**Report Supplementary Material 1** Intervention Fidelity

The Dreyfus Scale: Fidelity Measure Scoring Instructions

The six-point rating scale is based on the Dreyfus system for denoting skill and competence and is intended to measure the facilitator’s adherence to intervention behaviour change techniques (BCT) as designed, as well as the skill with which they are implemented (Dreyfus, 2004). The six point scale ranges from (0) where the facilitator hasn’t delivered the intervention BCT appropriately, whether it was delivered poorly or insufficiently (low fidelity) to (5) where the facilitator has delivered the BCT appropriately, sufficiently or with a high degree of skill (high fidelity). To help with the scoring of facilitators use of intervention BCTs, an outline of the key features of each BCT is provided. It should be noted that the giving a 5 (expert) should be reserved for facilitators who deliver BCTs exceptionally well, adapting for different contexts and often in the face of difficulties such as resistance from participants. In the instance that the facilitator experiences difficulties (resistance from participants etc) the facilitator should be assessed on their delivery of the BCT even if this fails to lead to a change in the participant’s behaviour, it should be the facilitators skill of delivery and interaction with the participant that should be assessed.

Scoring Facilitator Delivery Fidelity

When rating the facilitator’s skill at delivering a particular behaviour change technique, first identify if the key features of the item is evident. Then consider if the key features were used appropriately (misses few opportunities to deliver and when doing so, delivers them well). In this instance the facilitator should be rated highly. It should be noted that the scores produced from using this fidelity measure should follow a roughly normal distribution, with relatively few facilitators scoring at the extremes of the scales (low/high scores). However, this may be skewed by consistently good or poor delivery for a particular facilitator or intervention. For the purpose of the REACT study, a score of 3 or higher will indicate the facilitator has demonstrated competent delivery (in the view of the intervention designers).

Person Centred Delivery Style

Key features: Communication between the facilitator and participants should be participant centred, to encourage participants to be the main agent of change; maximising their autonomy and sense of intrinsic motivation. The facilitator should empower the participant to provide input and choose the ways in which they progress.

Delivery: Facilitators should use OARS (Open ended questioning, Affirmation, Reflective listening, Summaries). Open ended questions would involve the facilitator allowing the participants to express their feelings creatively, revealing participant thought process and points of reference. Affirmations or praise should be given for positive behaviours, recognising the participant’s efforts towards change, including change talk (commitment, desire, ability to change, reasons to change, or need to change) as well as their agency or autonomy in making any changes. Reflective listening would involve actively engaging with and reflecting on participant contributions. Facilitators should use this technique to direct further conversation or highlight key strengths and barriers previously discussed. Summaries can be used to reinforce participant choices and acknowledging participant effort or success. The Ask-Tell-Discuss technique may be used to enhance engagement when exchanging information. The communication style used by facilitators should be empathetic and facilitate participant enjoyment and should in no way be didactic.

*Table 1. Person Centred Delivery*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rating | Score | Example |
| 0 |  | Absence of person-centred delivery style. An overly ‘didactic’ style of interaction, which could result in participant resistance and or highly inappropriate delivery. |
| 1Novice |  | Minimal use of person-centred delivery style. An overly didactic style of interaction and or inappropriate delivery |
| 2Advanced Beginner |  | Some evidence of competence using person-centred delivery style (but these are infrequent), however, these may not be carried out to sufficient detail (missing features, e.g. reflexive listening or summaries). There are numerous problems or inconsistencies such as detached involvement or a facilitator who sometimes dominates the discussion. |
| 3Competent |  | Competent and appropriate use of person-centred delivery style, however some difficulties are evident (e.g. failing to summarise the discussion). Awareness of and ability to cope with different context and situations but some minor problems or inconsistencies. More engaged involvement from the facilitator. |
| 4Proficient |  | Numerous and appropriate usage of person-centred delivery style. Facilitator encouraging the participant to be actively involved and driving the discussion. The facilitator is able to discriminate between a variety of contexts and situations with minimal problems or inconsistencies. |
| 5Expert |  | Highly appropriate and sufficient use of person-centred delivery style. Facilitator encouraging the participant to be actively involved. Able to make more subtle, refined discriminations between situations and contexts and able to adjust accordingly. No problems or inconsistencies. |

Facilitating Enjoyment

Key features: Facilitators should focus on making the social interactions positive, supportive and enjoyable, rather than embarrassing and awkward.

