Health Coaching 2.0: Redefining a Key Lifestyle Medicine Intervention, PrioMed Pilot Program Evaluation

Keywords: behavior change; health coaching; lifestyle medicine; health promotion

Authors:

Ari Langinkoski, Graduate Student of Health Sciences, School of Medicine, Institute of Biomedicine: Sports and Exercise Medicine, University of Eastern Finland

Johanna Hämäläinen, MSc, School of Medicine, Institute of Biomedicine: Sports and Exercise Medicine, University of Eastern Finland

Krista Rapo, MSc, School of Medicine, Institute of Biomedicine: Sports and Exercise Medicine, University of Eastern Finland

Mikko Rinta, MSc, Licensed Dietician, Terveystalo Oyj

Pekka Aroviita, MD, PhD, DiplBLM, Terveystalo Oyj

Mika Venojärvi, PhD, School of Medicine, Institute of Biomedicine: Sports and Exercise Medicine, University of Eastern Finland

Corresponding author: Ari Langinkoski, arilan@student.uef.fi

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for- profit sectors.

Abstract

The world is suffering from a global epidemic of non-communicable diseases. Previous research has suggested that health coaching might be an effective way to help curb the epidemic. However, the ambiguous definition of health coaching hinders its widespread practical implementation.

We redefined the coaching process in the universal language of behavior change techniques with evidence of effectiveness, postulating this would make the process more efficient to teach and to apply and lead to results with excellent time efficiency.

This pilot study (n = 25) investigated the feasibility of such an approach. Despite the relatively short total time spent (< 4 hours per participant), the surveys conducted at baseline and six months showed significant improvements in customer-reported physical and mental health with implications of clinical significance.

These promising results pave the way for a universal definition of the coaching process, signaling a brighter future for the practice that merits further exploration.

Introduction

The world is suffering from a global epidemic of non-communicable diseases (NCD), which cause approximately 41 million deaths annually, accounting for 71% of all deaths (WHO, 2024). A significant portion of the risk factors behind these diseases are lifestyle-related either directly (e.g., diet, smoking, alcohol consumption, and excess sodium consumption) or indirectly (e.g., high blood pressure, high blood glucose, and obesity) (GBD 2019).

Systematic reviews suggest that health coaching might be an effective method (Kivelä et al.,2014; Sherifali et al., 2015; Pirbaglou et al., 2018) in preventing and treating lifestyle related NCDs, with emerging evidence of cost efficiency (Hale & Giese, 2017). However, the ambiguous definition of health coaching, which is observable throughout the literature (Sherifali et al., 2015; Pirbaglou et al., 2018; Mendes Sieczkowska et al, 2021), hinders its widespread practical implementation.

The purpose of our study was to create a methodology honoring the principles of health coaching (Wolever at al., 2013), defined in the universal and unequivocal terminology of behavior change technique (BCT) taxonomy v1 (Michie et al., 2013), utilizing the most effective BCTs according to current guidelines (Guerreiro et al., 2021) and other evidence provided by relevant systematic reviews (e.g., Ashton et al., 2020; Carraça et al., 2021; Samdal et al., 2017) and the “six pillars” of Lifestyle Medicine (Lippman et al., 2024) and to test the feasibility of its implementation and effectiveness in real-life private healthcare setting.

The primary aim of this study was to evaluate the pilot program's impact on the participant self-reporter health-related quality of life. The participants and coaches' experiences have been studied separately (J. Hämäläinen, unpublished data, 2024).

Methods

The participants of the study were recruited from private healthcare (Terveystalo Oyj) customers and the intake criteria was previous participation in an annual health checkup or a digital wellness program. 25 subjects completed global health survey at both time points. The study was approved by Regional Medical Research Ethics Committee of Wellbeing Services County of North Savo, Finland.

PrioMed® Health and Lifestyle coaching uses a systemized method (Figure 1) based on BCTs that have evidence of their effectiveness (Guerreiro et al., 2021) and is centered around goal setting (Ashton et al., 2020; Carraça et al., 2021; Samdal et al., 2017) and graded steps (Carraça et al., 2021). To emphasize the autonomy supportive and patient centered method (Samdal et al., 2017) the coaching process begins with a self-evaluation of the six pillars of lifestyle medicine (PrioMed Lifestyle Medicine Vital Signs [PMLMVS], Appendix A). After reflection with the coach, the patient self-selects the lifestyle he or she wishes to focus on.



