-shirt	450	
	Small gift incentives for control schools data collection	3 waves	£731 per wave	2192	
	Refreshments			100 ³	
	Travel expenses			446 ³	
Programme reinforcement stage 3	Half-day dance workshops for two control schools	9 hours	£27 per hour	243	<u>729</u>
	6 hour performance events for parents of girls at 3 intervention schools	18 hours	£27 per hour	486	
				Total	<u>£11,649</u>
BGDP Stages 0-3 costs £s		£11,649 2010-11 prices			
BGDP Stages 1-3 costs £s		£6,923 2010-11 prices			
BGDP Stages 1-3 minus control costs £s		£3,988 2010-11 prices			
BGDP cost per school £s		£1,329 2010-11 prices			
BGDP cost per pupil £s		£44.31 2010-11 prices			
*Research team administration, travel and other costs are not included. Control costs in this research are included for information					
Sources: 1. research team 2. project budget - all prices are actual rates paid. 3. Project budget - all costs are actual expenses incurred.					

Table IV. Preference rankings of first choice leisure activities at each time point N (%)

After-school leisure activity	Time 2		Time 1		Baseline Time 0	
	Ranking	N (%)	Ranking	N (%)	Ranking	N (%)
Go around with friends to shopping centres, streets, parks just for fun	1	46 (26)	1	33 (25)	2	12 (18)
Use the internet for fun: chats, YouTube, Facebook, Bebo, Myspace, looking for music (do not include school homework)	2	31 (17)	3	20 (15)	3	8 (12)
Take part in sports, athletics or physical activity	2	31 (17)	2	22 (17)	1	13 (20)
Play with or see friends at your home or their homes	3	21 (12)	4	11 (9)	5	5 (7)
Read books for enjoyment (do not include school books)	4	13 (7)	5	10 (8)	4	6 (9)
Go to discos or dance classes	5	11 (6)	8	5 (4)	5	5 (7)
Play a musical instrument, sing, draw, paint or write	6	9 (5)	4	11 (9)	3	8 (12)
Send text messages or use Twitter on your mobile phone	7	8 (5)	7	6 (5)	5	5 (7)
Play computer games	8	4 (2)	6	8 (6)	6	4 (6)
Watch TV DVDs or playbacks of programmes	8	4 (2)	9	4 (3)	7	2 (3)
Total of valid* responses/total responses		178/210		130/210		68/210

*A valid response = each after-school leisure activity is ranked by a separate number between 1 and 10 by each individual participant using a PDA

Table V. Regression coefficients indicating the value of dance classes at t0 (week 0) and t1 (week 9) by group allocation

	Control time 0 (n=104/120*)			Control time 1 (n=104/120*)			Intervention time 0 (n=80/90*)			Intervention time 1 (n=80/90*)		
	Coeff	SE	P value	Coeff	SE	P value	Coeff	SE	P value	Coeff	SE	P value
Frequency of dance class:			<0.01			<0.01			<0.01			0.04
Twice a week	0.18	0.07		0.30	0.07		0.25	0.58		0.13	0.06	
Three times a week	-0.18	0.07		-0.30	0.07		-0.25	0.58		-0.13	0.06	
Cost:			<0.01			<0.01			<0.01			<0.01
£1	0.22	0.05		-0.17	0.04		0.46	0.07		0.26	0.06	
£2	-0.22	0.05		0.17	0.04		-0.46	0.07		-0.26	0.06	
Other hours available for leisure activities on dance class days:			<0.01			<0.01			<0.01			<0.01
2 hours	0.35	0.06		-0.31	0.65		0.76	0.11		0.37	0.08	
3 hours	-0.35	0.06		0.31	0.65		-0.76	0.11		-0.37	0.08	

Preferred level of attribute in bold, attribute most concerned with shaded dark grey, attribute least concerned with shaded light grey *Number of valid responses from total possible responses

RESEARCH PILOT STUDY

Bristol Girls Dance Project feasibility study: using a pilot economic evaluation to inform design of a full trial

Powell, J.^{1§} Carroll, FE.² Sebire SJ.³ Haase, AM.³ Jago, R.³

¹ Professor of Public Health Economics, Department of Health and Applied Social Sciences, University of the West of England, Glenside Campus, Stapleton, Bristol, BS16 1DD, UK.

² Dr Fran E Carroll, Research Assistant, School of Social and Community Medicine, University of Bristol, BS8 2PS, UK.

³ Dr Simon J Sebire, Post-Doctoral Researcher, Centre for Exercise Nutrition and Health Sciences, School for Policy Studies, University of Bristol, BS8 1TZ, UK.

³ Dr Anne M Haase, Senior Lecturer in Exercise, Nutrition & Health, Centre for Exercise, Nutrition and Health Sciences, School for Policy Studies, University of Bristol, BS8 1TZ, UK.

³ Professor Russell Jago, Professor of Paediatric Physical Activity & Public Health Exercise, Nutrition & Health Sciences, Centre for Exercise, Nutrition & Health Sciences, School for Policy Studies, University of Bristol, BS8 1TZ, UK.

[§] Corresponding author Professor Jane Powell, Department of Health and Applied Social Sciences, University of the West of England, Bristol, BS16 1DD, UK. 0044 117 3288752

ABSTRACT

Wider context: There is currently little guidance for pilot trial economic evaluation where health outcomes and costs are influenced by a range of wider determinants and factors.

Objectives: This paper presents the findings of a pilot economic evaluation study running alongside the Bristol Girls Dance Project (BGDP) feasibility study ~~and describes how these have impacted the conduct and design of main trial economic evaluation.~~

Design: Three-arm, cluster randomised, controlled pilot trial and economic evaluation. Seven schools (n=210) from the Bristol and greater Bristol area, UK were randomly allocated to the intervention arm 3 schools (n= 90) and the control arms 4 schools (n=120).

Intervention: Girls aged 11-12 years with parental consent were provided with two, 90-minute dance sessions per week for 9-weeks at school facilities.

Economic outcome measures: Programme costs; and girls' preferences for attributes of dance and preferences for competing leisure time activities were measured. Primary outcome: ~~accelerometer derived moderate to vigorous physical activity (MVPA) minutes per day.~~

Results: ~~After school dance classes for girls aged 11-12 years are valued favourably in terms of other competing leisure choices compared with older adolescents. Discrete Choice Experiment (DCE) methods are acceptable to girls of this age.~~ The mainstream average cost of the BDGP programme (not including research, control and dance teacher training costs) per school ~~not including developmental and research costs at mainstream implementation~~ is was \$2,5552,126.40; £1,5961,329; €1,8701,555 and per participant \$85.1770.90; £53.2144.31; €62.3251.84 in 2010-11 prices. Discrete Choice Experiment (DCE) methods are acceptable to girls of this age indicating time available for other leisure activities on

1
2
3 dance class days is the attribute girls valued most and 2 hours leisure time remaining
4
5 preferred to 3 hours.
6
7

