

A RE-AIM Evaluation of a Workplace Physical Activity Microgrant Initiative

The 10,000 Steps Workplace Challenge

Mitch J. Duncan, PhD, Cristina M. Caperchione, PhD, Kelly Corry, BHMSc, Hons, Anetta Van Itallie, BHMSc, Hons, and Corneel Vandelanotte, PhD

Objective: This study examines the reach, effectiveness, adoption, implementation, and maintenance of the 10,000 Steps Pedometer Microgrant Scheme using the RE-AIM framework. **Methods:** The study used a mixed methods pre-post design. RE-AIM indicators were examined using employee surveys and workplace reports of microgrant implementation, adoption, and maintenance. **Results:** A total of 259 microgrants and 21,211 pedometers were awarded (reach). Significant increases in physical activity were observed ($P < 0.05$) (effectiveness). Many (78%) workplaces reported using at least one challenge resource (adoption). Barriers were higher (26.5%) or lower (20.5%) than anticipated participation rates (implementation). Fifty percent of workplaces would continue to promote physical activity (maintenance). **Conclusions:** The microgrant reached a large number of employees and workplaces, increased physical activity, and achieved good levels of adoption and implementation. Employee and workplace levels of maintenance were mixed and need to be improved.

Keywords: microgrants, pedometer, physical activity, process evaluation

Workplaces are a useful setting to conduct physical activity interventions due to their large potential reach, the amount of time adults spend at work, and the demonstrated efficacy of workplace-based interventions to increase physical activity.^{1,2} Yet, workplaces face many barriers when implementing health promotion initiatives, including securing management and employee support for the initiative, and also the financial costs associated with implementing and maintaining the initiative.²⁻⁷ Implementation costs can include staff time to oversee the roll out of the initiative, the provision of equipment or infrastructure (eg,

Learning Objectives

- Summarize the Pedometer Microgrant Scheme evaluated by Duncan et al, including the RE-AIM framework used in the evaluation.
- Describe the findings on evaluation of the microgrant initiative, including outcome indicators of implementation, adoption, and maintenance.
- Discuss the implications for improving specific outcome indicators in future microgrant initiatives.

installation of bike storage facilities, change room facilities), or subsidizing external health promotion activities (eg, gym memberships, health insurance).⁸

Implementation costs remain a real barrier for workplaces, particularly for small-to-medium sized workplaces.⁸ In this context, microgrants are a strategy where small amounts of money or resources are provided to individuals or organizations to implement a health promotion initiative, and are a potential strategy to reduce these financial barriers.⁸ Although microgrants are frequently used in community settings, they can also be used in the workplace setting to assist in the implementation of workplace health initiatives.⁹⁻¹² The evaluation of microgrants in the workplace setting is uncommon, and little is known regarding their reach and how they are implemented.⁸

Originally, a whole of community multilevel physical activity promotion program, the 10,000 Steps Australia program (www.10000steps.org.au), is now an online physical activity promotion program that is freely available for use by individuals, workplaces, and community groups.^{13,14} The program encourages participants to use a pedometer to self-monitor physical activity and a key strategy to promote physical activity in the workplace is the “Workplace Challenge.”¹³ The Workplace Challenge aims to promote awareness of physical activity, increase engagement in physical activity, foster support from management for physical activity, and promote social support for being active between employees.¹⁵ Employees count their steps using a pedometer and form teams within an organization for which the teams “compete” against each other to accumulate more steps. The Workplace Challenge has proven to be successful in engaging employees and workplaces in promoting physical activity.¹³ Although a growing number of workplaces have participated in the Workplace Challenge, the cost associated with purchasing pedometers for employees and employees needing to purchase their own pedometers are frequently reported barriers.¹⁵

To address this, the 10,000 Steps program implemented the 10,000 Steps Pedometer Microgrant Scheme. The intent of the Scheme was to increase the uptake and implementation of the Workplace Challenge by providing microgrants to workplaces. A key stakeholder evaluation of the microgrant scheme reported that the application process was feasible, the microgrants helped to create awareness of the need to increase physical activity, was key to

From the School of Medicine & Public Health, Faculty of Health and Medicine, The University of Newcastle, Callaghan, NSW, Australia (Dr Duncan); Priority Research Centre for Physical Activity and Nutrition, Faculty of Health and Medicine, The University of Newcastle, University Drive, Callaghan, NSW, Australia (Dr Duncan); Human Performance Research Centre, Sport and Exercise, Faculty of Health, University of Technology Sydney, Moore Park, Sydney, Australia (Dr Caperchione); Central Queensland University, School of Health, Medical and Applied Science, Physical Activity Research Group, Appleton Institute, Rockhampton, QLD, Australia (Ms Corry, Ms Itallie and Dr Vandelanotte).

MJD is supported by a Career Development Fellowship (APP1141606) from the National Health and Medical Research Council. CV (ID 100427) is supported by a Future Leader Fellowship from the National Heart Foundation of Australia. The microgrant scheme was supported by Queensland Health (a state health ministry in Australia), which is also funding the broader 10,000 Steps program [ID 71487].

Duncan, Caperchione, Corry, Itallie, and Vandelanotte have no relationships/conditions/circumstances that present potential conflict of interest.

The JOEM editorial board and planners have no financial interest related to this research.

Supplemental digital contents are available for this article. Direct URL citation appears in the printed text and is provided in the HTML and PDF versions of this article on the journal's Web site (www.joem.org).

Address correspondence to: Mitch J. Duncan, PhD, ATC-315, University of Newcastle, The University of Newcastle, University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308, Australia (mitch.duncan@newcastle.edu.au).

