# Appendix 1 Overview of barriers and facilitators related to program implementation organised by the TICD framework

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Domain** | **(+ / - )** | **Code** | **Description** | |
| **1 Program factors** | **Any factors that relate to the intervention itself, its materials, evidence for the program. Also includes the compatibility of the program with regular tasks in terms of how well the program fits the setting and the feasibility to run the program the way it is designed; also includes factors related to the development of the program (how it has been developed and he extent to which stakeholders were involved in this process).** | | | |
| 1 Program factors | Barrier | Time (-) | Time constraints in preparing and/or delivering the program in the way the program is designed (session duration, group size), also includes reasons why time is hindering. | |
| 1 Program factors | Barrier | Manuals (-) | Barriers related to the program manuals (coach manual, participant workbook). Manual too detailed, the length, manual not appealing, not clear. | |
| 1 Program factors | Barrier | Training (-) | Barriers/gaps/insufficiencies in the training that coaches received. Also includes ideas to improve the training and the need to be able to train new coaches in the future. | |
| 1 Program factors | Barrier | Program content (-) | Relates to what is in the program, what is done at each session, and experienced as negative by the participants and/or coaches/clubs. Also includes the environment and atmosphere in which the sessions are delivered. Also includes ideas for program refinement/improvement regarding the content. | |
| 1 Program factors | Barrier | Program structure (-) | Difficulties, barriers and constraints that were experienced with the way the program and sessions are structured (12 weeks, weekly sessions of theory and PA session, the order of program components, certain components sooner/later, balance between theory and PA). Also includes ideas for improvement. | |
| 1 Program factors | Barrier | Issues with SitFIT (-) | Any difficulties, barriers and constraints related to the SitFITs (technical issues, issues with procedures, validity of the SitFIT, number of sitFITs received, issues with usability of the sitFIT) | |
| 1 Program factors | Barrier | Issues with MatchFIT (-) | Difficulties, barriers and constraints related to MatchFIT (content issues, fairness of the game, not being appealing, technical issues, issues with procedures, issues with usability) | |
| 1 Program factors | Barrier | Recruitment of men (-) | Difficulties regarding (future) recruitment of men. Also includes potential difficulties in keeping the recruitment as broad as possible or targeted to the intended group. | |
| 1 Program factors | Barrier | Club attraction (-) | The extent to which a club is not seen as attractive (professional football clubs) enough to successfully run the program and attract men. | |
| 1 Program factors | Facilitator | Manuals (+) | The extent to which the program manuals facilitate the implementation (manuals are clear, appealing, attractive, easy to use, detailed). Also includes suggestions on how to improve the manual to make it easier to use, offering electronic digital/tech workbooks and worksheets. | |
| 1 Program factors | Facilitator | Recruitment of men (+) | Strategies or factors or features that facilitate the recruitment of men (part of way the program is designed), such as using club brand, incentives, features of the program or the research that attracted men). Also includes ideas that potentially can work to recruit men for the program for future deliveries. | |
| 1 Program factors | Facilitator | Credibility (+) | The extent to which credibility, working with an university, doing scientific research facilitates the implementation. Building an evidence base legitimizes the program. Also includes the extent to which its effectiveness can be monitored in the future to facilitate implementation. Also includes quality monitoring and assurance that the program is effective, the importance of monitoring quality and assuring effects, and the extent to which demonstrating the effects is a facilitator for funding. Note: characteristics of the way in which quality is monitored in relation to a license can be coded as Central roll-out and administration. | |
| 1 Program factors | Facilitator | Program structure (+) | Positive experiences with the program structure and the extent to which the structure facilitates implementation (the way the program and sessions are structured, the order of activities, balance between theory and PA, the extent to which the program offers flexibility) | |
| 1 Program factors | Facilitator | Program content (+) | Relates to what is in the program, what is done at each session, and in what environment and atmosphere the session was delivered, that were experienced as positive by the participants and/or coaches/clubs | |
| 1 Program factors | Facilitator | Perceived effects (+) | Belief/visibility/experience that program has positive effects/impact | |
| 1 Program factors | Facilitator | Positive on SitFIT (+) | Positive experiences with the SitFIT, as part of the program, or any specific statements that the SitFIT facilitates program implementation | |
| 1 Program factors | Facilitator | Positive on MatchFIT (+) | Positive experiences related to MatchFIT | |