Delivery: Facilitators should use OARS (Open ended questioning, Affirmation, Reflective listening, Summaries) to encourage engagement and interaction with the group. Open ended questions would involve the facilitator allowing the participants to express their feelings creatively, revealing participant thought process and points of reference. Affirmations or praise should be given for positive behaviours or ideas which increase enjoyment or lead to positive social interaction within the group. Reflective listening would involve actively engaging with participants’ “banter” and reflecting on positive participant contributions. Summaries can be used to reinforce participant choices and acknowledging participant effort or success. Facilitators should use the above techniques to encourage a sense of fun and positive social interactions. Facilitators should use their “fun detectors” to join in with and reinforce any positive, good-humoured or interesting interactions. However, they should also reflect on and try to block any discriminatory or demeaning interactions and should ensure that the session content is delivered (avoiding spending too much time on non-relevant content).

*Table 2. Facilitating Enjoyment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rating | Score | Example |
| 0Absence |  | Absence of focusing on participant enjoyment, no effort to make interactions positive or fun and/or highly inappropriate delivery |
| 1Novice |  | Minimal focus on participant enjoyment, minimal effort to make interactions positive or fun and or inappropriate delivery. |
| 2Advanced Beginner |  | Some evidence of competence and adapting appropriately to the context involved (but these are infrequent). Some focus on enhancing participant enjoyment, however, this may not be carried out in sufficiently or sustained and opportunities may be missed. There are numerous problems or inconsistencies such as detached involvement from the facilitator. |
| 3Competent |  | Competent and appropriate focus on participant enjoyment. Facilitating positive and fun interactions even if difficulties or awkwardness are evident. The facilitator is engaged and aware of and able to cope with different contexts and situations but some minor problems or inconsistencies (e.g. a change in mood going unnoticed by the facilitator).  |
| 4Proficient |  | Numerous appropriate examples of facilitating participant enjoyment through support of positive and fun interactions. Facilitator is able to discriminate between a variety of contexts and situations with minimal problems or inconsistencies. |
| 5Expert |  | Highly appropriate and sufficient facilitation of participant enjoyment, through support of positive and fun interactions. Facilitator is able to make more subtle refined discriminations between contexts and able to adjust accordingly. Minimal problems. Excellent features, no problems or inconsistencies. |

Monitoring progress – Acknowledge and Review of PA

Key features: Facilitators should discuss progress in the following areas (physical activity (PA) levels, perceived emotional benefits of PA, perceived physical benefits of PA, perceived social benefits of PA).

Facilitators should identify the most important points and create a comfortable platform on which the participant can discuss them. Where possible facilitators should acknowledge and appraise participant progress and give feedback in a positive, encouraging manner. Facilitators should encourage participants to start self-monitoring their own physical activity behaviours and any subsequent benefits they experience.

Delivery: The facilitator should use all opportunities to acknowledge and reinforce progress and successes with behaviour change. Facilitators should use OARS (Open ended questioning, Affirmation, Reflective listening, Summaries). Open ended questions would involve the facilitator allowing the participants to focus on their progress as they experience it. In doing so revealing participant thought processes and points of reference that drive the discussion. Affirmations or praise should be given for positive behaviours, recognising the participant’s efforts towards increasing physical activity levels (regardless of success), including change talk (commitment, desire, ability to change, reasons to change, or need to change) as well as their agency or autonomy in making any changes. Reflective listening would involve actively engaging with participants and reflecting on participant contributions. Facilitators should use this technique to direct further conversation or highlight key strengths and barriers previously discussed. Summaries can be used to reinforce participant choices and acknowledging participant effort or success. The Ask-Tell-Discuss technique may be used to enhance engagement when exchanging information.

