

1 **Title: A whole system approach to increasing children’s physical activity in a multi-ethnic UK city: a**
2 **process evaluation protocol**

3
4 **Authors**

5 Jennifer Hall^{1,2} (corresponding author)

6 Daniel D Bingham^{1,2}

7 Amanda Seims^{1,2}

8 Sufyan Abid Dogra^{1,2}

9 Jan Burkhardt¹

10 James Nobles^{3,4}

11 Jim McKenna⁵

12 Maria Bryant^{6,7}

13 Sally E Barber^{1,2}

14 Andy Daly-Smith^{1,2,8}

15 1. Bradford Institute for Health Research, Bradford Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust,
16 Bradford Royal Infirmary, Duckworth Lane, Bradford, BD9 6RJ, UK

17 2. Faculties of Life Sciences and Health Studies, University of Bradford, Richmond Road, Bradford,
18 BD7 1DP, UK

19 3. The National Institute for Health Research Applied Research Collaboration West (NIHR ARC West)
20 at University Hospitals Bristol National Health Service Foundation Trust, United Kingdom

21 4. Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, United Kingdom

22 5. School of Sport, Carnegie, Leeds Beckett University, Leeds, LS6 3QT, UK

23 6. Department of Health Sciences, Seebohm Rowntree Building, University of York, Heslington, York,
24 YO10 5DD, UK

25 7. The Hull York Medical School, University of York, YO10 5DD

26 8. Centre for Applied Education Research, Wolfson Centre for Applied Health Research, Bradford

27 **NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**
Royal Infirmary, West Yorkshire, UK

28 **Abstract**

29 **Background:** Engaging in regular physical activity requires continued complex decision-making in
30 varied and dynamic individual, social and structural contexts. Widespread shortfalls of physical
31 activity interventions suggests the complex underlying mechanisms of change are not yet fully
32 understood. More insightful process evaluations are needed to design and implement more
33 effective approaches. This paper describes the protocol for a process evaluation of the JU:MP
34 programme, a whole systems approach to increasing physical activity in children and young people
35 aged 5-14 years in North Bradford, UK.

36 **Methods:** This process evaluation, underpinned by realist philosophy, aims to understand the
37 development and implementation of the JU:MP programme and the mechanisms by which JU:MP
38 influences physical activity in children and young people. It also aims to explore behaviour change
39 across wider policy, strategy and neighbourhood systems. A mixed method data collection approach
40 will include semi-structured interview, observation, documentary analysis, surveys, and participatory
41 evaluation methods including reflections and ripple effect mapping.

42 **Discussion:** Not only is this an innovative approach to process evaluation but it will also feed into
43 iterative programme development to generate evidence-based practice and deliver practice-based
44 evidence. This paper advances knowledge regarding the development of process evaluations for
45 evaluating systems interventions, and emphasises the importance of process evaluation.

46

47 **Keywords:** physical activity, process evaluation, realist, systems thinking, children, behaviour
48 change, qualitative, ripple effect mapping, network mapping

49

50

51 **1.0 Background**

52 *1.1 Physical (in)activity and health inequalities*

53 There is substantial evidence that social structural factors such as deprivation, ethnicity, gender and
54 age influence health-related risk, health outcomes and mortality rates [1, 2, 3]. Physical activity (PA),
55 which is positively related to health, wellbeing and academic outcomes [4, 5, 6], is also socially
56 patterned [7]. Those who live in more deprived areas and/or are of ethnic minority populations are
57 consistently reported to engage in lower levels of PA than less deprived and / or ethnic majority
58 populations [8, 9, 10]. Social stratification of lifestyle behaviours, including PA, provides a partial
59 explanation for the social inequalities of health, and can serve to perpetuate existing health
60 inequalities [11].

61 *1.2 Approaches to increasing physical activity and reducing health inequality*

62 Increasing population levels of PA and reducing inequality is considered a public health priority [12,
63 13]. Until recently, PA interventions have emphasised individual-level behaviour change, which can
64 *worsen* health inequalities, as they are often less accessible and effective for more deprived
65 populations, due to lesser material resources and ‘leisure’ time [14]. Empirical evidence supports the
66 proposal that behaviour is not solely the product of ‘intention’, but rather is influenced by multiple
67 interacting forces at structural, environmental/neighbourhood, organisational, intrapersonal and
68 individual levels [15, 16]. Interventions that target multiple ‘levels’, alter structures and processes,
69 strengthen relationships between communities, and redistribute power resources, are more likely to
70 increase PA behaviour and reduce inequality, than interventions that only target or that focus
71 primarily on individual behaviour change [17, 18]. Hence, PA and health may be regarded as a “co-
72 responsibility” of governments, individuals, families, organisations, and communities [19]. ISPAH has
73 recently published a call to action outlining ‘eight investments that work for physical activity’. This
74 resource advocates whole systems change across eight domains including schools, communities,
75 travel, urban design, healthcare, workplaces, mass media, and sport and recreation [12].

76 *1.3 The Bradford Local Delivery Pilot context*

77 Responding to the need for whole systems change, Sport England has funded 12 Local Delivery Pilots
78 (LDPs) over a 5-year period (2019-2024), to take a whole systems, place-based approach to reduce
79 physical inactivity and health inequalities. In Bradford, 24% of residents are under the age of 16,
80 making it the ‘youngest’ city in the UK [20]. Bradford is an ethnically diverse city - over 20% of the
81 total district population, and over 40% of children, are of South Asian origin [21]. Bradford falls in the
82 most deprived quintile of the Index of Multiple Deprivation, with 60% of the population living in the
83 poorest 20% of wards in England and Wales [20]. The Bradford LDP is led by the [Born in Bradford](#)
84 research programme on behalf of [Active Bradford](#), a partnership of organisations committed to
85 improving physical activity within the district. Unpublished data from the Born in Bradford cohort
86 study [22] indicates that, on average, children and young people in Bradford have lower levels of PA
87 than the general UK population. Given the high numbers of children, and the inverse association
88 between PA levels and age during childhood [23] the Bradford LDP, [JU:MP](#) (Join Us: Move. Play), is
89 focused on reducing inactivity in the 27,000 children and young people aged 5-14, and their families
90 residing in the Bradford LDP area. Further information on the programme is contained in section 2.1
91 .

92 The JU:MP programme is one of several system-wide interventions contributing to a major new
93 prevention research programme called [ActEarly](#). The purpose of ActEarly is to identify, implement
94 and evaluate upstream interventions within a whole system city setting. The collective aim of these
95 multiple, system-wide interventions (including JU:MP), enacted in one locality (i.e. Bradford), is to
96 achieve a tipping point for better life-long health and wellbeing, and to evaluate the impact of this
97 way of working. As such, the process evaluation of JU:MP will acknowledge the broader context in
98 which the programme is operating, including understanding which other system-wide interventions
99 are concurrently taking place and how these interact with JU:MP to impact upon the health and
100 wellbeing of children and young people.

101 *1.4 The importance of process evaluation*

102 Randomised controlled trials and related outcome evaluations, such as quasi-experimental
103 controlled studies, tell us whether an intervention works in a particular setting, at a particular time,
104 with a particular group of people. In the Bradford LDP, effectiveness studies are taking place at both
105 population and neighbourhood levels. Better understanding of the ‘how’ and ‘why’ of the JU:MP
106 programme, to understand the processes and interlinked contextual factors influencing change, will
107 establish a greater appreciation of the transferability of the intervention. This is especially important
108 for evaluating complex (systems approaches, adaptive) multi-component interventions; mechanisms
109 influencing change are likely to be more complex, varied and dynamic [24]. Complementing an
110 outcome evaluation with a process-oriented evaluation helps uncover processes - incorporating
111 temporal and spatial contextual influences - influencing change [25].

112 Understanding how intervention (in)effectiveness arises is not the only valuable question within
113 intervention research [26]; feasibility and acceptability are important too - alongside effectiveness,
114 they also shape the level of embeddedness of different approaches as part of a wider whole system
115 programme. Furthermore, process evaluations involving ongoing interaction with key stakeholders
116 can help bridge the research-practice gap [27] and can be viewed as part of the intervention ‘system’
117 by providing feedback and contributing to iterative programme development [28]. A growing body
118 of evidence - in both the health and social sciences - supports conducting process evaluations of
119 complex interventions [e.g. 25, 29]. However, few PA evaluations have captured the complexity of
120 behaviour change systems [30]. This paper describes the protocol for a process evaluation of the
121 development, implementation and evaluation of the JU:MP programme.