| 1 Program factors | Facilitator | Training (+) | The extent to which coach training facilitates program implementation. Training was adequate, good, sufficient. Coach training as (essential) part of how the implementation of the program was achieved in the club. | |
| 1 Program factors | Facilitator | Club attraction (+) | The use of the club brand and identity facilitates implementation (club logo, shirts, football players, access to special facilities, access to the club, being in the stadium). Also includes the extent to which the club attraction (professional football clubs) is needed to successfully run the program and attract men in the first place. The attraction of the club as success factor for program implementation. | |
| 1 Program factors | Facilitator | Flexibility and innovation (+) | The need and capacity to improve and innovate the program to keep the program alive and sustainable in the long run. The club doesn’t want to deliver the exact same program year on year. To keep it alive they want to innovate the program every year. Therefore the program needs to be changeable, not rigid. Also includes: flexibility to adapt the program to local club situation. | |
| **2 Club/coach factors** | **Any factors that relate to the knowledge, skills, and qualities of coaches that are needed to deliver the program as designed; any factors that relate to the motivation, beliefs, attitudes of clubs or coaches that influence the implementation of the program. Also includes club culture aspects (such as internal communication channels and factors that relate to “that is how we do things here in the club” )** | | | |
| 2 Club/coach factors | Barrier | Club commitment (-) | Little/no club commitment to community projects in general / to EuroFIT (club not really wanting the program), not really involved. Note: a lack of commitment can reflect in less use of the club brand, less club attraction, no club extras. Use this code when respondent clearly states that it concerns a lack of club commitment.  Note: there is an interplay between the codes “club commitment” “club ethos” and “organisational structure, policy and change”  You can use the code club commitment when it is about the club living up to their promises, to deliver the program regardless of infrastructures and ethos (a club can deliver the program without embracing corporate social responsibility values or without existing infrastructures). | |
| 2 Club/coach factors | Barrier | Organisation of sessions (-) | Barriers and difficulties regarding how clubs organise the sessions and how clubs/coaches decide to deliver the program (2 sessions subsequently, work in the evenings, daily work schedule and workload for coaches). Note: Code this one when it concerns the club/coach who decides on the organisation of sessions. Code ‘program structure’(domain 1) when it concerns barriers to the way the program and sessions are structured by design and recommended by the guidance and when it is not a specific club/coach planning factor. | |
| 2 Club/coach factors | Barrier | Liaising with club departments (-) | Difficulties and barriers to liaise with club departments to get things done (e.g. collaborate with media, communications, PR department) | |
| 2 Club/coach factors | Barrier | Using the club brand (-) | Difficulties and barriers in using the club brand as described in the manual (arranging club ambassador or (former) players, ordering club clothes). Didn't use the brand as much as could or should have. Use this code when it concerns difficulties to use club brand as described. Use the code “No club extras” when it concerns extras not described in the manual. | |
| 2 Club/coach factors | Barrier | Recruitment of clubs and coaches (-) | Barriers and difficulties related to the recruitment of clubs and coaches to deliver the program. Also includes how coaches were recruited in a negative way, assigned the task without the possibility of saying no. Note: only code when coaches, clubs or participants stated that this was negative. | |
| 2 Club/coach factors | Barrier | Club / coach expectations (-) | Expectations/beliefs/ideas of clubs or coaches about the program before delivery that hinder the implementation of the program (ideas what the program is and what time and tasks are needed). | |
| 2 Club/coach factors | Barrier | Coach qualities and engagement (-) | Barriers, difficulties related to the skills, knowledge, competence, qualities, enthusiasm, commitment, involvement, engagement of coaches needed to deliver the program. | |
| 2 Club/coach factors | Barrier | Facilities (-) | Difficulties/barriers relating to the availability of facilities that are needed to deliver the program (room classroom sessions, changing rooms, field and equipment for physical activity sessions), capacity constraints. Also difficulties in scheduling sessions because of no facilities available, security protocols, and dealing with competing events in the stadium. Also includes men continuing with PA session after the program leading to capacity problems. | |
| 2 Club/coach factors | Barrier | Insufficient fan base (-) | The extent to which having a small number of fans, as a club, is a limitation for future recruitment and implementation. (note: please this factor was mentioned as possible barrier for future implementation in other clubs. This was not experienced in the trial clubs). | |