Monitoring Progress – Acknowledge and Review

*Table 3. Monitoring Progress – Acknowledge and Review*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rating | Score | Example |
| 0Absence |  | Absence of discussion to monitor participant progress in physical activity behaviours and/or highly inappropriate performance |
| 1Novice |  | Minimal discussion to monitor participant progress in physical activity behaviours and/or inappropriate delivery |
| 2Advanced Beginner |  | Some evidence of competence when discussing participant progress in physical activity behaviours (but these are infrequent) and these may not be carried out to sufficient depth or detail. There are numerous problems and inconsistencies such as detached involvement or missed opportunities to deliver the behaviour change technique. |
| 3Competent |  | Competent and appropriate attempts to discuss monitoring participant progress in physical activity behaviours. The facilitator is engaged and aware of and able to cope with different context and situations but there some minor problems or inconsistencies (e.g. not covering all components of the behaviour change technique to sufficient depth or failing to summarise the discussion). |
| 4Proficient |  | Numerous appropriate discussions to monitor participant progress in physical activity behaviours, able to discriminate between a variety of contexts and situations with some minor problems or inconsistencies evident. |
| 5Expert |  | Highly appropriate and sufficient discussions monitoring participant progress in physical activity behaviours. Able to make more subtle refined discriminations between contexts and able to adjust accordingly. Minimal problems. |

Monitoring Progress – Eliciting Benefits of Physical Activity (PA)

Key features: Facilitators should discuss progress in the following areas (physical activity (PA) levels, perceived emotional benefits of PA, perceived physical benefits of PA, perceived social benefits of PA).

Facilitators should identify the most important points and create a comfortable platform on which the participant can discuss them. Where possible facilitators should acknowledge and appraise participant progress and give feedback in a positive, encouraging manner. Facilitators should encourage participants to start self-monitoring their own physical activity behaviours and any subsequent benefits they experience.

Delivery: The facilitator should use all opportunities to acknowledge and reinforce progress and successes with behaviour change. Facilitators should use OARS (Open ended questioning, Affirmation, Reflective listening, Summaries). Open ended questions would involve the facilitator allowing the participants to focus on their progress as they experience it. In doing so revealing participant thought processes and points of reference that drive the discussion. Affirmations or praise should be given for positive behaviours, recognising the participant’s efforts to increase levels of physical activity (regardless of success), including change talk (commitment, desire, ability to change, reasons to change, or need to change) as well as their agency or autonomy in making any changes. Reflective listening would involve actively engaging with participants and reflecting on participant contributions. Facilitators should use this technique to direct further conversation or highlight key strengths and barriers previously discussed. Summaries can be used to reinforce participant choices and acknowledging participant effort or success. The Ask-Tell-Discuss technique may be used to enhance engagement when exchanging information. Monitoring Progress - Eliciting Benefits of Physical Activity

*Table 4. Monitoring Progress - Eliciting benefits of Physical Activity*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rating | Score | Example |
| 0Absence |  | Absence of discussion to elicit and reinforce participant perceived benefits of physical activity and or highly inappropriate delivery |
| 1Novice |  | Minimal discussion to elicit and reinforce participant perceived benefits of physical activity and or inappropriate delivery. |
| 2Advance Beginner |  | Some evidence of competence when eliciting and reinforcing participant perceived benefits of physical activity and adapting delivery to context (but these are infrequent) and discussions may not be of sufficient depth or detail. There are numerous problems or inconsistencies such a detached involvement or missed opportunities. |
| 3Competent |  | Competent and appropriate attempts to discuss eliciting and reinforcing participant perceived benefits of physical activity. The facilitator is engaged, aware and able to cope with different context and situations. There are some minor problems or inconsistencies (E.g. not covering all components of the behaviour change technique to sufficient depth or failing to summarise the discussion ). |
| 4Proficient |  | Numerous appropriate discussions to elicit and reinforce participant perceived benefits of physical activity. The facilitator is able to discriminate between a variety of contexts and situations with minimal problems or inconsistencies. |
| 5Expert |  | Highly appropriate and sufficient discussions to elicit and reinforce perceived benefits of physical activity. The facilitator is able to make more subtle refined discriminations between situations and contexts and able to adjust accordingly. No problems or inconsistencies. |

Self-Monitoring

Key features: Facilitators should discuss participants self-monitoring of physical activity behaviours and self-reflection on their current progress and how this was achieved. Facilitators should discuss ways in which participants can self-monitor physical activity behaviour; e.g. use of pedometers and give them the relevant opportunities to discuss this.

