# Qualitative Evaluation of the Work Lifestyle-integrated Functional Exercise Program for Older Employees (wLiFE55+) from Participants' Perspectives

**Authors:** Diana Pfister (University of Konstanz, Konstanz, Germany), Yvonne Ritter (University of Konstanz, Konstanz, Germany), Greta M. Steckhan (Institute of Occupational Medicine, Charité University Medicine Berlin, Berlin, Germany), Susanne Voelter-Mahlknecht (Institute of Occupational Medicine, Charité University Medicine Berlin, Berlin, Germany and Preventive Medicine, University Medical Center, Göttingen, Germany), Britta Weber (Institute for Occupational Safety and Health of the German Social Accident Insurance (IFA), Sankt Augustin, Germany), Rolf Ellegast (Institute for Occupational Safety and Health of the German Social Accident Insurance (IFA), Sankt Augustin, Germany), Markus Gruber (University of Konstanz, Konstanz, Germany), Michael Schwenk (University of Konstanz, Konstanz, Germany)

**Corresponding author**: Diana Pfister (University of Konstanz, Konstanz, Germany) (dianapfister@gmx.net)

**Clinical trial number:** not applicable

## Abstract

### Background

The rise in older employees and physical inactivity necessitates targeted health and exercise promotion approaches. Physical training has positive health effects; however, traditional offerings are often underutilized due to time constraints or lack of motivation. The wLiFE55+ program offers a promising approach by integrating neuromotor, strength, and physical activity activities into daily routines with minimal time commitment. There is a high demand for workplace physical activity intervention (WPAI) with sustainable implementation. This study evaluated the wLiFE55+ program, designed for employees aged 55+, focusing on (1) participants' perspectives on its components and (2) gathering insights for further development.

### Methods

The wLiFE55+ program was piloted in a four-week study with a pre-post design. Participants attended four personal trainer sessions and integrated neuromotor, strength, and physical activities into their daily routines. Two focus groups (n=8) were conducted post-program. Half of the focus group participants (mean age 58.5 years, SD = 3.1) were female (5 full-time, 3 part-time), with low to moderate physical activity levels at work and varying functional performance. Audio recordings were transcribed and analyzed using deductive qualitative content analysis. Participants' statements were categorized into predefined categories, creating a structured analysis system. Three main categories were applied to the transcripts.

### Results

The focus groups demonstrated a balanced distribution of speech contributions, with an average participation rate of 12.5% per participant. In total, 313 statements were categorized into three main areas: “Overall Program” (59), “Program Content” (137), and “Behavioral Change” (117). Participant feedback highlighted requests for more practice time, targeted communication, and

precise feedback about progress (“Overall Program”). Personal trainer support and tailoring of activities were evaluated positively (“Program Content”). High motivation existed at the start of the study but challenges in executing the program at the workplace were reported (“Behavioral Change”).

**Conclusion**

Overall, the wLiFE55+ program was well-received as a workplace physical activity intervention (WPAI), particularly for the support provided by personal trainers, the activities included, and participants’ progress. The wLiFE55+ program has shown potential as a WPAI, and areas for improvement were identified, such as more communication, digitizing the documentation process, and simplifying activity planning.

**Key Words (3-10)**

focus group, qualitative content analysis, Lifestyle-integrated Functional Exercise, older employees, workplace physical activity intervention, sedentary lifestyle, health promotion

## Background

The workforce is undergoing rapid transformation, primarily driven by the aging of the population [1]. Projections suggest a substantial increase in the proportion of older employees over the next two decades [2]. Employers are increasingly focusing on retaining and supporting older employees, particularly in response to skilled labor shortages and the aging workforce [3, 4].

For individuals to remain employed, they need to be able to work longer. However, older employees often face an age-related physical capacity decline that adversely affects their work capacity [5]. After the age of 55, there is a significant decrease in physical capacity, including muscular strength, neuromotor functions (i.e., balance control, coordination, agility), and aerobic capacity [6-8]. This decline can lead to mobility limitations, a greater risk of falling, and increased

79 morbidity and mortality rates [9, 10]. Low physical activity (PA) levels and a sedentary lifestyle
80 foster age-related physical capacity decline [9, 11, 12]. This is especially relevant for older
81 employees with limited PA due to their work requirements, such as office workers [13, 14].
82 Prolonged sitting, regardless of the degree of PA, has been associated with a range of health
83 problems, including muscular issues [15], low back pain [16], and the promotion of chronic
84 diseases [9].
85 Workplace physical activity interventions (WPAI) to support older employees in staying active at
86 work are critical but evidence is lacking to determine acceptability and effectiveness [17]. Existing
87 WPAI tailored to older employees have shown limited success [18].
88 A recent review by Garne-Daalgaard et al. [19] highlighted barriers to implementing WPAI,
89 including issues related to timing (conflicting work schedules), changes in workplace structures
90 (reorganization of workspaces), interruptions in workflow, limited personalization, and a lack of
91 time [19-22]. The absence of suitable equipment and exercise variety have also been common
92 obstacles [23]. Motivation loss due to a lack of exercise variety has been repeatedly reported [19,
93 24, 25]. A substantial implementation barrier is that WPAI is often perceived as "nice-to-have"
94 additions rather than integral aspects of working time [18]. The main foci of future intervention
95 development are sustainability and incorporating behavioral change strategies ensuring long-term
96 implementation [26-28]. In summary, new WPAI approaches for older employees are urgently
97 needed to address the above-mentioned implementation barriers.
98 Ritter et al. [29] developed a novel WPAI approach for older employees in office settings (i.e.,
99 wLiFE55+). wLiFE55+ aims to integrate PA, including specific strength and neuromotor activities,
100 into working tasks based on the Lifestyle-integrated Functional Exercise (LiFE) concept [30].
101 Unlike traditional WPAI, wLiFE55+ does not require much extra time, as tasks are integrated into
102 daily routines such as squatting to open a drawer (i.e., strength activity) or carrying out a one-leg
103 stand at the copy machine (i.e., neuromotor function activity). PAs can also be integrated into
104 commuting, such as brisk walking to the office. The personalized program is particularly appealing

to older employees who are not interested in traditional sports programs. wLiFE55+ integrates PA through specific behavioral change techniques, such as "if-then sentences" (e.g., "If I go to the printer then I do lunges on the way."). Additionally, environmental cues (e.g., placing a bin near your desk to remind you to do lunges when you need to throw something away) and situational cues (e.g., doing a sit-to-stand when receiving emails or phone calls) are used to establish routines for PA in the workplace.

Ritter et al. demonstrated the proof-of-concept of wLiFE55+ within a four-week pilot study in 15 employees aged 55. The feasibility and acceptability of the program and its specific components (e.g., activities, participant workbook and activity planner) were demonstrated based on quantitative data including questionnaires and performance-based measures. Pre-to-post increases in neuromotor function (i.e., significant increase in the Community Balance and Mobility Scale score) and sensor-derived PA characteristics suggest relevant health effects of wLiFE55+. Part of the wLiFE55+ proof-of-concept study was also qualitative research based on focus group interviews and these are the focus of this paper. Focus groups are an essential tool in qualitative research. They provide detailed insight into the needs and challenges of participants, capturing the motivations and barriers experienced by participants [31]. This process allows researchers to understand the issues from the participant's perspective [32]. In the pilot study by Ritter et al. [29], qualitative data were collected through post-intervention focus groups. In the current study this data is analyzed to gain insights into the implementation of WPAI and to identify the facilitators and barriers encountered. The insights gained aim to improve the wLiFE55+ program and make a significant contribution to the design of future WPAI. The present research focuses on the following questions: How do participants who completed the wLiFE55+ program evaluate the intervention within focus groups? What strengths and potential for improvement can be derived from this evaluation for the future refinement of the wLiFE55+ program?

# Methods

## Study design and settings

This qualitative study was conducted within a subsample of participants (n=8) from the wLiFE55+ study [29]. Participants in the wLiFE55+ study participated in a four-week intervention in which assessments of neuromotor function, strength and PA were conducted at baseline and follow up [29]. For the present study, qualitative data from two focus group discussions each including n=4 participants collected after the wLiFE55+ study follow-ups were analyzed.

## Program

wLiFE55+ aims to increase neuromotor function, strength, and PA to prevent age-related functional decline in older employees by integrating activities such as one-leg stands (i.e., neuromotor activity), squats (i.e., strength activity) and walking faster (activity for increasing PA) into their daily routines at work and during commuting. Table 1 provides an overview of the wLiFE55+ activities. Full details of the program are reported elsewhere [29].