122 **2.0 Methods**

123 This paper focuses on the process evaluation of the JU:MP programme approach. Reporting is
124 guided by the RAMSES II reporting standards for realist evaluations; see additional file 1. The process
125 evaluation will be conducted alongside a complementary effectiveness evaluation and findings from
126 across the broader evaluation will be integrated to advance knowledge production [31].

127 *2.1 Intervention: The JU:MP Programme*

128 The underlying themes, framework (tool, settings and principles) and theory of change for the JU:MP
129 programme were developed in 2018 based on community consultation and priority setting
130 workshops, data from the Born in Bradford research programme [22, 32, 33], international peer-
131 reviewed evidence [34, 35] and the socio-ecological model [36]. Subsequently the first iteration of
132 the JU:MP implementation plan was designed, with projects aligned to the programme themes and
133 content related to the theory of change. During 2019-2020 a test-and-learn phase was undertaken,
134 'pathfinder'. In 2021, based on the experiences from the 'pathfinder' phase a second version of the
135 implementation plan was drawn up. This included the creation of the JUMP model depicting 15
136 workstreams which will be taken forward into the delivery of the 'accelerator phase' (2021-2024).
137 JU:MP has been designed for continuous improvement, based on process evaluation and learning.
138 The description here reflects JU:MP as we transition from the pathfinder phase (the initial small
139 scale test and learn period over 2019-2021) to the accelerator phase (the roll-out of the developed
140 programme across the LDP over 2021-2024); see Figure 1 for a timeline illustrating key milestones.
141 JU:MP is seen as a whole system approach; the theory of change outlines five themes (family,
142 community, organisations, environment, and policy and strategy) through which JU:MP will 'act' to
143 increase PA in children aged 5-14 years, and subsequently improve wider health and social outcomes
144 (see Figure 2). While the underlying theory of change incorporates multiple 'mechanisms', it is
145 recognised that JU:MP is both a system-based intervention and is being implemented within a
146 complex social system, where the process of change in reality will be complex, messy and nonlinear.
147 As such, the theory of change does not provide an exhaustive list of practice-based mechanisms.
148 Four guiding principles underpin the JU:MP approach: i) tailored approaches to change and to link
149 levels within a whole system; ii) community involvement at every step of the process; iii) engaged,
150 active leaders and partners; and iv) evidence- and insight-led. The implementation plan includes 15
151 interacting work streams which cut across the five JU:MP themes. There are six overarching work

152 streams that are delivered across the whole LDP area, and nine that are developed and delivered at
153 a neighbourhood level (see Figure 3).

154 JU:MP is being implemented within eight distinct geographic ‘neighbourhoods’ within the Bradford
155 LDP area; see additional file 2 for a map of the LDP neighbourhoods. Neighbourhood boundaries
156 were based on areas having an area of green space with potential for development, at least 4-5
157 primary schools, and an active community organisation. This hyper-local scale of whole systems
158 delivery aims to foster genuine collaborative working and building strong sustainable relationships.
159 Using an asset-based community development approach, JU:MP facilitates the development of an
160 action group within each neighbourhood, including key organisational partners, community
161 members, and families. To allow the programme to meet local needs and facilitate longer-term
162 behaviour change, the action group is jointly responsible for (1) co-producing local action plans and
163 green space developments (approximately three months), (2) collectively delivering the local action
164 plans, with members contributing to delivering separate work streams (e.g. school stakeholders
165 deliver Creating Active Schools) (approximately one year) and (3) the ‘embed and sustain’ phase
166 during which time JU:MP facilitation is lessened (approximately one year).

167 Initially, the neighbourhood approach was operationalised within three ‘Pioneer Neighbourhoods’
168 (pathfinder phase - 2019-2021) to undertake a test and learn process. Subsequently, the programme
169 will be delivered in the five remaining neighbourhoods (2021-2024), to cover the whole LDP area.
170 The accelerator phase neighbourhoods are further broken down into those that are directly
171 facilitated by the JU:MP team, as in the pathfinder phase (n = 3), and those whose delivery will be
172 externally commissioned (n = 2). The programme model is illustrated in Figure 3. Additional file 3
173 offers a more detailed description of each work stream.

174 *2.2 Process evaluation theory: realism, systems thinking, complexity science*

175 A realist philosophy underpins this process evaluation. Realism posits that an objective reality exists,
176 but that knowledge is ‘value-laden’ and as such we can only understand reality from within a
177 particular discourse [37]. Realism holds that reality exists in an open-system, meaning that attention

178 in programme development and evaluation perspective focuses on how context and mechanisms
179 interact to influence outcomes [38]. Process evaluation is typically understood as “the evaluation of
180 a process of change that an intervention attempts to bring about in order, at least in principle, to
181 explain how outcomes are reached” [29].

182 Underpinned by realist principles, the role of context is prioritised in establishing intervention
183 (in)effectiveness [29]. Examining context implies focusing on social processes to establish an
184 understanding of how different notions of intervention feasibility, acceptability and effectiveness
185 can be framed. Another part of realist evaluation allows the development and / or refinement of
186 theories relating to mechanisms of change, focusing on context-mechanism-outcome configurations.
187 This supports the iterative development of programme logic models and theories of change [39].
188 However, a realist approach acknowledges that people attach meaning to experiences, and
189 meanings are implicated within causal processes [37]; behaviour therefore cannot be fully explained,
190 as people are conscious beings that act back on the structures and processes of social life [40].

191 Within the complex intervention evaluation field, recent calls to embed complexity science and
192 systems principles within process evaluation design reflect a move towards understanding how
193 interventions are part of complex adaptive systems [41, 42, 24]. Realist methodology is consistent
194 with systems thinking and complexity science [41]. They share a mutual belief that wider contexts
195 are inherent within change mechanisms [39]. Yet, systems thinking necessitates taking a holistic
196 view to examine how systems (including interventions) influence behavioural change, rather than
197 viewing interventions in isolation. Further, complexity science is concerned with how interactions
198 between different system elements (including interventions) create change, focusing on concepts
199 including dynamism, nonlinearity, adaptation, feedback loops, and co-evolution [41, 42].

200 Realism, systems thinking, and complexity science have shaped the development of the aims, study
201 design, data collection, and analysis of the JU:MP process evaluation. Predominantly qualitative
202 methods have been adopted here, using a longitudinal design, to establish a fuller understanding of

203 intervention acceptability and effectiveness, and to capture how acceptability and effectiveness
204 change as systems evolve e.g. generate feedback loops [39, 42].

205 *2.3 Aims, objectives and approach*

206 The overarching aim of the process evaluation is to understand the programme implementation and
207 the mechanisms through which JU:MP influences behaviour change across the neighbourhood, and
208 wider policy and strategy systems that it is seeking to influence. The evaluation also facilitates
209 dynamic system change via informing the refinement of the programme and associated theory of
210 change. To address these aims, and in accordance with the JU:MP delivery approach, the process
211 evaluation includes three distinct but interrelated packages of work: (1) a strategic-level evaluation,
212 (2) a neighbourhood-level evaluation, and (3) an end-user evaluation. Table 1 provides an overview
213 of the scope and objectives of each process evaluation work package.

214 *2.3.1 Strategic-level process evaluation study design*

215 A longitudinal mixed methods design is being adopted. The study received ethical approval from
216 Leeds Beckett University in March 2020 (ref: 69870), and will run until programme delivery ceases in
217 2024. The overarching objectives of the strategic-level process evaluation are to document, and
218 understand the feasibility, acceptability and impact of the strategic-level development, delivery and
219 evaluation of JU:MP. This includes a focus on the 15 JU:MP programme work streams (see Figure 2),
220 and the effectiveness, process and individual project evaluations, including interaction, synergy and
221 tension between these different JU:MP system elements.