| 2 Club/coach factors | Barrier | No club extras (-) | The extent to which there were no 'club extras' for the men. For example no extra foundation activities, vouchers, tickets, clothes, family days. No extra or follow-up activities for the participants during and after the program. Use this code when participants or coaches explicitly perceived this as negative.  Use the code “No club extras” when it concerns extras not described in the manual. Use the code “Using the club brand –“ when it concerns difficulties to use club brand as described in the manual. | |
| 2 Club/coach factors | Barrier | (Un)welcome environment (-) | The extent to which coaches don’t feel welcome in the club and facilities, and how this hinders implementation of the program. | |
| 2 Club/coach factors | Barrier | Club ethos (-) | The extent to which the club does not embrace the program, does not have a focus on social responsibility, men’s health. Also includes the extent to which the EuroFIT program is not in line with aims, strategy, and vision, internal values of the club. | |
| 2 Club/coach factors | Barrier | Relationship with fans (-) | The extent to which a club’s relationship with their fans may hinder implementation. Example: the players struggled to find out their role with the fans, and how a gap between the club and the fans had developed during the last few years, the fans did not feel very well informed by the clubs. This distance between club and fans could be a potential barrier for implementation. | |
| 2 Club/coach factors | Facilitator | Facilities (+) | Facilities are available, were easy to use, also includes specific access to club facilities or excellent/appealing facilities. | |
| 2 Club/coach factors | Facilitator | Club ethos (+) | The extent to which the club supports the program, has a focus on men’s health, social responsibility, sees the project as a new way to approach their fans, using club culture to facilitate delivery of program, the extent to which the EuroFIT program is in line with aims, strategy and vision of the club. Also includes the extent to which the solidness and stature of the club can facilitate the implementation of EuroFIT going forward.  The difference between Club Ethos and PR for club is about wanting EuroFIT because it fits their ethos and focus, and the experience that building positive relationships with fans is a positive side effect of the program and can act as incentive. | |
| 2 Club/coach factors | Facilitator | Coach qualities and engagement (+) | The extent to which coach qualities, skills, knowledge, enthusiasm, commitment, involvement, engagement, belief and background education facilitates a good implementation of the program. Also includes the way coaches of the same club had different roles during program delivery, complement each other and collaborated together in such a way that it facilitates implementation. Also includes the fit between coach and men. Also includes fun, coaches having fun during program delivery. | |
| 2 Club/coach factors | Facilitator | Club commitment (+) | Club commitment to community projects in general / to EuroFIT, (the club really wanting the program, wanting it to succeed, club is involved).  Note: there is an interplay between the codes “club commitment” “club ethos” and “organisational structure, policy and change”  You can use the code club commitment when it is about the club living up to their promises, to deliver the program regardless of infrastructures and ethos (a club can deliver the program without embracing corporate social responsibility values or without existing infrastructures). | |
| 2 Club/coach factors | Facilitator | Coach expectations (+) | Expectations/beliefs/ideas of clubs or coaches about the program before delivery that facilitate the implementation of the program (ideas what the program is and what time and tasks are needed). | |
| 2 Club/coach factors | Facilitator | Club extras (+) | The extent to which 'club extras' for the men facilitates implementation of the program, where gifts can be extra foundation activities, vouchers, tickets, clothes, family days. Offer extra or follow-up activities to the participants during and after the program. Also includes the willingness of the club to offer this to the men. Use this code when it concerns the perspective of the club. Use the code Willingness to participate in extensions (+) when it concerns the perspective of the men or coaches and clubs telling about what the men want. | |
| 2 Club/coach factors | Facilitator | Club rivalry (+) | Rivalry and competition between clubs to perform better in all fields facilitates the implementation of the program | |
| 2 Club/coach factors | Facilitator | Positive reception in clubs (+) | Positive talking about the project within the club | |
| 2 Club/coach factors | Facilitator | Liaising with other departments (+) | Facilitators related to liaising with other club departments and employees to get things done (e.g. collaborate with media, first team department, good internal working relations) | |
| 2 Club/coach factors | Facilitator | Recruitment of clubs and coaches (+) | Facilitators and strategies related to the recruitment of clubs and coaches to deliver the program. Also includes how coaches were recruited in a positive way, presented as an opportunity. Note: only code when coaches, clubs, participants stated that this was positive. | |