Assessments: Baseline and follow up assessments were conducted at the University of Konstanz (except for the ambulatory PA assessment). To test the feasibility of the program outside the laboratory, all assessments were carried out in a corridor or in an office or at the participant's office. Results of these quantitative assessment are reported elsewhere [29].

Administering the intervention: After the baseline assessment, participants received the wLiFE55+ manual [29] and met weekly with a personal trainer (holding sports science degrees) for up to 1.5-hour sessions for four weeks at their workplace [29]. During the first session, the personal trainer (a) introduced the wLiFE55+ by the use of the wLiFE55+ manual, (b) evaluated the ability and opportunities for wLiFE55+ activities using the Daily Routine Chart [29], (c) assessed the level of difficulty for each activity using the wLiFE55+ Assessment Tool (wLAT55+) [29], (d) discussed goal setting and (e) implemented up to four activities (neuromotor function, strength, and PA) linked to specific environmental and situational cues in the working environment, using the Daily

Routine Chart [29] and the Activity Planner [29]. In the 2nd, 3rd and 4th personal trainer session, the personal trainer (a) clarified any questions related to the wLiFE55+ program, (b) reviewed the wLiFE55+ activities commenced previously, (c) taught ways of making the program more effective (upgrading wLiFE55+ activities), (d) implemented up to four wLiFE55+ activities and (e) developed plans for embedding the wLiFE55+ activities into the daily routine. Personal trainers motivated participants and supported the adjustment of wLiFE55+ activities over three follow-up sessions based on preferences. wLiFE55+ activities were documented in the Activity Planner with details on how, when, and where to perform them, aligning with the Health Action Process Approach (HAPA) model recommendations, specifically adjusted to the Lifestyle-Integrated Functional Exercise (LiFE) concept [33].

**Table 1** *Short overview of wLiFE55+ activities with situations in the working environment (detailed table in [29])*

| **Domain** | **Activity** | **Situation in the working environment** | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **On the way to work/at home** | **In the office** | **Break** |
| **Neuromotor function** | *Tandem stand* | Do the *tandem stand* when you wait for the bus. | Do the *tandem stand* when you are booting your computer. | Do the *tandem stand when you* wait for lunch in the mensa. |
| | *One-leg stand* | Do the *one-leg stand* when you tie your shoes. | Do the *one-leg stand* at a height-adjustable desk when writing mail. | Do the *one-leg stand* when you wait for the coffee machine. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Strength** | *Squat/ one-legged squatting* | Do the *squatting* when you put down your working bag. | Do the *squatting* when you do phone calls with colleagues. | Do the *squatting* when you remove a cup. |
| | *lunging* | Do the *lunging* when you remove objects from your working bag. | Do the *lunging* when you wait at the copy machine. | Do the *lunging* when you throw something in the bin. |
| **Physical Activity** | *Walk longer* | *Walk longer* to the office. | *Walk longer* when you are going to the office of a colleague. | *Walk longer* back to the office after lunch. |
| | *Walk faster* | *Walk fast* for 100 m when you are on the way to the office. | *Walk faster* when you go to the restroom/ meeting. | *Walk faster* when you are going to the coffee machine. |

**Participants**

The inclusion criteria for participants in wLiFE55+ were: 1) age (over 55 years), 2) employment status (currently employed), and 3) health status (no pre-existing cardiovascular or orthopedic conditions). Participants were recruited via mail and newsletter. The eight individuals (4 women, 4 men; Mage = 58.5; range 55-63 years) participating in the focus groups were employed (5 full-time, 3 part-time), with an average weekly work time of 35.5 hours (± 8.4 hours, range 19.5-42 hours) (see Table 2). After completing the follow-up assessment, participants were invited to join the focus group at the study center (University of Konstanz) either face-to-face or via mail.

184 **Table 2** *Characteristics of focus group participants (n = 8)*

185

| | **Mean ± SD** |
|---|---|
| Age (years) | 58.5 ± 3.1 |
| Gender (women/men) | 4/4 |
| BMI (kg/m$^2$) | 26.0 ± 3.0 |
| Working hours (h/week) | 35.5 ± 8.4 |
| IPAQ, Total physical activity (MET-minutes/week) | 2835 ± 2239 |
| IPAQ, Work activity (MET-minutes/week) | 343 ± 809 |
| CBM, score (0-96) | 82.1 ±11.7 |
| 60 sec Chair Stand Test (repetitions) | 44.3 ± 11.6 |

186 *Note. BMI Body Mass Index, IPAQ* The International Physical Activity Questionnaire, *CBM*
187 *C*ommunity Balance and Mobility scale

188

189 **Data collection**

190 An interdisciplinary team of experts from sports science (DP, YR, MG, MS), occupational health
191 (GS, SVM), occupational safety (BW, RE), and the occupational healthcare industry (CK, FB)
192 developed a semi-structured interview guide (see Table 3) for the focus groups based on previous
193 qualitative studies evaluating LiFE [34-36].

194 The two focus groups ($n_{group\ 1}$ = 4; $n_{group\ 2}$ = 4) were conducted in a seminar room, each lasting
195 approximately 60 minutes. Both focus groups were interviewed by an independent researcher
196 (MS) not involved in study organization, baseline and follow-up assessment, or personal trainer
197 session to obtain unbiased perspectives from the participants.

At the beginning, the study purpose (evaluation of the wLiFE55+ program) was explained, and participants provided written informed consent. The interviewer informed the participants that the focus groups were designed to gather their experiences and impressions of wLiFE55+. The interviewer actively encouraged participants to share their views and ensured that all important topics were thoroughly discussed.

The discussions were recorded using the Dictaphone Pro application, and the data were transcribed in a content-semantic manner following Kuckartz's [37] guidelines using Microsoft© Word 2021. A content-semantic transcription suffices because the analysis solely pertains to the semantic content of the statements [37].

**Table 3** *Semi-structured interview guide for wLiFE55+ focus groups*

| Topic | Initial question | Prompts |
|---|---|---|
| Baseline assessment | Can you tell us what you thought of the baseline assessment at the beginning of the study? | How easy or difficult did you find the baseline assessment?<br>How did you feel about the duration of the assessment?<br>How motivated were you to continue participating in the study after you had taken part in the baseline assessment? |
| Personal trainer sessions | Can you tell us how you found the session with the personal trainer? | How challenging or undemanding did you find the personal trainer session?<br>How high was your motivation during the execution of the activities? |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | What did you think of the duration of the personal trainer sessions? What did you like?<br>Were there any difficulties?<br>What worked well?<br>What did you not like? |
| Activities | How did you find the activities? | How fitting or unfitting did you find the activities? If unfitting: Can you provide a reason for this response? Are there activities that you would suggest as alternatives? How did you find the difficulty levels of the activities? |
| Experiences between the weekly personal trainer sessions | How did you perceive the time between the personal trainer sessions, during which you could integrate the activities into your daily life on your own? | How easy or difficult was it for you to integrate the activities into your daily life? Which activities could be integrated into daily life particularly well or less well? In which everyday situation (e.g., at work or home) was the implementation of the program particularly easy or difficult? |
| Improvement suggestions | Do you have any ideas on how the wLiFE55+ program could be further improved? | Do you have ideas on how the personal trainer sessions can be improved? Do you have ideas on how the materials can be improved? How helpful did you find the activity planner? How helpful did you find the participant's manual? Are there any additional pieces of information that |

| | |
|---|---|
| | you think are important and might be missing? |

**Data analysis**

For the evaluation, Mayring's [38] content analysis was implemented, utilizing deductive content structuring to extract participants' statements from wLiFE55+ focus groups into predefined categories. This framework offers a systematic approach for theoretically evaluating implementation challenges, as well as other health-related behaviors [39]. The foundation for our deductive method was further strengthened by insights gained from prior studies on LiFE [34-36]. Aligned with LiFE's goal of fostering behavior change and habit formation, the Theoretical Domains Framework was integrated, which specifically addresses motivation, activity planning, and habit formation in the context of behavior change [40]. This framework played a pivotal role in shaping the categorization process within LiFE focus group studies [34-36].

To structure our content [38], a nominal category system through a literature search (search term: *focus group, workplace physical activity intervention, exercise training, participant perspectives, workplace intervention, evaluation, qualitative analysis, workplace-based intervention and lifestyle integrated functional exercise evaluation*) was crafted. Categories from six articles on exercise interventions, including aLiFE, gLiFE, and iLiFE [21, 34-36, 41, 42] were derived.

Initially, eleven categories from the literature were identified. During the analysis, four overarching categories were defined and clarified, two of which had subcategories. This categorization guide was developed with the assistance of a team (DP, YR and MS). Coding rules were established for semantic precision. To specify the semantic content of the categories, anchor examples were identified from the transcripts (see supplementary 1). The category system transitioned to MAXQDA© for line-by-line coding. The context unit was complete responses; except for a single

sentence of the overall statement that contained information relevant to coding. The smallest material component was chosen for the coding unit, and only manifest content was considered [38].