8
9
10
11 Conclusions: This pilot study indicates ~~The feasibility of providing~~ full cost data for a
12 ~~future~~ trial of the BGDG programme is feasible and practical. There is no evidence from
13 preference data to support adjustment to intervention design. A future economic evaluation is
14 likely to be successful utilising the resource use checklist developed. ~~has been established and~~
15 ~~an embryonic resource use checklist developed for this purpose.~~ The importance of
16 categorising separately ~~This pilot study has demonstrated~~ resources used to develop, prepare
17 ~~and~~ deliver and maintain the programme ~~should be categorised separately, so the cost of the~~
18 ~~mainstream programme can be to~~ estimated mainstream costs accurately is demonstrated in a
19 full trial.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 *Strengths and limitations of this study*

33
34
35 This pilot study used a systematic approach where there is currently minimal evidence to
36 determine ~~consider how the conceptual and measurement process of an economic~~
37 ~~evaluation~~ the costs of implementing a pilot dance intervention in girls 11-12 years old. might
38 ~~be enhanced in a full trial by learning more about the cost and outcome dimensions of~~
39 ~~economic evaluation and has~~ The study has produced findings about girls' preferences for
40 dance and an embryonic costing tool that can be applied to design and conduct an economic
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

51 This feasibility and exploratory pilot study is powered to test the intervention concept, the
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
feasibility of obtaining programme cost data in categories and the evidence required to power

1
2
3 a full cluster RCT in the future. Consequently, the variation in programme costs at the school
4
5 level has not been captured and this is a limitation of the programme-cost estimates presented.

6
7
8 ~~A social model of costing that reflects opportunity costs of participants and parents could be~~
9
10 ~~considered.~~
11
12

13 14 15 16 **BACKGROUND**

17
18
19
20 Recent influential studies attach substantial economic and social costs to obesity prevalence
21
22 projections.^{1 2} These forecasts are based upon a body of research from long term cohort
23
24 studies which suggest that change in the prevalence of obesity in children and adolescents
25
26 born at the millennium is likely to lead to increased health risks in middle-age irrespective of
27
28 adult adiposity.^{3 4 5} Consequently, there is a need for new interventions that focus on
29
30 preventing obesity or changing diet or physical activity; the two behaviours that are central to
31
32 the accrual of body mass.
33
34

35
36 As well as being a health and wellbeing issue, children's obesity also has serious economic
37
38 impacts. Scarce resources with competing uses in all health systems and the need to decide
39
40 between new, 'efficacious' primary prevention physical activity programme interventions on
41
42 the grounds of cost-effectiveness, has increased the significance of economic evaluation as a
43
44 concept and methodology. Recent guidance from the UK Medical Research Council (MRC)
45
46 for the development and evaluation of complex behavioural interventions suggests that
47
48 efficacy and cost-effectiveness should be established before programmes are implemented at
49
50 the population level.^{6 7} However, the meaningful determination of these criteria is often
51
52 problematic in primary prevention and guidelines for the design and conduct of economic
53
54 evaluation of complex interventions are at an early stage of development.^{8 9 10 11} It is therefore
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 important to develop the conceptual and measurement process by which effectiveness and
4
5 cost-effectiveness of complex physical activity interventions can be evaluated in a full trial
6
7 using a pilot study.
8
9

10 The [main findings of the Bristol Girls Dance Project \(BGDP\) feasibility trial, concerning](#)
11 [process evaluation, outcomes and effectiveness have been published elsewhere](#) ~~examined the~~
12 ~~potential utility of an after-school dance programme as a means of increasing moderate to~~
13 ~~vigorous physical activity (MVPA) among 11-12 year old girls (school year 7) seeking to~~
14 ~~discover any improvements that might need to be made to the programme prior to a main~~
15 ~~trial.~~¹² This [part of the study](#) suggested that it is feasible to deliver the intervention and that
16
17 participating in dance has the potential to yield change in [moderate to vigorous physical](#)
18 [activity \(MVPA\) among 11-12 year old girls \(school year 7\)](#) ~~girls' physical activity~~, but a
19
20 larger randomised controlled trial (RCT) would be needed to fully evaluate its effectiveness
21
22 and cost-effectiveness.¹² In the absence of ~~other~~[robust](#) evidence for the [cost and](#) outcome of
23
24 dance interventions, ~~another aim~~s of the feasibility pilot ~~was~~[ere](#) to refine the information
25
26 required to sufficiently power a full trial [and to use the preference data to inform potential](#)
27
28 [refinements to intervention design](#).
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Preferences for competing after-school activities are potential determinants of the economic
41
42 benefit of dance intervention, as increased physical activity must be valued in order for it to
43
44 be maintained⁸ and to have potential for long-term impact on physical activity levels. In this
45
46 study, [Discrete Choice Experiment \(DCE\)](#) and survey methods are applied to examine two
47
48 separate, but complementary aspects of value – preferences for the attributes of dance classes
49
50 and preferences for dance among other competing alternatives for spending leisure time
51
52 respectively. Physical activity levels decline during youth¹³ with the start of secondary
53
54 school being a critical period of change, so it was important to establish comparative
55
56 preferences for after-school, leisure activities on weekdays.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Value is a concept germane to recruitment and retention rates and linked to the outcome
4
5 dimension of the BGDG intervention and therefore important to examine in detail. [Discrete](#)
6
7 [Choice Experiment \(DCE\)](#) works on the premise that any 'product', for example a healthcare
8
9 treatment or physical activity programme, can be described by its characteristics, or
10
11 attributes, and the extent to which an individual values a 'product' is dependent on the level
12
13 of these characteristics.^{14 15 16}

14
15
16
17 Thus, this paper reports the ~~learning from and~~ findings of a pilot economic evaluation of the
18
19 Bristol Girls Dance Project for girls aged 11-12 years in a primary school setting in England
20
21 ~~impact the that can be applied to~~ design and conduct of a [future](#) full trial [and](#) economic
22
23 evaluation. ~~Other findings from the Bristol Girls Dance Project Feasibility Trial concerning~~
24
25 ~~process evaluation, outcomes and effectiveness have been reported elsewhere.~~¹²
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 ARTICLE SUMMARY

33 *Article focus*

34
35
36
37
38 To examine [whether the feasibility of proposed methods for collection of resource use data](#)
39
40 [for estimating the costs are feasible, practical and likely to be successful in full trial economic](#)
41
42 [evaluation providing complete programme cost data from a funder perspective.](#)

43
44
45 [To understand preferences for after-school dance classes in the context of weekday leisure](#)
46
47 [time at age 11-12 years that can be applied to inform intervention design. To demonstrate the](#)
48
49 [appropriateness of using DCE and survey methods to derive participants' preferences for](#)
50
51 [dance among other competing leisure activities.](#)

52
53
54
55 [To present learning from reflections on the findings of pilot economic evaluation to inform a](#)
56
57 [full trial economic evaluation](#)
58
59
60

Key messages

Time available for other leisure activities on dance class days is an attribute of after school dance classes girls aged 10-11 years valued most - followed by cost and frequency of dance classes per week.