222 Stakeholders involved in the development and delivery of JU:MP at a strategic-level, i.e. beyond
223 individual neighbourhoods, will be invited to participate. Data collection methods include surveys,
224 semi-structured interviews, participant observations, and reflections, which will all be implemented
225 at multiple time points throughout programme delivery; see section 2.6 for further detail. The
226 evaluation will iteratively refine as priorities surface; for example, we have recently incorporated a
227 sub-study to provide a 'deep dive' into the strategic-influencing work of JU:MP to examine the wider

	Strategic-level	Neighbourhood-level	End-user level
Scope (aims, stakeholders)	To understand the views and actions of JU:MP strategic-level stakeholders, including the core JU:MP team and executive board, stakeholders commissioned to lead on the strategic delivery of work streams, and city-wide strategic partners such as the Living Well programme strategic leads	To understand the views and actions of stakeholders involved in developing and / or implementing JU:MP within a JU:MP neighbourhood (e.g. voluntary organisation stakeholders, school leads, councillors, faith setting leads, friends of groups, families)	To understand the views and actions of the 'end user' recipients of JU:MP, i.e. children and young people and their families living in North Bradford
Objective (documentation)	To document the strategic-level design, delivery and evaluation processes of the JUMP programme, including: individual work streams and evaluation packages and interactions	To document JU:MP programme neighbourhood level design and delivery processes, including: (a) the community engagement and co-production process and (b) the design and implementation of the overarching action plan and specific interventions	n/a
Objective (feasibility and acceptability)	To examine the feasibility and acceptability of the strategic level design, delivery and evaluation of the JU:MP programme, by understanding the barriers, facilitators and contextual factors influencing design, delivery and evaluation, including: (a) Individual work streams and evaluation packages and interactions and (b) strategic influencing across the wider system	To examine the feasibility and acceptability of the neighbourhood level design and implementation of the JU:MP programme, by understanding the barriers, facilitators and contextual factors influencing design and delivery, including: (a) examining the feasibility and acceptability of the neighbourhood co-production approach and (b) examining the feasibility and acceptability of delivering the overarching plan and specific interventions	To examine the experience of children and families receiving JU:MP, including understanding the JU:MP 'journey' and acceptability of JU:MP for different users
Objective (impact)	(a) To understand the impact of JU:MP across the whole system including unintended consequences, and developing an understanding of change mechanisms (what works, for whom, and in what context) from the perspective of strategic-level stakeholders (b) To understand the impact of JU:MP on strategic-level stakeholders (c) to understand the impact of JU:MP on city-wide policy and strategic working around physical activity	(a) to understand the impact of JU:MP across and beyond the neighbourhood system including unintended consequences, and developing an understanding of change mechanisms (what works, for whom, and in what context) from the perspective of neighbourhood-level stakeholders (b) to understand the impact of JU:MP, on neighbourhood-level stakeholders	To understand the impact of JU:MP including unintended consequences, and change mechanisms

228 Table 1. The scope and objectives of the strategic, neighbourhood and end user-level process
229 evaluation work packages

230 intended and unintended impacts of city-wide policy and strategic working related to PA, following
231 the addition of policy and strategy as a theme within the theory of change.

232 *2.3.2 Neighbourhood-level process evaluation study design*

233 A longitudinal, mixed-methods case study design is being adopted, with individual neighbourhoods
234 being classified as ‘cases’. This study received ethical approval from the University of Bradford in
235 November 2020 (ref: E838) and will be implemented during the ‘delivery’ phase within each JU:MP
236 neighbourhood, which lasts approximately three years. Section 2.1 provides detail on the
237 neighbourhood delivery approach.

238 A minimum data-set will be collected from each neighbourhood, with additional data collection
239 occurring within selected ‘deep dive’ neighbourhoods. These neighbourhoods will include one from
240 the pioneer neighbourhood phase (with the primary aim of piloting and refining the data collection
241 techniques, and to inform programme design and delivery), and the three accelerator phase
242 neighbourhoods that are directly facilitated by the JU:MP team, in line with the neighbourhoods that
243 are included within the neighbourhood control trial that forms part of the effectiveness evaluation
244 of JU:MP. Aligning the ‘deep dive’ neighbourhoods with those included in the control trial will
245 generate greater understanding and explanation of control trial findings; the trial will provide
246 evidence of JU:MP effectiveness within the neighbourhood. The process evaluation will help explain
247 what worked, why, when, for whom, and within what context.

248 Amendments to the evaluation protocol will be made following piloting and prior to implementing
249 the study within the ‘accelerator phase’ neighbourhoods. Minimum-data data collection methods
250 include surveys and documentary analysis, and additional methods employed in ‘deep dive’
251 neighbourhoods include extra surveys, process observations, semi-structured interviews, and
252 participatory evaluation methods; see section 2.6 for further detail.

253 *2.3.3 End user-level process evaluation study design*

254 The end-user process evaluation will examine the experiences and impact of JU:MP amongst
255 children and families. This will feature focus groups with children and parents/guardians from across

256 the accelerator direct delivery neighbourhoods, approximately 12 months and 24 months following
257 JU:MP commencement. Additionally, in-depth longitudinal research will be conducted with
258 approximately four local families. Citizen science methods will be adopted, which involves members
259 of the public (non-scientists) collecting and analysing data, in collaboration with researchers [38], to
260 foster community engagement.

261 Multiple and innovative methods of data collection will be employed, which *could* include written or
262 video diaries, or photo-elicitation techniques, walk-and-talk interviews, but crucially, the families will
263 be engaged in developing the research approach, collecting and analysing their own data, and
264 making recommendations for future practice. A PhD studentship, jointly funded by Sport England (as
265 part of the programme funding) and the University of Bradford, will develop and conduct this work,
266 commencing in 2021. It is preemptive to give close detail of methods and analysis for an area of
267 work that is still emerging.

268 *2.4 Theories and models utilised within the process evaluation*

269 Various existing theories / models / frameworks underpin the development, delivery and evaluation
270 of the JU:MP programme. Herein, we focus on theories that are used directly, or indirectly as
271 sensitising concepts, within the process evaluation of JU:MP, including in the development of topic
272 guides and surveys, and analysis frameworks.

273 (1) Consolidated framework for implementation research (CFIR) [44] - The CFIR was developed
274 by synthesising implementation constructs from across 20 implementation sources and
275 multiple scientific disciplines [44], and is a comprehensive framework designed to examine
276 intervention implementation [45]. Five major domains comprise the CFIR: intervention
277 characteristics, inner setting, outer setting, characteristics of individuals involved in
278 implementation, and the implementation process [44] . The CFIR is being used as a
279 sensitising framework within the process evaluation to understand the feasibility of
280 implementing the JU:MP programme.

281 (2) Capability, opportunity, motivation-behaviour (COM-B) [46] and the Theoretical Domains
282 Framework (TDF) [47] - The COM-B model provides a comprehensive and evidence-based
283 model for understanding human behaviour and behaviour change. The model proposes that
284 behaviour is influenced by capability (physical, psychological), opportunity (physical, social)
285 and motivation (reflective, automatic), and that all three must be present for a behaviour to
286 occur [46]. The TDF consists of 14 'domains' of influence on behaviour, developed by
287 synthesising 33 theories of behaviour and behaviour change [47]. The Domains align to
288 COM-B categories and can be used to develop and implement interventions and to inform
289 understanding of the barriers and facilitators influencing behaviour change.

290 (3) JU:MP programme theory of change - The programme theory (see section 2.1 and Figure 1)
291 is implicated in the evaluation of JU:MP; it will be utilised to understand impact and
292 mechanisms of impact as well as being iteratively refined as programme delivery and
293 evaluation progress.

294 *2.5 Sampling and recruitment*

295 The proposed sample for the strategic-level study includes stakeholders who are part of the strategic
296 leadership of the JU:MP programme. This includes all members of the core JU:MP research and
297 implementation teams, stakeholders commissioned to lead on the strategic delivery of one of the 15
298 work streams across the LDP, JU:MP executive board members and members of the established
299 strategic development working group for integrating physical activity in policy and strategy across
300 the district. The sample size will be based on the number of individuals that meet the inclusion
301 criteria, which is expected to be around 100. The proposed sample for the neighbourhood-level
302 study includes stakeholders who are involved in designing and delivering JU:MP within one (or more)
303 of the participating neighbourhoods, as part of the neighbourhood action group, including for
304 example, JU:MP connectors, Islamic Religious Setting stakeholders, and children and families; see
305 section 2.1. The sample size is based on the expected number of individuals (20) that will form the
306 action groups within each neighbourhood, meaning there will be around 160 participants in total. As

307 detailed in section 2.6, not all participants will take part in all aspects of data collection, for example
308 interviews will only be conducted with approximately 20 individuals at each time point in both the
309 strategic and neighbourhood-level studies.