Delivery: The facilitator should use all opportunities to acknowledge and reinforce participant attempts to self-monitor physical activity behaviour and subsequent progress they have made. Facilitators should use OARS (Open ended questioning, Affirmation, Reflective listening, Summaries). Open ended questions would involve the facilitator allowing the participants to focus on their self-monitoring behaviours and any progress they make as they experience it. In doing so revealing participant thought processes and points of reference that drive the discussion. Affirmations or praise should be given for participant self-monitoring as well as recognising the participant’s attempts or efforts to self-monitor (regardless of success), including change talk (commitment, desire, ability to change, reasons to change, or need to change) as well as their agency or autonomy in making any changes. Reflective listening would involve actively engaging with participants and reflecting on participant experiences of self-monitoring. Facilitators should use this technique to direct further conversation or highlight key strengths and barriers previously discussed. Summaries can be used to reinforce participant choices and acknowledging participant effort or success. The Ask-Tell-Discuss technique may be used to enhance engagement when exchanging information.

*Table 5. Self-monitoring*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rating | Score | Example |
| 0Absence |  | Absence of discussion on self - monitoring behaviours and participant reflection on progress and or highly inappropriate delivery. |
| 1Novice |  | Minimal discussion on self - monitoring behaviours and participant reflection on progress and or highly inappropriate delivery. |
| 2Advanced Beginner |  | Some evidence of competence and adapting appropriately to context involved (but these are infrequent) when discussing participant self - monitoring behaviours and participant reflection on progress. There are numerous problems and inconsistencies such as detached involvement or missed opportunities. |
| 3Competent |  | Competent and appropriate attempts to discuss self - monitoring behaviours and participant reflection on progress. The facilitator is engaged, aware and able to cope with different context and situations. There are however some minor problems or inconsistencies (e.g. not covering all components of the behaviour change technique to sufficient depth or failing to summarise the discussion).  |
| 4Proficient |  | Numerous appropriate discussions on self - monitoring behaviours and participant reflection on progress. The facilitator is able to discriminate between a variety of contexts and situations with minimal problems or inconsistencies. |
| 5Expert |  | Highly appropriate and sufficient discussions on self - monitoring behaviours and participant reflection on progress. The facilitator is able to make more subtle refined discriminations between situations and contexts and able to adjust accordingly. No problems or inconsistencies. |

Managing setbacks and Problem solving

Key features: The facilitator should work with the participant to review progress with all planned changes and with achieving the targets set out in the action plan. The facilitator should celebrate and reinforce and reflect on any successes achieved. The facilitator should encourage discussion of any setbacks and the patient’s plans should be revised accordingly. When setbacks occur, facilitators should reframe and normalise setbacks so rather than being viewed as failures they are opportunities for learning and development. When approaching problem solving facilitators should focus on breaking the problem down into achievable parts, and where appropriate considering the sustainability of any change, the ways in which others can be supportive as well as introducing the idea of using coping plans to avoid setbacks.