2 hours available for other leisure activities on dance class days was preferred to 3 hours suggesting after-school dance classes are valued compared with other ways to spend leisure time after school on weekdays

Resources used in the development, preparation, delivery and maintenance of dance classes should be categorised separately in stages in order to identify the mainstream cost of the programme intervention to commissioners

A pilot economic evaluation has been applied to learn more about the feasibility of costing the BGDG complex intervention and categorising programme resources to identify the mainstream cost of the intervention during a full trial.

Pilot data from seven schools has been analysed to understand girls' preferences for dance versus other ways of spending their leisure time at age 11-12 years that can help to conceptualise and measure the outcome dimensions of economic evaluation alongside a full trial.

METHODS

Bristol Girls Dance Project (BGDP) feasibility study

1
2
3 BGDG was a three-arm, parallel group, cluster randomised, controlled pilot trial with schools
4 as the unit of allocation. Seven schools from three school districts, Bristol, Bath and South
5 Gloucestershire (UK) were recruited to take part in the study from schools in these districts
6
7 with no current after school dance provision.¹² The hip-hop and street dance style of dance to
8
9 popular music was facilitated by a professional dance teacher.
10
11

12
13
14 Stratifying by school district, three schools were randomly allocated to the intervention arm
15 (n= 90) and four schools to the two control arms (n=120) and each school was assigned a
16 dance teacher to lead the sessions. Randomisation was conducted by an independent member
17 of the clinical trials unit at Bristol University using computer-generated random sequences
18 and codes for school district and school name. A full description of this has been detailed in
19 another paper from this study.¹² The three intervention schools received two, 90-minute
20 after-school dance classes per week for 9 weeks selected to allow the entire programme to be
21 delivered within a school term. Pilot work had suggested that dance is a very attractive form
22 of PA for girls, so the control element was designed to ascertain whether offering a dance
23 workshop at the end of the research process (i.e., after the last data collection), would affect
24 either retention or the quality of data provided by participants. We therefore utilized a three-
25 arm design with two different control groups. In two schools, participants were provided with
26 small thank you gifts for each wave of data collection. In the other two control schools
27 participants were provided with the same small thank you gifts, as well as a half-day dance
28 workshop at the end of the study.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 *Sample size*
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 This feasibility study was powered to test the intervention concept and to provide the
4 necessary information to calculate the sample size of a full cluster RCT and economic
5 evaluation of an after school dance programme. The important parameters detection of 10
6 minutes difference in MVPA per weekday (50 minutes per week) between the intervention
7 and control groups, intra-class correlation for weekday MVPA at time 2 and associated
8 confidence intervals have been reported and profiled in another paper from this study.¹² For
9 practical reasons the sample was limited to thirty girls aged 11-12 years per school. Girls
10 were recruited from each school at random from those with parental consent.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 21 22 *The intervention*

23 ~~Intervention participants were provided with two, 90 minute dance sessions per week for 9-~~
24 ~~weeks at school facilities. The hip hop and street dance style of dance to popular music was~~
25 ~~facilitated by a professional dance teacher.~~
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 *Primary outcome measure*

37 ~~All participants were asked to wear an Actigraph accelerometer for seven days at baseline~~
38 ~~(week 0) during the last two weeks of the intervention (weeks 8 or 9) and 3 months after the~~
39 ~~intervention ended (Week 20).~~
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Economic measures

1) ~~Resource use cost~~

~~Resources used at each stage of the BGDG programme were recorded retrospectively by the project team on time sheets and expense sheets from a public sector perspective. Costing followed a method applied in a study of complex intervention with children in a school setting (A Stop Smoking in Schools Trial) ASSIST.¹⁷ Stage 0 intervention planning and development costs or costs associated with running the scientific study (e.g., control group incentives for data collection, control school dance workshops or recruitment events) would not recur during mainstream implementation, but these costs are included for completeness.~~

~~Expenses including entry incentives, postage and Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) checking were gathered. Travel time was estimated for all staff inputs at the school locations. Girls in the control schools received incremental thank you gifts at each data collection they attended. Space hire did not incur costs, but estimates of the cost of space hire for dance class delivery are included because costs connected with alternative use of space in schools. School overhead and capital costs are not included.~~

2) ~~Discrete Choice Experiment (DCE) and survey of preference ranking and use of leisure time~~

BGDG formative qualitative work indicated the frequency of after-school dance classes per week; cost per session and how much leisure time is left over on dance class days for other leisure activities are important considerations for girls in deciding whether to participate.¹⁸⁷ Participants were asked to select the 'dance class scenario' they preferred from a pair of

options. Table I presents the 4 paired scenarios (1A:1B, 2A:2B, 3A:3B, 4A:4B) consisting of a randomly determined combination of three attributes, each with two levels.

Table I

Four paired choice scenarios were administered to 210 girls in seven schools - 3 intervention schools (n=90) and 4 control schools (n=120). Measures were taken at baseline (time 0) and at 9 weeks (time 1) using large cards, and girls' preferred choice for each pair of scenarios was recorded by the project team. Two time points were needed to establish change in preferences before and after the intervention. Participants were also asked to give preference ratings for ten leisure activities on weekdays by survey using a ten-point scale (1 = favourite; 10 = least favourite). Participant responses were collected on Personal Digital Assistants (PDAs) and downloaded to a customised database.

2) Resource use-cost

At commencement of this pilot study there was minimal evidence on which to draw in identifying costs that might be included in a resource use checklist. One report from the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) had modelled the cost of delivering dance classes to young children and produced some ball park cost estimates.^{18 19} These were based on an account of the resources used in delivery of a dance programme for girls by Hampshire Dance and Laban²⁰ in which resources had been identified, but not costed. These uncontrolled studies provided a starting point and an opportunity to produce more complete and accurate costing data from the Bristol Girls Dance Project feasibility pilot trial in which the volume of resources used and prices could be treated separately. The cost items identified by NICE were entered into a database and data collected using time-sheets and expense sheets were collected by the project team. These cost estimates and some

1
2
3 estimates for teacher time to manage behaviour derived by the first author of this paper are
4 detailed in Table II.^{18 19 20} Table II was used as a template for identifying and costing
5 resources in the BGDG feasibility study.
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 TABLE II here
13
14
15
16
17

18 *Ethics*

19
20 Potential participants in all seven schools were told that there was a maximum of 30
21 randomly assigned spaces at the dance classes. The study was approved by a University of
22 Bristol ethics committee and informed parental consent was obtained for all participants.
23
24
25
26
27

28 *Analyses*

29
30 Proportions of the sample ranking ten weekday leisure activities as first choice activity (rank
31 = 1) were calculated after participants had rated all ten leisure activities from 1 to 10.
32