310 All potential participants across both the strategic and neighbourhood level studies will be engaged
311 in the design and delivery of JU:MP, and as such will already be known and identifiable to the
312 research team, via the implementation team. Potential participants will be given an information
313 sheet for the research, and informed consent will be obtained prior to data collection commencing.
314 Data collection will take place at multiple time-points over a significant time-period (up to for years).
315 At each data collection 'point', participants will be verbally reminded that they are taking part in the
316 study and what it involves, and will be given a verbal reminder to let the researcher know at any
317 time if they wish to withdraw their consent to participate.

318 *2.6 Process evaluation data collection methods*

319 This section provides a rationale for and description of each data collection method that is being
320 utilised within the JU:MP process evaluation. Table 2 provides a map of when and where each
321 method is being utilised as part of the strategic and neighbourhood evaluation work packages.

322 *2.6.1 Surveys*

323 (a) Personal characteristics survey - a short survey related to the participants' personal
324 characteristics, including gender, date of birth, home postcode, ethnicity, highest
325 qualification, employer, job role, and JU:MP role(s). This survey will enable characterisation
326 of the sample and will aid in contextualising and interpreting qualitative data.

327 (b) Influences on behaviour survey - the survey has been developed to assess factors influencing
328 participants' roles in supporting the design and delivery of JU:MP. The survey is an adapted
329 version of a validated 6-item COM-B questionnaire [48]; see additional file 4 for a copy of
330 the survey. Draft surveys were piloted with members of the core team, and refined based on
331 feedback. The survey will permit the identification of determinants of behaviour [49], which
332 will highlight areas for intervention to increase the capability, opportunity and / or

333 motivation of stakeholders to influence change and to support children to increase physical
334 activity. Repeating the survey at baseline, 6 months, 12 months and 24 months will permit
335 an understanding of how different influences change over time. Further exploration during
336 interviews for some participants will aid in understanding the reasons for these changes.

337 (c) Stakeholder mapping survey - this survey has been developed to facilitate a social network
338 analysis [50]; connections between stakeholders will be mapped to understand the impact
339 of JU:MP on relationships between parties within neighbourhood networks. Published
340 guidance on social network analysis [51] and input from network analysis specialists
341 informed the initial development of the survey. The survey is being refined following piloting
342 with pioneer neighbourhood stakeholders. Repeating the survey every six months will
343 permit an understanding of how relationships develop and change over the course of the
344 JU:MP programme. See additional file 5 for a copy of the stakeholder mapping survey.

345 (d) Feedback forms - feedback forms will be administered following neighbourhood action
346 group workshops to examine participants' thoughts and feelings about the workshop
347 content and process, and to understand the emerging impact of the work. The content of
348 the forms may be adapted depending on the workshop context, however questions will
349 typically include "What did you find most useful about the workshop?", "What did you find
350 least useful about the workshop?, How could it be improved?" and "What is the most
351 significant output of JU:MP so far?"

352 *2.6.2 Semi-structured interviews*

353 Semi-structured interviews provide an opportunity for in-depth reflection on the design and delivery
354 of JU:MP, including documenting and reflecting on progress, activity, decisions, perceptions, and
355 challenges [52]. Understanding these processes is important for evaluation, as it helps us to
356 understand the factors influencing whether or not the programme is successful in achieving its
357 outcomes. The interviews will explore the capability, opportunity and motivation of the participants
358 to support the JU:MP programme and will be tailored to their specific role within JU:MP. The

359 opportunity to reflect on involvement via an in-depth interview can also have a positive influence on
360 programme design and delivery via facilitating a process of continuous learning [53]. Interview
361 guides are theoretically informed; they draw on implementation theory (CFIR), behavioural theory
362 (COM-B and TDF), and the JU:MP theory of change. However, interview guides will be refined on an
363 iterative basis based on project developments and prior data collected via other methods, for
364 example, observations (see section 2.6.3).

365 2.6.3 Participant observation

366 Observation offers a direct view of behaviour, capturing events as they occur in their natural setting
367 [54]. Qualitative observations, completed by a researcher, provide an independent record of
368 activities, including developing an understanding of context, behaviours and interactions, allowing
369 reflection on these activities [29]. Key meetings (table 2) will be observed by a researcher. Informed
370 by Spradley [55] and aligned with the theories and frameworks underpinning programme design and
371 evaluation (systems thinking, JU:MP ToC, COM-B, CFIR), an observation summary sheet has been
372 prepared to guide this collection of observational data. This guidance provides common areas of
373 focus across observational records; additional file 6. During the observation the researcher will
374 record a 'condensed account' of the event, which will then be utilised as an aide-memoire to
375 develop an expanded account. These expanded accounts will be included in data analysis.

376 2.6.4 Documentary analysis

377 Key programme documents can provide insight into the design and delivery of programmes,
378 including information on decisions made / agreed actions and why, and implementation challenges.
379 Meeting and workshop notes and neighbourhood action plans will be included in qualitative
380 analyses (table 2). Additionally, key documents such as service agreements and project plans will be
381 requested from stakeholders prior to interviews, to aid the interview process e.g. discussing how
382 and why plans were delivered as intended or amended.

383 2.6.5 Participatory evaluation methods

384 (a) Reflections - Regularly reflecting on programme activity is important as it allows us to
385 document progress, activity, decisions, and challenges, as they are occurring. Reflective
386 practice can also have a positive influence on neighbourhood design and delivery via
387 facilitating a process of continuous learning [53]. Short reflection activities are being
388 embedded into key JU:MP meetings, with attendees being given 60-90 seconds each to
389 share a key learning (what happened, why and how, context, future planning) Reflections
390 are captured as part of documentary analysis; see section 2.6.4.

391 (b) Ripple effects mapping (REM) - This participatory method takes a qualitative, collaborative
392 approach to understanding wider programme impacts. Unlike traditional impact evaluation
393 methods, which tend to focus on a small number of pre-specified outcomes, REM is
394 designed to uncover a wider range of intended and unintended impacts stemming from a
395 programme [56]. This may be particularly important in whole systems programmes and
396 where interventions are co-produced, flexible and emerging. The method involves holding
397 researcher-facilitated workshops with the participants (approximately 12 per workshop)
398 involved in developing and delivering (an aspect of) the programme, to create a visual
399 output of impacts [57, 58]. The workshops involve four steps: team-based conversations,
400 mapping activities and impacts, reflecting further on impacts, and identifying the most and
401 least significant changes. The workshops can be repeated over time to understand impact
402 pathways and timelines [59]. Previous research has documented that participating in the
403 mapping process and realising the range of impacts can be motivating to stakeholders and
404 encourage further action [56, 60]. Within the process evaluation, this method will be used to
405 examine the impact of the strategic influencing work, and the neighbourhood programmes
406 involved in deep-dive evaluation.

407 *2.7 Data analysis*

408 *2.7.1. Qualitative data analysis*

409 Qualitative data including semi-structured interview data, reflections, key documents including

Data collection method	Strategic level process evaluation	Neighbourhood level process evaluation
Surveys	<p>Participant characteristics survey: upon recruitment (All recruited participants)</p> <p>Influences on behaviour survey : every 6 months (All recruited participants)</p>	<p>Participant characteristics survey: upon recruitment (All participants, all neighbourhoods)</p> <p>Influences on behaviour survey: baseline, 6-months, 12-months and 24 months (All participants, all neighbourhoods)</p> <p>Network mapping survey: baseline, 6-months, 12-months and 24 months (All recruited participants, all neighbourhoods)</p>
Process observations	<p>Process observations of meetings including:</p> <p>Implementation team meetings: one in every four (attended by core team members such as the programme director, community engagement managers and communications officer)</p> <p>Other key strategic meetings identified in collaboration with the implementation team</p>	<p>Process observations of action group workshops: every workshop, approximately once every six weeks (deep-dive neighbourhoods only)</p>
Documentary analysis	<p>Key documents for each work stream collated every 6 months (including service agreements, project plans and evaluations)</p>	<p>Action group workshop notes (All neighbourhoods)</p> <p>Neighbourhood action plans (All neighbourhoods)</p>
Semi-structured interviews	<p>Interviews with around 20 strategic stakeholders every 6 months (including members of the core team and one strategic lead for each workstream at each time point)</p> <p>Interviews with around six additional wider stakeholders every 12 months (three members of the executive board and three members of the strategic development)</p>	<p>Interviews with around 20 neighbourhood stakeholders at 6 and 18 months (including key delivery stakeholders such as JU:MP connector, Islamic Religious Setting lead, school lead etc. from across deep-dive neighbourhoods only)</p> <p>Interviews with around two commissioned organisation stakeholders at 6 and 18 months (commissioned neighbourhoods)</p>
Reflections	<p>Group reflections embed into key meetings:</p> <p>Weekly implementation team meetings: one in every four (attended by core team members such as the programme director, community engagement managers and comms officer)</p> <p>Weekly research team meetings: one in every four (attended by core team members such as the research directors and research fellows)</p>	-
REM	<p>REM workshops embedded into strategic development group meetings: every 6 months</p>	<p>REM workshops embedded into action group meetings: every 6 months (all neighbourhoods)</p>

