



Social Support Reciprocity and Persistence in Community Exercise Programs

Dr. Eleanor Mae Harrington

Senior Research Fellow in Social and Community Psychology
Department of Social Behaviour and Community Well-Being
Westbridge Institute for Behavioural Research
Bristol, United Kingdom

Article Type: Methodological Research Article

Submitted: 03-April-2024

Revised: 03-May-2024

Accepted: 04-June-2024

Published: 11-June-2024

Abstract: Persistence in community exercise programs depends on more than individual motivation and physical capability. Social relationships developed through repeated participation may also influence whether participants continue attending over time. Although social support is widely associated with physical activity and exercise adherence, comparatively less attention has been given to the reciprocal nature of supportive relationships. Social support reciprocity refers to the perceived balance between giving and receiving meaningful support within a group. This concept differs from simply having support available or receiving assistance from others. The present methodological research article proposes a structured framework for examining how perceived social support reciprocity may relate to persistence in community exercise programs. The framework draws on social support theory, social exchange theory, self-determination theory, social identity perspectives, group cohesion research, and the broader exercise-adherence literature. Five main constructs are included: perceived social support reciprocity, perceived belonging, peer encouragement, baseline exercise motivation, and exercise persistence. The proposed methodology separates support received from support provided and focuses on mutuality, fairness, relational value, and willingness to reciprocate. Exercise persistence is treated as a longitudinal behavioral outcome. It should preferably be assessed using attendance frequency, number of completed sessions, retention duration, continuation status, and relevant psychological indicators of commitment. The framework also proposes perceived belonging as a potential mediator and identifies individual-level and program-level characteristics as possible moderators or control variables. For future empirical validation, the framework recommends prospective and longitudinal study designs, validated measures,

factor-analytic assessment, multivariable regression, mediation and moderation analysis, mixed-effects modeling, and survival analysis. No original participant data or empirical effect estimates are reported in the present study. The main contribution of this article is the development of a transparent and reproducible methodological framework for testing whether reciprocal social support contributes to sustained participation in community exercise programs beyond general support availability and baseline exercise motivation.

Keywords: Social Support Reciprocity; Exercise Persistence; Community Exercise Programs; Social Support; Perceived Belonging; Peer Encouragement; Self-Determination Theory; Social Exchange Theory; Exercise Adherence; Longitudinal Research.

1. Introduction

Background

Regular physical activity plays an important role in health-related behavior, yet maintaining participation over time continues to be a major challenge. Starting an exercise program does not always lead to sustained attendance. Participants often begin with strong interest but later reduce or stop participation because of competing responsibilities, low enjoyment, perceived difficulty, weak social connection, reduced confidence, or changes in motivation. Exercise persistence therefore involves more than beginning physical activity. It requires continued engagement across repeated opportunities to participate.

Community exercise programs provide a useful setting for studying persistence because participation takes place within a social environment. Walking groups, recreational fitness classes, community sports sessions, group exercise programs, outdoor activity groups, and neighborhood-based initiatives bring people together repeatedly. Over time, participants often develop interpersonal relationships alongside their physical activity goals. These relationships influence feelings of belonging, encouragement, accountability, competence, and commitment to continued participation.

Social support has long been an important concept in health and behavioral research. Support within recurring community groups, though, is not always one-directional. Participants often move between the roles of receiving and providing support. One person might receive encouragement during one session and offer encouragement during another. A participant might ask for practical advice from a peer and later help the same peer remain engaged.

Through these repeated exchanges, social support becomes part of the social structure of group participation rather than a resource received from others.

Reciprocity therefore deserves greater attention when examining social relationships in community exercise settings. Perceived reciprocity refers to whether participants experience their relationships as involving a meaningful balance between giving and receiving support. This balance does not require equal contributions. Different forms of support often carry value, including emotional encouragement, practical help, information sharing, companionship, recognition, and continued participation.

Social exchange perspectives provide one theoretical basis for understanding these relationships. People often evaluate social interactions through expectations, rewards, costs, obligations, and perceptions of fairness. Community exercise relationships, though, extend beyond simple exchange. Participants often gain relational value through companionship, shared identity, mutual recognition, and belonging. For this reason, social exchange perspectives are best considered alongside motivational and identity-based approaches.

Self-determination theory provides another relevant perspective. Deci and Ryan emphasize autonomy, competence, and relatedness as important psychological needs associated with motivation and continued behavior. Within community exercise programs, supportive relationships are especially relevant to relatedness. They also contribute to feelings of competence and support continued voluntary participation.

Social identity theory adds a broader group-level perspective. When participants begin to identify with an exercise group, continued participation becomes connected with a valued sense of group membership. Exercise then represents more than a health-related activity. It also becomes part of how participants understand their social identity and their place within the group.

The present study brings these perspectives together to examine social support reciprocity as a social-psychological factor associated with persistence in community exercise programs. The focus is narrower than general social support. The central issue is whether perceived mutuality in supportive relationships holds particular relevance for sustained participation.

Problem Statement

Although social support has received considerable attention in physical activity research, several conceptual issues remain.

First, social support is often treated as a broad construct without clearly separating support received from participation in reciprocal support relationships. A participant who receives encouragement from others experiences a different social situation from someone who both receives support and contributes meaningful support to other group members.

Second, persistence in community exercise is often approached mainly as an individual motivational outcome. Such an approach risks overlooking the social processes involved in continued participation. Attendance is also shaped by whether participants feel recognized, useful, connected, expected, and socially embedded within the program.

Third, reciprocity is multidimensional. Emotional support, practical help, companionship, information sharing, and encouragement do not always occur at equal levels. Treating reciprocity as a simple numerical balance risks oversimplifying the complexity of social relationships within community exercise groups.

Fourth, reciprocal support is not always experienced positively. Strong expectations to return support might create pressure for participants with greater support needs or lower physical capacity. Some individuals might experience feelings of obligation or indebtedness rather than genuine mutual support. A useful framework should therefore distinguish supportive reciprocity from unwanted social pressure.

The central problem addressed by this study is:

How may perceived reciprocity in social support relationships contribute to persistence within community exercise programs?

Research Motivation

The motivation for this study comes from the need to understand exercise persistence as a socially embedded behavioral process. Participants do not experience community exercise programs in isolation. They take part alongside other people, and repeated interactions often become part of the reasons they continue participating.

Reciprocal support relationships create several potentially reinforcing experiences. Receiving encouragement often strengthens confidence, while providing encouragement strengthens a participant's sense of usefulness and group membership. Repeated supportive interactions also increase familiarity and belonging. These experiences help make participation socially meaningful even when individual motivation changes over time.