33 Responses from participants with repetition of ratings for one or more leisure activities or
34 missing ratings for leisure activities were excluded. Overall, where the proportion of the
35 sample rating activities as their first choice was the same, these activities were assigned the
36 same rank across all ten activities. ~~Valid responses as a proportion of total responses for the
37 survey ranking leisure activities were t2=178/210, t1=130/210, t0=68/210 across all group
38 allocations.~~
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 DCE data was 'effects-coded'¹⁹²¹ using STATA²²⁰ and analysed using conditional logistic
52 regression. Effects coding is similar to dummy variable coding, but is preferable in this
53 instance because interaction or trade-off between the attributes is likely to take place as well
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 as a main effect. The coefficients for each attribute are a measure of the influence of that
4
5 attribute level on choice. Positive values represent a positive influence on choice, or in other
6
7 words, a preference for that level of an attribute. These results can be used to establish girls'
8
9 overall preferences for attributes, as well as the order of their preferences (i.e. which attribute
10
11 is most and least important). Participants with missing data were excluded from the DCE
12
13 analysis.
14
15

16
17
18 Total and average cost estimates from a funder perspective were identified and derived for
19
20 BGDG based on staged timing, quantity, frequency and price of resource use in 2010-11
21

22 prices. Expenses including travel, intervention programme entry incentives, postage,
23
24 Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) applications were accessed from the database kept by the
25
26 project team. Girls in the control schools received small thank you gifts at each data
27
28 collection they attended. Space hire did not incur costs, but estimates of the cost of space
29
30 hire for dance class delivery are included because they are costs connected with alternative
31
32 use of space in schools. School overhead and capital costs are not included.
33
34
35

36
37
38 Grouping costs to enable estimation of the mainstream cost adopted the categories used in (A
39
40 Stop Smoking in Schools Trial) ASSIST.²³ Stage 0 intervention planning, development and
41
42 training costs, stage 1 intervention preparation, stage 2 intervention delivery and stage 3
43
44 intervention maintenance costs were separately identified. Training costs for dance teachers
45
46 are identified separately. Costs associated with running the research study, control group
47
48 incentives for data collection, control school dance workshops and recruitment events) would
49
50 not recur during mainstream implementation, but these costs are included for clarity and
51
52 completeness. All costs connected with tasks undertaken by the research team are not
53
54 included.
55
56
57
58
59
60

RESULTS

Identification and timing of resources used

Table III identifies and describes at four stages the resources use of the BGDG programme and presents total cost estimates. The proportion of total costs incurred were 42% at stage 0, 57% at stage 1, 47% at stage 2 and 6% at stage 3. ~~BGDG required at least 286 hours of staff input.~~ At stage 0 half of the costs are dance teacher preparation and training time which arguably would be incurred in part in delivery of a mainstream form of the programme.

Eighteen BGDG dance classes (2 classes per week for 9 weeks) of 90 minutes duration were delivered to 90 girls in three intervention schools (30 per school) for 81 hours (27 hours per school) at a total estimated cost ~~of \$7,666; £4,789; €5,609~~ \$6,380, £3,988, €4,666 in 2010-11 prices.²⁴⁺²⁵² ~~Removing stage 0 programme development and stage 1-3 research costs revealed an~~ The average cost of repeating at the BGDG programme in its mainstream form per school ~~of~~ was \$2,126.40; £1,329; €1,555 and per participant \$70.90; £44.31; €51.84 ~~\$2,555; £1,596; €1,870 and per participant of \$85.17; £53.21; €62.32~~ in 2010-11 prices. If training costs for dance teachers on the BGDG were included to the mainstream cost this would add \$1280; £800; €928 to the cost per school and \$43; £27; €31.60 to the cost per pupil. These are not insubstantial additions, but are at the high end of training costs because this new dance programme was properly prepared for delivery. Training costs for the delivery of an established dance programme are likely to be lower. It was not possible to calculate ~~There are no confidence intervals for these average programme costs~~ per school or per participant ~~participant estimates~~ (see limitations of this pilot study).

Table III here

~~The BGDG programme compares favourably in terms of average cost per user with the only other evidence for costing an after school dance class programme in England—estimated by Fordham and Barton²³ and included in NICE guidance²⁴ on the promotion of physical activity in children. These estimates^{23,24} were based on a report of the NRG dance programme²⁵ which was delivered at a total cost of \$32,975; £20,600; €24,129 at 2010-11 prices. Assumptions were made²³ to derive costs for NICE guidance from the NRG report.²⁵~~

The shorter and less intensive NRG programme costed in the NICE report¹⁹ comprised 10 dance classes of 60 minutes duration for ~~an assumed number of~~ 24 girls (an assumed number) in 14 groups or schools (n=336 girls) for 140 hours with a cost per participant of \$98.14; £61.31; €71.81, in 2010-11 prices. This includes 140 hours of teacher time sourced from national pay scales for England at £23.57 per hour at 2010-11 prices.²⁶

Preferences for leisure activities

All girls were asked to rank ten after-school leisure activities by first preference activity.

Valid responses as a proportion of total responses for the survey ranking leisure activities were t2=178/210, t1=130/210, t0=68/210 across all group allocations.

Table III presents proportions across the participants (n=210) for preference ranks for after-school leisure activities for all group allocations at each time point demonstrating consistency in preference ranks indicating girls' selection of first choice leisure activities at each time point. The after-school leisure activities indicating the highest proportion of first choice preference rankings at each time point include 'hanging out with friends away from home just for fun' (Ranking at t2=1, t1=1, t0=2); 'take part in sports, athletics or physical activity' (Ranking at t2=2, t1=2, t0=1) and 'using the internet for fun: chats, YouTube, Facebook, Bebo, Myspace, looking for music' (Ranking at t0=3, t1=3, t2=2). -Valid responses were

1
2
3 included in the analyses. Valid responses as a proportion of total responses for the survey
4
5 ranking leisure activities were $t_2=178/210$, $t_1=130/210$, $t_0=68/210$ across all group
6
7 allocations indicating particularly at baseline the participants experienced some problems
8
9 using a hand held PDA to rank and rate the weekday after-school leisure activities.

10
11
12
13 Table ~~III~~IV here
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 *DCE results*

21
22 The p values for the regression coefficients in Table IV indicates girls in this sample have a
23 preference for “time left for other leisure activities on dance class days”, over the “cost of”
24 and “frequency of dance classes per week”. Analysis of preference levels within each
25 attribute suggests 2 hours is preferred to 3 hours remaining for other leisure activities on
26 dance class days. This pattern was consistent in all intervention and control groups at t0 and
27 t1. Girls were least concerned with the frequency of dance classes per week with preference
28 proportions suggesting 2 classes were preferred to 1 dance class per week in both intervention
29 groups and the baseline control group. ~~This pattern was consistent in all groups at t0 and t1.~~
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Table ~~IV~~ here
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **DISCUSSION**

50 *What is already known on this topic*

51
52
53
54 There is minimal guidance to support how economic evaluations of complex public health
55 interventions should be designed and conducted in school and community settings.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 There are no checklists or tools available to support costing dance programmes and minimal
4
5 knowledge of how to categorise resources to identify the mainstream cost of delivery.
6
7

8 Discrete Choice Experiment (DCE) methods to elicit the relative preferences and choices of
9
10 girls aged 11-12 years are untried and untested, but it is important to capture how girls value
11
12 dance among other competing leisure activities using a robust and acceptable method.
13
14