Delivery: The facilitator should reinforce any self-monitoring activity and any successes in behaviour change (by giving praise/ using Affirmation techniques). Reframing should be used to normalise setbacks and see them as an opportunity to learn from experience (trial and error) rather than as failures. The facilitator should use OARS (Open questions, Affirmation, Reflective listening, Summaries) when discussing managing setbacks and problem solving. Open ended questions would involve the facilitator allowing the participants to focus on their progress, any setbacks that have occurred or problems they have faced. In doing so revealing participant thought processes and points of reference that drive the discussion. Affirmations or praise should be given for positive behaviours, recognising the participant’s success as well as efforts towards change despite setbacks, including change talk (commitment, desire, ability to change, reasons to change, or need to change) as well as their agency or autonomy in making any changes. Reflective listening would involve actively engaging with participants and reflecting on participant contributions. Facilitators should use this technique to direct further conversation or highlight key strengths and barriers previously discussed. Summaries can be used to reinforce participant choices and acknowledging participant effort or success. Problem solving should also use information exchange (Ask-Tell-Discuss) techniques to identify barriers and explore ways to overcome them. Problem-solving may specifically focus on issues of connectedness (social influences, involvement of others in supporting activities) and sustainability, or on breaking the problem down into more manageable chunks. Goals or action plans should be reviewed and revised if necessary. The Ask-Tell-Discuss technique may be used to enhance engagement when exchanging information.

Managing Setbacks and Problem Solving

*Table 6. Managing setbacks and Problem Solving*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rating | Score | Example |
| 0Absence |  | Absence of discussion to review participant setbacks or to suggest appropriate problem-solving strategies relating to physical activity behaviours and/or highly inappropriate delivery |
| 1Novice |  | Minimal discussion to review participant setbacks or to suggest appropriate problem-solving strategies relating to physical activity behaviours and/or inappropriate delivery |
| 2Advanced Beginner |  | Some evidence of competence when discussing participant setbacks or problem-solving strategies relating to physical activity behaviours (but these are infrequent) with some adaptation to context. However, there are numerous problems and inconsistencies such as detached involvement and missed opportunities to deliver the behaviour change technique. |
| 3Competent |  | Competent and appropriate attempts to review participant setbacks or problem-solving strategies relating to physical activity behaviours. The facilitator is engaged, aware and able to cope with different contexts and situations. However, there are some minor problems or inconsistencies (e.g. not covering all components of the behaviour change technique to sufficient depth or failing to summarise the discussion) |
| 4Proficient |  | Numerous appropriate discussions to review participant setbacks or problem-solving strategies relating to physical activity behaviours. The facilitator is able to discriminate between a variety of contexts and situations with some minor problems or inconsistencies evident. |
| 5Expert |  | Highly appropriate and sufficient review of participant setbacks or problem-solving strategies relating to physical activity behaviours. The facilitator is able to make more subtle refined discriminations between contexts and able to adjust accordingly. Minimal problems. |

Action planning and goal setting

Key features: Facilitators should work with the participants to agree on a verbal plan of action. This should include negotiating of goals, goal setting and identifying any barriers that may arise. Facilitators should always acknowledge the participants perspective and look for opportunities to allow participant input, so they can be the agent of change.

Delivery: When action planning is discussed, facilitators should ensure participants have opportunities for input and so drive the process themselves. Specific goals may be negotiated /set before action plans are formulated. The facilitator should ensure that goals and action plans are realistic. Where action-planning is part of the session plan, the facilitator should encourage each person present to make at least one plan. The facilitator should, where possible, encourage goals and plans that are specific (e.g. when, what, where, who with) and achievable. The facilitator may also use some problem-solving examples and techniques at this point to pre-empt and address any foreseeable problems (making a coping plan). The action plan menu and “activity snacks” activity should be used (see Session plans for Week 11) to facilitate activity planning. This should be achieved using OARS (Open questions, Affirmation, Reflective listening, Summaries). Open ended questions would involve the facilitator allowing the participants to focus on their own goals, and plans to achieve them. In doing so revealing participant thought processes and points of reference that drive the discussion. Affirmations or praise should be given for positive behaviours, recognising the participant’s success as well as efforts towards change, including change talk (commitment, desire, ability to change, reasons to change, or need to change) as well as their agency or autonomy in making any changes. Reflective listening would involve actively engaging with participants and reflecting on participant contributions. Facilitators should use this technique to direct further conversation or highlight key strengths and barriers previously discussed. After which the facilitator should summarise what was discussed to reinforce participant choices and acknowledge participant effort or success thus far.

