

Accepted Manuscript

BJGP OPEN

Using Self-Determination theory to understand the social prescribing process: a qualitative study

Bhatti Sara, Rayner Jennifer, Pinto Andrew D., Mulligan Kate, Cole Donald C.

DOI: <https://doi.org/BJGPO.2020.0153>

To access the most recent version of this article, please click the DOI URL in the line above.

Received 14 Sep 2020

Revised 02 Nov 2020

Accepted 02 Nov 2020

© 2020 The Author(s). This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). Published by BJGP Open. For editorial process and policies, see: <https://bjgpopen.org/authors/bjgp-open-editorial-process-and-policies>

When citing this article please include the DOI provided above.

Author Accepted Manuscript

This is an 'author accepted manuscript': a manuscript that has been accepted for publication in BJGP Open, but which has not yet undergone subediting, typesetting, or correction. Errors discovered and corrected during this process may materially alter the content of this manuscript, and the latest published version (the Version of Record) should be used in preference to any preceding versions

Title: Using Self-Determination Theory to understand the social prescribing process: a qualitative study

Authors:

Sara Bhatti, MPH¹

Jennifer Rayner, PhD¹⁻³

Andrew D. Pinto, MD CCFP FRCPC MSc^{3,6}

Kate Mulligan, PhD^{1,3}

Donald C. Cole, MD FRCP(C)^{3,7}

¹Alliance for Healthier Communities, Toronto, Canada

²Centre for Studies in Family Medicine, University of Western, London, Canada

³Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada

⁴Upstream Lab, MAP Centre for Urban Health Solutions, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, Unity Health Toronto, Toronto, Canada

⁵Department of Family and Community Medicine, St. Michael's Hospital, Toronto, Canada

⁶Department of Family and Community Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada

⁷South East Grey Community Health Centre, Dundalk, Canada

Corresponding Author:

Sara Bhatti, MPH

Alliance for Healthier Communities

Toronto, Canada

sara.bhatti@allianceON.org

Accepted Manuscript – BJGP – BJGP.2020.0153

Abstract

Background: Social prescribing assists patients to engage in social activities and connect to community supports as part of a holistic approach to primary care. *Rx: Community* was a social prescribing project, implemented within 11 community health centres situated across Ontario, Canada.

Aims: To explore how social prescribing as a process facilitates positive outcomes for patients.

Design and setting: We used qualitative methods, conducting 18 focus groups involving 88 patients and 8 additional in-depth interviews.

Methods: Interviews and focus groups were transcribed verbatim and analyzed thematically using a theoretical framework based on self-determination theory.

Results: Participants who had received social prescriptions described social prescribing as an empathetic process that respects their needs and interests. Social prescribing facilitated the patient's voice in their care, helped patient's develop skills in addressing needs important to them, and fostered trusting relationships with staff and other participants. Patients reported their social support networks were expanded, and they had improved mental health and ability in self-management of chronic conditions. Patients who became involved in social prescribing as voluntary "health champions" reported this was a positive experience and they gained a sense of purpose by giving back to their communities in ways that felt meaningful for them.

Conclusion: Social prescribing produced positive outcomes for patients, and fit well within the community health centre model of primary care. Future research should examine the impact on health outcomes and examine the return on investment of developing and implementing social prescribing programs.

Keywords: social prescribing, social determinants of health, primary health care, qualitative research, self-determination theory

How this fits in: Social prescribing has been identified as a way of addressing determinants of health in primary care settings. Existing literature has explored the implications of social prescribing on patients' health however, the mechanism for how social prescribing produces these outcomes has not been fully explored. Social prescribing facilitates patient's voice in their care, helps patient's develop skills/addressing needs important to them, and fosters trusting relationships with staff and other participants, and had a tangible impact on patient's lives. These results will be useful for primary care providers interested incorporating social prescribing into their practice.

INTRODUCTION

Social prescribing (SP) is a process of using a link worker to recommend patients engage in social activities and community supports in order to holistically address their needs.¹ The prescription can take many forms, depending on the community and resources available and patient's needs, but can include a knitting circle, walking group, bereavement support group, or volunteering. Multiple studies indicate that these prescriptions improve social inclusion²⁻⁵, mental well-being,⁶ physical activity levels,⁷ and self-management of health.^{8,9} However, beyond identifying the impact of these prescriptions, it is equally important to understand how SP as a process facilitates these outcomes. As such, this paper builds on the work done by Hanlon et al,¹⁰ Kellezi et al³ and Payne et al¹¹ in trying to understand the “how” of SP.