Copyright © 2019 American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine

DOI: 10.1097/JOM.0000000000001653

enabling the workplace to obtain pedometers, and was perceived to increase employee activity levels and comradery.¹⁵ Despite this, little is known about the type of workplaces that microgrants reach, if they are effective, and how they are implemented. The RE-AIM framework guides the process evaluation of programs using five dimensions: (1) **Reach** (the number and representativeness of participants in an intervention), (2) **Effectiveness** (the degree to which the intervention succeeds in achieving its outcomes), (3) **Adoption** (the proportion of individuals and workplaces that adopt the intervention), (4) **Implementation** (the extent to which the intervention is implemented as intended), and (5) **Maintenance** (the extent to which the program/initiative are sustained over time). Given the limited knowledge regarding workplace-based microgrants, the aim of this study was to assess the reach, effectiveness, adoption, implementation, and maintenance of the 10,000 Steps Pedometer Microgrant Scheme using the RE-AIM framework.

METHODS

Design

This study uses the RE-AIM framework in a mixed methods pre–post design to evaluate the 10,000 Steps Pedometer Microgrant Scheme conducted as part of the broader 10,000 Steps Workplace Challenge.^{8,13} More detailed descriptions of the original 10,000 Steps program and the Microgrant Scheme are detailed elsewhere.^{11,14,16–18} The program website (www.10000steps.org.au) and iPhone app allow members to self-monitor their physical activity. The website provides free access to a range of resources to workplaces and community groups to promote physical activity through the dissemination, adoption, and implementation of 10,000 Steps strategies.^{19,20} This study received ethical approval from CQUniversity Human Resources Ethics Committee (H1404-053).

Workplace Challenge

A representative from within a workplace is identified as a coordinator and leads the organizing and implementing of the challenge, which involves employees forming teams and competing against each other to accumulate steps during the challenge period. The 10,000 Steps website provides coordinators with free access to resources to assist the initiation, promotion, and evaluation of the challenge, including the Workplace Physical Activity Guide, Workplace Challenge Guide, and Workplace Challenge. Workplaces choose to participate in either a timed challenge (accumulate as many steps as possible in a specified time period), or route-based challenge (complete a set amount of steps to travel a specified route, eg, The Great Wall of China). The Workplace Challenge is one of the most popular strategies of the program and is delivered virtually via the website making it available to all workplaces to participate.¹³ Individuals, including employees participating in Workplace Challenges, use a pedometer to self-monitor their daily steps and moderate-to-vigorous intensity physical activity using the “Step-Log” on the website and/or via the iPhone app.^{19,20} The StepLog also allows participants to view their progress in comparison to their individual physical activity goals and also their teams progress against other teams in their Workplace Challenge.

10,000 Steps Pedometer Microgrant Scheme

The Pedometer Microgrant Scheme is briefly summarized here as it is described in detail elsewhere.⁸ From the July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2016, two rounds of the Pedometer Microgrant Scheme were conducted.⁸ Only Queensland (Australia)-based workplaces that were not an individual/sole trader, and were not a private company contracting the provision of workplace wellness initiatives to another company were eligible due to requirements set by the program funder, the Queensland Government. To maximize distribution of the scheme, workplaces could apply for a maximum of 200

pedometers in round 1, 150 pedometers in round 2, and could only receive a single microgrant with the exception of large workplaces who could apply for additional pedometers in consultation with project staff. Workplaces applied for microgrants using an online application form (details in Supplementary Material 1, <http://links.lww.com/JOM/A581>) and workplaces awarded a microgrant were provided with pedometers, not funding to subsequently purchase pedometers. In round one, microgrants were prioritized to those workplaces that had not conducted a Workplace Challenge within the past 2 years and would use the Workplace Challenge to initiate a workplace health promotion program. In round two, microgrants were prioritized to workplaces types underrepresented in round one and priority workplace identified by the funder: small workplaces (<20 employees), high-risk industry workplaces (eg, mining), and regional and remote workplaces throughout Queensland.⁸

MEASURES AND PROCEDURES

Data for this study were drawn from the microgrant application forms and final reports submitted by each recipient, and the Workplace Challenge Employee Survey (Employee Survey).

Microgrant Application Forms and Final Reports

The microgrant application form collected contact information of the coordinator and workplace descriptors, including size, activity levels of workers, and geographic location (Supplementary Material 1, <http://links.lww.com/JOM/A581>). The final report requested information on the benefits of the microgrant and challenge to the workplace and its employees, participant characteristics, usefulness of the resources as well as the barriers and facilitators of implementing the challenge.

Workplace Challenge Employee Survey (Employee Survey)

Online surveys embedded in the 10,000 Steps website were sent to all Queensland-based employees enrolled in a Workplace Challenge between August 2012 and December 2018, irrespective of if their workplace had received a microgrant or not. Employees completed surveys at baseline, 6 weeks, and 18 weeks after the challenge started. Emails and on-screen notifications provided all participating employees with the participant information statement, online informed consent, and prompts to complete the surveys. The baseline assessment could only be completed before the challenge started. The 6-week assessment represents the postintervention assessment as 10,000 Steps resources encourage workplaces to use a challenge of this duration to maximize employee engagement.^{8,13} The 18-week surveys were introduced in 2016 to provide a short follow-up focused only on physical activity levels. At all workplaces, the total number of employees invited to participate at baseline, 6 weeks, and 18 weeks, was 28,480, 8,392, 5,301, and a total of 8,499, 2,543, and 1,026 were completed, respectively, resulting in completion rates of 29.8%, 30.3%, and 19.4%. The number of surveys completed by workers at workplaces that received a pedometer grant was 1901, 681, and 238 at baseline, 6 weeks, and 18 weeks, respectively. It should be noted that 10,000 Steps is a service delivery project and not a research project, thus only online reminders ($n = 5$ per survey) were used to prompt participation in the survey.

