



An initiative by Irish Men's Sheds Association





MEN'S

Waterford Institute of Technology INSTITIÚID TEICNEOLAÍOCHTA PHORT LÁIRGE

# Sheds for Life Impact Report The Impact of implementation phase one on the health and Wellbeing outcomes of participants

Prepared by: Aisling McGrath, Professor Niamh Murphy and Dr Noel Richardson 2021

Institiúid Teicneolaíochta Cheatharlach INSTITUTE of TECHNOLOGY CARLOW At the heart of South Leinster



ties hi



Seirbhís Sláinte Building a Níos Fearr Better Health á Forhairt Service

Sláintecare.

Rialtas na hÉireann Government of Ireland





# **Table of Contents**

List of Abbreviations1
Foreword1
Sheds for Life Partners2
Executive Summary 3
Introduction: Responding to the need for gender-specific strategies that promote health
What is Sheds for Life?4
Research Methodology5
Results 6
Health and Wellbeing outcomes 6
Supplementary Components7
Sheds for Life Reach and Attendance
Conclusion8
Recommendations9
1.0 Introduction11
2.0 Review of Literature 13
2.1 Why focus on men's health? 13
2.2 The burden of ill-health in men 14
2.3 What influences men's health? 15
2.3 Wellbeing and masculinity 16
2.4 Engaging hard-to-reach men 17
2.5 Gender Transformative Approaches 18
2.6 The Men's Sheds as a setting to engage men20
2.7 The importance of evaluating community-based programmes to
promote systematic uptake23
2.5 Summary and Rationale24
3.0 Methodology 26
3.1 SFL Programme Design
3.1.1 Background of SFL
3.1.2 Format and Structure of the ten- week SFL programme
3.1.3 Gender Specific Strategies of SFL

3.2 Study Design 33
3.2.1 Implementation Testing 34
3.2.2 Effectiveness Testing
Methodology 36
3.2.3 Questionnaire Design
3.2.4 Supplementary Components. 38
Diabetes awareness
safeTALK
Digital Literacy
Oral Health38
Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation 39
Cancer awareness
3.2.5 COVID-19 adjustments 39
3.2.6 Participants and Sampling 39
3.2.7 Data Analysis 40
4.0 Results
4.1 Shed and Shedder Characteristics
4.2 Physical Activity47
4.3 Subjective Wellbeing 49
4.4 Mental Wellbeing51
4.5 Loneliness54
4.6 Social Capital55
4.7 Cost Analysis: The SF-6D57
4.8 Smoking and Alcohol61
4.9 Dietary habits and cooking skills 62
4.10 Supplementary Components 68
4.10.1 Diabetes Awareness 69
4.10.2 safeTALK- Suicide Awareness
4.10.3 Digital Literacy74
4.10.4 Oral Health 77
4.10.5 Cardiopulmonary
Resuscitation Training77
4.10.6 Cancer Awareness
4.11 Reach and Attendance
5.0 Discussion



Profile of the participants in the Sheds	
for Life intervention	84
Self-Rated Health	85
Seeking health information	86
Physical Activity	87
Subjective Wellbeing	88
Mental Wellbeing	89
	89
Loneliness	89
Social Capital	90
Cost Analysis	91
Smoking and Alcohol	92
Dietary Habits and Cooking Skills	93
Supplementary components	94
Diabetes Awareness	94

safeTALK- Suicide prevention and awareness	. 94
Digital Literacy	. 95
Oral Health	. 96
Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation Training	. 97
Cancer Awareness	. 97
Reach of Sheds for Life	. 98
6.0 Conclusion	. 99
6.1 Limitations	. 99
6.2 Conclusion	. 99
6.3 Recommendations	100
7.0 References	104