Rx: Community, was undertaken in Ontario Community Health Centres (CHC) from 2018-2020 (described in depth elsewhere).¹² The SP pathway implemented involved providers identifying a patient with unmet social needs (e.g. widowed patient frequently coming in for social visits) and jointly deciding what would work best for the patient. The provider would then refer the patient directly to the prescribed activity or to a SP navigator (i.e. link worker), if further discussions were needed. Afterwards, the patient would be supported in attending their prescribed activity or become involved as a health champion. The opportunity to become a health champion is a part of a SP model called Collaborative Practice in the UK and was not offered at all centres. It was unique in the sense that these individuals were not prescribed an activity to attend but rather the opportunity to lead the development and creation of programs within their centres as a volunteer.¹³ In this study, we aimed to explore the impact on patient's health and wellbeing as they navigated this SP pathway, and to use Self-determination theory (SDT) to understand how the pathway produced positive outcomes for patients within the CHC context.

METHODS

Study Design

We chose a qualitative case study approach to understand patient's experiences. The study was approved by Western University Ethics (#112612).

Theoretical Framework

To study the SP pathway, a theoretical framework based on SDT, a theory of motivation, was applied (figure 1.).^{14,15} The theory suggests that those who experience self-determination (i.e. the ability to make choices and exert control over one's life) are more motivated to take action and experience greater psychological health and wellbeing. However, to become self-determined three basic psychological needs must be satisfied: autonomy (the need to feel control over one's life and decisions), relatedness (the need to have close, affectionate relationships) and competence (the ability to influence outcomes, be capable and effective).^{14,15} Beneficence (having a positive impact on others) has recently been identified as a fourth psychological need.¹⁶ SDT has been used as a theoretical framework to design and study interventions that sustain behaviour changes¹⁷⁻²¹ and to study the impact of programs, including SP.^{10,22}

Self-determination at individual and community scales is a key component of health promotion theory.²³ In this study, the SP pathway was implemented in the context of a comprehensive Model of Health and

Wellbeing (see figure 2.). The model used by all CHCs, is rooted in this understanding of health and wellbeing, health equity, health promotion and community development.²⁴

Setting and Participants

The study involved 11 Ontario CHCs including a mix of rural, urban, Northern and Francophone. Among those who had received a social prescription, convenience sampling was used to recruit participants through poster advertisements and staff contact. Those who agreed to participate were offered a free meal and reimbursement for transportation.

Researcher characteristics

Research team members are of different genders (3 identify as women and 2 men), cultural and disciplinary backgrounds. They include those with clinical experience working in primary care settings with diverse populations, substantial health promotion and population health experience, and varied methodological training, including qualitative and health services research. Three are staff at the Alliance for Healthier Communities, while two researchers are with other organizations, hence bringing insider and outsider perspectives to the research team.

Data Collection

A semi-structured interview guide was developed to explore the referral process and uptake, and various outcomes (See Supplementary resource 1). From January 2019 – October 2019, interviews and focus groups were conducted at approximately the 3, 6 and 12 month's mark of the study. Focus groups conducted at the CHC or through video-conferencing ran for 60-90 mins. Interviews for those who could not attend a focus group or were uncomfortable in a group setting lasted from 30-40 mins over phone. Informed written consent was obtained from patients who participated. Interviews and focus groups were recorded and transcribed verbatim, with individual interview transcripts anonymized, and focus group transcripts only identifiable by CHC.

Analysis

Qualitative analysis was conducted in two stages using NVivo version 12. In the first stage, thematic analysis using an inductive approach was conducted on an initial set of transcripts to better understand the process and outcomes of SP as experienced by patients. Our initial analysis prompted us to choose a theory to help guide the second stage of analysis on how the SP pathway might facilitate these outcomes.