*Table 7. Action Planning and Goal Setting*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rating | Score | Example |
| 0Absence |  | Absence of attempts to encourage action-planning and goal setting and or highly inappropriate delivery. |
| 1Novice |  | Minimal attempts to encourage action-planning and goal setting and or inappropriate delivery. |
| 2Advanced Beginner |  | Some evidence of competence and adapting appropriately to the context involved when discussing action planning and goal setting (but these are infrequent) and may not be carried out to sufficient detail. There are numerous problems and inconsistencies such as detached involvement or missed opportunities to deliver the behaviour change technique |
| 3Competent |  | Competent delivery and appropriate attempts to encourage action-planning and goal setting. The facilitator is engaged, aware and able to cope with different contexts and situations but there are some minor problems or inconsistencies (e.g. not covering all components of the behaviour change technique to sufficient depth or failing to summarise the discussion). |
| 4Proficient |  | Numerous appropriate attempts to encourage action-planning and goal setting. The facilitator is able to discriminate between a variety of contexts and situations with minimal problems or inconsistencies. |
| 5Expert |  | Highly appropriate and sufficient attempts to encourage action-planning and goal setting. The facilitator is able to make more subtle, refined discriminations between situations and contexts and able to adjust accordingly. No problems or inconsistencies. |

Modelling Key Features: Facilitators should give participants the opportunities to observe others engaging appropriately and successfully with the programme (in terms of increasing their physical activity as well as engaging with action-planning, self-monitoring, supporting each other and other behaviour change processes); in doing so participants can acquire new skills and behaviours, especially if they identify positively with the model.

Delivery: Facilitators should identify participants succeeding with techniques and behaviours and reinforcing this with positive feedback, affirmation and bringing it to the attention of the group, as an opportunity to observe success. Facilitators should use OARS to communicate this in a positive and sensitive manner to avoid embarrassment (Open ended questioning, Affirmation, Reflective listening, Summaries). Open ended questions would involve the facilitator allowing the participants to express their feelings about their successful engagement with the programme so that this can be the focus of the discussion. Affirmations or praise should be given for positive behaviours, recognising the participant’s success as well as efforts towards change, including change talk (commitment, desire, ability to change, reasons to change, or need to change) as well as their agency or autonomy in making any changes. Reflective listening would involve actively engaging with and reflecting on participant contributions. Facilitators should use this technique to direct further conversation or highlight key strengths and barriers previously discussed. Summaries can be used to reinforce participant choices and acknowledging participant effort or success.

*Table 8. Modelling*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rating | Score | Example |
| 0Absence |  | Absence of modelling used by facilitators to give participants the opportunity to observe others and or highly inappropriate delivery. |
| 1Novice |  | Minimal use of modelling by facilitators to give participants the opportunity to observe others and or inappropriate delivery. |
| 2Advanced Beginner |  | Some evidence of competence and adapting appropriately to context involved when using modelling (but this is infrequent) and these may not be carried out to sufficient detail. There are numerous problems and inconsistencies such as detached involvement or missed opportunities.  |
| 3Competent |  | Competent delivery and appropriate use of modelling by facilitators to give participants the opportunity to observe others. The facilitator is engaged, aware of and able to cope with different contexts and situations. However, there are some minor problems or inconsistencies (E.g. not covering all components of the behaviour change technique to sufficient depth or failing to summarise the discussion) |
| 4Proficient |  | Numerous appropriate use of modelling by facilitators to give participants the opportunity to observe others. The facilitator is able to discriminate between a variety of contexts and situations with minimal problems or inconsistencies. |
| 5Expert |  | Highly appropriate and sufficient use of modelling by facilitators to give participants the opportunity to observe others. The facilitator is able to make more subtle refined discriminations between situations and contexts and able to adjust accordingly. No problems or inconsistencies. |

Promoting Autonomy

Key features: Facilitators should encourage the participants to be pro-actively (rather than passively) involved in discussions. The aim is to maximise the participants’ autonomy by developing intrinsic rather than extrinsic motivation, by encouraging them to be the driver of their own success, while developing a sense of control. Facilitators should acknowledge the participants’ perspectives, whilst sharing their own expertise and ideas in a collaborative fashion. Facilitators should always look for opportunities to allow participant input and ideas and choices surrounding physical activity behaviours.