# **List of Tables**

Table 1: Core components of SFL	27
Table 2: Supplementary components of SFL in phase one	28
Table 3: Facilitators to effective participant engagement in SFL	30
Table 4: SFL by count breakdown	41
Table 5: Martial status of participants	42
Table 6: Self-rated health rating at baseline	43
Table 7: Participant health screening results at baseline	44
Table 8: Self- Reported Health Ratings by Cohort one across T1 to T4	46
Table 9: Seeking health information by cohort from T1-T4	46
Table 10: Physical Activity outcomes from T1 to T4	47
Table 11: SWEMEBS scores by cohort across T1 to T4	51
Table 12: Mental Health outcomes from Mind your Mental Health Workshop across T1 to	o T4
	52
Table 13: UCLA loneliness scores for Cohorts 1 and 2 from T1 to T4	54
Table 14: Sense of belonging across T1 to T4	56
Table 15: Sense of close support across T1 and T4	56
Table 16: Results of the SF-6D across time points	57
Table 17: Cooking frequency, style and willingness across time points	63
Table 18: Confidence scores for cooking and healthy eating across T1 to T4	65
Table 19: Mean Diabetes Knowledge Scores across T1 to T3	69
Table 20: Outcomes from safeTALK across T1 to T3	71
Table 21: Changes digital literacy constructs from T1 to T3	74
Table 22: CPR confidence ratings across T1, T2 and T3	77
Table 23: Cancer Awareness outcomes across T1, T2 and T3	80



# List of Figures

Figure 1: Consolidated Framework for implementation research domains and constructs .	35
Figure 2: An Ecological model of potential influences on implementation in practice (Koor	ts
et al., 2018)	36
Figure 3: Life Satisfaction scores from T1 to T4 across Cohorts 1 &2	50
Figure 4: Perceived participant ratings of life worth in Cohorts 1 & 2 across T1 to T4	51
Figure 5: A representation of changes in subjective feelings of loneliness for Cohorts 1 &	2
from before joining a shed and from baseline to 12 months	55





# List of Abbreviations

- CFIR- Consolidated
   Framework for Implementation
   Research
- Community-based Participatory
   Research CBPR
- HSE Health Service
   Executive
- HTR- Hard-to-reach
- IMSA Irish Men's Sheds Association
- PA Physical Activity
- PRACTIS PRACTical planning for Implementation and Scale-up
- QALYs Quality Adjusted Life Years
- SDGs- Sustainable
   Development Goals
- SF-6D Short Form 6D
- SFL Sheds for Life

- SFL- Sheds for Life
- Shedders Men's Shed members

- Shedders- Men's Shed members
- Sheds- Men's Sheds
- SWEMWBS- Short Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale
- TILDA-The Irish Longitudinal
   Study on Ageing
- T1- Baseline (commencement of SFL ten week programme)
- T2- 3 month follow up (end of SFL ten week programme)
- T3- 6 month follow up
- T4- 12 month follow up
- WHO- World Health
   Organisation



# Foreword

The Men's Sheds movement in Ireland has been paramount in providing an alternative setting to enhance the wellbeing of men and is fundamentally changing the narrative around how men do health. The sense of enhanced wellbeing that occurs when a man joins a shed is of no mystery if we consider what the shed inherently provides for men. Sheds are a home from home for many men that offers social support, a sense of purpose and belonging. All of these elements have been shown to play a vital role in improving and maintaining wellbeing.

These unique health enhancing qualities of the shed have been recognised and acknowledged in our National Men's Health Policy and Healthy Ireland Men: Action Plan (2017-2021). Sheds for Life is an innovative approach which was developed to respond to the increasing call by such policies for gender-specific health promotion programmes that target lifestyle and health behaviour change in men.

This report signifies the importance of how a tailored community based men's health promotion programme, developed in collaboration with its intended participants, can have a profound impact in engaging and empowering what are often regarded as a 'hard to reach' group (middle-aged and older men) in the care of their own health. The success of Sheds for Life as identified in this report is strongly underpinned by working in partnership and by a range of capacity building measures which have achieved sustainable health and wellbeing outcomes for the men.