During the second stage, Braun and Clark's²⁵ approach to thematic analysis was used. This involved reading through transcripts and generating initial codes using a deductive approach (e.g. themes related to self-determination theory, social isolation, loneliness, barriers etc.) while still being open to new emergent themes and ones identified in the first round. Using the initial codes, one of the researchers and a research student used line by line coding to independently code transcripts. They then compared transcripts and generated a codebook, which was maintained by the researcher. By this time, it was apparent that enough interviews and focus groups had been conducted for no new themes to emerge. Transcripts were then coded for a second round and reviewed again to ensure credibility of analysis. Coders were in agreement for the majority of coding and disagreements regarding interpretation of

codes were resolved between the coders. Codes were then collated into themes and sub-themes and differences across CHC characteristics (i.e. size, rurality and age of CHC) were explored.

RESULTS

96 patients participated in this study, with 8 individuals interviewed one-on-one and the remaining in focus groups. The majority of participants (see table 1) were female and aged between 41-60 years, and of low-income. More than half had secondary or equivalent education, lived with other people and were of white ethnicity.

Findings from patient interviews and focus groups were categorized into broad themes of context of care, processes of receiving a social prescription, and outcomes in their health and wellbeing (see tables 2-4, with example quotes). Processes and outcomes related to elements of SDT are summarized in tables 3 & 4.

Context of Care Provided

Individualized Care. Patients revealed key differences in care they received at their CHC. Outside of the CHC they reported having little to no voice in their care/treatment - they would simply receive a medical prescription and be on their way. In contrast, CHC staff would give their undivided attention, and work with them on trying to find a solution to the issues they faced.

CHC is a safe space. Patients described their centres as a safe space where they felt welcomed, not judged for talking about personal issues or life experiences. They credited staff for creating a space which accepted people from all walks of life.

Processes of Social Prescribing

Aligned with interests. When facilitating social prescriptions, patients described providers respecting their needs and interests. They did not push their ideas or beliefs but instead worked with them on finding the right solution. Patients appreciated providers framing prescriptions as “is this something you would be interested in?” rather than “this is what you should do”. For health champions, the ability to align their involvement with their passions (e.g. music, gardening, etc) and comfort levels, was the type of volunteering they were interested in, as they had decision making power and weren’t simply filling a volunteer profile.

Supportive Staff. Patients commented on how appointments felt more like personal interactions where you wouldn’t be patronized for doing the ‘wrong’ thing. Instead staff would listen to you, make you feel supported and helped you find answers. Champions described the significance of staff brainstorming what can and cannot work instead of immediately shooting down their ideas and their ongoing support.

With respect to SDT, autonomy, competence and relatedness were present in the broad theme of ‘processes’. They were operationalized by participants respectively as having decision-making power in regards to their care, addressing health needs that were important for them, and forming trusted and supportive relationships with their providers.

Positive outcomes through engaging with social prescriptions

Social Connections. For patients experiencing feelings of loneliness due to their spouse or friends passing away, or arriving as a newcomer, attending their prescribed activity was their only opportunity to connect with others. They valued connecting with individuals with similar lived experiences (e.g. traumatic brain injury, bereavement, etc.) as this helped them feel less alone. Health champions enjoyed volunteering because it allowed them to meet new people, brainstorm ideas as a group and work together as a collective, which separated this work from traditional volunteering.

Sense of Community. In addition to social prescriptions facilitating social connections, patients discussed how this led to developing a sense of community at the centre; a place of belonging where people cared for one another. One patient described how they now understand what the term community means; she's come to understand it as a place where you can connect with others, receive support, support others and feel welcomed.

Improvement in self-management of health. Social prescriptions helped patients learn how to manage different aspects of their health, ranging from managing a new disability to living with anxiety and depression. The programs helped patients understand what they were going through and helped them feel capable in taking care of their health. This skill was further developed for some patients through peer-to-peer learning when patients with similar lived experiences connected with one another. This created a safe space allowing each to share stories and for many, hearing others successfully try a technique, encouraged them to try for themselves.

Improvement in mental health. Patients attended programs because it improved their mood, helped them manage anxiety, or allowed the opportunity to take a moment for themselves. For patients who recently retired, or their children had moved out, they highlighted how these programs kept them busy and gave them a reason to leave their homes. Champions discussed the importance of having the opportunity to feel useful after retiring or needing a break from full-time caregiving. Furthermore, being able to contribute to their community and seeing others enjoy their programs gave them a renewed sense of purpose.