Reliability checks included independent coding of the texts by three authors (DP, YR and AB). Due to some differences, the categorization system had to be adjusted. The revision of the categorization guide resulted in a refined category structure, reducing the number of main categories from five to three.

During the processing of the results, the text material per category was extracted and summarized, and the statements were labeled (e.g., B1). Representative citations, including contradictory statements for transparency, were selected. Paraphrasing was considered, focusing on material relevant to specific research questions [36, 38].

The number of statements in the focus groups was summed, and each participant's share of speech was calculated as a percentage. This share was determined by comparing the number of statements made by each participant to the total number of coded statements from all participants.

# Results

### Results focus groups

Three overarching categories were applied to structure the content of the transcribed audio material: “Overall program”, “Content of the program”, and “Changing behavior” (assignment of statements, see. Table 4 shows the breakdown of the statements into the categories. The subcategory “Motivation and Barriers” with n = 51 statements was the main focus of the focus group discussions, followed by “Challenges with implementation” with n = 39 statements and “Intensity” with n = 38 statements. The participants' statements were translated from German into English by the study team.

258 **Table 4** *Overview number of statements*

259

| Main category | Total number of statements *n* | Sub category | Number of statements n |
|---|---|---|---|
| Overall program | 59 | Overall program considerations | 13 |
| | | Challenges with implementation | 39 |
| | | Progress monitoring | 7 |
| Content of the program | 137 | Activities | 26 |
| | | Intensity | 38 |
| | | Personal trainer session | 28 |
| | | Material | 36 |
| | | Documentation | 9 |
| Changing behavior | 117 | Motivation to participate in the program | 20 |
| | | Planning actions | 26 |
| | | Motivation and Barriers | 51 |
| | | Habit formation and integration | 20 |

260

261 The proportion of speech in the focus groups varied, with the highest contribution being 16%,
262 while one participant contributed the least at 5%. On average, participants had a speaking rate of
263 12.5% (see Table 5).

264

265 **Table 5** *Share of Speech*

| **Participant** | B1 | B2 | B3 | B4 | B5 | B6 | B7 | B8 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Share of speech** | 15% | 15% | 16% | 12% | 15% | 12% | 10% | 5% |

266

**Overall program**

This category included all statements that referred specifically to feedback for the program. This superordinate category was divided into three categories: “Overall program considerations”, “Challenges with implementation” and “Progress monitoring”.

**Overall program considerations**

The following section presents the participants’ suggestions for improvement regarding the location and timing of the personal trainer sessions, the study design, the extension of the wLiFE55+ program to the upper body, digitalization, and the continuation of wLiFE55+ program.

For the location of the personal trainer session, participants suggested offering a neutral room if you have to share an office.

> “*So one idea would be, depending on if you don't have an office by yourself, to offer a neutral room somewhere where you could discuss it.*" - *B7*
>
> *“[...] if you were in an office of two or three and could just meet in a safe, neutral space [...] that would be a better option.” - B5*

Suggestions were made regarding the duration between the personal trainer sessions, recommending a longer time for practicing and habituating the wLiFE55+ activities.

> "*Maybe for a future study there would also be more practice time and more habituation time in between." - B3*
>
> *“Yes, that would be nice [...] That was a bit tight [...] because the weekend was in between.” - B2*

Participants expressed an interest in extending the wLiFE55+ program to include activities targeting the upper body, specifically requesting more information and activities for the arms.

> *"But I would have liked to know [...] what else I can do for my [...] arms" - B1*
>
> *"[...] include the top half a little more." - B4*

Participants inquired about the possibility of participating in a follow-up study.

*"Would we be allowed to participate in the next study again?" - B2*

*"Is there a follow-up?" - B1*

**Challenges with implementation**

This section discusses participants' feedback on various aspects of the wLiFE55+ program, including target group suitability, number of activities, baseline assessment communication, assessment conditions, and the convenience of location.

Some participants felt that the program did not reach the appropriate target group, suggesting it would be better suited for less active employees, such as administrative staff, rather than those who are already relatively fit.

"*[...]* I *see this group here and [...] this is the wrong target group. We are already relatively fit." - B6*

*"[...] because we are all on the road quite a bit, but the target group would have to be our administration." - B6*

*"I don't think it helps much if I only get active just before I retire. It doesn't reach the target group; it's always those who have already done a bit themselves." - B5*

Some participants felt overtaxed by the variety of wLiFE55+ activities conducted in a short time.

*"There were more and more activities [...] does it still fit into everyday life?" - B7*

Some participants found the baseline assessment surprising and noted that they would have appreciated more detailed information about the program content beforehand. Participants desired more information about the assessments conducted during the program.

*" [...] all these balance [activities] surprised me, if not almost overwhelmed me a little." - B5*

*"I would have liked to have been prepared with a few more words, that it's less about [endurance] or other performance, but more about balance and body control." - B8*

*"More information [...] why is it being assessed and what is being assessed?" - B1*

**Progress monitoring**

Participants expressed interest in understanding their physical performance within their age group and wanted differentiated feedback. They desired individual recognition and interim results, with one participant mentioning the motivational aspect of receiving feedback. Additionally, there was a suggestion to incorporate digital feedback, and participants expressed a desire to observe their progress over a longer period.

> *"I would have liked to have heard [the personal trainer] say, 'Wow, that was [good] for your age.'" - B1*
>
> *"[...] what I was missing a bit was [...] especially at the end, a clear interim result of how well or badly I can assess myself personally in the comparison group over the age of 55." - B7*
>
> *“And I think it would be feasible to [design it] digitally with more feedback.” - B4*
>
> *“I would be interested to see what it would be like after these six to eight weeks if it had become more firmly established. I would find [...] that exciting." - B6*

**Content of the program**

This category included all statements that referred specifically to proposals for the program. This superordinate category was divided into five categories: “Activities”, “Intensity”, “Personal trainer session”, “Material” and “Documentation”.

**Activities**

Participants in the study expressed diverse opinions about the wLiFE55+ activities. Some found them unusual, and the number of activities was high. However, one participant emphasized that having a variety of activities is important to enable individual variations.

> *"[...] some of the activities were [...] not quite usual." - B5*

*"More and more activities were added" - B2*

*"[...] But I think it's important that variation is possible." - B4*

Strength activities, especially climbing stairs, were considered suitable as they could be easily integrated at both the workplace and home due to their location independence.

"*So, I liked all the activities that involved strength and holding because I had the feeling that I could do them in almost any space, [...] I could even do them in a tight office. You can find stairs almost everywhere as well." - B4*

Jumping received mixed feedback. Some participants found it beneficial, some didn't like it.

*"I liked jumping. At my [...] age, reintegrating jumping into my life was good.*" *- B2*

*"I didn't like these jumps [...]." - B7*

Neuromotor activities were particularly enjoyed by one participant, who found them interesting and expressed surprise when faced with difficulties while executing the activities.

*"[...] balancing [...], yeah, I need that regularly." - B4*

Conversely, the tandem walk was repeatedly described as unsuitable.

*" [...] I wouldn't walk like that." - B4*

*"The [tandem walk] was an activity that was not my favorite." - B3*

Stepping over objects was considered too elaborate by one participant due to the additional effort involved.

"*Stepping over things and then setting up folders so that I can step over the folder [...] that wasn't for me." - B2*

Activities aimed at increasing PA such as integrating bouts of fast walking were generally perceived as unnecessary by some participants who felt they were already physically active.

*"We are already active, we don't need to further integrate it." - B6*

**Intensity**

Participants evaluated the intensity of both the baseline assessments and the intervention. The intensity of the baseline assessment was frequently described as manageable, though the duration was considered tiring.

*"rather light [...] except for balance" - B4*

*"For a study like this [...] okay"- B2*

*"Being challenged for one and a half hours was exhausting" - B3*

The neuromotor function assessment, particularly the one-leg stand with a dual-task and closed eyes, was unanimously deemed challenging.

*"I mainly had problems with closed eyes" - B5*

*"I found the balance test difficult and exhausting (...) with my eyes closed." - B7*

The intensity of the wLiFE55+ activities was adjusted with each personal trainer session. Participants were asked about the intensity of their activities during the intervention, with both neuromotor and strength activities rated as challenging. The tandem walk and the one-leg stand with closed eyes posed the greatest challenge for some participants, who noted that the challenge depended on individual ability. Additionally, participants felt that the progression in difficulty was too rapid.