As highlighted in the recommendations of this report, the dissemination of these findings highlight the success of a gender-specific community-based men's health programme that will not only benefit men's sheds but also provide an invaluable blueprint to inform and inspire other researchers, practitioners, policy makers and the wider community. During these uncertain and challenging times of COVID-19 we have witnessed how the pandemic disproportionately effects vulnerable males, this report identifies a real necessity for men's health programmes now more than ever.

The Irish Men's Sheds Association is delighted to share the findings from this Impact Report and would like to thank all those who have contributed to the success of Sheds for Life to date. In particular we acknowledge the Shedders, partner organisations, our academic partners and our funders for their invaluable contribution and commitment to the programme.

> Enda Egan Chief Executive Officer Irish Men's Sheds Association



# **Sheds for Life Partners**





# **Executive Summary**

# Introduction: Responding to the need for gender-specific strategies that promote health

Although an emphasis on the excess burden of ill-health and mortality in men has increased in recent years, men remain disproportionately impacted. This has resulted in increasing calls at national and global level to tackle inequalities in health through gendered responses. Health outcomes among men remain generally worse than females globally with men in Ireland continuing to experience a higher mortality rate from almost all leading causes of death while women are also more likely to experience more healthy life years than men. There is however increasing recognition that men and women are different in both biology and in the terms of normative gender roles and behaviours that are deemed to be culturally acceptable. This means that in order to tackle gender inequalities in health, there needs to be a gendered response that delivers tailored and targeted intervention, catering to the needs of women and men. In fact, an equal role for women in global health leadership is required to ensure that their needs are included in policy alongside the needs of men. Much of the excess burden of ill health experienced by men is avoidable and results from preventable lifestyle and other risk factors that are related to complex biopsychosocial responses such as gendered practices and behaviours relating to masculinity. Disparities in health that exist between genders, also exist within them, widening downwards through the social gradient as well as between different populations of men. Vulnerable populations of men are at an increased risk of the excess ill health burden with hard-to-reach (HTR) men less likely to engage with health and wellbeing. The health needs of men, particularly those who are at an increased risk, cannot be fully met until sex and gender are acknowledged at policy and practitioner level. Responses that focus on the complexities underpinning gendered practices and behaviours which influences male health engagement, and that align to existing public health priorities are necessary to tackle the burden of ill health in men.

The community as a setting for health promotion has demonstrated potential to implement preventative strategies that can ease the burden on health care systems and enhance population wellbeing. Strategies that utilise gender-specific strategies have proven most



effective in engaging vulnerable male populations. The Men's Sheds is a setting that is inherently conducive to promoting wellbeing in a place where men, some of which are HTR, naturally congregate within the safe and familiar environment. Sheds are organic health enhancing settings offering sense of purpose through meaningful work and skill sharing, social support, and camaraderie. Sheds also present a unique opportunity to reach a typically HTR group while learning from and giving a voice to more marginalised male populations in terms of how best to meet their health and wellbeing needs. Drawing on what works in other successful men's health programmes to inform strengths-based approaches, the Men's Shed setting is well positioned to deliver structured and tailored health promotion initiatives.



### What is Sheds for Life?

"Sheds for Life" (SFL) was first developed by the Irish Men's Shed Association (IMSA) in 2016 in a bid to respond to the increasing calls for gender specific strategies that engage men with health and also in response to the appetite Men's Shed members (Shedders) had to participate in more structured health

and wellbeing initiatives. The potential of Sheds to access a group of HTR men and engage them with health promotion initiatives is well established. Nevertheless, the IMSA wanted to oversee the implementation of health initiatives in Sheds in order to ensure that the environment of the Sheds and their members were protected and respected, with those working with the Sheds understanding and valuing the ethos of the Sheds environment. SFL uses a partnership approach, whereby allied provider organisations deliver various components of the programme in response to needs identified by Shedders. After initial pilot testing of various SFL components, SFL was structured into a formally evaluated ten-week programme that deliverers targeted and tailored health promotion directly to the Sheds. The programme comprises of a health check, three core pillars (physical activity, healthy eating and mental health) and a range of other health and wellbeing components into which Shed members self-select.