410 Table 2. Data collection methods for the strategic and neighbourhood process evaluation.

411 meeting notes, and process observation summaries will be analysed using a framework approach
412 [61]. Framework analysis is a type of thematic analysis aimed at providing descriptive and/or
413 explanatory findings clustered around themes. Uniquely, framework analysis features using a matrix
414 to systematically reduce the data. The key steps involved include (1) familiarisation, (2) identifying a
415 thematic framework, (3) indexing (applying the thematic framework to the data set), (4) charting
416 (entering data into framework matrices), and (5) mapping and interpretation [56].

417 A framework approach was selected for a number of reasons. First, the matrix permits multiple
418 comparisons, including between interventions, subjects, data sources and time points [62]. This is
419 particularly important for evaluating the JU:MP programme to allow findings to be examined both
420 within and across different interventions within the system, and over time. Second, a framework
421 aids in consolidating data across themes, identifying broad ranging data - discussing different JU:MP
422 interventions, via different methods, at different time points. The framework also allows the
423 isolation of specific data from different interventions, neighbourhoods, stakeholders etc. to be
424 analysed separately, if required. Third, the indexing and charting process allows all members of a
425 multidisciplinary team to engage with the analysis (e.g. of a particular theme) without needing to
426 read and code all the data [63]. Finally, the approach is suited to prolonged data collection, allowing
427 analysis to occur alongside data collection. This allows findings to inform iterative programme
428 development, and 'chunks' analysis across the timeframe of the programme.

429 An initial framework was developed based on theory underpinning the evaluation, the JU:MP
430 programme structure (deductive), and inductive coding of a small number of initial interview
431 transcripts. Over the course of the pathfinder phase, the framework was iteratively refined based on
432 coding of data, and the development of the programme. The refined framework includes separate
433 themes for the different work streams and evaluation work packages, as well as themes for the
434 overarching programme development, delivery and evaluation (additional file 7). Following coding
435 using NVivo 12.0, framework matrices will facilitate the interpretation of data and the construction
436 of themes. Miro will be used to visually illustrate the REM maps, while qualitative content analysis,

437 using NVivo 12.0, will analyse the data within the REM outputs. This type of analysis will identify
438 data patterns and quantify emerging aspects of programme outputs.

439 *2.7.2 Quantitative data analysis*

440 Data from the participant characteristics survey and influences on behaviour survey will be
441 summarised using descriptive statistics. Univariate statistical tests will be used to examine
442 differences between different groups of participants, and general linear models will explore any
443 differences in influences on behaviour over time. The network mapping survey will be analysed and
444 illustrated using social network analysis software.

445 *2.7.3 Mixed-method integration and evidence-practice feedback loops*

446 Following initial analysis as described in sections 2.7.1 and 2.7.2 the data will be integrated to
447 establish context-mechanism-outcome configurations, to understand what works, when, how, and
448 in what context [39]. Ongoing analysis will inform the refinement of the programme and associated
449 theory of change. To facilitate this process, bi-annual process learning workshops will take place with
450 the core JU:MP research and implementation team. Emerging findings will be presented and, using
451 Driscoll's learning cycle [64], the team will consider the implications of the findings and agree on
452 changes to the programme design, how the programme is delivered, and/or how the team work
453 (together). These changes will then be captured in the ongoing evaluation as part of workshop notes
454 and interviews, thus completing the cycle.

455 **3.0 Discussion**

456 This paper outlines the protocol for a process evaluation of JU:MP, the Bradford LDP, a whole
457 systems programme for increasing PA in children and young people aged 5 - 14. The aim of the
458 process evaluation is to understand the mechanisms through which JU:MP influences PA, and to
459 examine behaviour change across the wider policy and strategy and neighbourhood systems. The
460 evaluation also facilitates dynamic system change via informing the refinement of the programme
461 and associated theory of change. To address these aims, evaluations are taking place at the
462 strategic, neighbourhood, and end-user level. Mixed methods are being employed including surveys,

463 interviews, and process observations, and participatory methods including reflections and ripple
464 effect mapping.

465 Publishing a protocol for the process evaluation of the JU:MP programme is intended to both
466 highlight the importance of process evaluations in evaluating complex interventions, and to add to
467 the process evaluation methodology literature. While protocols of process evaluations of PA
468 programmes are now appearing in the literature [e.g. 65, 66, 67], typically they describe protocols
469 for process evaluating individual interventions. In this context, our plan is a rare example that
470 addresses a whole system programme incorporating multiple interventions [63, 64]. A key strength
471 is that our approach remains flexible to iterative development of the programme; it is not
472 constrained by requiring substantial ethical amendments, nor by pre-specified outcomes [56], while
473 still ensuring that the protocol is clear, detailed and has fixed parameters for transparency and
474 replicability purposes. At the same time, while the in-built processes can ensure evaluation is
475 delivered as planned, they can also record any required adaptations. This paper also advances the
476 literature by outlining a novel approach to evaluating a whole system programme, incorporating
477 innovative participatory methods that permit iterative refinement of the programme alongside
478 implementation [28, 27].

479 Given the time often required to conduct robust qualitative work, a challenge here is ensuring that
480 the process evaluation findings remain 'relevant' as the JU:MP programme progresses and evolves in
481 an agile way. It is, therefore, important to ensure that the findings are fed back in a timely manner
482 and in an appropriate format to allow the team to 'step back' and engage in systematic planning.

483 Whilst the evaluation outlined in this paper is resource-intensive, it is set up to generate a deep and
484 rich understanding of the processes underpinning programme design, implementation and impact,
485 and thus will be invaluable in supporting other communities to apply a similar approach and / or to
486 learn from things that have not delivered expected successes.

487 An embedded research team is critical for the development of research-practice partnerships, which
488 facilitates evidence-based practice, and the development of practice-based evidence through the

489 JU:MP programme [70]. However, a limitation of this approach is that it reduces the impartiality of
490 the research team and thus the independence of the evaluation [71]. Successfully negotiating a
491 suitable balance of involvement with, and detachment from, the JU:MP programme is critical to the
492 success of the process evaluation [72]. For example, it was imperative that the research team
493 worked alongside the programme team to develop a protocol that aligns with and meets the needs
494 of the programme, and involvement is also required to produce detailed and in-depth observational
495 records that reflect participant experiences. Detachment is also required throughout the research
496 process, for example when analysing data, to ensure that the analysis is reality-congruent and
497 theoretically informed, rather than a reflection of the researcher's experiences within the setting.

498 The process evaluation outlined within this paper forms part of a wider evaluation approach, which
499 includes an effectiveness evaluation (neighbourhood control trial, and a before and after evaluation
500 using the Born in Bradford birth cohort). Process evaluations can be complementary to outcome
501 evaluations, as the approaches produce different types of knowledge about a phenomenon that can
502 be combined to further advance knowledge [24, 73]. The JU:MP programme evaluation provides an
503 opportunity for mixed methods evidence synthesis, combining the advantages of controlled trials in
504 estimating intervention effects, with an in-depth understanding of participants' experiences and the
505 mechanisms underpinning change [39, 25]. However, in doing so, it is important that the inherent
506 value of process evaluation is appreciated, beyond facilitating interpretation of trial findings, to
507 avoid perpetuation of the paradigmatic hegemony existent within intervention evaluation research
508 [74].