| 2 Club/coach factors | Facilitator | Organisation of sessions (+) | Facilitators relating to how clubs organise the sessions and how clubs/coaches decide to deliver the program (2 sessions subsequently, work in the evenings, daily work schedule and workload for coaches). Note: code when it concerns facilitators regarding the club/coach who decides on the organisation of sessions. Code ‘program structure’(domain 1) when it relates to the program as it was designed and recommended by the guidance and when it is not a specific club planning the sessions factor | |
| 2 Club/coach factors | Facilitator | Club delivery model (+) | Ideas and suggestions for delivery and implementation models in clubs (a sustainable business model, personnel, flexibility to fit club activities). Any statements about a delivery model in the individual club. Note: statements about licensing system or a national administration can be coded using “central roll out and administration” . | |
| 2 Club/coach factors | Facilitator | Wish to widen the program (+) | Wish to widen the program / broaden the scope (for women, families, youth, mental health, stress, smoking) as ideas for future implementation | |
| 2 Club/coach factors | Facilitator | Experience of delivering EuroFIT (+) | Experience of delivering EuroFIT facilitates in-trial delivery (delivering EuroFIT gets easier over time) and is a potential incentive for post-trial delivery. | |
| 2 Club/coach factors | Facilitator | Welcome environment (+) | The extent to which coaches feel welcome in club and facilities, and how this facilitates the implementation of the program. | |
| **3 Participant factors** | **Any factors that relate to the needs, preferences, or behaviour of participants regarding the intervention** | | | |
| 3 Participant factors | Barrier | Participant characteristics (-) | Attitudes, preferences, skills, beliefs, expectations and characteristics of the men which functions as barriers for delivery and implementation of the program. | |
| 3 Participant factors | Barrier | Group dynamics (-) | The extent to which tricky/difficult/negative group dynamics hinder the implementation of the program (dominant participants, monopolization of time) | |
| 3 Participant factors | Barrier | Engagement of participants (-) | Low engagement, involvement, commitment and duty, low enthusiasm, low attendance of the participants with the program. Reasons for low attendance. | |
| 3 Participant factors | Facilitator | Fan demand (+) | High demand / willingness to participate from fans, high rates of expressions of interest | |
| 3 Participant factors | Facilitator | Willingness to participate in extensions (+) | Men are willing to participate (or organise) EuroFIT continuation/extensions after the program. Also includes men willing to pay for extensions. Use this code when it concerns statements from the perspective of the participants. Use the code “Club extras +” when it concerns extra or follow up activities during and after the program from the perspective of the club (willingness of the club to offer this to the men). | |
| 3 Participant factors | Facilitator | Group identity and dynamics (+) | The extent to which positive group dynamics facilitate the implementation of the program (interaction, synergies, initiatives, care for each other, social support) | |
| 3 Participant factors | Facilitator | Engagement of participants (+) | Engagement, involvement, commitment and duty, enthusiasm, high attendance of the participants with the program | |
| 3 Participant factors | Facilitator | Participant characteristics (+) | Attitudes, preferences, skills, beliefs and characteristics of the men which functions as facilitators for delivering the program | |
| 3 Participant factors | Facilitator | Positive on program (+) | The extent to which participants experiences were positive about the program facilitates the implementation (they like the program, they like playing football (again), ~~they like the sitFIT,~~ they like personal approach). Also includes fun, participants having fun during program delivery. | |
| **4 Factors related to professional interaction / networks** | **Any factors that relate to influences and wider local, national or international networks of clubs and coaches, for instance: coaches influenced by professional organisations, professional networks, prevailing norms or opinions of colleagues, football league organisations, or amateur football clubs. Also includes local collaborations with other partner organisations, such as healthcare organisations or universities.** | | | |
| 4 Factors related to professional interaction / networks | Barrier | Lack of coordinating organisations (-) | Lack of (suitable) partner organisations who are willing or able to lead/coordinate a roll-out and future implementation of the program in clubs | |
| 4 Factors related to professional interaction / networks | Barrier | Lack of support from current partners (-) | The extent to which a lack of support from current partners hinders future implementation (example: club rep thinks current partners would not financially support program for overweight football fans, because there are other priority target groups) | |