Figure 1. PrioMed Lifestyle Medicine Vital Signs and PrioMed Goal Setting Wheel. Behavior Change Techniques (BCT) from Michie et al. (2013).

Two nurses, with no prior experience or training in coaching, received three times 4 hours of training and a 25-page manual describing the use of the model. The manual was written, and the training designed and delivered by the first author. The coaching sessions were conducted over the phone and the coaches were allocated time for 7 meetings. The instructed use of time and the scope of the sessions was: 1. session (45 min), reflecting on PMLMVS, selecting the lifestyle of focus, and setting the first goal, if time allowed; 2. session (45 min), reflecting on PrioMed Needs Analysis (PMNA) and final goal setting; 3. session (15 min), feedback and social reward, if appropriate; 4. session (15 min), feedback and social reward, if appropriate; 5. session (30 min), feedback and social reward, if appropriate, and reviewing of the goals. 6. session, feedback and social reward, if appropriate; 7. session, feedback and social reward, if appropriate (+30 min for collecting the survey answers if not given before). The actual

number of sessions ranged from 4–7 (*M* = 6.04 *SD* = 0.84) and total time spend was <4 hours per participant.

The PMNA was inspired by a process that is typical, if not an integral part, of elite sports coaching. To our knowledge, this is not well documented in peer-reviewed literature, but the basic idea is this: First, you analyze the demands of the sport, e.g., strength, speed, agility & stamina. Then, you analyze the athlete on the same characteristics. Finally, you do a comparative analysis between the sports demands and the athlete, and the result is a precise needs analysis of what you need to focus on in the athlete's training.
In the PMNA the “sport” is the lifestyle in focus and the demands were taken from the COM-B model (Michie et al., 2011), which was specifically developed to serve as a logical foundation for interventions.

The participants completed the PMNA self-evaluation between the first and the second meeting. After a reflection whether some determinant might need special attention, the coach was encouraged to use the following BCTs (Figure 2), after which the process continued as per Figure 1. The exact definitions of each BCT can be found on the electronic supplementary material of BCT taxonomy v1 (Michie et al., 2013).



Figure 2. PrioMed Needs Analysis. Behavior Change Techniques (BCT) from Michie et al. (2013).

Participants survey instruments included demographic questions, PMLMVS (Appendix A) and PMNA questionnaires (Appendix B), and Global Health (PROMIS-10) questionnaire, measuring overall mental and physical health.

The participants PROMIS-10 survey data were exported to HealthMeasures Scoring Service, which rescales the raw sum score into a standardized score (T-score) with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation (SD) of 10. Higher scores are indicative of a healthier patient. These data were exported to SPSS version 29 for analysis. The normality was verified using Shapiro–Wilk test and the baseline and the follow-up survey responses were compared using paired sample t-test and Cohen's d, using the sample standard deviation of the mean difference as the denominator.

Results

Participants' ages ranged from 33 to 75 years (*M* = 61.92 *SD* = 10.81) with body mass index ranging from 20.92 to 40.27 (*M* = 28.67 *SD* = 4.80), 76% identified as female, 72% married or partnered, 48% reported being retired or not working, and 92% had post-secondary or higher education. In follow-up surveys, participants showed statistically significant improvements over baseline. At baseline participants T-scores were 45.51 (*SD* = 5.59) on PROMIS-10 Physical Health Scale and 50,20 (*SD* = 6.91) on Mental Health Scale. T-scores improved an average of 5.72 (*SD* = 4.36 95 *CI* 3.92 to 7.51, *p* = <.001,) points on Physical Scale and 4.43 (*SD* = 5.31 95 *CI* 2.24 to 6.62, *p* = <.001) points on Mental Scale. Effect sizes were large (*d* = 1.31 and *d* = 0.83 respectively).

Most utilized BCTs were Goal setting (behavior) with 100 % of the participants, Goal setting (outcome) with 88 %, Self-monitoring of behavior with 68 %, Social reward with 64 %, Review behavior goal(s) with 60 %, Comparative imagining of future outcomes with 60 %, and Action planning with 56 %. The other BCTs were used with less than 50 % of the subjects, which was to be expected given the nature and the relatively short duration of the intervention.

Discussion

The PROMIS-10 results of the participants seem promising, and the large effect sizes suggest an improvement in self-reported health with likely clinical significance.