509 **4.0 Conclusion**

510 Despite significant efforts to address children's physical inactivity by researchers, practitioners and
511 policy makers, physical activity levels are socially stratified, which can serve to perpetuate health
512 inequalities [7]. Sport England has invested significant funds in 12 LDPs to increase PA and reduce
513 inequalities through taking a place-based, whole systems approach. Methodologically rigorous, high
514 quality research is required to examine what works, why, for whom, and in what context, to

515 understand both the potential of whole system approaches for increasing children’s PA, and
516 whether and how they can be replicated in other geographical contexts. The process evaluation of
517 the Bradford LDP aims to address this.

518 **5.0 Abbreviations**

519 BCW: Behaviour Change Wheel

520 COM-B: Capability, Opportunity, Motivation-Behaviour

521 DD: Direct Delivery

522 JU:MP: Join Us: Move. Play

523 LDP: Local Delivery Pilot

524 REM: Ripple Effects Mapping

525 **6.0 Declarations**

526 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

527 Strategic-level process evaluation, Leeds Beckett University (69870). Neighbourhood-level process
528 evaluation, Bradford University (E838).

529 **Consent for publication**

530 Not applicable.

531 **Availability of data and material**

532 The dataset that will be generated and analysed during the current study are not publicly available
533 to reserve the anonymity of research participants.

534 **Competing interests**

535 The authors report no competing interests.

536 **Funding**

537 The authors’ involvement was supported by Sport England’s Local Delivery Pilot – Bradford; weblink:
538 <https://www.sportengland.org/campaigns-and-our-work/local-delivery>. Sport England is a non-
539 departmental public body under the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS).
540 James Nobles’ time was supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Applied

541 Research Collaboration West. The views expressed in this article are those of the author(s) and not
542 necessarily those of Sport England, DCMS, NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

543 **Authors' contributions**

544 This study was conceived and designed by JH and ADS, with input and feedback from all authors. The
545 manuscript was initially drafted by JH. Subsequent drafts were commented on by all authors and
546 revisions were made by JH. All authors have approved submission.

547 **Acknowledgements**

548 We are grateful for the funding provided by Sport England to implement and evaluate the
549 programme. The authors wish to thank the JU:MP team and wider stakeholders, including colleagues
550 within Born in Bradford and ActEarly, including Dr Laura Sheard and Dr Bridget Lockyer, for their
551 input in developing the process evaluation and their ongoing engagement with and openness to the
552 evaluation process. The authors also wish to thank Aira Armanaviciute, Catherine Sadler, Dionysia
553 Markesini, Emma Young, Isobel Steward, Lisa Ballantine, Simona Kent-Saisch, and Zubeda Khaton
554 for supporting the testing and refinement of the framework for analysing the qualitative data.

555 **8.0 References**

- 556 1. Landstedt E, Asplund K, Gillander Gådin K. Understanding adolescent mental health: the
557 influence of social processes, doing gender and gendered power relations. *Soc Health Illness*.
558 2009;31:962-78.
- 559 2. Marmot M, Allen J, Goldblatt P, Boyce T, McNeish D, Grady M. Fair society, healthy lives.
560 Strategic review of health inequalities in England post-2010. 2011.
561 [https://www.instituteofhealthequity.org/resources-reports/fair-society-healthy-lives-the-](https://www.instituteofhealthequity.org/resources-reports/fair-society-healthy-lives-the-marmot-review/fair-society-healthy-lives-full-report-pdf.pdf)
562 [marmot-review/fair-society-healthy-lives-full-report-pdf.pdf](https://www.instituteofhealthequity.org/resources-reports/fair-society-healthy-lives-full-report-pdf.pdf). Accessed 23 May 2021.
- 563 3. Nakray K. Addressing 'Well-Being' and 'Institutionalized power relations' in health policy. *J*
564 *Human Dev Cap*. 2011;12:595-598.
- 565 4. Álvarez-Bueno C, Pesce C, Cavero-Redondo I, Sánchez-López M, Garrido-Miguel M, Martínez-
566 Vizcaíno V. Academic achievement and physical activity: a meta-analysis. *Ped*. 2017;140:6.

- 567 5. Poitras VJ, Gray CE, Borghes MM, Carson V, Chaput JP, Janssen I, et al. Systematic review of
568 the relationships between objectively measured physical activity and health indicators in
569 school-aged children and youth. *App Physiol Nutr Metab*. 2016;41:197-239.
- 570 6. Warburton DE, Bredin SS. Health benefits of physical activity: a systematic review of current
571 systematic reviews. *Current Opp Cardiology*. 2017;32:541-556.
- 572 7. Kay T. Bodies of knowledge: connecting the evidence bases on physical activity and health
573 inequalities. *Int Sport Policy Politics*. 2016;8:539-57.
- 574 8. Collings PJ, Dogra SA, Costa S, Bingham DD, Barber SE. Objectively-measured sedentary time
575 and physical activity in a bi-ethnic sample of young children: variation by socio-demographic,
576 temporal and perinatal factors. *BMC Public Health*. 2020;20:109.
- 577 9. Sawyer AD, Jones R, Ucci M, Smith L, Kearns A, Fisher A. Cross-sectional interactions
578 between quality of the physical and social environment and self-reported physical activity in
579 adults living in income-deprived communities. *PLoS One*. 2017;12:12.
- 580 10. Williams DR, Priest N, Anderson NB. Understanding associations among race, socioeconomic
581 status, and health: Patterns and prospects. *Health Psychology*. 2016; 35:407.
- 582 11. Shareck M, Frohlich KL, Poland B. Reducing social inequities in health through settings-
583 related interventions - a conceptual framework. *Glob Health Prom*. 2013;20: 39-52.
- 584 12. International Society for Physical Activity and Health (ISPAH). ISPAH's Eight Investments
585 That Work for Physical Activity. 2020. www.ISPAH.org/Resources. Accessed 21 April 2021.
- 586 13. World Health Organisation. Global action plan on physical activity 2018–2030: more active
587 people for a healthier world. Geneva: World Health Organization. 2018. MacKay K, Quigley
588 M . Exacerbating inequalities? Health policy and the behavioural sciences. *Health Care
589 Analysis*, 2018;26:380-397.
- 590 14. Ogden J. Celebrating variability and a call to limit systematisation: the example of the
591 Behaviour Change Technique Taxonomy and the Behaviour Change Wheel. *Health Psych
592 Review*. 2016;10:245-250.

- 593 15. Speake H, Copeland RJ, Till SH, Breckon JD, Haake S, Hart O. Embedding physical activity in
594 the heart of the NHS: the need for a whole system approach. *Sports Med.* 2016;46:939-946.
- 595 16. Golden SD, Earp JAL. Social ecological approaches to individuals and their contexts: twenty
596 years of health education & behavior health promotion interventions. *Health Ed Behavior.*
597 2012;39:364-372.
- 598 17. Nobles JD, Radley D, Mytton OT, Whole Systems Obesity programme team. The Action
599 Scales Model: a conceptual tool to identify key points for action within complex adaptive
600 systems. *Pers Public Health.* 2021;11:17579139211006747.
- 601 18. Blacksher E, Lovasi GS. Place-focused physical activity research, human agency, and social
602 justice in public health: taking agency seriously in studies of the built environment. *Health
603 Place.* 2012;18:172-179.
- 604 19. City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council. Understanding Bradford District, Intelligence
605 Bulletin: Poverty and Deprivation. 2020. [https://ubd.bradford.gov.uk/media/1580/poverty -
606 and-deprivation-jan-2020-update.pdf](https://ubd.bradford.gov.uk/media/1580/poverty-and-deprivation-jan-2020-update.pdf). Accessed 25th November 2020.
- 607 20. Office for National Statistics. Research report on population estimates by ethnic group and
608 religion. 2020. [https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/population
610 roupandreligion/2019-12-04](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/articles/researchreportonpopulationestimatesbyethnicg
609 roupandreligion/2019-12-04). Accessed 25th November 2020.
- 611 21. Bird PK, McEachan RR, Mon-Williams M, Small N, West J, Whincup P, et al. Growing up in
612 Bradford: protocol for the age 7–11 follow up of the Born in Bradford birth cohort. *BMC
613 Public Health.* 2019;19:939.
- 614 22. Farooq MA, Parkinson KN, Adamson AJ, Pearce MS, Reilly JK, Hughes AR, et al. Timing of the
615 decline in physical activity in childhood and adolescence: Gateshead Millennium Cohort
616 Study. *British J Sports Med.* 2018;52:1002-6.
- 617 23. Rosas S, Knight E. Evaluating a complex health promotion intervention: case application of
618 three systems methods. *Critical Public Health.* 2019;29:337-352.

