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Background: Constructs from salutogenesis

• Sense of coherence (SOC)
  – Meaningfulness, Comprehensibility, Manageability
  – General coping capacity which aids people in dealing with risks

• Generalized resistance resources (GRRs)
  – Resources that aid people in interacting and dealing with risks

• (Meaningful) Life Experience (LE)
  – Defining moment in life; an event that changes the way you think about things

• Stronger SOC \(\rightarrow\) more likely one is to have and use GRRs in a health-promoting manner, and stay healthy (Eriksson & Lindström, 2006)
Relation between GRR’s and SOC

Learning processes

Adapted from: Vaandrager & Koelen (2013) Salutogenesis in the Workplace: building GRRs and SOC
The concept of learning in Salutogenesis

- Life experiences & learning processes: connecting GRR’s and SOC

- Salutogenesis in Workplaces (Vaandrager & Koelen, 2013)
  - Study I. Bregulla (2013): no relationship was found between Learning Processes and SOC
  - Possible explanation: operationalization of learning processes was insufficient

- New operationalization: literature study by B. Hoogenbosch (2014)
  - Learning processes could be operationalized using Experiential Learning Theory (ELT) of Kolb

- Implication: learning, also in organisations, takes place on an individual level
Problem statement: There are promising results in terms of potential benefits of outdoor experiential learning programmes. However knowledge on the interplay of factors that contribute to these outcomes is lacking.

Aim: to explore how (learning) experiences offered through outdoor experiential programmes, particularly the youth care farm approach, may (not) enhance young peoples’ ability to recognise and then utilise available resources for personal growth, protection and health promotion.

Method: semi-structured interviews with 11 youngsters, looking back at their experiences during a half-year stay on a care farm in the Netherlands.
Results Youth Care Farms study

• Several resources (and the interaction of these resources) on the youth care farm contributed to personal development and the sense of coherence of the youngsters

• Resources that evoked:
  – Comprehensibility:
    • Farm activities
    • Interaction with the farmer
    • Assignments given by the mentor
    • Individual placement on the farm with associated time for reflection
  – Manageability:
    • Tasks on the farm with guidance of the farmer
    • Examples set by the farmer and the mentor concerning communication skills
  – Meaningfulness:
    • Trust and responsibility given by the farmer
    • Interaction with and care for animals
    • Experiences support and encouragement from mentor/family/friends
    • Being cut off from family and friends
Results Youth Care Farms study

- A core strength of the program appears to be the **diversity and richness of resources (and stressors!)** available to the participants, creating various opportunities for learning

- When one of the potential resources (like a good relationship with the farmer) does not develop, it can be compensated by another resource (like the bond with animals)

In this study also different stages of Kolbs learning cycle can be recognised
GRRs Learning processes

Reflective observation

Concrete experience

Active experimentation

Abstract conceptualisation

SOC
Next step Healthy Eating study

- Aim: examine the association between SOC, GRRs and SRRs for food, eating and health (SRR-FEH)

- Hypothesis: Both GRRs and SRR-FEH relate to SOC
Invitation for discussion

• The place of learning processes in salutogenesis
  – Life experiences vs. learning processes?
  – Individual learning and collective learning?
  – The connecting mechanism between GRR’s and SOC?

• GRR’s and SRR’s?
Publications

Life experiences vs. learning

GRRs → Life exp. → SOC

GRRs ↔ Learning ↔ SOC
What predicts healthy eating?

Generalized resistance resources that predict healthy eating in Dutch adults
Authors: Emily Swan, MSc, RD¹, Laura Bouwman, PhD, RD¹, Noelle Aarts, PhD², Gert Jan Hiddink, PhD², Maria Koelen, PhD¹

Goal
• examine the predictors of healthy eating from a salutogenic perspective in a cross-sectional study

Methods
• Study population: Dutch adults aged ≥18 years (n= 703) from Tilburg University’s LISS research panel.
• Research instrument: Internet-based survey completed January 2013 measuring amongst others sense of coherence (SOC); psychosocial; socio-economic; health; and dietary factors.
• Statistical analysis: Chi-square, t-tests, multivariate logistic regression analysis
## Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant predictors</th>
<th>OR (95% CI)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being female</td>
<td>1.67 (1.16-2.39)</td>
<td>.005**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with partner</td>
<td>1.59 (1.03-2.47)</td>
<td>.037*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived health</td>
<td>1.34 (1.03-1.75)</td>
<td>.031*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SOC</td>
<td>1.50 (1.05-2.20)</td>
<td>.028*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible restraint of eating</td>
<td>1.02 (1.002-1.04)</td>
<td>.028*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy healthy eating</td>
<td>1.01 (1.001-1.01)</td>
<td>.015*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-significant predictors</th>
<th>OR (95% CI)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.02 (1.00-1.03)</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>.74 (.50-1.11)</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net income</td>
<td>1.00 (.99-1.00)</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition knowledge</td>
<td>1.11 (.97-1.30)</td>
<td>.124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Higher dietary score indicates diet more in line with dietary recommendations for fruit, vegetable, whole grain and fish intake; *Significance level of <.05; **Significance level of <.01