*"I think one thing is just easier and then there are things that are more difficult. And it just shows." - B5*

*"[...] the rapid increase in difficulty was challenging." - B3*

*"[...] it became more demanding." - B2*

**Personal trainer session**

Participants highly appreciated the support and coaching from personal trainers in the wLiFE55+ intervention. They noted significant improvements facilitated by the trainers.

*"[...] Having a personal trainer who continually challenges and supports you [...] that was very pleasant." - B2*

*“The personal trainer made it [visible] by demonstrating [...]." - B7*

*“I found it very appreciative. [The personal trainer] was very responsive to me and advised me when I [...] felt bad or couldn't manage something.” - B3*

Overall, the personal trainers and sessions were seen as pleasant, respectful, and reassuring. Participants valued the opportunity to seek alternatives and found the trainers to be open and empathetic. However, they desired more timely tips and assistance.

*"I found the small tips extremely helpful." - B1*

*"[...] the personal trainers looked for solutions." - B2*

*"[...] more of these tips from the beginning." - B3*

**Material**

Participants evaluated the provided materials, including the Activity Planner (see supplementary file 5 in Ritter et al, 2024) and wLiFE55+ manual (see supplementary file 1 in Ritter et al, 2024). All participants found the documentation of the If-then sentences in the Activity Planner (see supplementary file 5 in Ritter et al, 2024) challenging agreed that both contend-related and visual adjustments are necessary. They suggested expanding the wLiFEE55+ manual with useful tips for correct exercise execution for future reference.

*"I wouldn't have understood at all what that was supposed to be. It would have interested me." - B1*

Some participants found its structure not entirely clear. Using the planner over several weeks made it difficult to allocate days, causing clutter and requiring frequent flipping of pages.

*"I didn't understand why I had the history of each week in a row." - B1*

*"You had to flip through it a lot." - B4*

**Documentation**

Participants found the documentation process challenging and difficult to integrated into their routines, sometimes neglecting to record activities as they felt it was not essential for carrying out wLiFE55+.

> *"I then do the activities [...] in my daily routine, but don't necessarily have the tally sheet with me or next to me." - B3*
>
> *"So I haven't used it at all [...]." - B4*
>
> *"[...] I do the activities for myself, and whether I note one less or not." - B7*

**Changing behavior**

This category includes the statements on motivation at the beginning of the program, the planning of the activities, motivations and obstacles during the implementation of the intervention as well as the integration of the activities into everyday life. This superordinate category was divided into four categories: “Motivation to participate in the program”, “Planning actions”, “Motivations and Barriers”, and “Habit formation and integration”.

**Motivation to participate in the program**

Motivation levels varied, with some participants experiencing no change, while others felt increased motivation after the baseline assessment, shifting from initial neutrality to heightened enthusiasm.

> *"[...] it has not diminished my motivation [...]." - B1*
>
> *"Let's see how it turns out later." - B3*
>
> *"[...] after the measurement, I was very, very, very motivated and thought it could only make you better." - B2*

A key motivational factor was the interest in observing personal physical performance changes.

> *"[...] I'm simply interested in how the change is, [and] how beneficial it is." - B5*

**Planning actions**

During the training sessions, participants sometimes felt challenged by planning actions with the if-then sentences. They sometimes struggled to come up with situational cues on the spot, which were occasionally seen as less suitable later. As a result, a few participants did not always use the if-then sentences fully, finding the process a bit cumbersome.

> "*[...] overwhelmed to generate situational cues." - B1*
>
> *"And then you just had [...] to invent something spontaneously and later realized that it doesn't fit [into daily life]." - B2*
>
> *"I'm surprised right now, the if-then, [...] I completely blanked that out [...]." - B5*

There was a demand for more time to choose key cues and to try the activities with linked key cues later.

> *“Try it out." At home [...] or in the store. Where and how it fits.” - B2*
>
> *“A little more time. You would be more creative.” - B4*

Participants adjusted activities to ensure they were manageable and feasible for their routines.

> *"So I also felt that I had to adjust two or three activities myself because I knew I wouldn't do them otherwise" - B1*
>
> *“[...] I then did it for myself [...] differently. So that I could manage it." - B3*

**Motivation and Barriers**

Participants highlighted various factors that influenced their motivation both positively and negatively. Positive motivation was observed when they perceived personal progress, particularly in neuromotor function, which improved quickly and effectively within a short time.

> *“You could already see at least small improvements after one or two weeks.” - B6*
>
> *“Balance improves very quickly, very well.” - B3*

*“So I was more motivated when I [...] realized that I could sometimes stand longer on one leg [...].” - B1*

On the other hand, some participants felt less motivated due to negative experiences and the higher demands. Also, the increase in intensity was found to negatively impact on motivation.

*“I stumbled around [...] it demotivated me a bit [...].” - B7*

*“I found that some of the steps were too big, which demotivated me from doing the exercises at all.” - B3*

The environment in which activities took place played a significant role in motivation. Depending on the setting, motivation either increased or decreased. For instance, motivation was higher at work.

*“At work [the motivation] was higher.” - B8*

Unexpected work-related stressors and tasks hindered activities compliance, making activities impractical due to irregular work routines.

*“When tasks or stress suddenly get in the way, it becomes significantly more difficult to get back to it. I felt it was more of a nuisance.” - B4*

The social aspect had a dual effect, being both supportive and hindering. One participant used the cue to bring his daily work post to his colleagues, which motivated him.

*“I used colleagues [as a reason to move more] that I was there several times a day, that was really nice.” - B4*

However, the presence of others was often perceived as a hindrance, as the participants felt uncomfortable when they were observed during the exercises. This discomfort also extended to acquaintances such as work colleagues or visitors.

“*There's a visitor, and you don't incorporate these activities at all. And at the other end [...] there are people in my circle who I show it to, and we have a great time. I think it depends on the people who happen to be there.” - B2*

*“In my case, it was partly my colleague who just laughed in the background.”* - B7

*“He always had fun with me too.” - B5*

One participant expressed a desire to motivate others to participate in the program.

*"I would have liked it if I could have convinced people to join in." - B1*

**Habit formation and integration**

Whether the integration of the activities was successful was very individual. Some participants needed natural opportunities in which activities could be integrated automatically and combined well with everyday situations.

*“So I've found that they work best when it's a natural situation [...] I find that wherever I wait, I automatically do one of the balance exercises [...] You can even stand in tandem.” - B3*

*“If I can connect it and immediately see what I do in my daily routine, then I just do it automatically.” - B5*

Furthermore, one participant used the available time slots to integrate activities.

*“I now have 3 to 4 minutes that I can simply use for this.” - B4*

Difficulties with integration arose when the activities were not compatible with the situations. Some program participants had challenges integrating activities with cueing. Difficulties with integration resulted from incompatible combinations.

*“Then, either do one properly or the other, but not both.” - B3*

*“Some combinations do not work.” - B5*

The participants developed appropriate strategies to integrate activities into their worklifes.

*“Well, for me, it didn't work so well with these cues because I also have such a varied daily routine. So, I rather took a bunch of activities and thought about where I could incorporate them.” - B6*

However, participants acknowledged the time required for a new activity to become routine.

*"[...] for it to become a routine, it needs at least six to eight weeks [...]. It takes a much longer period for it to settle in." - B6*

## Discussion

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first qualitative study evaluation of the participants' experience after conducting the wLiFE55+ program. Overall, participants gave positive feedback on various aspects of the intervention, such as the personal trainer sessions, specific activities, and integration into workplace routines. This suggests that wLiFE55+ has potential as an innovative workplace physical activity intervention by incorporating activities into daily routines.

On the same note, participants' feedback revealed several areas for improvement of wLiFE55+ including 1) providing more pre-study information to prepare to the wLiFE55+ intervention including the baseline assessments and the content of the wLiFE55+ program 2) feedback on physical performance in assessments, 3) easier to handle documentation of the wLiFE55+ activities, and 4) removing barriers to the implementation of the intervention, such as observation by a colleague.

Most participants' statements were categorized under "Motivation and Barriers", underscoring their critical relevance in the wLiFE55+ intervention context. This is likely because the present study was carried out in the proof-of-concept phase of the wLiFE55+ development process [29] necessitating further adjustments and emphasizing long-term implementation for behavioral change [43, 44] . Participants also noted several program's intensity and implementation challenges, which are crucial for identifying barriers and further refining wLiFE55+ [18]. From a sports science perspective, analyzing the intensity and demands of the training intervention is essential, as these factors significantly impact motivation [45].