Positive impact on others. Champions enjoyed the opportunity to support others using their lived experiences and contribute to their communities in ways that felt meaningful for them. For example, a widowed champion started a bereavement support group called "life after grief" to help others cope with loss, while another individual who used arts and crafts as a way to manage their anxiety, initiated a drop in crafts program. These individuals and many others spoke about how gifting their time not only benefited others but also themselves, and how this acted as a great motivator for them to continue volunteering.

Regarding participation in light of SDT theory, individual needs for competence, relatedness and beneficence were satisfied. Respective examples were: learning how to manage their health, patients finding community, and having a positive effect on others.

DISCUSSION

Summary

Using our theoretical framework, we found that participants engaging in the SP pathway in a CHC setting, broadly satisfied the elements present in SDT. During the referral process (steps 1 and 2 in Figure 1.), patients were supported in having a voice in their care (autonomy), they co-designed prescriptions based on their interests (competence), and created trusted relationships with staff (relatedness). When engaged with their prescriptions (steps 3 and 4 in Figure 1.) patients were satisfying a need or developing a skill important to them (competence), created meaningful relationships with other group participants and developed a sense of community (relatedness). Although not present for all patients, our findings along with Hanlon et al.'s¹⁰ suggest that components of SDT are reflected within the SP pathway, thereby making it a useful framework in understanding how SP as a process is impactful for patients.

Our findings also suggest that along with prescribing programs, it is equally important to help mobilize patients to create and deliver programs themselves. In this study, health champions chose how they wanted to volunteer (autonomy), designed and led programs based on their interests (competence), formed friendships with other champions (relatedness) and used their lived experiences to help others (beneficence). This opportunity proved to be a powerful enabler for patient's empowerment and the majority of centres involved transitioned into offering this opportunity as a result.

Strengths and limitations

The use of focus groups as the main data collection method had both strengths and weaknesses. A group setting allowed participants to build off each other's ideas, however, individuals who indicated agreement were not captured non-verbally, and individuals may have been less likely to voice disagreements, discuss personal barriers and equally participate in discussions. The sample size was large; however, using a convenience sampling strategy potentially favoured patients with positive experiences and those who were physically able to participate, limiting the transferability of our results to other participants.

Comparison with existing literature

While limited literature exists regarding how SP produces positive outcomes, our findings mirror themes identified in studies conducted by Hanlon et al¹⁰, Kellezi et al³ and Payne et al¹¹, among others that studied uptake and adherence of SP.^{6, 25-27} Participants in Hanlon et al.'s study emphasized the importance of having the power to set their own priorities in regards to their health.¹⁰ In all three studies, participants valued the personal and tailored interactions they had with their SP navigator and their use of an empathetic approach. The supportive nature of SP navigators made patients feel valued and listened to, and they appreciated their professionalism (e.g. SP navigators following through with what they had been asked of by patients).^{3, 10, 11} Participants identified the social connections made with staff and other participants as contributing to their positive experiences. When individuals did not feel welcomed or integrated with the group they were more likely to cite the experience as negative.^{3, 10} Individuals emphasized the value of shared experiences in helping them feel less alone¹⁰ and the importance of participating in these activities because it addressed a need important to them.^{10, 11}

In regards to the studies that explored uptake and adherence of prescriptions, autonomy was reflected in patient's having a voice in their treatment and was deemed vital in increasing uptake of referrals.^{7, 26-28} Competence, through aligning referrals with patient's interests was found to increase the likelihood of patients identifying and following through with the referral.^{27, 28} Regarding actual engagement with prescriptions, Husk et al²⁸ found that when participation resulted in a positive change (competence), adherence was more likely to be maintained. Relatedness could be described in other studies as using a person-centered care approach that was non-judgmental and facilitated a sense of trust.^{7, 26, 27}

Implications for research

This first Canadian SP study contributes to the existing literature on how SP as a pathway produces positive outcomes for patients, in light of a health promotion theory. By applying a theoretical framework, the study outlines how the concepts of autonomy, competence, relatedness, and beneficence are reflected within the key components of the SP process. This will be useful for future implementation and evaluation as they will have greater understanding on what makes a difference for patients and why. It is distinctive as it incorporated the involvement of health champions and was implemented in a team-based model of care within CHCs, with their focus on equity. Although this study has demonstrated SP to be a worthwhile intervention to become part of routine primary care, further investigation is required to understand what social prescriptions work best for whom, and how this could be implemented in different primary care settings in other countries.