| 4 Factors related to professional interaction / networks | Barrier | Competition with similar programs (-) | Any statement that references how EuroFIT will face competition with other health improvement initiatives, both within football and the broader field of professional sport. Any statements referring to similar program on the market (FFIT, EuroFIT, FanActive), competing with EuroFIT being implemented. | |
| 4 Factors related to professional interaction / networks | Barrier | Central roll out and administration (-) | Any negative statements or expected barriers regarding a potential licensing system or central roll-out strategy, telling that central system and administration would hinder the implementation of the program in clubs. Also includes the do-nots or negative characteristics of such a licensing system, central quality assurance, program package and PR. | |
| 4 Factors related to professional interaction / networks | Facilitator | University support (+) | Good support from researchers, technical support, expertise in content of sessions, phone contacts, empathy and flexibility of researchers. The extent to which partnership with /involvement of the university facilitates the implementation | |
| 4 Factors related to professional interaction / networks | Facilitator | Central roll out and administration (+) | Any positive statements on a potential licensing system or central roll-out strategy, telling that central system and administration would facilitate and speed up the implementation of the program in clubs. Also includes suggestions, characteristics, procedures or conditions of such a licensing system, central quality assurance, program package and PR. | |
| 4 Factors related to professional interaction / networks | Facilitator | Potential network of clubs / coaches (+) | A network of coaches either national or international to facilitate knowledge sharing | |
| 4 Factors related to professional interaction / networks | Facilitator | Potential collaboration (+) | Ideas for collaboration with (current) partner organisations to facilitate implementation of the program | |
| 4 Factors related to professional interaction / networks | Facilitator | Growth through reputation and ambassadors (+) | Hearing about EuroFIT from clubs who are already involved, ambassadors for the project, national and across Europe. | |
| **5 Resources and incentives** | **Any factors that relate to financial resources (funding) and human resources (such as the availability of or access to coaches) and any other resources needed to implement the program. Any factors related to financial and non financial incentives, also includes factors related to quality monitoring as incentive.** | | | |
| 5 Resources and incentives | Barrier | Insufficient financial resources (-) | | Insufficient financial resources for conducting EuroFIT project/and trial delivery at club; The extent to which the clubs’ finances act as a barrier for the future implementation of EuroFIT and difficulties to find (long term) funding for the program. Also includes difficulties with costs of the program. Also includes difficulties with regard to the money needed for management, administration, monitoring. |
| 5 Resources and incentives | Barrier | Trial restrictions (-) | | Being in a research trial poses restrictions to the implementation (for instance no local partnerships possible, less media). Also includes extra workload put upon club employees in regards to the trial. |
| 5 Resources and incentives | Barrier | HR resources (-) | | Insufficient and inadequate HR resources hindering the implementation. Difficulties, barriers regarding the availability of coaches to deliver the program in the future. Potential staffing issues. Also includes lack of coaches, instability within the coach team. Ideas for how to circumvent potential HR issues regarding implementation. |
| 5 Resources and incentives | Barrier | Stakeholder interest (-) | | The extent to which stakeholder interest conflicts with the implementation of EuroFIT. Partners, stakeholders, sponsors, community, municipality, policy makers, funders can have different perspectives on corporate social responsibility, on community work and the value of it, the value of EuroFIT. Also includes statements about what and why they would want to use EuroFIT for. Also includes competing interest, struggling with different values. |
| 5 Resources and incentives | Facilitator | PR for club (+) | | The extent to which the program provides opportunities and potential for clubs for PR, media exposure(positive club image, commercial and media opportunities), and building positive relationship with fans, ’giving something back to fans’ and the local community, getting to know fans in very personal way, building relationship between fans and stewards and club is an incentive and facilitator for implementation  Note: use the code “Club ethos” when EuroFIT fits the club aims, the club wants to focus on this new way to approach their fans. The difference between Club Ethos and PR for club is about wanting EuroFIT because it fits their ethos and focus, and the experience that building positive relationships with fans is a positive side effect of the program and can act as incentive. |
| 5 Resources and incentives | Facilitator | Financial resources (+) | | Internal and external financial resources available for conducting the project facilitates the implementation. Also includes the extent to which the payment is attractive. Also includes ideas and opportunities for finding financial resources for future implementation. |