15
16
17
18
19
20 *What this study adds*
21

22 Providing programme cost data for a full trial of the BGDG programme is feasible, practical
23
24 and likely to be successful. Around two-~~ffth~~thirds of resources are development and
25
26 research control costs, so resources used to develop, prepare and deliver these programmes
27
28 should be categorised separately, so the cost of the mainstream programme can be estimated
29
30 accurately in a full trial.
31
32

33
34 Discrete Choice Experiment is an acceptable method to elicit preferences of girls aged 11-12
35
36 years.
37
38

39 At this point in their lives after-school dance is an activity valued by popular choice girls
40
41 when offered within the context of other competing choices and parental support for activities
42
43 for spending leisure time after school on weekdays. ~~predicts positive recruitment and~~
44
45 ~~retention rates in after school dance activities.~~
46
47

48
49 Participation in after-school dance classes has opportunity costs for participants and parents
50
51 extending beyond the funder that suggest a social model of cost should be considered for a
52
53 full trial to capture the costs associated with intervention outcome.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Robust evidence for the cost-effectiveness of physical activity complex interventions is
4 important for knowing where to invest scarce resources and commission programmes to
5 maximise health outcomes in primary prevention.^{27 28 29} However, gathering robust evidence
6 to support investment in public health interventions is a challenge.^{30 31} Significant barriers
7 remain and there is currently little guidance in how to conduct economic evaluation where
8 behaviour change is associated with health outcomes determined beyond genetic inheritance
9 by family, social and physical environments.^{32 33}

10
11
12 Indicative programme cost data from the pilot economic evaluation indicated a substantial
13 proportion of the intervention programme costs 42% occur at Stage 0 – the pre-programme
14 ~~planning and~~ development stage. This is an important finding because it suggests provided
15 BGDG is effective and cost-effective in a full trial, it would be substantially less costly to roll
16 out in its mainstream form. All complex interventions in primary prevention are likely to
17 generate a high proportion of upfront development costs that will not reoccur once a
18 programme is mainstreamed – an aspect of investment in public health interventions often
19 overlooked by decision makers.

20
21
22 Application of DCE is an established technique in adult populations, but to our knowledge
23 has not been applied previously in populations of children aged 11-12 years to establish
24 values for the attributes of physical activities. This study has demonstrated application of
25 DCE methods is feasible and acceptable to girls of this age. This is important because it
26 suggests DCE could be applied in other studies with children to understand the concept of
27 ‘value’ of an activity which plays an important role in recruitment, participation and
28 maintenance of participants which are all linked to intervention outcome. In addition to its
29 acceptability in this study the DCE method has produced more complete and valid data than
30 the direct survey method in eliciting preference ranks for after-school leisure activities. These

1
2
3 findings support a previous contention that DCE techniques may have merit over more
4 'traditional' survey methods³⁴ in eliciting preferences. However, more evidence would be
5
6
7 required to fully support this finding.
8
9

10 Taken together, findings of the DCE and survey of leisure activity preference in this study
11 indicate dance is a valued leisure activity among competing alternatives and reveals more
12 about the attributes of dance classes in girls of this age that can be taken forward to maximise
13 recruitment and retention in the BGDG programme. The findings of this study suggest that
14 dance has immediate appeal as an after-school leisure activity among a range of strongly
15 competing alternatives in girls of this age compared with older adolescents.³⁵ Girls in this
16 study have a first rank preference for the attribute 'time remaining for other leisure activities
17 on dance class days', over the 'cost of' and 'frequency of dance classes per week'. The
18 finding that in the intervention group two hours is preferred to three hours remaining for
19 other leisure activities on dance class days is significant. Overall these findings could suggest
20 that at this point in their lives dance is ~~popular choice in~~ valued by girls as a physical and
21 social activity of this age when offered within the context of ~~other~~ competing and constrained
22 choices for spending leisure time at this age. For example, at this age girls are not likely to be
23 able to go to 'discos or dance classes' without parents or carers or to 'hang around on street
24 corners with friends' and these issues may have affected their responses in the survey. These
25 are important findings because they predict positive recruitment rates and participation of
26 girls aged 11-12 years in dance as a physical leisure time activity and in a full trial.³⁶
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Delivery of after-school dance classes is dependent upon substantial commitment from the
50 girls giving up their after-school leisure time to participate in dancing. In turn, participation
51 is dependent upon the willingness of parents and carers to support attendance and to provide
52 encouragement and a means of travelling back home after school hours when school buses
53 are not available. This pilot study suggests development of a social model of costing that
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 reflects the cost of participants' and parents' time and opportunity costs are substantial
4
5 elements of the intervention cost that could be captured, if practical, in a full trial.
6
7

8 However, methods and tools to capture 'hidden' cost items that facilitate the success of the
9
10 intervention, but are not incurred by funders are not yet fully established. ⁴⁷²³ Where to
11 include training costs in these metrics is a question that remains for a future trial as they
12 should arguably be included in mainstream cost estimation despite their categorisation as
13 development costs. How identification of costs falling outside the public sector that are
14
15 relevant to programme implementation can be captured at a full trial stage also needs to be
16
17 considered carefully.³⁷ In a full trial resources used should be captured prospectively³⁸ and
18
19 this pilot study has established categories of resource use are also important to consider to
20
21 establish accurate mainstream programme costs.
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 29 **CONCLUSIONS**

30
31 The feasibility of providing costing data for full trial of the BGDG programme in is
32
33 established and an embryonic resource use checklist has been developed. Resources used to
34
35 develop and run the BGDG programme should be categorised separately in order for the
36
37 mainstream delivery cost of BGDG to be estimated accurately in a full trial. A social model of
38
39 costing that reflects participants and parents opportunity costs should be considered. BGDG
40
41 after-school dance classes have potential for sustained participation and cost-effective
42
43 delivery, but a full trial using methodological learning from this study is required.
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Competing interests**

50
51 There are no competing interests.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Authors' Contributions

The quantitative analysis plan was conceived by JP, FC, RJ and SJS. Analyses were performed by JP and FC and interpretation by JP, FC, RJ, SJS and AMH. JP drafted the first version of the manuscript with additional sections provided by FC. All authors provided critical edits and revisions to the paper and have reviewed and approved the final version of the paper.

Data sharing statement No additional data are available

Funding

This research was funded by the National Prevention Research Initiative (<http://npri.org.uk>), consisting of the following funding partners: Alzheimer's Research Trust; Alzheimer's Society; Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council, British Heart Foundation; Cancer Research UK; Chief Scientist Office; Scottish Government Health Directorate; Department of Health; Diabetes UK; Economic and Social Research Council; Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council; Health & Social Care Research & Development Office for Northern Ireland; Medical Research Council; The Stroke Association; Welsh Assembly Government and World Cancer Research Fund [grant number G090084].