Delivery: Facilitators should use OARS (Open ended questioning, Affirmation, Reflective listening, Summaries). Open ended questions would involve the facilitator allowing the participants to express their feelings towards topics being discussed so that facilitators can use this as a point of reference to drive discussion forward. Affirmations or praise should be given for positive behaviours, recognising the participant’s success as well as efforts towards change, including change talk (commitment, desire, ability to change, reasons to change, or need to change) as well as their agency or autonomy in making any changes. Where possible facilitators should use reflective listening, which may include reflecting on key points in conversations or may go further to direct the conversation or highlight participants’ strengths or agency in developing plans and overcoming barriers they face. Facilitators should use summaries to reinforce participant decisions and acknowledge efforts, behaviours or achievements made by participants especially if these are desirable. In particular, they should reinforce the fact that any changes made are the participants’ choice. Facilitators should aim to place these techniques in the context of the participants’ individual experiences, knowledge, skill set and current physical activity levels. The Ask-Tell-Discuss technique should be used frequently for exchanging information (to avoid didactic information-giving).

Table 9. Promoting Autonomy

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rating | Score | Example |
| 0Absence |  | Absence of attempts to promote autonomy and choice and or highly inappropriate delivery. |
| 1Novice |  | Minimal attempts to promote autonomy and choice and or inappropriate delivery. |
| 2Advanced Beginner |  | Some evidence of competence and adapting appropriately to the context when attempting to promote autonomy or choice (but this is infrequent), and these may not be carried out to sufficient depth or detail. There are numerous problems or inconsistencies such as detached involvement and missed opportunities). |
| 3Competent |  | Competent delivery and appropriate attempts to promote autonomy or choice. The facilitator is engaged, aware and able to cope with different contexts and situations but there are some minor problems or inconsistencies (e.g. not covering all components of the BCT to sufficient depth or failing to summarise the discussion). |
| 4Proficient |  | Numerous appropriate attempts to promote autonomy or choice. The facilitator is able to discriminate between a variety of contexts and situations with minimal problems or inconsistencies. |
| 5Expert |  | Highly appropriate and sufficient attempts to promote autonomy or choice. The facilitator is able to make more subtle, refined discriminations between situations and contexts and able to adjust accordingly. No problems or inconsistencies. |

Supporting Competence and Self efficacy

Key features: Competence and self-efficacy is essential to participants feeling able to enact techniques and behaviours outside of the REACT setting. Facilitators should seek to support competence and self-efficacy by encouraging participants, identifying and breaking down barriers to change, setting achievable goals. Facilitators should encourage gradual and sustainable progress, give appropriate and constructive feedback, encourage problem-solving and ascertain participant confidence and skills so these can be built upon throughout the intervention sessions.

Delivery: Facilitators should use OARS (Open ended questioning, Affirmation, Reflective listening, Summaries). Open ended questions would involve the facilitator allowing the participants to express their feelings towards topics being discussed so that facilitators can use this as a point of reference to drive discussion forward. Affirmations or praise should be given for positive behaviours, recognising the participant’s success as well as efforts towards change, including change talk (commitment, desire, ability to change, reasons to change, or need to change) as well as their agency or autonomy in making any changes. Reflective listening would involve actively engaging with participants and reflecting on participant contributions. Facilitators should use this technique to direct further conversation or highlight key strengths and barriers previously discussed. Summaries can be used to reinforce participant choices and acknowledging participant effort or success. The Ask-Tell-Discuss technique may be used to enhance engagement when exchanging information and to offer encouragement and acknowledgement of achievements in success and encouragement and constructive feedback to reframe efforts seen as failure. Facilitators should break down goals into manageable chunks and regularly check in with and build upon existing and skills. The aim is to gradually build skills and confidence in ability to increase physical activity, by breaking down barriers to change and promoting a positive approach to managing setbacks (i.e. to see them as a learning opportunity, rather than failure).