Previous research (J. Hämäläinen, unpublished data, 2024) has shown that the coaching experience was well received. The program experience survey (n = 19) reflected considerable satisfaction with the experience: To the question “In your perception, did you receive encouragement and support from your coach to achieve your goals?” 100 % (n = 19) replied “Yes” and 0 % replied “No”. To the question: “In your perception, were the coaching methods suitable for you personally?” 94 % (n = 18) replied “Yes” and 5 % (n = 1) “No”. Particularly the holistic lifestyle medicine approach was praised. This was perhaps best reflected by the statement of one participant, who felt that for the first time ever the focus was on something that was important to her personally, and after that, everything else just seemed to fall into place.

Previous research (J. Hämäläinen, unpublished data, 2024) has also shown that the coaches felt the training was intensive and theoretical and could have benefitted from more practical training. After the training they estimated their skills as modest (2–3 on the Likert scale [1 = No skills, 2 = Some skills, 3 = Can not specify, 4 = Good skills, 5 = Excellent skills]). After the intervention they estimated their skills as good (4 on the Licker scale).

The combined experience of the coaches and the participants speaks for the feasibility and effect of the method itself. Despite the lack of confidence of the coaches after the initial training the participants were highly satisfies and the results seem promising. However, implementing more practical training would likely result in better confidence of the coaches, which in turn might influence the participants results favorably.

Our study has some limitations. The sample size was small and drawn from a pool of people likely already interested in their health, limiting the generalizability of our results. The absence of a control group constrained us from conclusively associating the observed effects with the coaching intervention.

The biggest strength of our study lies in the definition of the coaching process. We do not suggest that this approach would be the only appropriate method of health coaching. Yet, this approach addresses a major weakness in all health coaching studies that we know of, which is the ambiguous definition of the coaching method. Defining the coaching methodology in the universal and unequivocal terminology of BCTs creates a clearly defined process, which can be taught effectively and seems to yield promising results in a relatively short timeframe.

Our study provides one possible answer to a dire need: How to support people in making healthy lifestyle changes; how to implement lifestyle medicine and health coaching in practice and in a way that is clearly defined, replicable, and offers further opportunities to draw evidence-based conclusions for further improvement of the method. We hope that this result paves the way for a clear definition of health coaching, which would help remove one significant barrier to its widespread adoption. However, more research is needed to verify these preliminary findings and perhaps to streamline the process even further.

The Authors declares that there is no conflict of interest.

References

Ashton L.M., Sharkey T., Whatnall M. C., Haslam R. L., Bezzina A., Aguiar E. J., Collins C. E., & Hutchesson M. J. (2020). Which behaviour change techniques within interventions to prevent weight gain and/or initiate weight loss improve adiposity outcomes in young adults? A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Obesity Reviews, 21(6), e13009. https://doi.org/10.1111/obr.13009

Carraça E., Encantado J., Battista F., Beaulieu K., Blundell J., Busetto L., van Baak M., Dicker D., Ermolao A., Farpour-Lambert N., Pramono A., Woodward E., Bellicha A., & Oppert J.-M. (2021). Effective behavior change techniques to promote physical activity in adults with overweight or obesity: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Obesity Reviews, 22(Suppl 4), e13258. https://doi.org/10.1111/obr.13258

IHME, Global Burden of Disease Study (2019) – processed by Our World in Data: https://ourworldindata.org/grapher/number-of-deaths-by-risk-factor

Guerreiro M., Strawbridge J., Miguel Cavaco A., Brito Félix I., Moreira Marques M., & Cadogan C. (2021). Development of a European competency framework for health and other professionals to support behaviour change in persons self-managing chronic disease. BMC Medical Education, 20;21(1):287. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-021-02720-w

Hale R. & Giese J. (2017). Cost-Effectiveness of Health Coaching: An Integrative Review. Professional Case Management, 22(5), 228-238. https://doi.org/10.1097/NCM.0000000000000223

Kivelä K., Elo S., Kyngäs H., & Kääriäinen M. (2014). The effects of health coaching on adult patients with chronic diseases: a systematic review. Patient Education and Counseling, 97(2), 147-57. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2014.07.026

Lippman D., Stump M., Veazey E., Tanigawa Guimarães S., Rosenfeld R., Kelly J. H., Ornish D., & Katz D. L. (2024). Foundations of Lifestyle Medicine and its Evolution. Mayo Clinic Proceedings: Innovations, Quality & Outcomes, 8(1), 97–111. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mayocpiqo.2023.11.004