The study is also motivated by the distinction between support availability and support reciprocity. Knowing that support is available provides one form of social security. Seeing

oneself as an active contributor to the group's supportive environment introduces a different form of relational involvement. This distinction is important for understanding participant retention in community exercise programs and for examining how social relationships contribute to continued participation.

2. Literature Review

Social Support and Physical Activity Behaviour

Social support has been widely studied as an important factor associated with physical activity and exercise participation. It can take several forms, including emotional encouragement, companionship, practical help, informational guidance, and social reinforcement. Its influence often depends on who provides the support, the type of activity involved, the needs of the individual, and the broader social setting in which the activity takes place.

Bauman et al. (2012) identified social and environmental influences among the many factors associated with physical activity. Their review showed that physical activity is shaped by multiple levels of influence and should not be understood only in terms of individual motivation.

The importance of social support is also visible in intervention research. Kahn et al. (2002) reviewed community-based strategies designed to increase physical activity and highlighted the value of interpersonal and organizational approaches. Their findings support the view that physical activity promotion often depends on social structures as well as individual-level information.

Maintaining physical activity is especially challenging because starting exercise and continuing exercise are different behavioral processes. A person may begin exercising because of a specific goal but continue because the activity becomes part of daily routines, relationships, and social expectations. This distinction makes community-based exercise programs useful settings for studying persistence.

Reciprocity and Social Exchange

Reciprocity is a central idea in research on social relationships. Gouldner's classic formulation of the norm of reciprocity proposed that people are generally expected to respond positively when they receive beneficial actions from others. Later social exchange

perspectives developed this idea further by focusing on perceived rewards, costs, fairness, trust, commitment, and mutual dependence.

Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005) reviewed social exchange theory and emphasized that exchange relationships involve more than immediate transactions. Over time, social exchanges can create obligations, trust, commitment, and relational expectations. These processes are relevant to community exercise groups because repeated participation gives supportive relationships time to develop.

Reciprocity should still be interpreted with care. Reciprocal support does not mean that each participant must give and receive exactly the same amount of assistance. People differ in their needs, abilities, experience, and circumstances. A balanced relationship may therefore involve different but complementary forms of support rather than strict equality.

Within community exercise settings, reciprocity may appear in several ways. One participant may encourage another to attend a session, while the other provides companionship during a difficult activity. Someone may share useful information with a new participant and later receive motivation or practical help in return. These exchanges may still be experienced as mutually supportive even when the type of support differs.

Relatedness, Motivation, and Persistence

Self-determination theory provides another useful explanation for persistence. Deci and Ryan (2000) argued that autonomous motivation is supported by the psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Ryan and Deci (2000) also emphasized the importance of social environments in shaping more self-determined forms of motivation.

Relatedness is especially relevant in community exercise programs. Participants who feel socially connected may experience exercise as part of a meaningful interpersonal setting rather than as an isolated task. Supportive interactions may also strengthen competence by providing encouragement, feedback, and recognition.

Wilson et al. (2002) examined exercise motivation from a self-determination theory perspective and demonstrated the relevance of psychological needs and motivational regulation to physical activity. Edmunds, Ntoumanis, and Duda (2006) similarly examined motivational processes in exercise and highlighted the importance of need-supportive environments.

These findings provide a theoretical basis for proposing that social support reciprocity may influence persistence indirectly. Reciprocal relationships may strengthen relatedness and

perceived competence, which in turn may support more autonomous motivation. In the present paper, this pathway is treated as a theoretical proposition rather than an established causal finding.

Social Identity and Group-Based Participation

Social identity theory offers another explanation for why people may continue participating in community exercise programs. Ellemers, Spears, and Doosje (2002) described social identity as an important part of self-definition and group processes. Hogg et al. (2004) also emphasized the role of social identity in self-conception, group functioning, and social relationships.

When participants develop a meaningful identity connected with an exercise group, attendance may become linked with maintaining group membership. The group can provide recognition, continuity, and a sense of social connection, while regular participation can strengthen belonging. This process may be especially important in stable programs where participants meet one another repeatedly.

Jetten et al. (2012) introduced the broader social cure perspective, which emphasizes the potential contribution of group membership and social identity to health and well-being. Community exercise should not automatically be described as a social cure, but this perspective provides a useful basis for examining how group membership may support continued behavioral engagement.

Group Exercise and Social Connectedness

Research on group-based exercise also shows that social interaction can play an important role in continued participation. Estabrooks and Carron (1999) examined social influence and exercise behavior and demonstrated the relevance of group processes within physical activity settings.

Burke et al. (2006) reviewed social influence in physical activity and highlighted several pathways through which the social environment may operate, including modeling, support, social norms, and interpersonal relationships. This literature suggests that social processes may influence both decisions to participate and the maintenance of participation over time.

Carron, Hausenblas, and Mack (1996) provided an influential framework for understanding group dynamics in exercise settings, with particular attention to cohesion as a possible influence on exercise adherence. Cohesion and reciprocity are different concepts, but they may interact because repeated mutual support may strengthen feelings of group connection.

Spink and Carron (1992) also examined the relationship between group cohesion and adherence in exercise settings. Their work contributed to the wider evidence suggesting that group-level processes can shape persistence in physical activity. Later research has continued to examine social interaction, group dynamics, and adherence within exercise environments.

Social Support, Belonging, and Community Participation

Belonging is another important concept for understanding persistence. Baumeister and Leary (1995) argued that forming and maintaining interpersonal bonds represents a fundamental human motivation. Although their framework was not developed specifically for exercise, it helps explain why repeated social interaction may become meaningful within community programs.

In community exercise settings, belonging may develop through regular attendance, recognition by others, shared routines, informal conversations, and mutual encouragement. Reciprocity may strengthen this process because participants are not simply receiving a service. They also contribute to the social environment around them.

This distinction has practical relevance. Programs focused only on exercise instruction may provide fewer opportunities for interpersonal contribution than programs that encourage meaningful interaction among participants. Still, social interaction does not always lead to positive outcomes. Exclusion, status differences, conflict, and excessive competition may weaken belonging and reduce the value of supportive relationships.

Exercise Adherence and Behavioral Maintenance

Exercise adherence is influenced by many factors, including motivation, self-efficacy, enjoyment, accessibility, program structure, previous experience, and social support. Dishman (2001) emphasized that maintaining exercise behavior is a complex process involving multiple psychological and environmental influences.

Williams et al. (2007) demonstrated the importance of autonomous motivation and perceived competence for sustained physical activity. These findings support the broader idea that social environments may influence persistence by shaping psychological experiences linked with continued motivation.

Kinnaefick, Thøgersen-Ntoumani, and Duda (2014) examined physical activity maintenance through self-determination theory and showed that social contextual factors can contribute to autonomous motivation and continued behavior. Their work provides an important connection between motivational theory and the social environment of exercise participation.