550 **Overall Program Considerations**

551 There were differing opinions regarding the frequency and the time between personal trainer
552 sessions. The coordination of the dates with the participants, one week before the next session,
553 was positively received. However, some participants wished for longer intervals between personal
554 trainer sessions. Flexibility and adaptability are crucial for the acceptance of WPAIs [19] and
555 promote autonomy [40]. It should be possible to determine the interval of the personal trainer
556 sessions individually and more flexibly to give participants the time they need to integrate the
557 program into their daily work. Flexibly timed personal trainer sessions had positive effects on
558 program adherence [46]. WPAI are more successful when they are tailored to individual needs
559 and focus on occasional PA in and around the workplace [46, 47].

560

561 **Challenges with Implementation**

562 The results of the study show that some participants did not identify themselves with the target
563 group of the intervention, perceiving themselves as already physically active. However, our
564 previous results [29] confirm that even these participants can benefit from the wLiFE55+ program,
565 despite their subjective assessment of their fitness levels. Interestingly, the participants' fitness
566 and physical activity (PA) levels varied considerably (see Table 2), which may have influenced
567 their identification with the target group.

568 Participants who may not identify with the target group may show lower motivation and willingness
569 to participate [48]. Research suggests that individuals who strongly identify with a group where
570 PA is normative show a higher willingness to engage in regular PA compared to those who weakly
571 identify with the group [49, 50]. To address this, it is crucial to clearly communicate the benefits of
572 wLiFE55+ to all participants, regardless of their current PA levels, and provide feedback after the
573 baseline assessment to objectively highlight areas where improvement is needed.

574 The strong interest among participants in continuing the wLiFE55+ program is a positive indicator
575 of its sustainability and motivational impact [46]. Continued participation could promote the long-

term maintenance of PA and thus preventing accelerated functional decline typically starting after the age of 60 years [51]. Additionally, such an approach could encourage participants to adopt a permanently active lifestyle, thereby improving their overall health and well-being.

Our research indicates that participants perceived the baseline assessment as surprising and partly overtaxing, revealing a gap between their expectations and the actual program design. A notable criticism was the lack of adequate communication about the program content prior to the assessment, which left participants feeling not fully prepared. The neuromotor activities in the wLiFE55+ program were unexpected and challenging for participants, who had anticipated endurance and strength exercises. However, they were positively received, which is encouraging as early neuromotor training is crucial in preventing functional decline [52]. This suggests the program can place a stronger focus on balance training moving forward, with participants showing a willingness to engage in this area.

Participants also expressed a need for clearer communication about the assessment procedures. The findings underline the importance of better managing expectations through more detailed information in advance.

**Progress monitoring**

The participants expressed a strong interest in understanding their physical performance relative to their peer group and desired more detailed and personalized feedback. They also emphasized the need for interim results, feeling that periodic assessments throughout the program would have helped them gauge their progress and maintain motivation. Regular feedback can serve as an important tool for sustaining engagement and providing reassurance or incentives for improvement [53]. Additionally, there was a suggestion to incorporate digital feedback mechanisms. Digital tools can offer real-time progress tracking and personalized feedback, making it easier for participants to see their improvements over time [54, 55]. This continuous

601 monitoring and feedback loop can help anchor new behaviors and promote long-term adherence
602 to the program.
603
604 **Content of the program**
605
606 **Activities**
607 The participants rated the majority of the wLiFE55+ activities (neuromotor, strength, PA) positively
608 as they could be integrated into their daily work routines. The strength activity of climbing stairs
609 was particularly well-received by the participants consistent with previous research [30].
610 Conversely, the activity of stepping over objects was disliked, aligning with the findings of other
611 studies evaluating the LiFE program [30, 34, 36].
612 Some participants noted that they found the range of activities they were asked to integrate during
613 the four-week intervention a bit challenging. This feeling of being overwhelmed could be because
614 the pilot study aimed to test and evaluate a wide range of activities in a work environment. Similar
615 observations were noted in previous pilot studies for adapting the LiFE program to young retired
616 seniors [30].
617 Despite the challenge of performing many activities simultaneously in different locations and
618 during daily tasks, participants perceived the activity repertoire as positive overall. In particular,
619 the ability to choose from a variety of activities could be perceived as motivating [19, 24, 25]. For
620 future studies, however, it would be important to reduce the number of activities to be integrated
621 and to select activities that are best suited to the target group, while maintaining a balanced range
622 of activities.
623 Participants expressed the desire for activities of the upper extremities. Similar results were
624 already obtained from the aLiFE focus group discussion [34]. A previous study showed that
625 targeted upper body training in older women led to a reduction in reaction time, the potential risk
626 of falling, and the risk of injury [56].

**Intensity**

The participants rated the intensity of the assessments as appropriate. However, they felt that the intensity of the neuromotor and strength activities increased too rapidly during the personal trainer sessions. In contrast to the experience with aLiFE, the participants felt over challenged rather than underchallenged [34]. Participants with lower baseline scores, particularly in balance, reported experiencing higher levels of difficulty, underscoring the need for personalized adjustments to the program's implementation. To prevent potential demotivation, the intensity should be carefully calibrated to match individual capabilities.

**Personal Trainer Session**

The role of the personal trainer in the wLiFE55+ program was highly valued by participants. The personal guidance and support were crucial, especially when difficulties arose, and helped participants to maintain new behaviors. This is in line with previous studies showing the inclusion of a trainer significantly boosts the motivation of older adults participating in the LiFE program [34, 36]. The personal trainer not only facilitated the correct execution of the activities but also provided important social support for the long-term sustainability of PA programs [46]. The personal trainer is an important part of the wLiFE55+ program and is valued by participants.

**Materials**

The design of the materials provided for the wLiFE55+ program were not perceived as optimal for the target group of employees in terms of content and appearance, resulting in unanimous feedback that they were suboptimal. The Activity Planner [29] has some flaws in terms of its functionality and design. Some participants found its structure not entirely clear, and its use over several weeks proved challenging, as allocating days became cumbersome and required frequent flipping.

Given these issues, a revision of the activity planner is essential to ensure comprehensive support throughout the program and beyond. High-quality, user-friendly materials are crucial for participant engagement and success [36]. The wLiFE55+ program should aim to optimize its materials to provide the same level of support and clarity that has been shown to be effective in similar programs [57, 58]. Adapting the materials to digital formats could be a worthwhile option to enhance accessibility and ease of use.

**Documentation**

The documentation of activities in the wLiFE55+ program was found to be time-consuming and not always compatible with the participants' daily work routines. This finding is consistent with previous studies, which also reported that extensive documentation negatively impacted participant adherence [34, 59]. The necessity for modern, digital documentation solutions for wLiFE55+ is evident. Digital tools can streamline the documentation process, making it less intrusive and more manageable within the context of daily work life. By adopting digital solutions, the program can enhance adherence and facilitate implementation for participants.

**Changing behavior**

**Motivation to participate in the program**

The motivation of participants to engage in the wLiFE55+ program was generally positive, particularly affected by the baseline assessment. These spurred a desire to improve their results in the follow-up assessment, especially concerning neuromotor function. The motivation derived from personal progress is crucial for the sustained adoption of new behaviors.

**Planning Actions**

Activity planning during the personal trainer sessions was occasionally challenging for participants, as they required more time to identify and test suitable environmental and situational cues. According to the Theoretical Domains Framework, effective activity planning is essential for initiating behavior change [40]. Not all participants were able to perform the activities using a cue, a finding that aligns with conclusions from other LIFE studies [36]. Therefore, future iterations of the program should allocate more time for planning and provide greater support from personal trainers. Some participants were able to adapt their activities independently, achieving the goal of the LiFE program by exercising autonomy [60]. However, more time is needed to fully integrate this aspect into the program, which was constrained by the current study's timeline.

**Motivation and Barriers**

Participants' own progress served as a significant motivator, reinforcing their self-efficacy. Individuals with high self-efficacy are more likely to engage in activities, work harder, and persist longer despite challenges [61]. Progress was more visible with the neuromotor function than with the strength activities. This increased visibility of progress had a positive effect on motivation not only at the start of the training intervention but also throughout its continuation. Similarly, in the aLiFE program, noticeable improvements in neuromotor function significantly boosted motivation [34]. This highlights the need to implement neuromotor activities, which, despite initially seeming challenging and unexpected, can enhance motivation.

Given these findings, it is essential to ensure that participants can see their progress clearly. This can be facilitated by integrating smartphone interventions that help individuals track and visualize their progress. Such tools have been shown to support goal achievement and promote health-enhancing behavior changes [62-64].

The social aspect in the workplace played a dual role. Colleagues can be both supportive and obstructive. Supportive colleagues provided acceptance and encouragement, which facilitated

adherence to the program [65]. Additionally, involving colleagues can enhance a sense of connectedness, thereby increasing intrinsic motivation [55, 66, 67]. Social interaction and peer support have proven crucial for the success of WPAIs [24, 68]. Lack of understanding and support from colleagues creates barriers and can negatively impact the implementation of the program [24, 69]. Future iterations of the program should consider either a group-based supplementary offer, such as the gLiFE program, or involve and inform colleagues and managers in this program [24, 36].