The employee survey included sociodemographic characteristics, physical activity,²¹ and satisfaction with the challenge. Sociodemographics assessed included age, gender, education level, employment status, occupational level, and height and weight which was used to calculate BMI. Physical activity was assessed using the Active Australia Survey which has acceptable psychometric properties and assesses the duration and frequency of walking, moderate and vigorous intensity physical activity in the last week.^{22,23} Standardized scoring protocols were used to classify participants as reporting Sufficient Physical Activity (classified as a minimum of 150 minutes

TABLE 1. RE-AIM Dimensions and Indicators

Dimension	Outcome Measures	Methods
Reach	• Number of pedometers awarded	10,000 Steps documents
	• Ratio of participating employees/total number of pedometers awarded	Final reports
Effectiveness	• Number of microgrants awarded	10,000 Steps documents
	• Comparison of workplace characteristics between workplaces awarded and not awarded a microgrant	Final report
	• Changes in employee physical activity	Employee Survey
Adoption	• % of workplaces reporting effectiveness to increase employee physical activity levels	Final report
	• % of workplaces reporting challenge raised awareness of physical activity, incidental activity	Final report
	• % employees reporting management encourage them to participate, they liked using the StepLog to record activity and view progress, liked the overall presentation of the website, and easily navigate the website	Employee Survey
Implementation	• Number and type of 10,000 Steps Challenge Resources used	Employee Survey
	• % reporting that pedometer motivated to increase physical activity and helped achieve daily physical activity goals, enjoyed taking part in challenge, achieved their physical activity goal during challenge, stopping the challenge before it was finished	Final report
	• % workplaces implementing challenge as planned,	Final report
Maintenance	• Reported barriers to implementation	Final report
	• % workplaces reported that challenge increased comradery, and morale	Final report
	• % reporting increased physical activity at work, outside work and continue being active	Employee Survey
	• % reporting intention to increase physical activity	Employee Survey
	• % reporting they would participate in challenge again, and recommend challenge to others	Final report
	• % planning to implement future workplace health initiative	Final report

of physical activity in five or more sessions) or Insufficient Physical Activity (classified as less than 150 minutes of activity).²¹ Participants also reported their enjoyment and satisfaction with the challenge, satisfaction with the StepLog, if they felt encouraged and supported by coworkers and management to increase their physical activity and if they stopped participating, why they stopped.

RE-AIM Evaluation Framework

Indicators of each RE-AIM dimension are described in Table 1. Indicators of Reach included the ratio of participating employees to the number of pedometers awarded, the number of microgrants awarded, and comparison of workplace characteristics between those awarded and not awarded a microgrant. Indicators of effectiveness included changes in the proportion of employees reporting sufficient physical activity from baseline to 6 weeks and to 18 weeks, and the proportion of workplaces reporting how effective the challenge was in increasing workers physical activity levels. Indicators of adoption included the proportion of employees reporting that they felt encouraged to participate by coworkers, who liked using the StepLog to record their steps, and also the number and type of challenge resources that workplaces reported using. Indicators of implementation included the proportion of participating workers who achieved their physical activity goals, the proportion of workplaces implementing the challenge as intended, and the barriers to implementation. Maintenance indicators included the proportion of workers who reported that they would participate again and recommend the challenge to others, and the proportion of workplaces who reported that they intended to implement a workplace health initiative in the future.

Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize RE-AIM components and χ^2 analyses were used to examine differences in workplace characteristics between workplaces who did and did not receive a microgrant. Changes in the proportion of employees reporting sufficient levels of physical activity at baseline, 6 weeks and 18 weeks were examined using multilevel mixed-effects logistic regression, with a fixed effect for time and a random intercept for individual participants and adjusted for participant age, BMI, gender, and clustering within workplaces. Alpha was set at 0.05 and all analyses were conducted using Stata (15.1).

RESULTS

Reach

A total of 323 microgrant applications were received and a total of 259 microgrants were awarded (Rnd 1: $n = 131$, Rnd 2: $n = 128$; 80% award rate) which provided a total of 21,211 pedometers. A total of 216 workplaces returned a final report; they were awarded 17,375 pedometers, employed 78,622 employees in total, and reported that 14,472 employees participated in the challenge. Thirty-two workplaces reported purchasing 2009 pedometers in addition to those provided by the microgrant. The participation rate was 83.3% (number of participating employees in relation to number of pedometers awarded). A significantly higher proportion of workplaces awarded a microgrant were from regional and remote locations in comparison to workplaces not awarded a microgrant ($\chi^2 = 43.7944$, $P = <0.001$). There were no significant differences in the workplace size and worker activity level between workplaces awarded and not awarded a microgrant (Table 2).

TABLE 2. Comparison of Workplace Characteristics Awarded and Not Awarded a Microgrant

	Awarded Microgrant	Not Awarded Microgrant	P
	N (%)	N (%)	
Geographical location			
Metropolitan	107 (41.31)	56 (87.50)	<0.001
Regional or remote	152 (58.69)	8 (12.50)	
Workplace size			
Small	27 (10.42)	3 (4.69)	0.367
Medium	140 (54.05)	37 (57.81)	
Large	92 (35.52)	24 (37.50)	
Worker activity level			
Low	122 (47.10)	37 (57.81)	0.306
Medium	123 (47.49)	24 (37.50)	
High	14 (5.41)	3 (4.69)	

Effectiveness

At baseline, 1846 individuals provided complete data and were included in the analysis. These individuals were from 99 workplaces. At baseline, 6 weeks, and 18 weeks, the proportion of employees reporting participating in sufficient physical activity was 68.6%, 80.2%, and 76.9%, respectively. In comparison to baseline, a significantly higher proportion of employees reported engaging in sufficient physical activity at 6 weeks (odds ratio [OR] = 2.45, 95% confidence interval [CI], 1.88 to 3.18), and 18 weeks (OR = 1.78, 95% CI, 1.19 to 2.65). Of the 216 final reports returned, 76.9% of workplaces reported the challenge increased employee physical activity, 73.6% reported the challenge increased awareness of the importance of physical activity for health, 25.9% reported the challenge helped to increase awareness of the importance of incidental physical activity.