Taken together, the literature suggests that social support should be examined alongside motivational and group-based processes rather than as an isolated factor. The present study extends this perspective by focusing specifically on the reciprocal nature of supportive relationships and their possible relevance to persistence in community exercise programs.

3. Research Gap

The literature establishes important relationships among social support, exercise motivation, group cohesion, social identity, and the maintenance of physical activity. Despite this foundation, the specific role of social support reciprocity in sustaining participation in community exercise programs has received comparatively limited attention.

Most research on social support focuses on the amount of support people receive or the extent to which support is available. This approach may overlook the psychological value associated with providing support to others. Receiving encouragement and offering encouragement can serve different functions, and the combination of both may be especially relevant in community settings where participants interact repeatedly over time.

A second gap concerns the difference between interpersonal support and a broader sense of group belonging. A participant may have a supportive relationship with one or two individuals without feeling integrated into the wider exercise group. Reciprocal support may help connect individual relationships with broader group participation by creating repeated patterns of mutual contribution and social involvement.

A third gap relates to the mechanisms through which reciprocity may influence persistence. Possible pathways include relatedness, perceived usefulness, social accountability, self-efficacy, group identification, and perceptions of fairness. These mechanisms have often been examined separately across different areas of research, but they have received less integrated attention within the context of community exercise programs.

The present research therefore addresses the following gap:

There is a need for a focused social-psychological framework explaining how reciprocal support relationships may contribute to sustained participation in community exercise programs.

4. Novelty / Proposed Contribution

The main novelty of this study lies in the development of a methodological framework that treats social support reciprocity as a distinct construct rather than simply as an extension of general social support. The framework separates support received, support provided,

perceived mutuality, perceived fairness, and willingness to reciprocate. This provides a clearer basis for examining how reciprocal social relationships may relate to persistence in community exercise programs.

A second contribution is the development of a structured measurement framework that distinguishes social support reciprocity from perceived belonging, peer encouragement, baseline exercise motivation, and exercise persistence. This distinction is important because these constructs may be related while still representing different psychological and behavioral processes. The proposed framework therefore supports clearer operational definitions and provides a basis for later assessment of reliability, construct validity, and predictive validity.

The study also contributes by proposing a prospective and longitudinal research design for future empirical testing. Rather than depending only on cross-sectional associations, the framework recommends measuring reciprocity and related psychosocial variables at baseline and then assessing persistence through attendance, retention duration, completed sessions, and continuation status. This structure provides a stronger basis for examining whether earlier experiences of reciprocal support are associated with later persistence.

Another contribution is the specification of a mediation and moderation architecture. Perceived belonging is proposed as a potential mediator through which reciprocal support may relate to persistence. Baseline motivation, group cohesion, program type, accessibility, participant characteristics, and perceived fairness of reciprocal expectations are identified as potential moderators or control variables. This structure supports analysis of both the mechanisms through which reciprocity may matter and the conditions under which its role may differ.

The study further proposes a reproducible empirical-validation protocol. The framework includes recommendations for validated measurement, a priori sample-size justification, exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis, reliability assessment, multivariable regression, mediation and moderation analysis, longitudinal mixed-effects modeling, survival analysis, transparent statistical reporting, and appropriate ethical procedures. These elements provide a structured basis for independent replication and empirical testing across different community exercise settings.

Overall, the proposed contribution is methodological rather than empirical. The study does not report observed effect sizes or population-level relationships. Its novelty lies in presenting a theoretically grounded, operationally clear, and empirically testable framework for

examining whether and how reciprocal social support is associated with sustained participation in community exercise programs.

5. Research Objectives / Research Questions

The primary objective of this study is to examine the conceptual relationship between social support reciprocity and persistence in community exercise programs. The study also considers the social and motivational processes through which reciprocal support relationships may relate to continued participation.

Research Objectives

- To examine the conceptual relationship between perceived social support reciprocity and persistence in community exercise programs.
- To explore how receiving and providing support may work together in supporting continued participation.
- To examine perceived belonging as a theoretically relevant pathway linking reciprocal support with persistence.
- To assess peer encouragement as a complementary social influence on continued exercise participation.
- To develop a clear analytical framework for future empirical research on reciprocal support and exercise persistence.

Research Questions

- How should perceived social support reciprocity be conceptualized and measured within community exercise programs?
- What role may perceived belonging play in the relationship between social support reciprocity and exercise persistence?
- How may peer encouragement contribute to the relationship between reciprocal support and continued participation in community exercise programs?
- How should exercise persistence be defined and measured when examining its prospective relationship with perceived social support reciprocity?
- What methodological and analytical procedures are needed to empirically validate the proposed relationships among social support reciprocity, perceived belonging, peer encouragement, baseline exercise motivation, and exercise persistence?

6. Methodology

Research Design

The present study adopts a methodological research design focused on developing a structured analytical framework for examining social support reciprocity and persistence in community exercise programs. The approach draws on established perspectives from social support research, social exchange theory, self-determination theory, social identity theory, group cohesion research, and the exercise-adherence literature.

The aim is not to estimate population-level effects or report findings from a completed participant study. Instead, the study provides a transparent procedure for defining, measuring, and empirically testing the relationship between reciprocal support and sustained participation in community exercise settings.

The methodological framework is organized around five main constructs: perceived social support reciprocity, perceived belonging, peer encouragement, baseline exercise motivation, and exercise persistence. These constructs were selected because previous research identifies them as relevant to socially embedded participation and behavioral maintenance.

Construct Development

Perceived social support reciprocity is defined as the perceived mutuality involved in giving and receiving meaningful social support within a community exercise group. This construct differs from general social support because a participant may receive substantial support without experiencing the relationship as reciprocal.

The proposed construct includes several dimensions:

- support received from other participants
- support provided to other participants
- perceived balance or mutuality of supportive exchange
- perceived fairness of the exchange
- willingness to provide support in the future
- perceived relational value of the supportive relationship

Perceived belonging refers to a participant's sense of acceptance, recognition, connection, and membership within the exercise group.

Peer encouragement refers to interpersonal reinforcement from fellow participants through motivational communication, recognition, reassurance, and encouragement to continue participating.

Baseline exercise motivation refers to the participant's existing motivation toward exercise before considering the additional influence of reciprocal social relationships.

Exercise persistence is defined as continued participation over time rather than initial enrollment or occasional attendance.

Measurement Framework

The proposed framework recommends measuring support received and support provided separately before developing an overall measure of reciprocity. This approach avoids treating different forms of social support as a single broad construct.

A future empirical instrument should include separate item groups assessing support availability, received support, provided support, mutuality, fairness, belonging, peer encouragement, autonomous motivation, and exercise persistence.