Mendes Sieczkowska S., Padilha de Lima A., Swinton P. A., Dolan E., Roschel H., & Gualano B. (2021). Health Coaching Strategies for Weight Loss: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Advances in Nutrition, 12(4), 1449-1460. https://doi.org/10.1093/advances/nmaa159

Michie S., van Stralen M. M., & West R. (2011). The behaviour change wheel: a new method for characterising and designing behaviour change interventions. Implementation Science, 6, 42. https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-6-42

Michie S., Richardson M., Johnston M., Abraham C., Francis J., Hardeman W., Eccles M. P., Cane J., & Wood C. E. (2013). The behavior change technique taxonomy (v1) of 93

hierarchically clustered techniques: building an international consensus for the reporting of behavior change interventions. Annals of Behavioral Medicine, 46(1), 81–95. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12160-013-9486-6

Pirbaglou M., Katz J., Motamed M., Pludwinski S., Walker K., Ritvo P. (2018) Personal Health Coaching as a Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus Self-Management Strategy: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. American Journal of Health Promotion. 32(7), 1613-1626. https://doi.org/10.1177/0890117118758234

Samdal G. B., Eide G. E., Barth T, Williams G., & Meland E. (2017). Effective behaviour change techniques for physical activity and healthy eating in overweight and obese adults; systematic review and me-ta-regression analyses. International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity 14(1), 42. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12966-017-0494-y

Sherifali D, Viscardi V, Bai J-W., & Ali M. U. (2016) Evaluating the Effect of a Diabetes Health Coach in Individuals with Type 2 Diabetes. Canadian Journal of Diabetes, 40(1), 84-94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcjd.2015.10.006

Wolever R. Q., Simmons L. A., Sforzo G. A., Dill D., Kaye M., Bechard E. M., Southard M. E., Kennedy M., Vosloo J., & Yang N. (2013). A Systematic Review of the Literature on Health and Wellness Coaching: Defining a Key Behavioral intervention in Healthcare. Global Advances in Health and Medicine, 2(4):38-57. https://doi.org/10.7453/gahmj.2013.04

World Health Organization. (2024). Noncommunicable diseases: Mortality. The Global Health Observatory. https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/themes/topics/topic-details/GHO/ncd-mortality

Appendix A

(NOTE: The questionnaires used in the study were in Finnish language, here an English translation is presented.)

PrioMed Lifestyle Medicine Vital Signs Questionnaire

Please evaluate every statement on a scale of 0–10, where 0 means *I strongly disagree* and 10 means *I strongly agree*.

I strongly disagree										I strongly Agree
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

1. In my perception, my eating habits promote my well-being and health.
2. In my perception, my physical activity levels are adequate for promoting my well-being and health.
3. In my perception, I get adequate amounts of good quality sleep to promote my well-being and health.
4. In my perception, my mental strain (feeling of stress) is on a level that does not hinder my well-being or health.
5. In my perception, if or when I use substances (such as alcohol or tobacco), my use is on a level that does not hinder my well-being or health.

6. In my perception, my social relationships are rewarding and promote my well-being and health.

(Perception = the way in which something is regarded, understood, or interpreted.

Almost the same as I believe...)

Appendix B

(NOTE: The questionnaires used in the study were in Finnish language, here an English translation is presented.)

Example of PrioMed Needs Analysis Questionnaire (Nutrition)

Please evaluate every statement on a scale of 0–10, where 0 means *I strongly disagree* and 10 means *I strongly agree*.

I strongly disagree										I strongly Agree
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

NUTRITION

1. I know well which eating habits best promote my health. In addition, I possess the practical skills necessary to prepare healthy meals and maintain eating habits that enhance my well-being.

2. I know how to make healthier nutritional choices, and I have the resources to maintain these healthier choices even in challenging conditions and situations.

3. I am well-informed about the health effects of nutrition. I have contemplated the importance of nutrition and its impact on my health and well-being. I am also motivated to find ways to eat more healthily.

4. I have established behaviors or routines that I naturally follow in my daily life, which help me make healthy nutrition choices.

5. My life situation and physical environment enable the consumption of healthy food. For instance, I have time to prepare healthy meals, and healthy options are available where I usually eat or purchase my food.

6. My social environment, such as family members, friends, or colleagues, values the importance of healthy nutrition and supports my efforts to eat more healthily.