| 5 Resources and incentives | Facilitator | Practical resources (+) | | Practical resources available facilitates the implementation, such as using existing databases of fans, targeting specific local fan base, using new apps. |
| 5 Resources and incentives | Facilitator | HR resources (+) | | Sufficient and adequate HR resources facilitates the implementation. Also includes access to pool of coaches, stability within the coach team, using student next to club based coach. Also sufficient time before start of the project to be able to arrange HR resources and appoint a coach is included. |
| 5 Resources and incentives | Facilitator | Stakeholder interest (+) | | The extent to which stakeholder interest complements with and facilitates the implementation of EuroFIT. Partners, stakeholders, sponsors, community, municipality, policy makers, funders can have complement or influencing perspectives on corporate social responsibility, on community work and the value of it, the value of EuroFIT. Also includes statements about what and why they would want to use EuroFIT for. Also includes using their influence to speed up the implementation of EuroFIT. |
| **6 Capacity for organisational change** | **Any factors that relate to the mandate, decision making, leadership, organisational regulations, organizational rules or policies, the priority to make a change.** | | | |
| 6 Capacity for organisational change | Barrier | Lack of organisational structure, policy and change (-) | | The extent to which organisational policy is unable/unwilling to change to implement EuroFIT, and how EuroFIT does not fit current club structure and policy. Also includes that no organisational structure exists at the club regarding community projects (no community department). Also includes the lack of continuity of projects (the come and go of projects, an “issues of today” attitude).  Organisational structures regarding community projects are non-existent or challenging for implementation (no community department, different executive boards controlling different parts of club operations). |
| 6 Capacity for organisational change | Barrier | Decision making (-) | | The extent to which the decision making (mandate, hierarchical structure, decision making process) was difficult and hindered the implementation. Also includes suggestions on how to improve the ‘sell’ of EuroFIT for future implementation. |
| 6 Capacity for organisational change | Barrier | Club leadership (-) | | Existing or new club leaders, management board, owners make take the club in a different direction that disrupts community work. |
| 6 Capacity for organisational change | Facilitator | (easy) decision making (+) | | The extent to which the decision making (mandate, hierarchical structure, decision making process) was easy and facilitated the implementation. Includes what clubs need to make this decision. |
| 6 Capacity for organisational change | Facilitator | Organisational structure, policy and change (+) | | The extent to which organisational policy fits and facilitates the implementation of EuroFIT, and how EuroFIT fits the current club structure. Also includes the extent to which the community department is well functioning and facilitating the implementation of EuroFIT. |
| 6 Capacity for organisational change | Facilitator | Capacity for innovation (+) | | To be able to innovate the program in the future, to have capacity (staff and competence and initiative) to be innovative. The need to improve and continuously innovate to keep the program alive, sustainable and to be competitive to the other clubs.  Note: different than the code in domain 1 (capacity for program innovation), this code focuses on the organization level. Even if the program is not rigid and allows changes and innovation, does the club have the right staff and competence to revise and be innovative each year. |
| **7 Social, geographical, political, legal factors** | **Factors that relate to the wider social and political environment, legislation, political decisions, macro budgets, corruption, influential stakeholders** | | | |
| 7 Social, political, legal factors | Barrier | Geographical distance (-) | | Scattered settlement in local area, long distance to venue |
| 7 Social, political, legal factors | Barrier | Does not fit with health agenda (-) | | The extent to which the focus and aims of the program does not fit with funding priorities and the health agenda. |
| 7 Social, political, legal factors | Barrier | Political access and influences (-) | | Difficulties and barriers related to political access and contacts at the Ministry to lobby and make a case for the program |
| 7 Social, political, legal factors | Barrier | Public health funding issues (-) | | Difficulties and barriers related to finding funding and for funding public health initiatives. Also includes agenda setting and opportunities for funding in the broader public health context. |
| 7 Social, political, legal factors | Barrier | Access to healthy food (-) | | Difficulties or (financial or geographical) barriers to obtain healthy food, for instance high prizes of healthy food, cheap junk food, nothing nearby where one can buy healthy food |
| 7 Social, political, legal factors | Facilitator | Fit with health agenda (+) | | The extent to which the focus and aims of the program fit with funding priorities and the (local or national) health agenda. |