Additional Information

Funding: This project was funded by the Health and Wellbeing Grant from the Ontario Ministry of Health (formally known as the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care).

Ethical Approval: The study protocol was approved by Western University Ethics (#112612).

Acknowledgements: We wish to acknowledge and express appreciation to all study participants who shared their experiences. We are grateful for the valuable assistance of our practicum students throughout the study: Shafeeq Armstrong, Marcus Wong, Ayesha Asaf, and Jessica Zhang. Finally, we would like to thank Altogether Better and Herts Valley Clinical Commissioning Group for their mentorship.


Competing Interests Statement: The authors report no competing interests.

REFERENCES

1. Kimberlee R. Gloucestershire clinical commissioning group's social prescribing service: Evaluation report. 2016. <http://eprints.uwe.ac.uk/30293/> (accessed 6 April 2020).
2. Hassan SM, Giebel C, Morasae EK, Rotheram C, Mathieson V, Ward D, Reynolds V, Price A, Bristow K, Kullu C. Social prescribing for people with mental health needs living in disadvantaged communities: the Life Rooms model. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2020; 20(1):1-9.
3. Kellezi B, Wakefield JR, Stevenson C, McNamara N, Mair E, Bowe M, Wilson I, Halder MM. The social cure of social prescribing: a mixed-methods study on the benefits of social connectedness on quality and effectiveness of care provision. *BMJ Open* 2019; 9(11).
4. Todd C, Camic PM, Lockyer B, Thomson LJ, Chatterjee HJ. Museum-based programs for socially isolated older adults: understanding what works. *Health & Place* 2017; 48:47-55.
5. Woodall J, Trigwell J, Bunyan AM, Raine G, Eaton V, Davis J, Hancock L, Cunningham M, Wilkinson S. Understanding the effectiveness and mechanisms of a social prescribing service: a mixed method analysis. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2018;18(1):1-2.
6. Bickerdike L, Booth A, Wilson PM, Farley K, Wright K. Social prescribing: less rhetoric and more reality. A systematic review of the evidence. *BMJ open*. 2017; 1;7(4):e013384.
7. Moffatt S, Steer M, Lawson S, Penn L, O'Brien N. Link Worker social prescribing to improve health and well-being for people with long-term conditions: qualitative study of service user perceptions. *BMJ Open* 2017; 7(7):e015203.
8. Redmond M, Sumner RC, Crone DM, Hughes S. 'Light in dark places': exploring qualitative data from a longitudinal study using creative arts as a form of social prescribing. *Arts & Health* 2019; 11(3):232-45.
9. Elston J, Gradinger F, Asthana S, Lilley-Woolnough C, Wroe S, Harman H, Byng R. Does a social prescribing 'holistic'link-worker for older people with complex, multimorbidity improve well-being and frailty and reduce health and social care use and costs? A 12-month before-and-after evaluation. *Prim Health Care Res Dev* 2019; 20.
10. Hanlon P, Gray CM, Chng NR, Mercer SW. Does Self-Determination Theory help explain the impact of social prescribing? A qualitative analysis of patients' experiences of the Glasgow 'Deep-End'Community Links Worker Intervention. *Chron Ill* 2019; 3:1742395319845427.
11. Payne K, Walton E, Burton C. Steps to benefit from social prescription: a qualitative interview study. *BJGP* 2019; 70(690): e36-44.
12. Mulligan K, Hsiung S, Bhatti S, Rehel J, Rayner J. *Rx: Community – Social Prescribing in Ontario, Final Report*. Alliance for Healthier Communities. 2020. https://issuu.com/aohc_acso/docs/rxcommunity_final_report_mar2020_fullweb (accessed 2020 Mar 31).
13. Altogether Better. Working together to create healthier people and communities: bringing citizens and services together in new conversations. 2016. <https://www.altogetherbetter.org.uk/the-evidence-behind-our-work> (accessed 16 Mar 2020).
14. Ryan RM, Deci EL. Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist* 2000; 55(1):68.
15. Ryan RM, Patrick H, Deci EL, Williams GC. Facilitating health behaviour change and its maintenance: Interventions based on self-determination theory. *The European Health Psychologist* 2008; 10(1):2-5.
16. Martela F, Ryan RM. The benefits of benevolence: Basic psychological needs, beneficence, and the enhancement of well-being. *Journal of personality* 2016; 84(6):750-64.
17. Williams GC, Niemiec CP, Patrick H, Ryan RM, Deci EL. The importance of supporting autonomy and perceived competence in facilitating long-term tobacco abstinence. *Annals Behav Med* 2009; 37(3):315-24.
18. Fortier MS, Duda JL, Guerin E, Teixeira PJ. Promoting physical activity: development and testing of self-determination theory-based interventions. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2012;9 (1):20.