Where feasible, persistence should be assessed using both psychological and behavioral indicators. Psychological measures may include intention to continue and perceived commitment to the program. Behavioral indicators should include attendance frequency, number of completed sessions, duration of program membership, temporary lapses, and retention status.

Objective attendance records are preferable where available because they provide behavioral evidence that complements self-reported persistence.

Proposed Sampling Framework

Future empirical validation should recruit participants from organized community exercise programs involving repeated group participation. Suitable settings may include walking groups, recreational exercise classes, community fitness programs, outdoor activity groups, and other structured physical-activity programs where participants interact regularly.

Eligibility criteria should be defined before recruitment. Participants should have sufficient exposure to the program to form meaningful judgments about supportive relationships within the group. Researchers should therefore establish a minimum number of attended sessions or a minimum period of participation before inclusion in the primary analysis.

The sample should also include participants with different levels of program experience. Including both newer and longer-term participants would help determine whether reciprocal support develops differently across stages of participation.

Sample size should be determined through an a priori power analysis based on the main statistical model, expected number of predictors, anticipated effect size, significance level, and desired statistical power.

Proposed Data Collection Procedure

Future empirical studies should use a prospective or longitudinal design where feasible.

At baseline, participants should complete measures of perceived social support reciprocity, belonging, peer encouragement, autonomous motivation, group identification, and relevant demographic and program-related characteristics.

Attendance behavior should then be monitored over a predefined follow-up period. The timing of follow-up assessments should reflect the duration and structure of the exercise program.

Repeated measurement should examine whether reciprocity, belonging, motivation, and group identification change as participants spend more time in the program.

At least three measurement occasions would be preferable for examining change over time: an initial assessment, an intermediate assessment, and an end-of-follow-up assessment.

Proposed Analytical Framework

Analysis should begin with an assessment of data quality, including missing-data patterns, response distributions, outliers, and consistency checks.

Internal consistency should be assessed separately for each multi-item construct. If a new reciprocity scale is developed, exploratory factor analysis should first examine its dimensional structure. Confirmatory factor analysis should then test whether support received, support provided, mutuality, fairness, and belonging represent empirically distinct dimensions.

Descriptive statistics should summarize participant characteristics and the main study variables.

Bivariate correlations may be used to examine preliminary relationships among reciprocity, belonging, peer encouragement, motivation, and persistence.

Multiple regression analysis may then test whether perceived social support reciprocity is associated with later persistence after accounting for baseline motivation and other theoretically relevant covariates.

Mediation Analysis

The framework identifies perceived belonging as a potential mediator of the relationship between social support reciprocity and persistence.

The proposed pathway is:

Reciprocity → Belonging → Persistence

This pathway reflects the theoretical proposition that reciprocal support may contribute to persistence by helping participants feel more recognized, connected, and socially embedded within the exercise group.

Indirect effects should be evaluated using bootstrap confidence intervals rather than relying only on conventional significance testing.

Moderation Analysis

The relationship between reciprocity and persistence may vary across individuals and program settings.

Potential moderators include:

- baseline exercise motivation
- length of program membership
- activity type
- group size
- perceived group cohesion
- physical limitations
- accessibility
- perceived fairness of reciprocal expectations
- program competitiveness

Moderation analysis would help determine whether reciprocity has similar relevance across different exercise settings or whether its association with persistence depends on specific personal or contextual conditions.

Longitudinal Analysis

If repeated measurements are available, linear mixed-effects models should be considered because observations would be nested within participants over time.

These models would allow researchers to examine whether changes in perceived reciprocity within the same individual are associated with changes in belonging, motivation, or participation.

For retention outcomes, survival analysis may be more appropriate than ordinary regression. Time-to-event models could examine the relationship between reciprocal support and the likelihood or timing of program discontinuation.

Evaluation Criteria

The proposed methodological framework should be evaluated using six criteria.

- **Construct validity:** Whether social support reciprocity can be empirically distinguished from general social support, belonging, and peer encouragement.
- **Reliability:** Whether the proposed measures demonstrate acceptable internal consistency and stability.
- **Predictive validity:** Whether reciprocity contributes to explaining later exercise persistence.
- **Incremental validity:** Whether reciprocity explains additional variation in persistence beyond baseline motivation, general social support, and program characteristics.
- **Temporal validity:** Whether earlier reciprocity is associated with later persistence rather than only with concurrent participation.
- **Reproducibility:** Whether sampling procedures, measurement definitions, data-processing decisions, statistical models, and reporting practices are documented clearly enough for independent replication.

Statistical Reporting

Future empirical studies should report unstandardized and standardized regression coefficients where appropriate, confidence intervals, effect sizes, exact sample sizes, missing-data procedures, model assumptions, and relevant diagnostic statistics.

Statistical significance should not be interpreted on its own. Researchers should also consider the magnitude, precision, theoretical importance, and practical relevance of observed associations.

Where several models are tested, confirmatory analyses should be clearly separated from exploratory analyses. Primary hypotheses and analytical decisions should be specified before outcome data are examined wherever feasible.

Ethical Considerations

The present methodological article does not report original human-participant data. No participant recruitment, intervention, behavioral tracking, or collection of identifiable personal information was conducted for this study.

Any future empirical validation involving community exercise participants should obtain appropriate institutional ethics approval where required. Participants should receive clear

information about the study purpose, voluntary participation, confidentiality, data use, and their right to withdraw.

Attendance records should only be linked with psychological questionnaire data where appropriate consent and data-protection procedures are in place.

Methodological Transparency

The framework deliberately separates theoretical development from empirical validation. No numerical relationship among social support reciprocity, belonging, peer encouragement, motivation, or exercise persistence is presented as an observed effect in the current study.

The proposed analytical procedures provide a reproducible foundation for future empirical research. Any subsequent study should report participant characteristics, sampling procedures, measurement instruments, reliability estimates, statistical assumptions, analytical decisions, and uncertainty estimates in enough detail to support independent evaluation and replication.

7. Results

The present methodological study does not report empirical participant outcomes or simulation-based effect estimates. Instead, the Results section presents the main methodological outputs developed through the proposed framework for examining social support reciprocity and persistence in community exercise programs. The framework defines the constructs to be measured, their proposed relationships, the temporal structure of assessment, and the statistical procedures required for future empirical validation.

The methodological development identified five principal constructs: perceived social support reciprocity, perceived belonging, peer encouragement, baseline exercise motivation, and exercise persistence. These constructs were retained as separate analytical components because each represents a different aspect of the social and motivational processes that may contribute to continued participation in community exercise programs.

Construct Differentiation

The first methodological outcome concerns the distinction between general social support and social support reciprocity. Social support reciprocity is defined as more than the availability or receipt of assistance. It refers to the perceived mutuality involved in supportive exchanges within the exercise group.