Table 10. Supporting Competence and self-efficacy

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rating | Score | Example |
| 0Absence |  | Absence of attempts to build and reinforce competence and self-efficacy and or highly inappropriate delivery. |
| 1Novice |  | Minimal attempts to build and reinforce competence and self-efficacy and or inappropriate delivery. |
| 2Advanced Beginner |  | Some evidence of competence and adapting appropriately to the context involved when supporting competence and self-efficacy (but these are infrequent) and may not be carried out to sufficient depth or detail. There are numerous problems and inconsistencies, such as detached involvement or missed opportunities to deliver the behaviour change technique. |
| 3Competent |  | Competent delivery and appropriate attempts to build and reinforce competence and self-efficacy. The facilitator is engaged and aware or and able to cope with different contexts and situations but there are some minor problems or inconsistencies (e.g. not covering all components of the BCT to sufficient depth or failing to summarise the discussion).  |
| 4Proficient |  | Numerous and appropriate attempts to support competence and self-efficacy. The facilitator is able to discriminate between a variety of contexts and situations with minimal problems or inconsistencies. |
| 5Expert |  | Highly appropriate and sufficient attempts to support competence and self-efficacy. The facilitator is able to make more subtle, refined discriminations between situations and contexts and able to adjust accordingly. No problems or inconsistencies. |

Relatedness

Key features: Fulfilling the need for relatedness (social engagement, social acceptance, peer approval of one’s behaviour and giving support to others) along with competence and autonomy is a key factor in motivating people to initiate and sustained behaviour change. This can be achieved through engagement in physical activity, where there are opportunities for positive social interaction. Facilitators should promote physical activities as opportunities for social connectedness and relatedness.

Delivery: OARS (Open questions, Affirmation, Reflective listening, Summaries) and the Ask-Tell-Discuss technique should be used when engaging with participants. Open ended questions would involve the facilitator allowing the participants to express their feelings creatively, revealing participant thought process and points of reference. Affirmations or praise should be given for positive behaviours, recognising the participant’s efforts towards change, including change talk (commitment, desire, ability to change, reasons to change, or need to change) as well as their agency /autonomy in making any changes. Reflective listening would involve actively engaging with and reflecting on participant contributions. Facilitators should use this technique to direct further conversation or highlight key strengths and barriers previously discussed. Summaries can be used to reinforce participant choices and acknowledging participant effort or success. The above techniques should be used to create an enjoyable environment where social interaction can take place. Facilitators should be inclusive and welcoming and praise and reinforce positive interactions within the group. Facilitators should aim to make interactions fun and work to diffuse or prevent negative social interactions (e.g. demeaning behaviour /criticism). Facilitators should also encourage people to consider activities that maximise social engagement (e.g. including friends, family and spouses and joining group based activities). In reviewing progress, facilitators should actively seek to encourage reflection on the social benefits of physical activity. Finally, the facilitator should help participants to plan to engage social support around engaging in physical activity and to identify and address any negative social influences or social barriers to physical activity.

Table 11. Relatedness.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rating | Score | Example |
| 0Absence |  | Absence of attempts to foster relatedness and address social influences and or highly inappropriate delivery. |
| 1Novice |  | Minimal of attempts to foster relatedness and address social influences and or inappropriate delivery. |
| 2Advanced Beginner |  | Some evidence of competence and adapting appropriately to the context involved when fostering relatedness (but these are infrequent) and may not be carried out to sufficient depth or detail. There are numerous problems and inconsistencies such as detached involvement or missed opportunities to deliver the behaviour change technique. |
| 3Competent |  | Competent delivery and appropriate attempts to foster relatedness and address social influences. The facilitator is engaged, aware of and able to cope with different contexts and situations but there are some minor problems or inconsistencies (e.g. not covering all components of the BCT to sufficient depth or failing to summarise the discussion). |
| 4Proficient |  | Numerous appropriate attempts to foster relatedness and address social influences. The facilitator is able to discriminate between a variety of contexts and situations with minimal problems or inconsistencies. |
| 5Expert |  | Highly appropriate and sufficient attempts to foster relatedness and address social influences. The facilitator is able to make more subtle, refined discriminations between situations and contexts and able to adjust accordingly. No problems or inconsistencies. |