

# SPORT ENGLAND CONTRACT REFERENCE: SE730

## RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS

### Question 1

On Section 6, Part 3 (Approach):

- a. Does Sport England, or any other party affiliated to SE, own a dataset that has both Active Lives and IPAQ-SF? And if such a dataset exists, could it be made available to the supplier/successful tenderer?
- b. We are unclear what “we would like suppliers to advise on the most appropriate method for this research” means. Does it mean that (i) we advise Sport England so that Sport England organises the data collection using an existing online platform? Or (ii) the expectation is that the supplier will be responsible for organising such a data collection and the costs and resources needed will be included in the submitted tender budget?

### Response

Sport England does not currently own a dataset that contains data from both the Active Lives survey and IPAQ-SF.

If primary data collection is required, then we would expect this to be conducted by the supplier with the required costs and resources outlined in the tender budget. To aid this, we can make data from the Active Lives survey available to the supplier along with contact details if re-contacting Active Lives respondents is the preferred solution. Alternatively, Sport England can provide links to current projects if the supplier would like to administer both questionnaires to a fresh sample.

As outlined in the ITT, potential suppliers should indicate in their responses if they think the proposed timeline of 6 weeks for phase 1 and 10 weeks for phase 2 is achievable, and if not, what timetable would be realistic.

### Question 2

Phase 1 refers to both correlation and agreement between ranks. Does this mean you are looking for agreement between categories of activity (e.g. active, inactive sedentary) between Active Lives and IPAQ-SF? If yes, what sort of categories are you hoping to produce from this analysis? What do you mean by ranking? What sort of categories? Prevalence of sports?

### Response

IPAQ-SF currently measures the number of days where the respondent did moderate and vigorous physical activity in the last week, and then the time usually spent doing PA on one of those days. Walking is measured separately and sports are not measured so we do not expect correlation for specific sports to be assessed.

We want to look for agreement between IPAQ and Active Lives using measures that can be calculated using both datasets, e.g. once a week MVPA or Chief Medical Officer’s physical activity measures.

By ranking, we simply mean that someone who is identified as doing a lot of PA in IPAQ is also identified as doing a lot of PA in Active Lives and a person not doing much PA is categorised similarly using both questionnaires. We expect potential suppliers to decide and suggest which categories for ranking are most appropriate.

### Question 3

The introduction to Phase 2 says that if IPAQ-SF and Active Lives have good agreement in classifying activity levels then you would like to develop another alternate tool that you subsequently want to test against IPAQ-SF and/or active lives. Can you clarify that is in fact what you mean and if yes what is the purpose of Phase 1?

### Response

Yes, this is what we mean. The purpose of Phase 1 is to establish that IPAQ-SF is a suitable basis for developing a new measure from. We want there to be correlation between our project-level measurement and population-level measurement.

#### **Question 4**

When you say keep the best features of IPAQ-SF for Phase 2 what are you referring to?

#### **Response**

We are not referring to specific features of the questionnaire here, but more the fact that IPAQ-SF is recognised as being validated for use in the UK, reliable (including test-retest reliability) and can be used to measure total physical activity.

#### **Question 5**

Are you amenable to other ideas for a survey tool to be adapted rather than IPAQ (if we can make the case for a different approach)?

#### **Response**

We have based our decision to use IPAQ-SF on available research on current physical activity measures. If an existing tool can be demonstrated to be significantly better than IPAQ-SF and may be more easily adapted to meet our requirements, then we would be open to this. We would still want to go through the same process to determine correlation with Active Lives outlined in phase 1 of the ITT. You may want to include this as an option in your tender rather than the only approach.

#### **Question 6**

Is it the case that you are proposing to validate IPAQ data (with a one-week recall) against Active Lives (with a four-week recall)?

#### **Response**

Yes, if possible.

#### **Question 7**

Do you have a coding algorithm for Active Lives that produces summary outputs?

#### **Response**

The Active Lives dataset includes derived variables. Depending on the supplier's requirements we are happy to look at creating new variables or writing code to allow for the relevant analysis.

#### **Question 8**

Are you amenable to better design methods? E.g. repeat measures for reliability; criterion validity using accelerometers? We understand the point about the CMO measure being based on self-report but that does not mean that questionnaires should not be validated against accelerometers or other objective measures.

#### **Response**

We do not feel that other design methods (e.g. objective measures) will be practical for the vast majority of our projects, hence our choice of a self-report measure.

#### **Question 9**

Can we work with IPSOS MORI to administer surveys for the validation work? I.e. we provide the questions and IPSOS MORI run the surveys among a small sample.

#### **Response**

We are not expecting Ipsos MORI to be involved in administration of surveys for this validation work but if a potential supplier did wish to partner with them we could explore this.