The proposed construct includes several related but distinct dimensions: support received, support provided, perceived mutuality, perceived fairness, willingness to provide future

support, and the relational value attached to supportive interactions. This multidimensional approach avoids reducing reciprocity to a simple numerical comparison between support given and support received.

Perceived belonging was retained as a separate construct because feeling accepted and connected within an exercise group differs conceptually from exchanging support. A participant may both give and receive support without developing a strong sense of group membership. Similarly, someone may feel a strong sense of belonging even when direct supportive exchanges are limited.

Peer encouragement was also treated separately from reciprocity. Encouragement reflects positive interpersonal reinforcement, such as reassurance, recognition, or motivation. Reciprocity refers to the broader perception that supportive relationships involve meaningful mutual contribution. Frequent encouragement alone therefore does not necessarily represent a reciprocal relationship.

Baseline exercise motivation was included as an independent control construct because continued participation may partly reflect motivational characteristics that existed before, or operate separately from, supportive group relationships.

Proposed Measurement Structure

The methodological analysis produced a measurement framework in which social support reciprocity should be assessed through separate indicators of support received and support provided before broader perceptions of mutuality and fairness are considered.

Table 1. Proposed Measurement Framework for Empirical Validation

Construct	Proposed Measurement Domain	Principal Analytical Role
Social Support Reciprocity	Support received, support provided, mutuality, fairness, willingness to reciprocate	Primary explanatory construct
Perceived Belonging	Acceptance, recognition, social connection, group membership	Potential mediator
Peer Encouragement	Motivational reinforcement, reassurance, recognition of progress	Complementary social predictor
Baseline Exercise Motivation	Autonomous motivation and pre-existing commitment to exercise	Control variable
Exercise Persistence	Attendance, retention duration, completed sessions, continuation status	Primary outcome

The framework therefore separates relational exchange, group belonging, interpersonal encouragement, individual motivation, and behavioral persistence rather than combining them into one broad social-support measure.

Exercise persistence was also identified as a multidimensional outcome. Intention to continue provides useful psychological information, but behavioral indicators such as attendance frequency, completed sessions, retention duration, and continuation status offer stronger evidence of persistence. For this reason, the proposed methodology gives priority to objective attendance or retention records where available.

Proposed Temporal Structure

A prospective design was identified as the preferred structure for future empirical research because persistence develops over time. Measuring social support reciprocity and exercise persistence at the same time would make temporal ordering difficult to establish.

The proposed design therefore separates baseline predictors from later persistence outcomes. Social support reciprocity, perceived belonging, peer encouragement, and baseline motivation should ideally be measured during an initial assessment. Attendance and retention should then be monitored over a predefined follow-up period.

Where resources permit, psychological measures should also be repeated across multiple time points. This structure would allow researchers to examine whether reciprocity changes during participation and whether those changes are associated with later changes in belonging, motivation, or attendance.

Proposed Moderation Structure

The framework also suggests that the relationship between reciprocity and persistence may differ across participants and program settings.

Potential moderators include baseline motivation, program duration, group size, activity type, perceived group cohesion, accessibility, physical limitations, perceived fairness of reciprocal expectations, and competitive intensity.

For example, reciprocal support may hold greater relevance in highly interactive programs where participants meet regularly and have repeated opportunities to support one another. Its role may be weaker in programs involving limited interaction or highly individualized participation.

Similarly, strong expectations to return support may reduce the positive value of reciprocity when participants experience the relationship as an obligation rather than as voluntary mutual support.

Proposed Analytical Sequence

The methodological development produced a sequential strategy for future empirical analysis.

First, data quality should be assessed by examining missing values, response distributions, outliers, and inconsistent records.

Second, the measurement properties of the proposed reciprocity construct should be evaluated. If new items are developed, exploratory factor analysis should first be used to examine the underlying dimensional structure. Confirmatory factor analysis should then test the proposed structure using an independent sample or a suitably separated validation dataset. Third, reliability should be assessed separately for social support reciprocity, perceived belonging, peer encouragement, motivation, and any other multi-item constructs.

Fourth, descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations should be used to summarize the main study variables and examine preliminary relationships.

Fifth, multivariable regression should test whether reciprocity is associated with later persistence after accounting for baseline motivation and relevant participant or program characteristics.

Sixth, mediation and moderation analyses should examine the proposed mechanisms and conditional relationships.

Finally, longitudinal mixed-effects models or survival analysis should be applied where repeated observations or time-to-discontinuation data are available.

Methodological Findings

The methodological analysis produced five principal findings.

- First, social support reciprocity should be measured separately from general social support. Receiving support alone does not fully capture the mutual nature of supportive relationships within community exercise programs.
- Second, exercise persistence should preferably be measured behaviorally and longitudinally. Attendance frequency, completed sessions, duration of participation, and retention provide stronger indicators of persistence than intention alone.

- Third, perceived belonging represents a theoretically distinct mechanism through which reciprocal support may relate to continued participation.
- Fourth, baseline motivation and program characteristics should be included as competing explanatory factors. Without accounting for these variables, an observed relationship between reciprocity and persistence may partly reflect existing motivational differences or structural features of the exercise program.
- Fifth, temporal ordering is essential for stronger inference. Measuring reciprocity before later persistence provides a stronger methodological test than assessing both constructs at the same point in time.

Interpretation of Results

The present Results section should therefore be understood as reporting the outcomes of methodological development rather than empirical behavioral findings. No participant-level effect sizes, regression coefficients, significance tests, persistence means, or prevalence estimates are reported.

The contribution of the study lies in developing a theoretically grounded and empirically testable methodology that distinguishes support received from reciprocal support exchange, incorporates perceived belonging and peer encouragement, accounts for baseline exercise motivation, and defines persistence through longitudinal behavioral indicators.

The proposed framework provides a structured foundation for future empirical research in community exercise settings. Its usefulness should ultimately be evaluated through prospective studies using validated measures, appropriate sample-size justification, objective participation records, suitable ethical procedures, and transparent statistical analysis.

8. Discussion / Critical Discussion

Methodological Interpretation

The main contribution of the present study lies in defining social support reciprocity as a construct that should be examined separately from general social support. Research on exercise participation often focuses on the availability or receipt of support. In contrast, the framework developed here treats reciprocity as a multidimensional process involving support received, support provided, perceived mutuality, fairness, willingness to reciprocate, and the relational value of supportive exchanges.

This distinction is important because receiving encouragement or assistance does not always mean that a participant experiences the relationship as reciprocal. One participant may

receive substantial support but still feel socially peripheral within the group. Another may experience a stronger sense of mutual involvement through smaller but meaningful exchanges. The proposed framework therefore focuses on how participants interpret the balance and quality of supportive relationships rather than relying only on the amount of support received.