Unforeseen stressful situations hindered the implementation of the intervention in everyday working life. This issue was also addressed in the focus groups for previous LiFE programs [34, 36]. Participants faced difficulties performing activities due to task interruptions and workplace disturbances. The high levels of stress often present in daily work life need to be considered when supporting the formation of new behaviors [70, 71].

Fortunately, there are already several strategies to mitigate these problems. Implementing flexible scheduling can help accommodate unforeseen work demands and reduce stress related to rigid program requirements [19]. Additionally, developing and integrating digital tools, such as mobile apps, can provide participants with reminders, motivational messages, and stress management tips. These tools offer on-demand support and guidance, helping participants stay on track even during stressful periods [55]. Furthermore, establishing peer support groups within the workplace can provide a platform for participants to share their experiences, challenges, and strategies for coping with stress. Peer support has been shown to enhance motivation and adherence to health programs [69].

**Habit Formation and Integration**

Natural situations, such as waiting periods, were preferred for integrating new behaviors, while artificially created situations were less effective for habit formation. This preference was also

730 observed in previous LiFE studies [36]. Flexibility in performing activities is a strength of the
731 program, as restricted flexibility can hinder program execution [24].
732 Implementation challenges arose due to the high intensity of the activities in daily work life.
733 Nonetheless, participants demonstrated the ability to independently adjust the intensity of the
734 activities and situations when overtaxed. Overcoming these hurdles autonomously is crucial for
735 maintaining new behaviors, as self-determined adjustments support long-term behavior change
736 [40, 72]. A core aspect of the wLiFE55+ program is to enable participants to set their own goals
737 and tailor activities to their work routines [60]. This autonomy is essential for behavior change;
738 however, a sustained behavior change requires significantly more time than four weeks. Autonomy
739 is critical for behavior change; however, sustained behavior change typically requires more than
740 four weeks, with significant increases occurring over three months and potentially extending up to
741 a year [73, 74].
742
743 **Optimizations of wLiFE55+**
744 Based on the results, specific suggestions for optimization and program refinement could be
745 derived for future studies (see Table 6). These include enhancing communication before the start
746 of the intervention, better preparation for new content not typically included in traditional WPAI
747 interventions (such as neuromotor training), greater individualization of training intervals, and the
748 introduction of digital tools for documentation and feedback. The aim is to better integrate the
749 measures into everyday working life and to further increase participation and acceptance among
750 participants.

751 **Table 6** *Overview of all optimization measures*

| Topic | Problem | Measures and optimization |
|---|---|---|
| Communication and information | Lack of specific information before the start of the intervention, particularly about neuromotor activities, as participants are often not familiar with these activities | Provision of detailed information and feedback at the beginning and during the intervention |
| Target group | Some participants did not identify themselves as a target group, although they could benefit | Clearly communicate the benefits of the program to all potential participants, particularly the aspect of early prevention in the age of 55+, as accelerated functional decline starts at 60+ years |
| Flexibility | Different opinions on the frequency of training sessions | More flexible and customizable training intervals |
| Activities | Interest in additional exercises for the upper extremities | Expansion of the program to include activities for the entire body, including the upper extremities |
| | Few disliked activities | Remove activities that are continuously rated poorly from the program, such as stepping over objects |
| | Variation is important | Keep variation |
| Documentation | Complex documentation impaired integration into everyday working life | Introduction of digital documentation solutions to simplify the process |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Material | Materials were not optimally adapted to the needs of the employees | Revision of the activity planner |
| Personal Trainer | Role of the personal trainer was rated very positively | Maintaining and possibly expanding personal trainer support |
| Regular feedback and comparability with the peer group | Desire for performance status and regular feedback | Introduction of a system for regular (e.g. digital) and structured feedback to support motivation and adjustments |
| Activity planning | Participants needed more time to plan and adapt activities | More time and support for planning activities from personal trainers |
| Social aspects | Social interactions were both disruptive, involvement of colleagues was desired | Involving and informing colleagues and superiors to encourage support |
| Stress and everyday working life | Stressful situations made it difficult to implement the intervention in everyday working life | Implementation of flexible schedules and digital tools for stress management and exercise reminders |
| Habit formation | Natural situations were more effective for integrating new behaviors than artificial situations | Promoting flexibility when carrying out exercises and adapting to natural work situations |

## Conclusion

The wLiFE55+ program has shown potential as a WPAI, with positive feedback on personal trainer sessions, specific activities, and participant progress. However, several areas for improvement were identified, including more comprehensive baseline assessment information, assessment feedback, simplified documentation, and addressing social barriers. Recommendations for future studies include providing flexible training intervals, incorporating upper body activities, extending the program to include colleagues, and using digital tools for documentation. Ensuring clear instructions and support from personal trainers, along with considering the social aspects of WPAI, can enhance motivation and adherence. Continuous evaluation and adaptation of the program are crucial for its long-term sustainability and effectiveness.

## Strength and Limitation

A key strength of this study is the balanced share of speech in the two focus groups, which helps ensure a representative and diverse dataset and prevents any single voice from dominating the discussions [75]. The open and transparent communication among participants about the program's challenges indicates minimal social bias, essential for identifying issues and proposing meaningful optimizations.

The rigorous application of qualitative content analysis following Mayring's [38] guidelines further strengthens the study. The decision to split the eight participants into two smaller groups was effective, as smaller groups are known to facilitate richer, more detailed discussions [32, 76]. Additionally, having an independent facilitator conduct the focus groups reduced the risk of subjective bias [36].

The pilot study lasted only four weeks, which meant that personal trainers aimed to integrate as many activities as possible into the participants' daily routines to provide a broad range of

activities. We recognize that more time is needed for the integration and habit formation of the activities. Therefore, the results must be interpreted with this consideration in mind.

However, the study's sample size of 15 participants, with 8 involved in the focus groups, may limit the generalizability of the findings. The deductive approach used for category formation, while appropriate, might have constrained the discovery of new, emergent themes. Moreover, the absence of a fully documented reliability check weakens the overall reliability of the findings [38]. Finally, the potential influence of social desirability bias on participants' responses cannot be entirely excluded [77].

**List of abbreviations**

PA = physical activity

WPAI = workplace physical activity intervention

wLAT55+ = work LiFE55+ Assessment Tool

wLiFE55+ = work Lifestyle-integrated Functional Exercise Program for employees over 55 years

**Declarations**

- Ethical approval and consent to participate: All participants provided written informed consent prior to their involvement in the study. The study protocol was reviewed and approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Konstanz, under the ethics approval number IRB23KN07-005w.
- Consent for publication: All the patients who provided their case reports provided consent for publication.
- Availability of data and materials: All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this published article and its supplementary information files.
- Competing interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

- Funding: This work was supported by the AFF Young Scholar Fund of the University of Konstanz. The content of this paper is solely the responsibility of the authors.
- Authors' contributions:

  YR developed the concept and design, was responsible for the study management, statistical analysis and interpretation of the data and wrote the manuscript.

  DP was involved in the study management and data collection and analyzed the available qualitative results (preparation of interview guidelines, transcription and evaluation of the focus groups).

  MS was responsible for obtaining funding, developing the concept and design, implementation of the focus groups, interpreting the data and writing the manuscript.

  All authors contributed to the interpretation of the data, the writing of the article and the final approval of the version to be published.
- Acknowledgments: The authors cordially thank the wLiFE55+ participants for making this research possible by taking part in the study.

  The authors further thank Alina Boden (AB) (University of Konstanz) for contribution in supporting the coding of participant statements.
- Authors' details (optional): Not applicable

**Literature**

1. Vasconcelos AF. Older workers: some critical societal and organizational challenges. Journal of Management Development. 2015;34(3):352-72.

2. Harasty C, Ostermeier M. Population ageing: Alternative measures of dependency and implications for the future of work: ILO Working Paper; 2020.

3. Westermeier C, Wolf M. Betriebe wollten 2018 deutlich mehr rentenberechtigte Mitarbeiter halten als 2015. IAB-Kurzbericht; 2020.