## **Research Methodology**



The SFL evaluation uses an implementation science hybrid approach which dually tests effectiveness and implementation outcomes. This approach enables a simultaneous focus on demonstrating the impact of SFL on participants as well as assessing the effectiveness of its roll-out across the Sheds. This approach focuses not only on testing clinical effectiveness at individual or participant level but also on the broader implementation environment at the provider, organisation and wider systems level in order to identify barriers and facilitators to implementation of SFL. The aim is to promote the systematic uptake of SFL in the real-world setting and limit translation issues that can occur when attempting to scale up effective programmes. Central to the success of this approach is collaboration. SFL aims to work collaboratively with all key stakeholders to ensure that it is an acceptable and appropriate model for participants and providers and delivered in a way that maintains its fidelity as it moves across Sheds. A mixed methods approach is applied to the research to assess implementation and effectiveness outcomes. The purpose of this report is to highlight effectiveness outcomes, more specifically the impact of SFL on the health and wellbeing outcomes of participants. Two cohorts of Shed members (n=212,n=209) were recruited to participate in the SFL programme and evaluation and followed up to 12 months at baseline, 3, 6 and 12 months. Questionnaires measuring different health and wellbeing outcomes as well as constructs relating to the different SFL components were administered at each time point. Focus groups (n=8) and short interviews (n=16) were also conducted with participants and a flavour of these findings are presented in this report to compliment the quantitative findings.



## Results



Below is a summary of the main findings from the assessment of health and wellbeing outcomes of SFL participants:

- SFL was delivered across 22 Shed settings with n=421 Shed members participating in the programme across four counties; Waterford, Kildare, Limerick and Louth.
- The mean age of participants was 69.1 ± 9.136 years, ranging from 27-90 years.

### Health and Wellbeing outcomes

- There was a significant increase in self-rated health from baseline (immediately prior to SFL) post SFL (p<0.001) sustained up to 12 months.</p>
- Those who reported liking to find out about their health significantly increased post SFL (p<0.001) and remained sustained.</p>
- Days physically active for 30 minutes or more significantly increased post SFL (p<0.001) and remained significantly higher than baseline up to 12 months, with a significant increase in days spent walking and in those meeting the physical activity guidelines as well as physical activity self-efficacy scores.</p>
- In terms of subjective wellbeing, life satisfaction and life worth scores increased significantly from baseline with sustained change up to 12 months (p<0.001).</p>
- Mental Wellbeing scores significantly increased and remained significantly higher than baseline. There was also a significant and sustained improvement in; understanding about mental health, having a conversation about mental health and feeling equipped with supports to maintain mental health post SFL (p<0.001).</p>
- Outcomes relating to social capital improved significantly and were sustained beyond baseline with enhancements in; sense of belonging (p<0.001), close support (p<0.001) and trust (p<0.001).</p>
- Analysis of the SF-6D for measuring cost-effectiveness highlighted a significant improvement in physical functioning (p<0.001), role limitation (p<0.005), mental health (p<0.001) and vitality (p<0.001 with no change in constructs assessing pain or social functioning.
- A minority (8.4%) were reported to smoke at baseline, with a significant decrease in amount smoked post SFL (p<0.05). In relation to alcohol, 68.3% were reported to</p>



drink alcohol at baseline with a significant decrease in days drinking post SFL but this was not sustained.