Adoption

Table 3 summarizes the adoption indicators from the employee 6-week survey and the workplace final reports. Approximately 60% of workers reported being encouraged by management to participate in the challenge, and approximately 75% of employees reported being encouraged by coworkers. The majority (79.7% to 86.5%) of employees reported they liked using the StepLog to record their activity, view their progress, and that it was easy to use. The proportion of workplaces that reported using the provided

resources ranged between 54.2% and 63.0% depending on the resource used (Table 3), and 77.8% of workplaces reported using at least one of these resources to assist in promoting physical activity and the challenge in the workplace.

Implementation

Indicators of implementation are displayed in Table 3. The majority of participants reported that the pedometer helped them achieve their goals and enjoyed participating in the challenge, whereas only 15.4% reported stopping the challenge before it was over. Of the workplaces completing a final report, less than 40% reported that the challenge improved either coworker comradery or morale, and 54.2% reported that they were not able to implement the challenge as planned, and workplaces indicated that this was due to higher (26.5% of workplaces) or lower (20.5% of workplaces) than anticipated participation rates and timing of the challenge (35.0% of workplaces). Timing issues included holiday periods and busy periods of work interfering with the scheduling of the challenge. Other impediments reported included the burden of manually entering steps ($n = 5$), administrative burden of managing the challenge ($n = 3$), lack of time ($n = 3$), lack of motivation ($n = 3$), weather ($n = 3$), and issues with pedometer accuracy ($n = 3$).

Maintenance

The separate indicators of maintenance are shown in Tables 3 and 4. Approximately half of employees reported they increased their activity outside of work, and nearly two-thirds reported that they increased their activity at work and the majority of employees reported that they would continue to be active without the challenge. The majority of employees reported that they would participate in

TABLE 3. Indicators of Adoption, Implementation, and Maintenance of the 10,000 Steps Microgrant Scheme

Indicator	%
Adoption	
Management encouraged me to participate	61.4
Felt encouraged to participate*	75.2
Liked using the StepLog to record their steps*	80.3
Liked using the StepLog to view their progress*	79.7
Liked the overall presentation of the website*	86.5
StepLog was easy to navigate*	87.7
Workplace reported use of the Workplace Physical Activity Guide [†]	63.0
Workplace reported use of the Workplace Challenge Resources [†]	59.3
Workplace reported use of the Workplace Challenge Guide [†]	54.2
Implementation indicator	
Pedometer helped me achieve my daily physical activity goals*	79.6
I enjoyed taking part in the challenge*	88.1
I achieved my physical activity goals during challenge*	66.7
I stopped participating before the challenge was over*	15.4
Workplace reported it was not able to implement the challenge as planned [†]	54.2
Workplace reported the challenge improved coworker comradery [†]	32.4
Workplace reported the challenge improved coworker morale [†]	39.4
Maintenance indicator	
I was able to increase my activity at work*	65.9
I was more active outside of work*	56.1
I am likely to continue to be active without the challenge *	79.0
I intend to increase my activity in the next month*	58.9
I would recommend the challenge to other workplaces*	91.3
I would participate in the challenge again*	87.2

*Reported percentages are calculated based on 681 responses to the 6-week employee survey.

[†]Reported percentages are calculated based on 216 responses to the 6-week employee survey.

TABLE 4. Proportion of Workplaces Indicating Existing or Future Implementation of the Following Health Promotion Initiatives

	N Responses	Proportion Indicating Yes, %
Existing		
Have a healthy promotion policy available	216	7.0
Receiving microgrant demonstrated commitment to workplace health	216	50.2
Future		
Plan to implement future workplace health initiative	216	36.1
Implement future 10,000 Steps Challenges	216	30.1
Implement regular health screening	216	14.8
Regular information workshops	216	28.7
Increased promotion of community activities	216	12.5
Promote workplace physical activity	216	50.0
Promote walking groups	216	17.6
Promote quit smoking	216	19.4
Promote healthy eating initiatives*	107	39.3
Promote responsible alcohol policy at work events*	107	18.7
Promote stress/fatigue management initiatives	216	18.5
Subsidise healthy activities for workers	216	10.2

*Number of responses is lower due to missing responses for this outcome.

the challenge again and recommend it to other workplaces. Approximately 50% of workplaces reported that the microgrant demonstrated their commitment to workplace health, although considerably fewer workplaces indicated they had plans to implement a future workplace health initiative (36.1%) or had a health promotion policy available (7%). Half of workplaces reported they would continue to promote workplace physical activity, 30.1% reported they would implement another 10,000 Steps Challenge and 39.7% would promote healthy eating initiatives (Table 4).

DISCUSSION

The 10,000 Steps Microgrant Scheme reached a large number of employees and workplaces, was effective at increasing sufficient physical activity, had acceptable levels of adoption of the program resources and the challenge, and achieved good levels of implementation by employees and workplaces. Employee and workplace levels of maintenance were mixed, high proportions of employees reported they would continue to be active without the Workplace Challenge and would recommend the challenge to others, whereas workplaces reported moderate levels of planning to implement health promotion initiatives in the future.