827 4. Sippli K, Schmalzried P, Rieger MA, Voelter-Mahlknecht S. Challenges arising for older
828 workers from participating in a workplace intervention addressing work ability: a qualitative
829 study from Germany. International archives of occupational and environmental health.
830 2021;94:919-33.
831 5. Suorsa K, Mattila V-M, Leskinen T, Heinonen OJ, Pentti J, Vahtera J, et al. Work ability
832 and physical fitness among aging workers: the Finnish Retirement and Aging Study. European
833 journal of ageing. 2022;19(4):1301-10.
834 6. Kenny GP, Yardley JE, Martineau L, Jay O. Physical work capacity in older adults:
835 implications for the aging worker. American journal of industrial medicine. 2008;51(8):610-
836 25.
837 7. Marées Hd, Heck H. Sportphysiologie.[Unveränd. Nachdr. d.] korr. Nachdr d. 2006;9.
838 8. de Fátima Ribeiro Silva C, Ohara DG, Matos AP, Pinto ACPN, Pegorari MS. Short
839 physical performance battery as a measure of physical performance and mortality predictor
840 in older adults: a comprehensive literature review. International journal of environmental
841 research and public health. 2021;18(20):10612.
842 9. Bauman A, Merom D, Bull FC, Buchner DM, Fiatarone Singh MA. Updating the
843 evidence for physical activity: summative reviews of the epidemiological evidence,
844 prevalence, and interventions to promote "active aging". The gerontologist.
845 2016;56(Suppl_2):S268-S80.
846 10. Claudino JG, Afonso J, Sarvestan J, Lanza MB, Pennone J, Filho CAC, et al. Strength
847 training to prevent falls in older adults: a systematic review with meta-analysis of randomized
848 controlled trials. Journal of clinical medicine. 2021;10(14):3184.

849 11. Ferrucci L, Cooper R, Shardell M, Simonsick EM, Schrack JA, Kuh D. Age-related
850 change in mobility: perspectives from life course epidemiology and geroscience. Journals of
851 gerontology series a: biomedical sciences and medical sciences. 2016;71(9):1184-94.
852 12. Wackerhage H, Sitzberger C, Kreuzpointner F, Oberhoffer-Fritz R. WHO-Leitlinien zu
853 körperlicher Aktivität und sitzendem Verhalten. Bayerisches Ärzteblatt. 2021(3):91-3.
854 13. Smith L, Hamer M, Ucci M, Marmot A, Gardner B, Sawyer A, et al. Weekday and
855 weekend patterns of objectively measured sitting, standing, and stepping in a sample of
856 office-based workers: the active buildings study. BMC public health. 2015;15:1-9.
857 14. Thorp AA, Healy GN, Winkler E, Clark BK, Gardiner PA, Owen N, et al. Prolonged
858 sedentary time and physical activity in workplace and non-work contexts: a cross-sectional
859 study of office, customer service and call centre employees. International journal of
860 behavioral nutrition and physical activity. 2012;9:1-9.
861 15. Shariat A, Cleland JA, Danaee M, Kargarfard M, Sangelaji B, Tamrin SBM. Effects of
862 stretching exercise training and ergonomic modifications on musculoskeletal discomforts of
863 office workers: a randomized controlled trial. Brazilian journal of physical therapy.
864 2018;22(2):144-53.
865 16. Swathi S, Senthil P, Neelam S. Nonspecific low back pain in sedentary workers: A
866 narrative review. Biomedicine. 2022;42(5):863-9.
867 17. Neupane S, Kyrönlahti S, Oakman J, Siukola A, Riekhoff A-J, Kuivalainen S, et al. Can
868 workplace intervention prolong work life of older workers? A quasi-experimental study.
869 International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health. 2023;96(2):237-46.
870 18. Holtermann A, Straker L, Lee I-M, Van Der Beek AJ, Stamatakis E. Long overdue
871 remarriage for better physical activity advice for all: bringing together the public health and

872 occupational health agendas. BMJ Publishing Group Ltd and British Association of Sport and
873 Exercise Medicine; 2020. p. 1377-8.
874 19. Garne-Dalgaard A, Mann S, Bredahl TVG, Stochkendahl MJ. Implementation
875 strategies, and barriers and facilitators for implementation of physical activity at work: a
876 scoping review. Chiropractic & manual therapies. 2019;27:1-13.
877 20. Justesen JB, Eskerod P, Christensen JR, Sjøgaard G. Implementing workplace health
878 promotion–role of middle managers. International Journal of Workplace Health
879 Management. 2017;10(2):164-78.
880 21. Kinnafick F-E, Thøgersen-Ntoumani C, Shepherd SO, Wilson OJ, Wagenmakers AJ,
881 Shaw CS. In it together: a qualitative evaluation of participant experiences of a 10-week,
882 group-based, workplace HIIT program for insufficiently active adults. Journal of Sport and
883 Exercise Psychology. 2018;40(1):10-9.
884 22. Taylor WC, Horan A, Pinion Jr C, Liehr P. Evaluation of booster breaks in the workplace.
885 Journal of occupational and environmental medicine. 2014;56(5):529-34.
886 23. Tudor-Locke C, Hendrick CA, Duet MT, Swift DL, Schuna Jr JM, Martin CK, et al.
887 Implementation and adherence issues in a workplace treadmill desk intervention. Applied
888 physiology, nutrition, and metabolism. 2014;39(10):1104-11.
889 24. Bredahl TVG, Særvoll CA, Kirkelund L, Sjøgaard G, Andersen LL. When intervention
890 meets organisation, a qualitative study of motivation and barriers to physical exercise at the
891 workplace. The Scientific World Journal. 2015;2015(1):518561.
892 25. Taylor WC, King KE, Shegog R, Paxton RJ, Evans-Hudnall GL, Rempel DM, et al. Booster
893 Breaks in the workplace: participants' perspectives on health-promoting work breaks. Health
894 education research. 2013;28(3):414-25.

895 26. Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, Michie S, Nazareth I, Petticrew M. Developing and
896 evaluating complex interventions an introduction to the new Medical Research Council
897 guidance. Evidence–Based Public Health: Effectiveness and Efficiency. 2010;1:185-203.
898 27. Mackenzie K, Such E, Norman P, Goyder E. The development, implementation and
899 evaluation of interventions to reduce workplace sitting: a qualitative systematic review and
900 evidence-based operational framework. BMC Public Health. 2018;18:1-18.
901 28. Pieper C, Schröer S, Eilerts A-L. Evidence of workplace interventions—a systematic
902 review of systematic reviews. International journal of environmental research and public
903 health. 2019;16(19):3553.
904 29. Ritter Y, Pfister D, Steckhan GM, Voelter-Mahlknecht S, Weber B, Ellegast R, et al. The
905 work Lifestyle-integrated Functional Exercise program for preventing functional decline in
906 employees aged 55 years and older: development and initial evaluation. European Review of
907 Aging and Physical Activity. 2024;21(1):21.
908 30. Schwenk M, Bergquist R, Boulton E, Van Ancum JM, Nerz C, Weber M, et al. The
909 adapted lifestyle-integrated functional exercise program for preventing functional decline in
910 young seniors: development and initial evaluation. Gerontology. 2019;65(4):362-74.
911 31. Fitzgerald S, Geaney F, Kelly C, McHugh S, Perry IJ. Barriers to and facilitators of
912 implementing complex workplace dietary interventions: process evaluation results of a
913 cluster controlled trial. BMC health services research. 2016;16:1-13.
914 32. Krueger RA, Casey MA. Focus group interviewing. Handbook of practical program
915 evaluation. 2015:506-34.

33. Schwarzer R. Self-efficacy in the adoption and maintenance of health behaviors: theoretical approaches and a new model. Self-efficacy: thought control of action. Washington, DC, US: Hemisphere Publishing Corp. 1992:217-43.

34. Boulton E, Hawley-Hague H, French DP, Mellone S, Zacchi A, Clemson L, et al. Implementing behaviour change theory and techniques to increase physical activity and prevent functional decline among adults aged 61–70: The PreventIT project. Progress in cardiovascular diseases. 2019;62(2):147-56.

35. Kramer F, Labudek S, Jansen C-P, Nerz C, Fleig L, Clemson L, et al. Development of a conceptual framework for a group-based format of the Lifestyle-integrated Functional Exercise (gLiFE) programme and its initial feasibility testing. Pilot and feasibility studies. 2020;6:1-18.

36. Reicherzer L, Kramer-Gmeiner F, Labudek S, Jansen C-P, Nerz C, Nystrand MJ, et al. Group or individual lifestyle-integrated functional exercise (LiFE)? A qualitative analysis of acceptability. BMC geriatrics. 2021;21:1-12.

37. Kuckartz U. Qualitative inhaltsanalyse: methoden, praxis, computerunterstützung: Beltz Juventa; 2012.

38. Mayring P. Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. Grundlagen und Techniken (Beltz Pädagogik, 12., überarb. Aufl.). Weinheim: Beltz; 2015.