- 619 24. Moore GF, Evans RE, Hawkins J, Littlecott H, Melendez-Torres GJ, Bonell C, et al. From
620 complex social interventions to interventions in complex social systems: future directions
621 and unresolved questions for intervention development and evaluation. *Eval.* 2019;25:23-
622 45.
- 623 25. Boeije HR, Drabble SJ, O’Cathain A . Methodological challenges of mixed methods
624 intervention evaluations. *Methodology.* 2015;11:119-125.
- 625 26. Huby G, Hart E, McKeivitt C, Sobo E. Addressing the complexity of health care: the practical
626 potential of ethnography. *J Health Serv Res Policy.* 2007;12:193-4.
- 627 27. Breckenridge JP, Gianfrancesco C, de Zoysa N, Lawton J, Rankin D, Coates E. Mobilising
628 knowledge between practitioners and researchers to iteratively refine a complex
629 intervention (DAFNE plus) pre-trial: protocol for a structured, collaborative working group
630 process. *Pilot Feas Studies.* 2018;4:120.
- 631 28. Morgan-Trimmer S. Improving process evaluations of health behavior interventions: learning
632 from the social sciences. *Evaluation Health Prof.* 2019;38:295-314.
- 633 29. Quested E, Ntoumanis N, Thøgersen-Ntoumani C, Hagger MS, Hancox JE. Evaluating quality
634 of implementation in physical activity interventions based on theories of motivation: current
635 challenges and future directions. *Int Review Sport Ex Psych.* 2017;10:252-269.
- 636 30. Zachariadis M, Scott S, Barrett M. Methodological implications of critical realism for mixed-
637 methods research. *MIS Quarterly.* 2013;1:855-79.
- 638 31. Dogra SA, Rai K, Barber S, McEachan RR, Adab P, Sheard L. Delivering a childhood obesity
639 prevention intervention using Islamic religious settings in the UK: What is most important to
640 the stakeholders? *Prev Med Reports.* 2021;24:101387.
- 641 32. Nagy LC, Horne M, Faisal M, Mohammed MA, Barber SE. Ethnic differences in sedentary
642 behaviour in 6–8-year-old children during school terms and school holidays: a mixed
643 methods study. *BMC Public Health.* 2019;19:152.

- 644 33. Ding D, Sallis JF, Kerr J, Lee S, Rosenberg DE. Neighborhood environment and physical
645 activity among youth: a review. *Am J Prev Med.* 2011;41:442-55.
- 646 34. Van Sluijs EM, Kriemler S. Reflections on physical activity intervention research in young
647 people – dos, don'ts, and critical thoughts. *Int J Behav Nutr Physical Activity.* 2016;13:1-6.
- 648 35. Sallis JF, Cervero RB, Ascher W, Henderson KA, Kraft MK, Kerr J. An ecological approach to
649 creating active living communities. *Annual Review Public Health.* 2006;27:297-322.
- 650 36. Sayer A. *Realism and Social Science.* SAGE Publications Ltd; 2000.
- 651 37. Shearn K, Allmark P, Piercy H, Hirst J. Building realist program theory for large complex and
652 messy interventions. *Int J Qual Methods.* 2017;16: 1609406917741796.
- 653 38. Fletcher A, Jamal F, Moore G, Evans RE, Murphy S, Bonell C. Realist complex intervention
654 science: applying realist principles across all phases of the Medical Research Council
655 framework for developing and evaluating complex interventions. *Eval.* 2016;22: 286-303.
- 656 39. Porter S, Ryan S. Breaking the boundaries between nursing and sociology: a critical realist
657 ethnography of the theory-practice gap. *J Adv Nursing.* 1996;24:413-420.
- 658 40. Egan M, McGill E, Penney T, Anderson de Cuevas R, Er V, Orton L, et al. NIHR SPHR Guidance
659 on Systems Approaches to Local Public Health Evaluation. Part 1: Introducing Systems
660 Thinking. NIHR SPHR Guidance on Systems Approaches to Local Public Health Evaluation.
661 2019. [https://sphr.nihr.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/NIHR-SPHR-SYSTEM-GUIDANCE-](https://sphr.nihr.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/NIHR-SPHR-SYSTEM-GUIDANCE-PART-1-FINAL_SBnavy.pdf)
662 [PART-1-FINAL_SBnavy.pdf](https://sphr.nihr.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/NIHR-SPHR-SYSTEM-GUIDANCE-PART-1-FINAL_SBnavy.pdf). Accessed 23 May 2021.
- 663 41. McGill E, Marks D, Er V, Penney T, Petticrew M, Egan M. Qualitative process evaluation from
664 a complex systems perspective: a systematic review and framework for public health
665 evaluators. *PLoS Medicine.* 2020;17:e1003368.
- 666 42. King AC, Winter SJ, Sheats JL, Rosas LG, Buman MP, Salvo D et al. Leveraging citizen science
667 and information technology for population physical activity promotion. *Translational J Am*
668 *College Sports Med.* 2016;1:30.

- 669 43. Damschroder LJ, Aron DC, Keith RE, Kirsh SR, Alexander JA, Lowery JC. Fostering
670 implementation of health services research findings into practice: a consolidated framework
671 for advancing implementation science. *Imp Sci.* 2009;4(1):1-15.
- 672 44. Safaeinili N, Brown-Johnson C, Shaw JG, Mahoney M, Winget M. CFIR simplified: Pragmatic
673 application of and adaptations to the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research
674 (CFIR) for evaluation of a patient-centered care transformation within a learning health
675 system. *Learning Health Systems.* 2020;4:e10201.
- 676 45. Michie S, Van Stralen MM, West R. The behaviour change wheel: a new method for
677 characterising and designing behaviour change interventions. *Imp Sci.* 2011;6:1-12.
- 678 46. Cane J, O'Connor D, Michie S. Validation of the theoretical domains framework for use in
679 behaviour change and implementation research. *Imp Sci.* 2012;7:1-17.
- 680 47. Keyworth C, Epton T, Goldthorpe J, Calam R, Armitage CJ. Acceptability, reliability, and
681 validity of a brief measure of capabilities, opportunities, and motivations ("COM-B"). *British J*
682 *Health Psych.* 2020;25:474-501.
- 683 48. Huijg JM, Gebhardt WA, Verheijden MW, van der Zouwe N, de Vries JD, Middelkoop BJ, et al.
684 Factors influencing primary health care professionals' physical activity promotion behaviors:
685 a systematic review. *Int J Behav Med.* 2015;22:32-50.
- 686 49. Monaghan S, Lavelle J, Gunnigle P. Mapping networks: exploring the utility of social network
687 analysis in management research and practice. *J Business Research.* 2017;76:136-144.
- 688 50. Digital Promise. Social Network Analysis Toolkit: Planning a Social Network Analysis. 2018.
689 <https://digitalpromise.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/SNA-Toolkit.pdf>. Accessed 21 April
690 2021.
- 691 51. Doody O, Noonan M. Preparing and conducting interviews to collect data. *Nurse Researcher.*
692 2013;20:5.
- 693 52. Heyer R. Learning through reflection: the critical role of reflection in work-based learning. *J*
694 *Work-Applied Management.* 2015;7:15-27.