Few physical activity interventions are disseminated at scale and the microgrant scheme aimed to enhance the reach of the 10,000 Steps Workplace Challenge and engage workplaces in ongoing health promotion activities.^{13,24} Approximately 260 workplaces and 14,500 employees were reached and the participation rate ranged from 18.4% to 83.3% depending on the denominator used (number of pedometers awarded vs number of employees). However, given the nature of the microgrant scheme and the pedometer-based challenge, defining reach based on the number of pedometers awarded (83.3%) is likely more meaningful. The level of reach achieved in this study compares favorably to the participation rates (3% to 78%) reported in a systematic review of workplace physical activity interventions.¹ The reach of the microgrant scheme is also higher than that observed when an e-health physical activity and nutrition intervention targeting mid-aged men was attempted to be disseminated to workplaces (reach = 25%, $n = 3$ workplaces)²⁵; however, this intervention only contained resources and did not provide pedometers or other incentives. The favorable levels of reach may be due to several factors, including the provision of pedometers at no cost, dissemination of the grants as part of a well-known program and the ease of the online application process.⁸ These factors may have been particularly relevant for the high proportions of nonmetropolitan workplaces (58%), and small-to-medium sized workplaces (64%) who may have less resources to implement workplace physical activity initiatives. The significant increases in the proportion of employees reporting sufficient physical activity is consistent with evaluations of workplace physical activity interventions and pedometer based interventions that also report increases in physical activity.^{1,26,27} Despite differences in baseline levels of physical activity between the current study (68%) and an evaluation of the Global Corporate Challenge (40.9%), which is a similar workplace-based pedometer intervention, both interventions achieved similar increases in the proportion of participants meeting guidelines (current study: 76.9% at 18 weeks; Global Corporate Challenge: 47.6% at 16 weeks).²⁸ However, the unique contribution of this study is that it demonstrated that a technology and pedometer-based workplace physical activity intervention supported by a microgrant scheme can increase physical activity when disseminated.

Physical activity did decline from 6 to 18 weeks, which is not uncommon, and highlights the importance of maintaining the initial intervention efforts.²⁹ The behavior change strategies used in the challenge focus on initiation of behavior. And given that different strategies are needed to initiate behavior change (eg, biofeedback, demonstration of the behavior) and maintain behavior change (eg,

self-reward, prompt/cues), the challenge may need to be revised to include greater emphasis on maintaining changes in activity.^{29,30} This could include a series of challenges that differ in their focus (eg, initiation vs maintenance) which may be feasible given many employees reporting being willing to participate in another challenge. However, this strategy would also need to be cognizant of the fact that approximately 30% of workplace indicated that they would implement a challenge again.

Adoption and implementation of programs is important if they are to be effective and several indicators suggest that the challenge was adopted and implemented. The StepLog is a key feature of the challenge, as it allows self-monitoring of physical activity, and high proportions of employees reported favorable perceptions of this feature. Several studies have examined the usability of the StepLog and informed its development, this likely contributed to the levels of satisfaction and use of the StepLog observed.^{31,32} This is important given the interrelationship between usability and engagement with e-health interventions.³³ The microgrants were supported with resources to assist the adoption and implementation of the challenge including promoting participation in the challenge. The many workplaces reporting using the challenge resources, high proportions of employees reporting management and coworker support for participation, and the good participation rate in the challenge, suggesting that the resources were useful for this purpose. This is consistent with a key stakeholder evaluation of the challenge resources and microgrant participants and evidence that coworker and management support is associated with higher participation in health promotion programs.^{8,34} The importance of implementing resources to support organizational support for physical activity in the 10,000 Steps Challenge is highlighted by observations that the combination of an organizational support intervention in combination with an activity tracker produces larger increases in daily steps in comparison to a organizational support only intervention.³⁵

The main barriers to implementing the challenge as planned were higher and lower than expected participation, and the timing of the challenge due to holidays and work demands. Higher participation rates may cause increases in administration burden for coordinators, and/or a shortage of pedometers. Only a small number of workplaces specifically reported administration burden was an issue and the exact nature of this burden is unknown. Currently, a coordinator needs to manually assign individuals to a team and this may be one source of burden when participation is higher than anticipated. This highlights the importance of programs that are easy to use and administer. For the challenge, this may mean enhancing the website user interface and design to streamline this process.

Indicators of maintenance were mixed in the present study. Approximately 87% of employees reported being willing to participate in another challenge and 79.0% indicated they would be active without the challenge. Although only 30% of workplaces reported, they would offer another challenge, and 30% to 50% of workplaces intended to offer ongoing health promotion initiatives depending on the initiative. The reasons and barriers to workplaces maintaining the provision of the challenge and broader health promotion initiatives in the present study are unknown and may be similar to those (eg, time, costs, expertise) reported in the broader literature.²⁻⁷ It may also be due to only 30% to 40% of workplaces reported the challenge increased employee comradery and morale and workplaces not being aware of these less tangible benefits the challenge may create in the workplace. Addressing this may help contribute to workplaces increasing their willingness to offer future workplace health initiatives and maintaining the provision of existing initiatives such as the challenge.

A pre-post design without a control group was used to determine improvements in physical activity, and although this is not as strong as other designs (eg, RCT), it is difficult and at times

impractical to adopt such designs in implementation research.³⁶ Other limitations include the low completion rate of surveys, and also that no economic evaluation was undertaken despite the microgrant pedometers costing a total of \$115,000 AUD (round 1: \$35,000 AUD; round 2: \$80,000). Although a portion of workplaces indicated that they would implement future health promotion initiatives in the future we did not evaluate if this occurred. Activity levels were assessed using a self-report instrument which has acceptable measurement properties, although all self-report measures are prone to reporting bias.^{22,23} Baseline levels of sufficient physical activity (68.6%) were higher than that reported for the Australian population (~56%),^{37,38} but were lower relative to an evaluation of another workplace pedometer program—the Global Corporate Challenge (98%).³⁹ Withstanding this limitation, to maximize potential gains from physical activity more emphasis on engaging less active workers is necessary. Despite these limitations this study demonstrates that a pedometer microgrant scheme can reach and engage workplaces and employees in a workplace physical activity intervention and that it can increase engagement in sufficient physical activity. Future microgrant initiatives may benefit from conducting cost-effective analyses and integrating enhanced strategies to promote physical activity maintenance.