In relation to dietary habits and cooking skills, there was a significant and sustained improvement in cooking preparation techniques (p<0.005), as well as cooking frequency (p<0.005), and willingness to cook (p<0.05). There was also a significant increase in all confidence constructs related to cooking and healthy eating; cooking using raw ingredients (p<0.001), following a simple recipe (p<0.001), shopping for healthier food to eat (p<0.001), cooking new foods (p<0.001), cooking healthier foods (p<0.001), storing food safely (p<0.001), using leftovers to cook other meals (p<0.001), cooking whole raw chicken from scratch (p<0.001), reading food labels (p<0.001) and food hygiene (p<0.001).</p>

#### **Supplementary Components**

- In the Diabetes Workshop there was a significant improvement in 6 out of 7 constructs measuring changes in diabetes knowledge. All participants "Strongly Agreed" (85.5%) or "Agreed" (14.5%) that the workshop improved their understanding of diabetes prevention and management.
- Of those who participated in safeTALK suicide prevention training, there was a significant increase in confidence to deal with the needs of someone who might be suicidal (p<0.001) and identifying appropriate services for someone in distress (p<0.001). There was no significant change in willingness to talk openly about suicide but there was a significant increase in confidence in terms of feeling prepared to do so (p<0.005).</p>
- In relation to Digital Literacy there was a significant increase in levels of confidence; accessing a website (p<0.001), sending and receiving an email (p<0.001), staying connected with family and friends online (p<0.001), renewing motor tax, shopping and banking online (p<0.001) and getting online with apps on a smartphone (p<0.001).</p>
- Following on from the Oral Health Workshop there was significant enhancement in the perceived importance of going for annual oral checks (p<0.05). All respondents also "Strongly Agreed" (77.8%) or "Agreed" (22.2%) that the workshops helped them to improve their understanding of how to manage and maintain their oral health.
- Of those who participated in CPR training, there was a significant increase in confidence; recognising cardiac arrest and calling the emergency services



(p<0.001), performing chest compression (p<0.001) and operating an AED (p<0.001).

Sheds who participated in the Cancer Awareness Workshop reported increased understanding of; the cancer related early detection signs (p<0.001), the cancers most prevalent in men (p<0.001) and cancer screening services in Ireland (p<0.001).</p>

#### Sheds for Life Reach and Attendance

- An estimated reach rate calculated on the proportion of Shed members eligible to attend across targeted Sheds (n=565) against numbers who enrolled into SFL (n=421) was calculated at 73%.
- Attendance rates estimated on numbers who signed up to each component along with attendance records and self-reported attendance was estimated overall at 72.46%.

## Conclusion



Phase one of SFL has demonstrated that the programme has been successful

in effectively engaging a HTR group of men and enhancing their health and wellbeing outcomes. It has highlighted the rich potential of the Shed environment for men to engage with health and wellbeing in a meaningful and effective way. Building upon the inherent health promoting qualities found in the Shed, SFL has successfully implemented a structured and targeted prevention strategy that responds to the needs of Men's Shed members made possible by the strength of its partnership approach. The programme has demonstrated its feasibility by maintaining impact as it is translated across Shed settings. As well as highlighting the potential that tailored and targeted men's health interventions can have for addressing gender inequalities in health, SFL can inform health promotion strategies not just in Sheds, but in other community-based men's health programmes more broadly.



## Recommendations

Below is a summary of the recommendations emerging from the research:



# R1: Respond to the evolving needs of Shed members:

SFL should aim to continually adapt its programme content over time to respond to the evolving needs of Shed members.

## R2: Make provision for follow-on supports post SFL

A follow-on or step down programme should be made available for past participants of the ten-week programme to encourage maintenance of positive behaviour change.

## R3: Ensure that engagement is based on informed choices

Shed members should be fully informed of the evidence and importance of elements of SFL so that they can make informed and autonomous decisions to freely choose which elements of the programme to engage in.

## R4: Maintain and strengthen partnerships

It is an important success factor of SFL that strategic and allied partnerships are maintained and respected while new partners who can respond effectively to the needs of Shed members are sought.