The framework also separates perceived belonging, peer encouragement, baseline exercise motivation, and exercise persistence as analytically distinct constructs. Perceived belonging is treated as a potential psychological pathway through which reciprocal relationships may become relevant to continued participation. Peer encouragement represents interpersonal reinforcement, but it is not treated as equivalent to reciprocity. Baseline exercise motivation is retained as an important alternative explanation for continued engagement.

Keeping these constructs separate reduces the risk of combining related but conceptually different variables into one broad measure of social support. It also provides a stronger basis for future testing of construct validity and for examining how each factor relates independently to exercise persistence.

Another important methodological issue concerns how persistence is measured. The proposed framework does not treat intention to continue exercising as equivalent to sustained participation. Instead, persistence should preferably be assessed through longitudinal behavioral indicators such as attendance frequency, completed sessions, retention duration, and continuation status. Psychological indicators may still provide useful supporting information.

This approach creates a clearer distinction between motivation to continue and actual behavioral maintenance. It also provides a stronger basis for evaluating whether participants remain engaged in community exercise programs over time.

Comparison with Previous Studies and Theoretical Perspectives

The proposed framework is consistent with research showing that physical activity is influenced by both personal and social factors. Bauman et al. (2012) identified social and environmental influences as important determinants of physical activity behavior, supporting the view that exercise participation should not be explained only through individual motivation.

The present framework builds on this position by focusing specifically on reciprocity as a relational process. It proposes a structured method for examining whether mutual supportive

exchange is associated with persistence beyond general support availability and existing motivation.

The framework also aligns with self-determination theory. Deci and Ryan (2000) identified autonomy, competence, and relatedness as central psychological needs, while Ryan and Deci (2000) emphasized the importance of social environments in supporting self-determined motivation.

Reciprocal support may be particularly relevant to relatedness because participants experience themselves as both recipients and contributors within the group. Providing encouragement or practical help may also strengthen feelings of competence and social usefulness. The present study therefore treats reciprocity as a possible social process through which need-supportive experiences develop, while recognizing that these relationships still require empirical testing.

The framework is also consistent with research on exercise groups and social identity. Estabrooks and Carron (1999) demonstrated the importance of group-based social influence in exercise settings, while Carron and colleagues emphasized the role of cohesion in continued participation.

Social identity perspectives also suggest that group membership becomes more meaningful when participants include group affiliation within their sense of self. The present framework differs by focusing specifically on reciprocal supportive exchange rather than treating reciprocity, cohesion, belonging, and identity as interchangeable concepts.

This distinction creates a more differentiated analytical structure. Reciprocity may contribute to belonging or group identification, but it is treated as conceptually separate from both.

Implications for Future Empirical Validation

Future empirical research should avoid assuming that stronger reciprocity always leads to greater exercise persistence. Reciprocal support may become less beneficial when participants feel pressured to return assistance in equal measure or when people with greater physical, social, or practical needs feel unable to contribute in return.

Perceived fairness is therefore likely to play an important role. Reciprocity should be understood as meaningful mutual contribution rather than strict equality in the amount or type of support exchanged.

The quality and context of supportive interactions should also be considered. Frequent but superficial exchanges may have different consequences from fewer but more meaningful interactions. Program structure may further shape these relationships.

Competitive exercise environments, recreational walking groups, cooperative fitness classes, and community activity programs may provide different opportunities for trust, belonging, social contribution, and peer encouragement. Future studies should therefore examine whether the relationship between reciprocity and persistence differs according to program type, group size, competitive intensity, accessibility, and stage of participation.

Alternative explanations also need careful consideration. Participants with stronger baseline motivation may be more likely both to continue exercising and to develop reciprocal relationships. This creates the possibility of selection effects.

Continued attendance may also create more opportunities for supportive exchange, meaning the relationship between reciprocity and persistence may operate in both directions. Longitudinal research is therefore important for establishing temporal ordering.

Future studies should measure reciprocity and related psychosocial variables at baseline, monitor attendance and retention over time, and apply suitable multivariable, mediation, moderation, mixed-effects, or survival-based analyses. This approach would provide a stronger basis for examining whether social support reciprocity contributes independently to exercise persistence and through which psychological or contextual processes this relationship develops.

9. Research Contribution / Implications

The main theoretical contribution of this paper is the distinction between social support received **and** social support exchanged. This distinction provides a clearer way to understand why some participants continue attending community exercise programs even when their individual motivation changes over time.

The proposed framework suggests that reciprocal support may influence persistence through several related processes. Receiving support may strengthen perceived competence and make participation feel socially easier. Providing support may increase a participant's sense of usefulness and investment in the group. Together, these experiences may strengthen belonging and support continued attendance.

The framework also contributes by linking social exchange theory with self-determination theory. Social exchange theory emphasizes mutuality, trust, and perceptions of fairness, while

self-determination theory focuses on psychological needs and autonomous motivation. Social support reciprocity may therefore represent a process through which these perspectives interact within community exercise settings.

A further contribution relates to program design. Community exercise programs may benefit from creating opportunities for participants to contribute socially rather than treating them only as recipients of instruction or assistance. At the same time, reciprocity should not become a fixed expectation. Programs should remain accessible to participants with different abilities, needs, and levels of experience.

The following implications emerge from the conceptual analysis:

- **Social relationship design:** Community exercise programs should create opportunities for participants to communicate, encourage one another, and recognize progress.
- **Belonging:** Programs should consider whether participants experience genuine inclusion rather than simple physical presence within the same setting.
- **Participant contribution:** Opportunities to provide encouragement or practical help may strengthen participants' sense of membership and involvement.
- **Measurement:** Future research should distinguish support received, support provided, and perceived reciprocity rather than combining them into a single broad support measure.
- **Retention monitoring:** Exercise persistence should preferably be assessed using objective attendance or retention records alongside psychological measures.
- **Equity:** Reciprocal support should not create disproportionate social expectations for participants who require greater assistance or have fewer opportunities to provide support in return.

10. Conclusion

Persistence in community exercise programs is best understood as a socially embedded behavioral process rather than an outcome shaped only by individual motivation. The methodological framework developed in this study treats social support reciprocity as a construct that differs from general support availability or support received. Reciprocity includes support given, support received, perceived mutuality, perceived fairness, and the relational value attached to supportive exchanges within the exercise group.

The framework also emphasizes that exercise persistence should be assessed prospectively and, where possible, through behavioral indicators rather than intention alone. Attendance

frequency, completed sessions, retention duration, and continuation status provide more direct evidence of sustained participation. These indicators may be supported by psychological measures of commitment. This approach helps future studies distinguish actual behavioral maintenance from temporary motivation or stated intention.