REFERENCES

- To QG, Chen TTL, Magnussen CG, To KG. Workplace physical activity interventions: a systematic review. *Am J Health Promot.* 2013;27:e113–e123.
- Malik SH, Blake H, Suggs LS. A systematic review of workplace health promotion interventions for increasing physical activity. *Br J Health Psychol.* 2014;19:149–180.
- Caperchione CM, Reid RC, Sharp PG, Stehmeier J. How do management and non-management employees perceive workplace wellness programmes? A qualitative examination. *Health Educ J.* 2016;75:553–564.
- Person AL, Colby SE, Bulova JA, Eubanks JW. Barriers to participation in a worksite wellness program. *Nur Res Pract.* 2010;4:149–154.
- Sorensen G, Landsbergis P, Hammer L, Amick 3rd BC, Linnan L, Yancey A, et al. Preventing chronic disease in the workplace: a workshop report and recommendations. *Am J Public Health.* 2011;101(Suppl. 1):S196–S207.
- Goetzel RZ, Ozminkowski RJ. The health and cost benefits of work site health-promotion programs. *Annu Rev Public Health.* 2008;29:303–323.
- Cherniack M, Lahiri S. Barriers to implementation of workplace health interventions: an economic perspective. *J Occup Environ Med.* 2010;52:934–942.
- Caperchione CM, Vandelanotte C, Corry K, Power D, Gill N, Duncan MJ. Qualitative Exploration of the Feasibility and Acceptability of Workplace-Based Microgrants to Improve Physical Activity: The 10,000 Steps Pedometer Microgrant Scheme. *J Occup Environ Med.* 2018;60:e406–e411.
- Caperchione C, Mummery WK, Joyner K. WALK Community Grants Scheme: lessons learned in developing and administering a health promotion microgrants program. *Health Promot Pract.* 2010;11:637–644.
- Hartwig KA, Bobbitt-Cooke M, Zaharek MM, Nappi S, Wykoff RF, Katz DL. The value of microgrants for community-based health promotion: two models for practice and policy. *J Public Health Manag Pract.* 2006;12:90–96.
- Schmidt M, Plochg T, Harting J, Klazinga NS, Stronks K. Micro grants as a stimulus for community action in residential health programmes: a case study. *Health Promot Int.* 2009;24:234–242.
- Caperchione CM, Sabiston CM, Clark MI, Bottonoff JL, Toxopeus R, Campbell KL, et al. Innovative approach for increasing physical activity among breast cancer survivors: protocol for Project MOVE, a quasi-experimental study. *BMJ Open.* 2016;6:e012533.
- Duncan M, Brown W, Mummery W, Vandelanotte C. 10,000 Steps Australia: a community-wide eHealth physical activity promotion program. *Br J Sports Med.* 2018;52:885–886.
- Mummery K, Brown W, Trost S, Eakin E. 10,000 Steps Rockhampton: establishing a multi-strategy physical activity promotion project in a community. *Health Promot J Aust.* 2003;14:95.
- Caperchione CM, Vandelanotte C, Corry K, Power D, Gill N, Duncan MJ. Qualitative exploration of the feasibility and acceptability of workplace-based microgrants to improve physical activity: the 10,000 steps pedometer microgrant scheme. *J Occup Environ Med.* 2018;60:e406–e411.
- Brown WJ, Mummery WK, Eakin E, Schofield G. 10,000 Steps Rockhampton: evaluation of a whole community approach to improving population levels of physical activity. *J Phys Act Health.* 2006;3:1–14.
- Mummery WK, Brown WJ. Whole of community physical activity interventions: easier said than done. *Br J Sports Med.* 2009;43:39–43.
- Mummery WK, Schofield G, Hinchliffe A, Joyner K, Brown W. Dissemination of a community-based physical activity project: the case of 10,000 steps. *J Sci Med Sport.* 2006;9:424–430.
- Guertler D, Vandelanotte C, Kirwan M, Duncan MJ. Engagement and nonusage attrition with a free physical activity promotion program: the case of 10,000 steps Australia. *JMIR.* 2015;17:e176.
- Kirwan M, Duncan MJ, Vandelanotte C, Kerry Mummery W. Using smartphone technology to monitor physical activity in the 10,000 steps program: a matched case-control trial. *J Med Internet Res.* 2012;14:176–185.
- Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. *The Active Australia Survey: A Guide and Manual for Implementation, Analysis and Reporting.* Canberra: AIHW; 2003.
- Brown WJ, Bauman A, Chey T, Trost S, Mummery K. Comparison of surveys used to measure physical activity. *Aust N Z J Public Health.* 2004;28:128–134.
- Brown WJ, Bauman A, Trost S, Mummery WK, Owen N. Test-retest reliability of four physical activity measures used in population surveys. *J Sci Med Sport.* 2004;7:205–215.
- Milat AJ, Bauman AE, Redman S, Curac N. Public health research outputs from efficacy to dissemination: a bibliometric analysis. *BMC Public Health.* 2011;11:934.
- Caperchione CM, Duncan M, Kolt GS, Vandelanotte C, Rosenkranz RR, Maeder A, et al. Examining an Australian physical activity and nutrition intervention using RE-AIM. *Health Promot Int.* 2016;31:450–458.
- Bravata DM, Smith-Spangler C, Sundaram V, et al. Using pedometers to increase physical activity and improve health: a systematic review. *JAMA.* 2007;298:2296–2304.
- Kang M, Marshall SJ, Barreira TV, Lee JO. Effect of pedometer-based physical activity interventions: a meta-analysis. *Res Q Exerc Sport.* 2009;80:648–655.
- Freak-Poli R, Wolfe R, Backholer K, de Courten M, Peeters A. Impact of a pedometer-based workplace health program on cardiovascular and diabetes risk profile. *Prev Med.* 2011;53:162–171.
- Howlett N, Trivedi D, Troop NA, Chater AM. Are physical activity interventions for healthy inactive adults effective in promoting behavior change and maintenance, and which behavior change techniques are effective? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Transl Behav Med.* 2018;9:147–157.
- Troop NA, Howlett N, Chater AM, Trivedi D. Are physical activity interventions for healthy inactive adults effective in promoting behavior change and maintenance, and which behavior change techniques are effective? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Transl Behav Med.* 2018;9:147–157.
- Kirwan M, Duncan MJ, Vandelanotte C, Mummery WK. Design, Development, and Formative Evaluation of a Smartphone Application for Recording and Monitoring Physical Activity Levels The 10,000 Steps “iStepLog”. *Health Educ Behav.* 2013;40:140–151.
- Hinchliffe A, Mummery WK. Applying usability testing techniques to improve a health promotion website. *Health Promot J Austr.* 2008;19:29–35.
- Short CE, Rebar AL, Plotnikoff RC, Vandelanotte C. Designing engaging online behaviour change interventions: a proposed model of user engagement. *Eur Health Psychologist.* 2015;17:32–38.
- Kilpatrick M, Blizzard L, Sanderson K, Teale B, Jose K, Venn A. Barriers and facilitators to participation in workplace health promotion (WHP) activities: results from a cross-sectional survey of public-sector employees in Tasmania, Australia. *Health Promot J Austr.* 2017;28:225–232.
- Brakenridge CL, Fjeldsoe BS, Young DC, Winkler EAH, Dunstan DW, Straker LM, et al. Evaluating the effectiveness of organisational-level strategies with or without an activity tracker to reduce office workers’ sitting time: a cluster-randomised trial. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act.* 2016;13:115.
- Milat AJ, King L, Bauman AE, Redman S. The concept of scalability: increasing the scale and potential adoption of health promotion interventions into policy and practice. *Health Promot Int.* 2013;28:285–298.
- ABS. 4364.0.55.001—National Health Survey: First Results, 2014–15. Canberra: ABS; 2015.
- Gordon S, Vandelanotte C, Rayward AT, Murawski B, Duncan MJ. Socio-demographic and behavioural correlates of insufficient sleep in Australian adults. *Sleep Health.* 2019;5:12–17.
- Macniven R, Engelen L, Kacen MJ, Bauman A. Does a corporate worksite physical activity program reach those who are inactive? Findings from an evaluation of the Global Corporate Challenge. *Health Promot J Aust.* 2015;26:142–145.