39. Atkins L, Francis J, Islam R, O'Connor D, Patey A, Ivers N, et al. A guide to using the Theoretical Domains Framework of behaviour change to investigate implementation problems. Implementation science. 2017;12:1-18.

40. Cane J, O'Connor D, Michie S. Validation of the theoretical domains framework for use in behaviour change and implementation research. Implementation science. 2012;7:1-17.

939 41. Banerjee S, Semper K, Skarparis K, Naisby J, Lewis L, Cucato G, et al. Patient
940 perspectives of vigorous intensity aerobic interval exercise prehabilitation prior to radical
941 cystectomy: a qualitative focus group study. Disability and rehabilitation. 2021;43(8):1084-
942 91.
943 42. Burn NL, Weston M, Atkinson G, Weston KL. Using focus groups and interviews to
944 inform the design of a workplace exercise programme: an example from a high-intensity
945 interval training intervention. Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine.
946 2021;63(2):e63-e74.
947 43. Blom V, Drake E, Kallings LV, Ekblom MM, Nooijen CF. The effects on self-efficacy,
948 motivation and perceived barriers of an intervention targeting physical activity and sedentary
949 behaviours in office workers: a cluster randomized control trial. BMC public health.
950 2021;21(1):1048.
951 44. Teixeira PJ, Carraça EV, Marques MM, Rutter H, Oppert J-M, De Bourdeaudhuij I, et al.
952 Successful behavior change in obesity interventions in adults: a systematic review of self-
953 regulation mediators. BMC medicine. 2015;13:1-16.
954 45. Kim J, Mizushima R, Nishida K, Morimoto M, Nakata Y. Proposal of a Comprehensive
955 and Multi-Component Approach to Promote Physical Activity among Japanese Office
956 Workers: A Qualitative Focus Group Interview Study. International Journal of Environmental
957 Research and Public Health. 2022;19(4):2172.
958 46. Ooms L, Veenhof C, De Bakker DH. The Start2Bike program is effective in increasing
959 health-enhancing physical activity: a controlled study. BMC Public Health. 2017;17:1-11.
960 47. Marshall AL. Challenges and opportunities for promoting physical activity in the
961 workplace. Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport. 2004;7(1):60-6.

962 48. Stevens M, Rees T, Coffee P, Steffens NK, Haslam SA, Polman R. A social identity
963 approach to understanding and promoting physical activity. Sports Medicine. 2017;47:1911-
964 8.
965 49. Oyserman D, Fryberg SA, Yoder N. Identity-based motivation and health. Journal of
966 personality and social psychology. 2007;93(6):1011.
967 50. Terry DJ, Hogg MA. Group norms and the attitude-behavior relationship: A role for
968 group identification. Personality and social psychology bulletin. 1996;22(8):776-93.
969 51. Jonkman NH, Del Panta V, Hoekstra T, Colpo M, Van Schoor NM, Bandinelli S, et al.
970 Predicting trajectories of functional decline in 60-to 70-year-old people. Gerontology.
971 2018;64(3):212-21.
972 52. Adams M, Gordt-Oesterwind K, Bongartz M, Zimmermann S, Seide S, Braun V, et al.
973 Effects of physical activity interventions on strength, balance and falls in middle-aged adults:
974 a systematic review and meta-analysis. Sports Medicine-Open. 2023;9(1):61.
975 53. Winstone NE, Nash RA, Parker M, Rowntree J. Supporting learners' agentic
976 engagement with feedback: A systematic review and a taxonomy of recipience processes.
977 Educational psychologist. 2017;52(1):17-37.
978 54. De Santis KK, Jahnel T, Matthias K, Mergenthal L, Al Khayyal H, Zeeb H. Evaluation of
979 digital interventions for physical activity promotion: Scoping review. JMIR Public Health and
980 Surveillance. 2022;8(5):e37820.
981 55. Hamari J, Koivisto J. “Working out for likes”: An empirical study on social influence in
982 exercise gamification. Computers in human behavior. 2015;50:333-47.

56. Arnold CM, Lanovaz J, Farthing JP, Legg H, Weimer M, Kim S. Fall arrest strategy training improves upper body response time compared to standard fall prevention exercise in older women: A randomized trial. Clinical rehabilitation. 2022;36(7):940-51.

57. Clemson L, Singh MAF, Bundy A, Cumming RG, Manollaras K, O'Loughlin P, et al. Integration of balance and strength training into daily life activity to reduce rate of falls in older people (the LiFE study): randomised parallel trial. Bmj. 2012;345.

58. Jansen C-P, Becker C, Klenk J, Koenig H-H, Wahl H-W, Schmidt L, et al., editors. Lifestyle-integrated Functional Exercise Training (LIFE): Comparison of a group-based and individually taught LIFE Program in terms of Effectiveness and Cost. ZEITSCHRIFT FUR GERONTOLOGIE UND GERIATRIE; 2017: SPRINGER HEIDELBERG TIERGARTENSTRASSE 17, D-69121 HEIDELBERG, GERMANY.

59. Burton E, Lewin G, Clemson L, Boldy D. Effectiveness of a lifestyle exercise program for older people receiving a restorative home care service: a pragmatic randomized controlled trial. Clinical interventions in aging. 2013:1591-601.

60. Lock M, Post D, Dollman J, Parfitt G. Development of a self-determination theory-based physical activity intervention for aged care workers: Protocol for the activity for well-being program. Frontiers in public health. 2018;6:341.

61. Schunk DH. Self-efficacy, motivation, and performance. Journal of applied sport psychology. 1995;7(2):112-37.

62. Eichhorn D, Ott I. Nudging im Unternehmen: den Weg für gesunde Entscheidungen bereiten: Institut für Arbeit und Gesundheit der Deutschen Gesetzlichen ...; 2019.

63. Fishbach A, Hofmann W. Nudging self-control: A smartphone intervention of temptation anticipation and goal resolution improves everyday goal progress. Motivation Science. 2015;1(3):137.

64. Ledderer L, Kjær M, Madsen EK, Busch J, Fage-Butler A. Nudging in public health lifestyle interventions: a systematic literature review and metasynthesis. Health Education & Behavior. 2020;47(5):749-64.

65. Tassi JM, Fajardo MÁL, García JD, Calvo TG, Ponce IG. Attentional focus in team sports: Effects of an intervention program on football players. European Journal of Human Movement. 2023;50:52-61.

66. Ryan RM, Deci EL. Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. American psychologist. 2000;55(1):68.

67. Tuckman BW. Developmental sequence in small groups. Psychological bulletin. 1965;63(6):384.

68. Lawton R, Mceachan R, Jackson C, West R, Conner M. Intervention fidelity and effectiveness of a UK worksite physical activity intervention funded by the Bupa Foundation, UK. Health promotion international. 2014;30(1):38-49.

69. Burton E, Farrier K, Hill KD, Codde J, Airey P, Hill A-M. Effectiveness of peers in delivering programs or motivating older people to increase their participation in physical activity: Systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of sports sciences. 2018;36(6):666-78.

70. Burg MM, Schwartz JE, Kronish IM, Diaz KM, Alcantara C, Duer-Hefele J, et al. Does stress result in you exercising less? Or does exercising result in you being less stressed? Or

1026 is it both? Testing the bi-directional stress-exercise association at the group and person (N of
1027 1) level. Annals of Behavioral Medicine. 2017;51(6):799-809.
1028 71. Stults-Kolehmainen MA, Sinha R. The effects of stress on physical activity and
1029 exercise. Sports medicine. 2014;44:81-121.
1030 72. Teixeira PJ, Marques MM, Silva MN, Brunet J, Duda JL, Haerens L, et al. A classification
1031 of motivation and behavior change techniques used in self-determination theory-based
1032 interventions in health contexts. Motivation science. 2020;6(4):438.
1033 73. Lally P, Van Jaarsveld CH, Potts HW, Wardle J. How are habits formed: Modelling habit
1034 formation in the real world. European journal of social psychology. 2010;40(6):998-1009.
1035 74. Van der Weiden A, Benjamins J, Gillebaart M, Ybema JF, De Ridder D. How to form good
1036 habits? A longitudinal field study on the role of self-control in habit formation. Frontiers in
1037 Psychology. 2020;11:494700.
1038 75. Smithson J. Using and analysing focus groups: limitations and possibilities.
1039 International journal of social research methodology. 2000;3(2):103-19.
1040 76. Fern EF. The use of focus groups for idea generation: the effects of group size,
1041 acquaintanceship, and moderator on response quantity and quality. Journal of marketing
1042 Research. 1982;19(1):1-13.
1043 77. Acocella I. The focus groups in social research: advantages and disadvantages.
1044 Quality & Quantity. 2012;46:1125-36.
1045