19. Edmunds J, Ntoumanis N, Duda JL. Adherence and well-being in overweight and obese patients referred to an exercise on prescription scheme: A self-determination theory perspective. *Psychol Sport Exerc* 2007;8 (5):722-40.
20. Williams MD, Patrick H, Niemiec CP, Williams LK, Divine G, Lafata JE, Heisler M, Tunceli K, Pladevall, M. How self-determination theory may help improve medication adherence and quality of life. *Diabetes Educ* 2009: 35(3).
21. Sebire SJ, Toumpakari Z, Turner KM, Cooper AR, Page AS, Malpass A, Andrews RC. "I've made this my lifestyle now": a prospective qualitative study of motivation for lifestyle change among people with newly diagnosed type two diabetes mellitus. *BMC Public Health* 2018; 18(1):204.
22. Lloyd K, Little DE. Self-determination theory as a framework for understanding women's psychological well-being outcomes from leisure-time physical activity. *Leisure Sciences* 2010; 32(4):369-85.
23. World Health Organization. Ottawa Charter for Health Promotion. Ottawa, ON: WHO, 1986. <https://www.who.int/healthpromotion/conferences/previous/ottawa/en/> (accessed 8 Apr 2020).
24. Rayner J, Muldoon L, Bayoumi I, McMurchy D, Mulligan K, Tharao W. Delivering primary health care as envisioned. *J Integ Care* 2018.
25. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qual Res Psychol* 2006; 3(2):77-101.
26. Wildman JM, Moffatt S, Penn L, O'Brien N, Steer M, Hill C. Link workers' perspectives on factors enabling and preventing patient engagement with social prescribing. *Health Soc Care Community* 2019; 27(4):991-8
27. Pescheny J, Randhawa G, Pappas Y. Patient uptake and adherence to social prescribing: a qualitative study. *BJGP Open* 2018; 2(3).
28. Husk K, Blockley K, Lovell R, Bethel A, Lang I, Byng R, Garside R. What approaches to social prescribing work, for whom, and in what circumstances? A realist review. *Health Soc Care Community* 2020; 28(2):309-24.

Figure 1. Theoretical framework of Self-Determination Theory applied to the Social Prescribing pathway



Accepted Manuscript – BJGF

20.0153

Figure 2. Model of Health and Wellbeing



Accepte

1753

Table 1. Patient participant Characteristics (N=96)

Characteristics	N	%
Age		
26-40 years	11	11.5%
41-60 years	24	25.0%
61-80 years	55	57.3%
81+ years	6	6.3%
Gender		
Female	59	61.5%
Male	29	30.2%
Other (Intersex, Trans, Two Spirit, other)	8	8.3%
Income		
\$0-39,999	56	58.3%
\$40,000-59,999	14	14.6%
\$60,000-150,000	5	5.2%
Other (do not know, prefer not to answer)	21	21.9%
Education		
No formal education	2	2.1%
Primary or equivalent	9	9.4%
Secondary or equivalent	49	51.0%
Post-secondary or equivalent	21	21.9%
Other (do not know, Prefer not to answer)	15	15.6%
Household Composition		
Multiple occupants	52	54.2%
Single	28	29.2%
Other (do not know, prefer not to answer)	16	16.7%
Ethnicity		
White	63	65.6%
Black	5	5.2%
Asian	4	4.2%
Indigenous	2	2.1%
Latin American	3	3.1%
Middle Eastern	1	1.0%
Other (do not know, prefer not to answer)	18	18.8%

Table 2. Context sub-themes with examples (18/29 transcripts)