Supplementary Material 1

Example 10,000 Steps Microgrant application form

Organisation Details	
Organisation Name	
Organisation Street Address* <i>*N.B. Not P.O. Box If successful, pedometers and will be couriered to this address.</i>	
Organisation Phone Number	
Which industry type best describes your workplace	Accommodation and food services Administrative and support services Agriculture, forestry and fishing Arts and recreation services Construction Education and training Electricity, gas, water and waste services Financial and insurance services Healthcare and social assistance Information media & telecommunications Manufacturing Mining Other services Professional, scientific & technical services Public administration and safety Rental, hiring and real estate services Retail trade Transport, postal and warehousing Wholesale trade Other – please specify
Please provide a brief description of your workplace, including an overview of its core functions and services offered.	

Primary Contact Person	
Name	
Position title	
Email	
Additional Contact Person	
<i>NB: The additional contact is an alternate contact person who has knowledge of the pedometer grant application and 10,000 Steps Workplace Challenge if the Primary contact person is not contactable.</i>	
Name	
Position title	
Email	
Phone number	
Participant Information	
Approximately, how many workers are in your organisation?	
How many workers do you estimate will take part in the challenge?	
What type of activity do the majority of workers in your workplace perform?	
Low activity: Sedentary work, physically very easy, mostly sitting, office work Moderate activity: Intermediate work, includes a combination of sitting and walking High activity: Active strenuous work including walking and lifting or heavy manual labour	

10,000 Steps Workplace Challenge details	
What is the title for this project? <i>(This title briefly describes your project and will help us differentiate applications, e.g. Bob's Plumbing Workplace Challenge – Brisbane Branch)</i>	
Are the workers doing your Workplace Challenge based in Queensland?	Yes No
Proposed Workplace Challenge start date: <i>(Please allow at least 8 weeks for delivery of pedometers when choosing your start date)</i>	

Proposed Workplace Challenge length (weeks):	
Has your organisation conducted a 10,000 Steps Challenge within the last two years?	Yes No
Where will your Workplace Challenge take place? <i>(Please list the locations of all worksites where the challenge will take place, i.e. names of towns and/or cities and postcodes)</i>	
How will your workplace benefit from doing a 10,000 Steps Workplace Challenge? <i>(A 2-4 sentence answer is sufficient)</i>	

Ongoing commitment to workplace wellness

Once you have completed the Workplace Challenge, how will your organisation continue to address workplace wellness?
(A 2-4 sentence answer is sufficient)

--

Pedometer Information

How many pedometers are you applying for?
(Maximum 150)

How did you find out about the 10,000 Steps Pedometer Grants?

10,000 Steps website

Healthier. Happier. Workplaces website

Workplace Health and Safety Queensland website

Media (Newspaper, radio & TV)

Facebook

Twitter

Word of mouth

Other – please specify

Example 10,000 Steps Microgrant Final Report Template

Organisation Details

Organisation	
Organisation Name:	
Organisation Mailing Address:	
Phone:	

Primary Contact Person (who is familiar with the project)	
Name:	
Position title:	
Email:	

Additional Contact Person	
Name:	
Position title:	
Email:	
Phone:	

10,000 Steps Workplace Challenge

Objectives

Please describe the main objectives and aims for the 10,000 Steps Workplace Challenge.