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank all the participants, dance teachers, school teachers and schools who participated in or assisted with this research. Professor Powell acknowledges discussion of and feedback from a draft version of this paper presented at the Health Economists Bristol (HEB) journal club <http://www.bris.ac.uk/social-community-medicine/centres/healthecon> in

1
2
3 November 2011. Laura Davis project manager BGDG and Jade McNeil research associate are
4
5 acknowledged for data collection leading to this paper. Fran Carroll's contemporaneous PhD
6
7 research was supervised by Dr Alan A Montgomery at the time of DCE design and data
8
9 analysis. Dr Jago is supported by a National Institute for Health Research career development
10
11 fellowship. This work was also supported by DECIPHER, a UKCRC Public Health Research:
12
13 Centre of Excellence. Funding from the specific funders under the auspices of the UK
14
15 Clinical Research Collaboration is gratefully acknowledged. The other co-applicants of the
16
17 main BGDG study, Professor Ashley R Cooper and Dr Alan A Montgomery are
18
19 acknowledged. The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not
20
21 necessarily those of the NHS, the National Institute for Health Research or the Department of
22
23 Health.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

1. Foresight. *Tackling obesity: future choices*. London: Government Office for Science, 2007.
2. Stamatakis E, Zaninotto P, Falaschetti E, Mindell, J. Head J. Time trends in childhood and adolescent obesity in England from 1995 to 2007 and projections of prevalence to 2015. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2010; **64**:167-174.
3. Gunnell D, Frankel S, Nanchahal K, et al Childhood obesity and adult cardiovascular mortality: a 57 year follow-up study based on the Boyd Orr cohort. *Am J Clin Nutr* 1998; **67**:1111-18.
4. Must A, Jacques PF, Dallal GE, et al. Long term morbidity and mortality of overweight adolescents – a follow-up of the Havard growth study of 1922 to 1935. *N Engl J Med* 1992; **327**:1350-5.

- 1
2
3 5. Engeland A, Bjorge T, Sogaard AJ, et al. Body mass index in adolescence in relation
4
5 to total mortality: 32-year Follow-up of 227,000 Norwegian boys and girls. *Am J*
6
7 *Epidemiol* 2003;157:517-23.
8
9
- 10
11
12 6. Lancaster GA, Dodd S, Williamson P. Design and analysis of pilot studies:
13
14 recommendations for good practice. *J Eval Clin Pract* 2004, 10, 2:307-312.
15
16
17
- 18
19 7. Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, Michie S, Nazareth I, Petticrew M. Developing and
20
21 evaluating complex interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance. *BMJ*
22
23 2008, 337:a1655.
24
25
26
- 27
28 8. Wolfenstetter SB. Conceptual framework for standard economic evaluation of
29
30 physical activity programmes in primary prevention. *Prev Sci.*2011; 12(4):435-51.
31
32
33
- 34
35 9. Sheill, A. Hawe, P. Gold, L. Complex interventions or complex systems? Implications
36
37 for health economic evaluation. *BMJ*, 2008; 336:1281-1283.
38
39
- 40
41 10. Weatherly H, Drummond M, Claxton K, et al. *Assessing the challenges of applying*
42
43 *standard methods of economic evaluation to public health interventions*. York: Centre
44
45 for Health Economics, 2009.
46
47
- 48
49 11. Anderson R. Systematic reviews of economic evaluations: utility or futility. *Health*
50
51 *Econ*, 2010;19:350-364.
52
- 53
54 12. Jago R, Sebire S, Cooper AR, et al. Bristol Girls Dance Project Feasibility Trial:
55
56 Outcome and process evaluation results. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*, 2012; 9, 83.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 13. Gorely T, Marshall S, Biddle SJH, Cameron N. The prevalence of leisure time
4
5 sedentary behaviour and physical activity in adolescent girls: An ecological
6
7 momentary assessment approach. *Int J Pediatr Obes*, 2007; 2:227-234.
8
9
10
11
12 14. Cheraghi-Sohi S, Bower P, Mead N, McDonald R, Whalley D, Roland M. Making
13
14 sense of patient priorities: applying discrete choice methods in primary care using
15
16 'think aloud' technique. *Fam Pract*, 2007; 24: 276-282.
17
18
19 15. Green C, Gerard K. Exploring the social value of health-care interventions: a stated
20
21 preference discrete choice experiment. *Health Econ*, 2009; 18:951-976.
22
23
24
25 16. Petrou S, McIntosh E. (2009) Women's Preferences for Attributes of First-Trimester
26
27 Miscarriage Management: A Stated Preference Discrete-Choice Experiment. *Value*
28
29 *Health*, 12,4:551-559.
30
31
32
33 ~~17. Hollingworth W, Cohen D, Hawkins J, et al. Reducing smoking in adolescents: cost-~~
34
35 ~~effectiveness results from the cluster randomised ASSIST (A Stop Smoking in~~
36
37 ~~Schools Trial). *Nicotine & Tob Res*, 2011; 14, 2:161-168.~~
38
39
40
41
42 ~~18-17.~~ Jago, R. Davis, L. McNeil, J. et al. Adolescent girls' and parents' views on
43
44 recruiting and retaining girls into an after-school dance intervention: implications for
45
46 extra-curricular physical activity provision. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*, 2011, 8, 91.
47
48
49
50
51 ~~19-18.~~ Fordham R, Barton GP. *Promotion of physical activity in children programme*
52
53 *guidance: a cost-effectiveness scenario analysis. London:NICE, 2008.*
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- ~~20-19.~~ [NICE public health guidance 17. Promoting physical activity, active play and sport for pre-school and school-age children and young people in family, pre-school, school and community settings. NICE:London, 2009.](#)
- ~~21-20.~~ [Hampshire Dance and Laban \(2007\)\[online\] Accessed on December 7th 2012. NRG Youth Dance and Health Report 2005-6.](#)
<http://www.hampshiredance.org.uk/documents/NRGEvaluationReport.pdf>
- ~~22-21.~~ Bech,M. Gyrd-Hansen,D.. Effects coding in discrete choice experiments. *Health Econ*, 2005; 14,10.
- ~~23-22.~~ STATA CORP LP (2009) *STATA user's guide release 11*. Texas, USA: STATA CORP LP.
- ~~23.~~ [Hollingworth W, Cohen D, Hawkins J, et al. Reducing smoking in adolescents: cost-effectiveness results from the cluster randomised ASSIST \(A Stop Smoking in Schools Trial\). *Nicotine & Tob Res*, 2011; 14, 2:161-168.](#)
24. Safalra [online] 2012. *Historical UK Inflation and price conversion rates*. Accessed on May 3rd 2012 at:- <http://safalra.com/other/historical-uk-inflation-price-conversion/>.
25. Oanda [online] 2012. *Historical exchange rates*. Accessed on May 3rd 2012 at:- <http://www.oanda.com/currency/historical-rates/>.
- ~~26.~~ [Fordham R, Barton GP. Promotion of physical activity in children programme guidance: a cost effectiveness scenario analysis. London:NICE, 2008.](#)
- ~~27.~~ [NICE public health guidance 17. Promoting physical activity, active play and sport for pre-school and school-age children and young people in family, pre-school, school and community settings. NICE:London, 2009.](#)

~~28. Hampshire Dance and Laban (2007)[online] Accessed on December 7th 2012. NRG
Youth Dance and Health Report 2005-6.~~

~~<http://www.hampshiredance.org.uk/documents/NRGEvaluationReport.pdf>~~

29-26. ____ TES [online] 2011 *Teacher's pay scales from September 2011 unchanged from 2010*. <http://www.tes.co.uk/article.aspx?storycode=6000186>

30-27. ____ Rush B, Sheill A, Hawe P. A census of economic evaluations in health promotion. *Health Educ Res*, 2004; 19:707-719.