Perceived belonging is proposed as an important pathway through which reciprocal support may relate to persistence. Peer encouragement, baseline exercise motivation, group cohesion, program characteristics, accessibility, and other contextual factors should also be considered as complementary predictors, moderators, or covariates. This structure recognizes that reciprocal support may influence continued participation through several processes and that its relevance may differ across participants and exercise settings.

The study therefore provides a theoretically grounded and empirically testable methodological framework for examining the role of reciprocal social relationships in community exercise persistence. No empirical effect sizes or causal relationships are claimed in the present article. Future validation should use well-designed prospective or longitudinal studies, validated measures, objective participation records, appropriate sample-size justification, and reproducible statistical procedures. Such research is needed to determine whether social support reciprocity makes an independent contribution to sustained participation and under which psychological and program conditions this relationship is strongest.

11. Limitations

The main limitation of the present study is the absence of original empirical participant data. The proposed framework is methodological and has not yet been tested using observed data from community exercise programs. As a result, the study does not establish the magnitude, statistical significance, predictive strength, or causal direction of the proposed relationships among social support reciprocity, perceived belonging, peer encouragement, baseline exercise motivation, and exercise persistence.

A second limitation concerns the conceptual complexity of social support reciprocity. Reciprocal support may involve emotional, informational, practical, companionship-based, and motivational forms of exchange. These dimensions may operate differently across participants and exercise settings. Treating reciprocity as a single composite score may therefore hide meaningful differences in the type, quality, direction, and perceived fairness of

supportive interactions. Future empirical research should examine whether reciprocity is better represented as a single construct or as a multidimensional structure.

A third limitation relates to the measurement of exercise persistence. Attendance frequency, completed sessions, retention duration, temporary lapses, continuation status, and intention to remain enrolled represent related but distinct indicators. No single measure fully captures sustained participation. Future studies should define the primary persistence outcome before data collection and, where feasible, combine objective behavioral records with psychological measures of commitment and intention to continue.

A fourth limitation concerns differences across community exercise settings. Programs vary in activity type, leadership style, group size, competitiveness, accessibility, duration, frequency of interaction, participant composition, and opportunities for social exchange. These contextual differences may shape both the development of reciprocal relationships and the importance of reciprocity for continued participation. Findings from one type of program should therefore not be assumed to apply automatically to all community exercise settings.

A fifth limitation is that reciprocity may produce both supportive and burdensome experiences. Mutual exchange may strengthen belonging, relational investment, and perceived usefulness. At the same time, strong expectations to reciprocate may create pressure, indebtedness, or reduced autonomy, especially for participants with greater physical, social, or practical support needs. Future studies should therefore assess perceived fairness and voluntary mutuality rather than assuming that higher reciprocity is always beneficial.

A sixth limitation concerns possible confounding and selection effects. Participants with stronger baseline motivation, greater self-efficacy, higher social confidence, or more positive previous exercise experiences may be more likely both to remain in a program and to develop reciprocal relationships. Participants who attend more frequently also have more opportunities to exchange support, which creates the possibility of reverse or bidirectional relationships. Prospective and longitudinal designs are therefore needed to establish temporal ordering and to separate the contribution of reciprocity from existing motivational and behavioral differences.

Finally, the proposed measurement and analytical procedures require empirical validation before firm methodological conclusions are drawn. The reliability, factor structure, construct validity, incremental validity, predictive validity, and temporal stability of the proposed reciprocity measures still need to be established. Future research should test these properties

using appropriately powered samples, validated comparison measures, objective participation indicators, and transparent statistical procedures across a range of community exercise settings.

12. Future Work

Future research should first focus on developing or validating measures designed specifically to assess perceived reciprocity within exercise groups. These measures should distinguish support received, support provided, perceived balance, perceived fairness, and willingness to provide support in the future.

Second, longitudinal studies should examine whether reciprocal support is associated with later attendance after accounting for baseline motivation, self-efficacy, accessibility, program satisfaction, and previous exercise experience. This would provide a stronger basis for evaluating whether reciprocity contributes independently to persistence.

Third, future research should examine potential psychological pathways linking reciprocity with persistence. A suitable model could test whether reciprocity relates to continued participation through belonging, relatedness, perceived competence, group identification, or autonomous motivation. These relationships should be examined using real participant data and appropriate longitudinal methods.

Fourth, researchers should consider differences across program types. Walking groups, resistance-training classes, recreational sport programs, outdoor activity groups, and community fitness classes may create different patterns of social interaction. Comparing these settings would help identify the conditions under which reciprocity has greater relevance.

Fifth, future studies should distinguish quality of support from quantity of support. Several weak or superficial interactions may offer less relational value than a smaller number of meaningful reciprocal relationships.

Sixth, researchers should examine whether reciprocity functions differently across stages of participation. New participants may initially benefit more from receiving guidance and encouragement, while experienced participants may gain additional value from providing support to newer members.

Finally, future empirical studies should use transparent preregistration, clearly defined hypotheses, validated measures, objective behavioral indicators, appropriate sample-size justification, and reproducible statistical procedures. Where longitudinal data are available,

mixed-effects models or survival-based approaches may provide a stronger basis for examining persistence than simple cross-sectional correlations.

13. Declarations

Conflict of Interest

The author declares no known financial, professional, or personal conflicts of interest that may have influenced the development, interpretation, or presentation of this methodological research article.

Funding

No external funding was received for the preparation of this methodological study.

Ethics Statement

The present article develops a methodological framework and does not report original data collected from human participants, clinical populations, or identifiable individuals. No participant recruitment, intervention, behavioral observation, or collection of personally identifiable information was conducted as part of this study. Therefore, human-participant ethics approval and informed consent were not required for the work reported in this manuscript.

Any future empirical study based on the proposed framework should obtain appropriate institutional ethics approval, where required, before participant recruitment and data collection. Such studies should also ensure informed consent, confidentiality, voluntary participation, appropriate data protection, and participants' right to withdraw in accordance with relevant institutional and legal requirements.

Data Availability

No empirical participant dataset was generated or analyzed for the present methodological article. The study develops a theoretical measurement and analytical framework intended for future empirical validation. Therefore, no participant-level dataset is associated with the current manuscript.

Any future empirical application of the proposed framework should report data-management procedures transparently. Where ethically and legally appropriate, de-identified data, analysis code, and supporting materials should be made available in line with the policies of the target journal and relevant institution.

Author Contribution

The author was responsible for developing the methodological framework, integrating the relevant theoretical literature, specifying the proposed measurement and analytical procedures, critically interpreting the framework, and preparing the manuscript.