Rationale

Why did your organisation apply for the Pedometer Grant and conduct a 10,000 Steps Workplace Challenge?

Implementation

Describe how you implemented the 10,000 Steps Workplace Challenge in your organisation.
I.e. What type of challenge did you conduct? When did it start and finish? Where did the challenge take place? Please list all worksite locations where the challenge was conducted.

Implementation (continued)

How did you promote the 10,000 Steps Workplace Challenge in your workplace?
*I.e. Which of the following methods were used, such as emails, flyers, posters, or meetings?
What supporting activities were conducted, such as a launch, walking group, completion celebrations, or awards/prizes?*

Were you able to implement the 10,000 Steps Workplace Challenge as initially planned?
*Please describe what changes were made and why they were necessary.
E.g. We had to change start dates to fit in with company events; we had more staff participate than anticipated so we changed the challenge type to make it easier to manage etc.*

Reach

How many workers were offered the chance to participate in your 10,000 Steps Workplace Challenge?	
How many workers participated in your 10,000 Steps Workplace Challenge?	
Did you utilise all the pedometers granted?	

Reach

If no, why didn't you use all of the pedometers granted?

N.B. Your organisation can continue to use the surplus pedometers.

Did you purchase any additional pedometers?

If yes, how many?

Participants

Please describe the workers that participated in your 10,000 Steps Workplace Challenge.

Please enter an approximate number of workers within each category.

Age of participants

18-34 years:

35-44 years:

45-54 years:

55+ years:

Gender of participants

Male:

Female:

Of the workers that participated, what are the general types of activity they perform?

Low activity: Sedentary work, physically very easy, mostly sitting, office work

Low activity:

Medium activity: intermediate work, includes a combination of sitting and walking

Medium activity:

High activity: Active strenuous work including walking and lifting or heavy manual labour

High activity:

Participants (continued)

Is there any other way that you could describe the workers that participated in your challenge? If yes, please include here.

Physical Activity outcomes

How do you think the 10,000 Steps Workplace Challenge has influenced the participant's physical activity levels?

How do you think the 10,000 Steps Workplace Challenge has influenced the participant's awareness of physical activity and the benefits of physical activity?

Workplace Challenge outcomes

What were the positive aspects of the 10,000 Steps Workplace Challenge?

Workplace Challenge outcomes (continued)

Did you encounter any difficulties with the 10,000 Steps Workplace Challenge? If so, what were they?

How did you overcome the barriers /difficulties associated with the 10,000 Steps Workplace Challenge?

Did you receive feedback from participants about the 10,000 Steps Workplace Challenge? Please summarise any feedback you received.
I.e. Did they enjoy the challenge? Did they find it easy or difficult to participate? How did they overcome any difficulties (if any)?

What were the key factors that enabled the 10,000 Steps Workplace Challenge to be a success?
E.g. Committed participants, dedicated coordinator, communication with 10,000 Steps staff, a well organised wellness committee, promotion within the workplace, Pedometer Grants.

Workplace Challenge outcomes (continued)

If you were to conduct another 10,000 Steps Workplace Challenge in the future, what would you do differently?

Please provide us with any other comments, suggestions or feedback that would further assist workplaces in implementing a 10,000 Steps Workplace Challenge.

Workplace Wellness outcomes

How has receiving a Pedometer Grant influenced your organisation's view towards worker health and wellbeing?

How will your organisation continue to address worker health and wellbeing?
I.e. What other activities do you have planned? What other health issues will you address?

Workplace Wellness outcomes (continued)

Which of the following supporting programs and resources have you used?

- 10,000 Steps promotional materials
- 10,000 Steps Workplace Guide
- 10,000 Steps Workplace Challenge resources
- 10,000 Steps Workplace Challenge Guide
- Healthier. Happier. Workplaces website (formally Workplaces for Wellness)
- Healthier. Happier. Workplaces free wellness planning resources (formally Workplaces for Wellness)
- Healthier. Happier. Workplaces Recognition Scheme (formally Workplaces for Wellness)
- Get Healthy Coaching and Information Service (promoted it within your workplace)
- Workplace Quit Smoking Program
- Workplace Health and Safety Queensland website

Would you like further support in developing a workplace wellness program?
(If yes, your contact details will be passed on to an external Advisory Service)

Pedometer Grant

We would appreciate feedback on your experience with the Pedometer Grant process.

On a scale of 1 to 5, (1 = Strongly agree and 5 = Strongly disagree) please rate your level of agreement with the statements below.

1. The guidelines were easy to understand.						
Strongly Agree		Undecided		Strongly Disagree		N/A
1	2	3	4	5		N/A
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The final report template was easy to use.						
Strongly Agree		Undecided		Strongly Disagree		N/A
1	2	3	4	5		N/A
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Overall, the process of preparing a submission for the Pedometer Grants was straight forward.						
Strongly Agree		Undecided		Strongly Disagree		N/A
1	2	3	4	5		N/A
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
4. I found the advice/support provided by 10,000 Steps staff to be useful.						
Strongly Agree		Undecided		Strongly Disagree		N/A
1	2	3	4	5		N/A
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Our workplace would have conducted a 10,000 Steps Challenge even if we did not receive a Pedometer Grant.						
Strongly Agree		Undecided		Strongly Disagree		N/A
1	2	3	4	5		N/A
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

Did the pedometers meet your expectations?

I.e. Did they arrive when expected? Were they of suitable quality?

Pedometer Grants (continued)

What were the positive aspects of the Pedometer Grants?

What were the difficult aspects of the Pedometer Grants?

Please provide us with any other comments, suggestions or feedback that would further assist workplaces in receiving Pedometer Grants.

Thank you for completing the final report for the 10,000 Steps Pedometer Grants. We appreciate your feedback.