31-28. ____ Kelly MP, McDaid D, Ludbrook A, Powell JE. *Economic appraisal of public health interventions*. London:Health Development Agency, 2005.

32-29. ____ Anderson R. New MRC guidance on evaluating complex interventions. *BMJ*, 2008;337:944-5.

33-30. ____ Buchanan J, Wolstenholme J, Foster C. *A rapid review of economic literature related to the promotion of physical activity, play and sport for pre-school and school-age children in family, pre-school, school and community settings*. London:NICE, 2008.

34-31. ____ Richardson AK. Investing in public health: barriers and possible solutions. *J Public Health* 2012; 34:322-7.

35-32. ____ Ogilvie D, Bull F, Powell J, et al. An applied ecological framework for evaluating infrastructure to promote walking and cycling: the iConnect study. *Am J Public Health*. 2011;101:473-481.

1
2
3
4
5 | 36-33. Powell J. Compression of morbidity outcomes key to investment in public
6 health. *J Public Health* 2012; 34:329.
7
8
9

10
11 | 37-34. Alvarez-Farizo B, Hanley N, Barberan R. The value of leisure time: a
12 contingent rating approach, *J Environ Plan Man*, 2001; 44(5):681-699.
13
14
15

16
17 | 38-35. O'Neill, J. Pate, R. Hooker, SP. The contribution of dance to daily physical
18 activity among adolescent girls. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*, 2011; 8:87.
19
20
21

22
23 | 39-36. Nader PR, Bradley RH, Houts RM, McRitchie SL, O'Brien M: Moderate-to-
24 vigorous physical activity from ages 9 to 15 years. *JAMA* 2008, 300:295-305.
25
26
27

28
29 | 40-37. Alvarez-Farizo B, Hanley N, Barberan R. The value of leisure time: a
30 contingent rating approach, *J Environ Plan Man*, 2001; 44,5:681-699.
31
32
33

34
35 | 41-38. Ridyard C, Hughes D. Methods for the collection of resource use data within
36 clinical trials: a systematic review of the studies funded by the UK Health Technology
37 Assessment Programme. *Value Health*, 2010; 13, 8:867-872.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

TABLES

Table 1. Attributes and levels of the Discrete Choice Experiment and the four choice sets given to participants

Level of attributes	Attributes		
	Frequency of dance classes per week	Cost per session	Hours left for other leisure activities on that day
Upper	2 dance classes per week	£1 per session	Leaving 3 hours for other leisure activities on the evening of the dance session
Lower	1 dance class per week	50p per session	Leaving 2 hours for other leisure activities on the evening of the dance session
1A ←		→ 1B	
You take one after school dance class each week at a cost of £1 per class leaving you 3 hours on that evening for other leisure activities		You take two after school dance classes each week at a cost of 50p per class leaving you 2 hours on those evenings for other leisure activities	
2A ←		→ 2B	
You take two after school dance classes each week at a cost of £1 per class leaving you 2 hours on those evenings for other leisure activities		You take one after school dance class each week at a cost of 50p per class leaving you 3 hours on that evening for other leisure activities	
3A ←		→ 3B	
You take one after school dance class each week at a cost of 50p per class leaving you 2 hours on that evening for other leisure activities		You take two after school dance classes each week at a cost of £1 per class leaving you 3 hours on those evenings for other leisure activities	
4A ←		→ 4B	
You take two after school dance classes each week at a cost of 50p per class leaving you 3 hours on		You take one after school dance class each week at a cost of £1 per class leaving you 2 hours on that	

those evenings for other leisure activities	evening for other leisure activities
---	--------------------------------------

For peer review only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table II. Resources use identification template used to inform BGDG feasibility study

<u>NRG Youth Dance & Health Project¹</u>	
	<u>²Total Cost £</u>
<u>Project planning work: initial research into existing action research projects</u>	<u>500.00</u>
<u>Lead artist fee -programme design/artist training</u>	<u>800.00</u>
<u>Artists' travel fees – attending training/planning sessions</u>	<u>637.35</u>
<u>Artists' fee</u>	<u>5,806.00</u>
<u>Artists' travel costs</u>	<u>1,515.44</u>
<u>Coach hire – school group for pilot session</u>	<u>562.88</u>
<u>Space hire</u>	<u>254.70</u>
<u>Disclosures/refreshments</u>	<u>77.98</u>
<u>Postage</u>	<u>64.03</u>
<u>Management fee</u>	<u>4,000.00</u>
<u>Staff travel</u>	<u>443.65</u>
<u>Documentation (dissemination advocacy)</u>	<u>269.70</u>
<u>Road-show event – end of project</u>	<u>562.88</u>
<u>Additional schools workshop</u>	<u>151.80</u>
<u>Total 2005-6 prices £</u>	<u>15,203.53</u>
<u>Teacher time for behaviour management (not included in NRG report)³</u>	<u>3,300.00</u>
<u>Total 2007-8 prices £ with teacher management</u>	<u>19,427.76</u>
<u>Total 2010-11 prices £</u>	<u>20,600.00</u>
¹ resource use items identified by Hampshire Dance and Laban, NRG Youth Dance and Health Project Evaluation report²⁰ ² assumptions and costing profile produced by Fordham & Barton (2008)¹⁸ for NICE Guidance 17 (NICE,2009)¹⁹ ³ This item was identified in the NICE report²⁰ but not included in the NICE costing^{18 19}	

Table III. Description of resources used, unit volumes, and prices and estimated costs* by category by school by pupil in 2010-11 prices