References

1. Baert, H., Gorus, E., Mets, T., Geerts, C., & Bautmans, I. (2011). Motivators and barriers for physical activity in the oldest old: A systematic review. *Ageing Research Reviews*, 10(4), 464–474. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arr.2011.04.001>
2. Bauman, A. E., Reis, R. S., Sallis, J. F., Wells, J. C., Loos, R. J. F., & Martin, B. W. (2012). Correlates of physical activity: Why are some people physically active and others not? *The Lancet*, 380(9838), 258–271. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(12\)60735-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60735-1)
3. Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (2005). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 131(4), 497–529. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.131.4.497>
4. Burke, S. M., Carron, A. V., Eys, M. A., Ntoumanis, N., & Estabrooks, P. A. (2006). Group versus individual approach? A meta-analysis of the effectiveness of interventions to promote physical activity. *Sport and Exercise Psychology Review*, 2(1), 19–35.
5. Carron, A. V., Hausenblas, H. A., & Mack, D. (1996). Group dynamics in sport. *Fitness Information Technology*.
6. Carron, A. V., Brawley, L. R., & Widmeyer, W. N. (2002). The measurement of cohesion in sport groups. In T. S. Horn (Ed.), *Advances in sport psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 213–226). Human Kinetics.
7. Cohen, S. (2004). Social relationships and health. *American Psychologist*, 59(8), 676–684. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.59.8.676>
8. Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 98(2), 310–357. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.98.2.310>
9. Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 874–900. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279602>
10. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01

11. Dishman, R. K. (2001). The problem of exercise adherence: Fighting sloth in the real world. *Quest*, 53(2), 279–295.
12. Edmunds, J., Ntoumanis, N., & Duda, J. L. (2006). A test of self-determination theory in the exercise domain. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36(9), 2241–2265.
13. Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (2002). Self and social identity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 161–186. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135228>
14. Estabrooks, P. A., & Carron, A. V. (1999). The influence of the group with elderly exercisers. *Small Group Research*, 30(4), 438–452.
15. Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25(2), 161–178. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2092623>
16. Hagger, M. S., Chatzisarantis, N. L. D., & Harris, J. (2006). From psychological need satisfaction to intentional behavior: Testing a motivational sequence in two behavioral contexts. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32(2), 131–148.
17. Hagger, M. S., Chatzisarantis, N. L. D., Culverhouse, T., & Biddle, S. J. H. (2003). The processes by which perceived autonomy support in physical education promotes leisure-time physical activity intentions and behavior: A trans-contextual model. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95(4), 784–795.
18. Hagger, M. S., & Chatzisarantis, N. L. D. (2007). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in exercise and sport. *Human Kinetics*.
19. Hogg, M. A., Abrams, D., Otten, S., & Hinkle, S. (2004). The social identity perspective: Intergroup relations, self-conception, and small groups. *Small Group Research*, 35(3), 246–276.
20. Jetten, J., Haslam, C., & Haslam, S. A. (Eds.). (2012). *The social cure: Identity, health and well-being*. Psychology Press.
21. Kahn, E. B., Ramsey, L. T., Brownson, R. C., Heath, G. W., Howze, E. H., Powell, K. E., Stone, E. J., Rajab, M. W., & Corso, P. (2002). The effectiveness of interventions to increase physical activity: A systematic review. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 22(4 Suppl.), 73–107.
22. Kinnafick, F.-E., Thøgersen-Ntoumani, C., & Duda, J. L. (2014). Physical activity adoption to maintenance, lapses and relapse: The role of psychological needs, self-regulation and self-efficacy. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 15(3), 337–344.

23. McAuley, E., Blissmer, B., Katula, J., Duncan, T. E., & Mihalko, S. L. (2000). Exercise environment, self-efficacy, and affective responses to acute exercise. *Psychology & Health*, 15(4), 485–501.
24. McNeill, L. H., Kreuter, M. W., & Subramanian, S. V. (2006). Social environment and physical activity: A review of concepts and evidence. *Social Science & Medicine*, 63(4), 1011–1022.
25. Nicholson, M., & Hoyer, R. (Eds.). (2008). *Sport and social capital*. Butterworth-Heinemann.
26. Ntoumanis, N. (2001). A self-determination approach to the understanding of motivation in physical education. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 71(2), 225–242.
27. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68–78. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68>
28. Ryan, R. M., Patrick, H., Deci, E. L., & Williams, G. C. (2008). Facilitating health behaviour change and its maintenance: Interventions based on self-determination theory. *The European Health Psychologist*, 10(1), 2–5.
29. Smith, A. L. (2003). Peer relationships in physical activity contexts: A road less traveled in youth sport and exercise psychology research. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 4(1), 25–39.
30. Spink, K. S., & Carron, A. V. (1992). Group cohesion and adherence in exercise classes. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 14(1), 78–86.
31. Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (2001). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In M. A. Hogg & D. Abrams (Eds.), *Intergroup relations: Essential readings* (pp. 94–109). Psychology Press.
32. Williams, G. C., McGregor, H. A., Sharp, D., Levesque, C., Kouides, R. W., Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2006). Testing a self-determination theory intervention for motivating tobacco cessation: Supporting autonomy and competence in a clinical trial. *Health Psychology*, 25(1), 91–101.
33. Williams, G. C., McGregor, H. A., Zeldman, A., Freedman, Z. R., & Deci, E. L. (2004). Testing a self-determination theory process model for promoting glycemic control through diabetes self-management. *Health Psychology*, 23(1), 58–66.

34. Wilson, P. M., Rodgers, W. M., Blanchard, C. M., & Gessell, J. (2003). The relationship between psychological needs, self-determined motivation, exercise attitudes, and physical fitness. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 33(11), 2373–2392.
35. Wilson, P. M., Rodgers, W. M., Fraser, S. N., & Murray, T. C. (2004). Relationships between exercise regulations and motivational consequences in university students. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 75(1), 81–91.
36. Wilson, P. M., Rodgers, W. M., Loitz, C. C., & Scime, G. (2006). “It's who I am ... really!” The importance of integrated regulation in exercise contexts. *Journal of Applied Biobehavioral Research*, 11(2), 79–104.
37. Williams, D. M., Papandonatos, G. D., Napolitano, M. A., Lewis, B. A., Whiteley, J. A., & Marcus, B. H. (2006). Perceived susceptibility to disease, exercise motivation, and perceived barriers to physical activity. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 29(5), 435–444.
38. World Health Organization. (2010). Global recommendations on physical activity for health. World Health Organization.
39. World Health Organization. (2018). More active people for a healthier world: Global action plan on physical activity 2018–2030. World Health Organization.
40. World Health Organization. (2020). WHO guidelines on physical activity and sedentary behaviour. World Health Organization.