Sub-theme	Examples
Individualized Care (12/29 transcripts)	<i>“They always make you feel like--when you go there, especially the medical side, they make you feel like [...] you have their undivided attention and they seem to be--you know, they’re concerned for your wellbeing. It makes you feel good when you go to them, because nothing worse than going to a doctor and feeling like, oh, you’re just a number...” – Centretown patient</i>
CHC is a safe space (6/29)	<i>“Yes, another thing that I find for which I’m very grateful and surprised is how understanding people here are. It’s about one of the very few places that I feel welcome and respected as I am.” - Centretown patient</i>

Accepted Manuscript – BJGPO – BJGPO-2020-0153

Table 3. Processes and relevance to Self-Determination Theory (SDT) Components (18/29 transcripts)

Sub-theme	Examples	SDT component(s)*
<p>Aligned with Interests (18/29 transcripts)</p>	<p><i>“I’m diabetic, so Type 2 diabetes and the stress eating one was referred to me by my doctor because she knew that I had at the time a very stressful call centre job, so--and you have a tendency to just eat while you’re stressed and I had an interest in controlling it” – Centretown patient</i></p> <p><i>“[...]. I had been hesitant to volunteer about doing something specifically, committing--for a variety of my own personal reasons, so this idea of being able to give back in a way that I was comfortable with, that wasn’t dictated to me in any way, that could draw upon my strengths, my needs, and could be fairly flexible. That was one of the things I was looking for.” – South Georgian Bay champion</i></p>	<p>A,C</p>
<p>Supportive Staff (18/29 transcripts)</p>	<p><i>“I’m not a very trustful person, and I’m not a very open person, to be honest, even though it may seem it. They just--they seemed to be more--I don’t know, they just give you more a sense of comfort and that they’re not there to say, okay, well you should have done this, this and this, or you should do this, kind of more bossy or anything. They seemed more open to things and more willing to sit there and listen to you, and not--like, I’ve had doctors in the past where I’ve been in an abusive relationship and I’m afraid to say anything to them, where with these guys I’m more willing to sit there and tell them what’s going on, if there’s something wrong, and not worry that they’re going to judge me or force me to do something that I may not be ready to do at the time.” – West Elgin patient</i></p> <p><i>“Yes, another thing that I find for which I’m very grateful and surprised is how understanding</i></p>	<p>R</p>

people here are. It's about one of the very few places that I feel welcome and respected as I am." - Centretown patient

* A (autonomy), C (competence), R (relatedness) and B (beneficence).

Accepted Manuscript – BJGPO – BJGPO.2020.0153

Table 4. Outcomes and relevance to Self-Determination Theory Components (25/29 transcripts)

Sub-theme	Examples	SDT component(s)*
Social Connections (24/29 transcripts)	<i>“For myself, when I first started coming here, they gave me the opportunity to understand what the situation was, to understand what stress is, what type of stresses there were, and they gave me all these tools to how to help. But along with that, just within the groups I found that it’s not just attacking stress, it’s the friendships there that I’ve gained, the community, the laughter, everything attributes to this problem that they never mentioned in the course. These are things that also would help my stress.” – Centretown patient</i>	C,R
Sense of community (14/29)	<i>“By giving of my time, I have felt much more integrated into the community...So by going out and doing things, I have felt--multiple things, not just this volunteer work, I feel like I’m getting back to being myself, to establishing what I used to be... and this is feeling like home”- South Georgian Bay Health Champion</i>	C,R
Improvement in self-management of health (15/29)	<i>“Sometimes you can feel so overwhelmed by the challenges you’re facing, but when you get involved with a group and with other people and you share, it can just be totally transforming of your life.” - Centretown patient</i>	C,R
Improvement in mental health (25/29)	<i>“So this is kind of giving me a feeling of, you know what, you’re not useless. You don’t need a computer to be useful. There are other ways you can be useful and helpful, so that’s really important to me because it’s been many years for me now since I’ve really felt like, yeah, you know what, if I don’t have my part-time evening job, there’s something else that I can do.” – Guelph health champion</i>	C
Positive impact on others (12**/29)	<i>“[...] it makes me feel good because I feel like I have helped other people, and that they are getting something from something that I’m</i>	B

*doing. So it's very valuable to the other people,
and by them feeling food, it makes me feel like
I've done something good." – Belleville and
Quinte West champion*

* A (autonomy), C (competence), R (relatedness) and B (beneficence).

**100% of health champion transcripts mentioned beneficence

Accepted Manuscript – BJGPO – BJGPO.2020.0153