Stage of BGDG	Description of resources used	Number of units ¹	Price per unit ²	Cost £ 2010-11 prices	Cost stage
Pre-Programme planning development stage 0	Lead dance artist consultation and development work	2 days	£500 per day	1000	<u>4726</u>
	Lead dance artist time, to adapt training programme for hip hop genre	1 day	£500 per day	500	
	Lead dance artist time, to prepare dance teachers for 9 week intervention	1 day	£500 per day	500	
	3 dance teachers preparation/training time	7.5 days	£27 per hour	2400	
	Travel expenses			288 ³	
	Disclosures CRB forms			38 ³	
Programme preparation stage 1	Space hire for dance taster sessions in intervention schools	6 hours	£15 per hour	90	<u>819</u>
	Dance teacher delivery of taster sessions in intervention schools	6 hours	£27 per hour	162	
	Control schools (n=4) recruitment presentations	1 day	500 per day	500	
	Postage costs			25 ³	
	Travel expenses			42 ³	
Programme delivery stage 2	Delivery 18 dance classes at 90 minutes per class over 9 weeks x 3 schools	81 hours	£27 per hour	2187	<u>5375</u>
	T-shirts for 3 intervention schools	90 girls	£5 per T-shirt	450	
	Small gift incentives for control schools data collection	3 waves	£731 per wave	2192	
	Refreshments			100 ³	
	Travel expenses			446 ³	
Programme reinforcement stage 3	Half-day dance workshops for two control schools	9 hours	£27 per hour	243	<u>729</u>
	6 hour performance events for parents of girls at 3 intervention schools	18 hours	£27 per hour	486	
				Total	<u>£11,649</u>
BGDP Stages 0-3 costs £s		£11,649 2010-11 prices			
BGDP Stages 1-3 costs £s		£6,923 2010-11 prices			
BGDP Stages 1-3 minus control costs £s		£3,988 2010-11 prices			
BGDP cost per school £s		£1,329 2010-11 prices			
BGDP cost per pupil £s		£44.31 2010-11 prices			
*Research team administration, travel and other costs are not included. Control costs in this research are included for information					
Sources: 1. research team 2. project budget - all prices are actual rates paid. 3. Project budget - all costs are actual expenses incurred.					

Resources, estimated total costs and average cost per participant 2010-11 prices

Stage of BGDG	Description of resources used	Total cost \$ (£, €) 2010-11 prices
Stage-0 Pre-Programme planning-development	Nine hours to adapt training programme for hip-hop genre, two 3-hour sessions to prepare dance teachers for 9-week intervention-delivery by lead-dance teacher, 20 hours preparation by 3 dance teachers, disclosures-CRB forms	\$8,525 £5,326 €6,238
Stage-1 Programme preparation	Space-hire for two 3-hour dance-taster sessions, dance teacher's delivery of two 3-hour taster sessions, 2 control recruitment presentations (90 minutes), postage costs	\$936 £585 €685
Stage-2 Programme delivery	Delivery of 18 dance classes at 90 minutes per class over 9 weeks in three schools, incentives for intervention schools, incentives for control schools data collection, refreshments	\$9,575 £5,982 €7,007
Stage-3 Programme reinforcement	Three dance workshops for two control schools at 90 minutes per workshop, three 6-hour end-of-intervention performance events for parents	\$1,153 £720 €843
BGDG Stages 0-3	Total cost	\$20,189 £12,613 €14,773
BGDG Stages 1-3	Total cost	\$11,664 £7,287 €8,535
BGDG Stages 1-3	Total cost minus research costs	\$7,666 £4,789 €5,609
	BGDG Cost per participant (N = 90)	\$85.17 £53.21 €62.32

Table IV. Preference rankings of first choice leisure activities at each time point N (%)

After-school leisure activity	Time 2		Time 1		Baseline Time 0	
	Ranking	N (%)	Ranking	N (%)	Ranking	N (%)
Go around with friends to shopping centres, streets, parks just for fun	1	46 (26)	1	33 (25)	2	12 (18)
Use the internet for fun: chats, YouTube, Facebook, Bebo, Myspace, looking for music (do not include school homework)	2	31 (17)	3	20 (15)	3	8 (12)
Take part in sports, athletics or physical activity	2	31 (17)	2	22 (17)	1	13 (20)
Play with or see friends at your home or their homes	3	21 (12)	4	11 (9)	5	5 (7)
Read books for enjoyment (do not include school books)	4	13 (7)	5	10 (8)	4	6 (9)
Go to discos or dance classes	5	11 (6)	8	5 (4)	5	5 (7)
Play a musical instrument, sing, draw, paint or write	6	9 (5)	4	11 (9)	3	8 (12)
Send text messages or use Twitter on your mobile phone	7	8 (5)	7	6 (5)	5	5 (7)
Play computer games	8	4 (2)	6	8 (6)	6	4 (6)
Watch TV DVDs or playbacks of programmes	8	4 (2)	9	4 (3)	7	2 (3)
Total of valid* responses/total responses		178/210		130/210		68/210

*A valid response = each after-school leisure activity is ranked by a separate number between 1 and 10 by each individual participant using a PDA

Table V. ~~Order of preferences and preference proportions of levels~~ Regression coefficients -indicating the value of dance classes at t0 (week 0) and t1 (week 9) by group allocation

	Control time 0 (n=104/120*)			Control time 1 (n=104/120*)			Intervention time 0 (n=80/90*)			Intervention time 1 (n=80/90*)		
	Coeff	SE	P value	Coeff	SE	P value	Coeff	SE	P value	Coeff	SE	P value
Frequency of dance class:			<0.01			<0.01			<0.01			0.04
Twice a week	0.18	0.07		0.30	0.07		0.25	0.58		0.13	0.06	
Three times a week	-0.18	0.07		-0.30	0.07		-0.25	0.58		-0.13	0.06	
Cost:			<0.01			<0.01			<0.01			<0.01
£1	0.22	0.05		-0.17	0.04		0.46	0.07		0.26	0.06	
£2	-0.22	0.05		0.17	0.04		-0.46	0.07		-0.26	0.06	
Other hours available for leisure activities on dance class days:			<0.01			<0.01			<0.01			<0.01
2 hours	0.35	0.06		-0.31	0.65		0.76	0.11		0.37	0.08	
3 hours	-0.35	0.06		0.31	0.65		-0.76	0.11		-0.37	0.08	

Preferred level of attribute in bold, attribute most concerned with shaded dark grey, attribute least concerned with shaded light grey *Number of valid responses from total possible responses

	Level preferences <i>Preference proportions[‡]</i>			
Ranking of Attributes	Control time 0 <i>(n=104/120*)</i>	Control time 1 <i>(n=104/120*)</i>	Intervention time 0 <i>(n=80/90*)</i>	Intervention time 1 <i>(n=80/90*)</i>
1. Time for other activities on dance class days <i>2 hrs/day v 3hrs /day</i>	Having 2 hours remaining for other leisure activities on dance class days <i>67% v 33%</i>	Having 3 hours remaining for other leisure activities on dance class days <i>35% v 65%</i>	Having 2 hours remaining for other leisure activities on dance class days <i>82% v 18%</i>	Having 2 hours remaining for other leisure activities on dance class days <i>68% v 32%</i>
2. Cost <i>50p v £1</i>	£1 cost <i>39% v 61%</i>	50p cost <i>58% v 42%</i>	£1 cost <i>28% v 72%</i>	£1 cost <i>37% v 63%</i>
3. Frequency of dance classes per week <i>1 p/wk v 2 p/wk</i>	2 classes per week <i>41% v 59%</i>	2 classes per week <i>36% v 64%</i>	2 classes per week <i>38% v 62%</i>	2 classes per week <i>44% v 56%</i>

[‡] Preference proportions holding all else equal, the proportion of the sample that would choose particular level over the other within that attribute
^{*} Number of valid responses from total possible responses