- 695 53. Watson TJ. Ethnography, reality, and truth: the vital need for studies of 'how things work' in
696 organizations and management. *JManagement Studies*. 2011;48:202-217.
- 697 54. Spradley JP. Participant observation. Waveland Press; 1980.
- 698 55. Emery M, Higgins L, Chazdon S, Hansen D. Using ripple effect mapping to evaluate program
699 impact: choosing or combining the methods that work best for you. *J Extension*. 2015;53:2.
- 700 56. Chazdon S, Emery M, Hansen D, Higgins L, Sero R. A field guide to ripple effects mapping.
701 University of Minnesota Libraries Publishing; 2017.
- 702 57. Taylor J, Goletz S, Ballard J. Assessing a rural academic-community partnership using ripple
703 effect mapping. *J Comm Practice*. 2020;28:36-45.
- 704 58. Nobles H, Wheeler J, Dunleavy-Harris K, Holmes R, Inman-Ward A, Potts A, et al. Ripple
705 effects mapping: capturing the wider impacts of systems change efforts in public health. In
706 preparation.
- 707 59. Welborn R, Downey L, Dyk PH, Monroe PA, Tyler-Mackey C, Worthy SL. Turning the tide on
708 poverty: documenting impacts through ripple effect mapping. *Comm Dev*. 2016;47:385-402.
- 709 60. Ritchie J, Spencer L. Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research. In Bryman B,
710 Burgess R, editors. *Analyzing qualitative data*. New York: Routledge. 1994;173–194.
- 711 61. Gale NK, Heath G, Cameron E, Rashid S, Redwood S. Using the framework method for the
712 analysis of qualitative data in multi-disciplinary health research. *BMC Medical Research
713 Methodology*. 2013;13:1-8.
- 714 62. Parkinson S, Eatough V, Holmes J, Stapley E, Midgley N. Framework analysis: a worked
715 example of a study exploring young people's experiences of depression. *Qual Research
716 Psych*. 2016;13:109-129.
- 717 63. Driscoll J, Teh B. The potential of reflective practice to develop individual orthopaedic nurse
718 practitioners and their practice. *J Orthopaedic Nursing*. 2001;5:95-103.

- 719 64. Di Lorito C, Bosco A, Goldberg SE, Nair R, O'Brien R, Howe, et al. Protocol for the process
720 evaluation of the promoting activity, independence and stability in early dementia (PrAISED),
721 following changes required by the COVID-19 pandemic. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10: e039305.
- 722 65. Jong ST, Brown HE, Croxson CH, Wilkinson P, Corder KL, van Sluijs EM. GoActive: a protocol
723 for the mixed methods process evaluation of a school-based physical activity promotion
724 programme for 13–14year old adolescents. *Trials*. 2018;19:1-11.
- 725 66. Mclaughlin M, Duff J, Sutherland R, Campbell E, Wolfenden L, Wiggers J. Protocol for a mixed
726 methods process evaluation of a hybrid implementation-effectiveness trial of a scaled-up
727 whole-school physical activity program for adolescents: physical activity 4 everyone (PA4E1).
728 *Trials*. 2020;21:1-11.
- 729 67. Jenkins E, Lowe J, Allender S, Bolton KA. Process evaluation of a whole-of-community
730 systems approach to address childhood obesity in western Victoria, Australia. *BMC Public*
731 *Health*. 2020;20:1-9.
- 732 68. Smith J, Wistow G, Holder H, Gaskins M. Evaluating the design and implementation of the
733 whole systems integrated care programme in North West London: why commissioning
734 proved (again) to be the weakest link. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2019;19:1-14.
- 735 69. Green LW. Public health asks of systems science: to advance our evidence-based practice,
736 can you help us get more practice-based evidence? *Am J Public Health*. 2006; 96:406-409.
- 737 70. Cheetham M, Wiseman A, Khazaeli B, Gibson E, Gray P, Van der Graaf P, et al. Embedded
738 research: a promising way to create evidence-informed impact in public health? *J Public*
739 *Health*. 2018;40:64-70.
- 740 71. Mansfield L. Involved-detachment: A balance of passion and reason in feminisms and
741 gender-related research in sport, tourism and sports tourism. *J Sport Tourism*. 2007;12:115-
742 141.
- 743 72. Simons L. Moving from collision to integration: Reflecting on the experience of mixed
744 methods. *J Research Nursing*. 2007;12:73-83.

745 73. Hesse-Biber S, Johnson RB. Coming at things differently: Future directions of possible
746 engagement with mixed methods research. *J Mixed Methods Research*. 2013;7:103-109.

747 **9.0 Figure legends**

748 Figure 1. JU:MP programme timeline (key milestones)

749 Figure 2. JU:MP theory of change

750 Figure 3. The JUMP programme model

751 **10.0 Additional files**

752 Additional file 1. RAMSES reporting checklist. A table outlining how and where the protocol
753 conforms to the RAMSES II reporting standards for realist evaluations. File extension: docx

754 Additional file 2. JU:MP neighbourhood map. A geographical map of the JU:MP neighbourhood
755 boundaries within the LDP area. File extension: png

756 Additional file 3. JU:MP programme plan. A table providing a description of each of the 15 JU:MP
757 work streams. File extension: docx

758 Additional file 4. Influences on behaviour questionnaire. A survey, adapted from Keyworth et al. [42],
759 used to understand the capability, opportunity, motivation and behaviour of neighbourhood-level
760 stakeholders related to supporting children to be physically active. File extension: doc

761 Additional file 5. Network mapping survey. A survey to map connections and relationships between
762 different stakeholders and organisations within JU:MP neighbourhoods. File extension: pdf

763 Additional file 6. Observational framework. A framework designed to guide the collection and
764 recording of observational data. File extension: doc


765 Additional file 7. JU:MP thematic framework. The framework used to index data as part of the
766 qualitative framework analysis. File extension: doc



JOIN US.
MOVE. PLAY.



THEORY OF CHANGE



FAMILIES

SUPPORT CHILDREN* TO BE ACTIVE



- 1 Families have the knowledge, skills and motivation to be physically active
- 2 Families think there are opportunities for children to be physically active safely
- 3 Families allow children to be physically active
- 4 Family and friends support each other to be physically active

∞ Children are active independently and with their family and friends

COMMUNITIES

SUPPORT CHILDREN TO BE ACTIVE




- 1 People trust other people in their community
- 2 People influence local decisions for physical activity in their community
- 3 People can access resources and support children to be physically active in their community

∞ Children take part in physical activity with and in their community, and do physical activity with people from diverse backgrounds

ORGANISATIONS

SUPPORT CHILDREN TO BE ACTIVE



- 1 Organisations have the knowledge, skills and motivation to support families to be active
- 2 Organisations implement policies and strategies that support children to be active
- 3 Organisations provide opportunities for children to be active
- 4 Organisations provide families with the knowledge and skills to be active
- 5 Organisations provide social support and encouragement for families to be active

∞ Children are physically active in the organisations they attend

THE ENVIRONMENT

(HOMES, STREETS, GREEN SPACES AND PARKS) SUPPORT CHILDREN TO BE ACTIVE



- 1 Streets, homes, green spaces and parks are suitable places for children to be physically active
- 2 Environments are safe, clean and accessible
- 3 Environments are engaging and fun, and provide challenges that develop physical skills
- 4 Neighbourhoods are suitable for active travel

∞ Children are physically active in homes, streets, green spaces, parks, and travel actively

BETTER PHYSICAL HEALTH

BETTER MENTAL HEALTH

BETTER SKILLS

SAFER MORE ACTIVE COMMUNITIES



CITY-WIDE POLICY AND STRATEGY

CREATES A POSITIVE CHANGE WITHIN ORGANISATIONS, COMMUNITIES AND THE ENVIRONMENT THAT SUPPORTS CHILDREN TO BE ACTIVE



- 1 Policy makers and strategic leads value and prioritise (childrens) physical activity
- 2 Policy makers and local leaders work collaboratively to influence (childrens) physical activity
- 3 Children can influence policy and strategy
- 4 Policies and strategies support (childrens) physical activity, and are implemented



*Children and young people aged 5 - 14 years in the JU:MP area

2018

Development Funding Awarded
£1 Million December 2017

Consultation
- Young people
- Parents and Families
- Wider Stakeholders

Evidence Review
- Rapid Review of Reviews
- Local Evidence from Born in Bradford

Design (2018-2019)

Co-production of theory of Change - Version 1


Pathfinder Funding Awarded
£3 Million May 2019

Implementation Team Recruited

Implementation Plan - Version 1

Developed Neighbourhood Approach and Delivered the Implementation Plan in the 3 Pioneer Neighbourhoods

Pathfinder Phase (2019-2021)



Capacity and Evaluation Funding Awarded
£2.5 Million Sept 2020

JU:MP Model Created

Accelerator Phase (2021-2024)

Accelerator Funding Awarded
£6 Million Feb 2021

3 Pioneer Neighbourhoods Continue....

5 Accelerator Neighbourhoods Convene Action Group

Quasi Experimental Controlled Trial

Co-designing and delivering Neighbourhood Action Plan

Embed and Sustain

Baseline - 2021

Follow Up 1 - 2023

Follow Up 2 - 2024

2025

PROCESS EVALUATION