# R5: Maintain a collaborative approach with Shed members

Collaboration with Shed members informs key insights into barriers and facilitators within the intervention setting and also enhances feelings of reciprocity and trust. The collaborative approach also facilitates identification of health champions and leaders who are instrumental to the success of SFL at ground level.

# R6: Asses for Cost-effectiveness

Preliminarily evidence suggests that SFL offers good value for money, particularly through the enhanced health and wellbeing outcomes and its engagement of an at risk



10

group. It is important to apply the findings to a cost-effect analysis as it is an important determinant of the scalability of SFL.

# R7: Inform implementation outcomes for scale-up

Assessing the implementation outcomes of SFL will provide clear differentiation from clinical effectiveness outcomes and assist in forming a blueprint for the wider roll-out of SFL ensuring that effect is maintained at scale.

# R8: Disseminate SFL findings to key stakeholders

Dissemination of SFL research findings in appropriate format for key stakeholder is recommended. SFL will provide a blueprint for practical application and will be a valuable addition to other researchers, practitioners, policy makers, the wider community and men's shed members.





# **1.0 Introduction**

Sheds for Life is a community-based health promotion programme aimed at supporting the physical, mental and social wellbeing of men's sheds members.

The development of Sheds for Life commenced in 2016 and has been guided by the needs, wishes and feedback of the men's sheds members throughout Ireland. The Sheds for Life vision is a future where all men's sheds members can enjoy physical and mental health and wellbeing to their full potential.

In partnership with researchers supporting the development and evaluation of SFL and a host of partner organisations who deliver various components of SFL in the Sheds, The Irish Men's Sheds Association (IMSA) designed a 10-week SFL programme for its members. The first phase of the Life structured Sheds for programme was implemented



with Sheds in counties Kildare, Waterford, Limerick and Louth across 2019.

The purpose of SFL is to engage men to successfully facilitate more open and meaningful discussions around their physical and mental wellbeing while encouraging them to increase their health awareness and maintain healthier lifestyle choices in areas such as physical activity, healthy eating and mental wellbeing. More broadly, SFL aims to respond to global health conversations and policies that are increasingly calling for more gender-specific health promotion strategies that target lifestyle and health behaviour change, particularly to so called 'hard-to-reach' groups of men. The community as a setting in which to promote male health and wellbeing demonstrates promise in promoting social support, enhancing communities and encouraging healthy lifestyles in men while actualising the recommendations set out at policy level.



The IMSA called for the evaluation of SFL in order to strengthen its implementation and impact for its members as well as highlighting the Shed setting to policy makers, funders and partners as an effective route to engage men with health and wellbeing through gender-specific approaches.

This study is funded by the Irish Research Council's Employment-Based Postgraduate Scheme Project ID: EBPPG//256 and was conducted by a PhD scholar at Waterford Institute of Technology with the IMSA as employment partner also supported by the Institute of Technology Carlow. The first delivery phase of SFL has been funded with thanks to the HSE. The next phase of Sheds for Life will be delivered to counties; Leitrim, Roscommon and Meath and is supported by the HSE and Sláintecare Integration funding.



# **2.0 Review of Literature**

## 2.1 Why focus on men's health?

Increasing focus has been mounting in the area of men's health in recent years at national and global level, both in policy and research into correlates and determinants that influence men's health and the need to address the burden of ill health in men (Department of Health, 2016, WHO, 2018). While there has undoubtedly been progress over the past twenty years recent reports highlight that men's health still remains generally absent from policies and programmes at all levels while global gender equity policy often fails to acknowledge men or else position men and masculinities in a negative way (Baker, 2020; Smith et al., 2020) Evidence about how to engage men with health and wellbeing in a way that is responsive to their needs is more widely available but men still remain underrepresented at programme level, a fact compounded by the inadequate knowledge and representation among policy makers of men's health issues alongside lack of political will to advocate for inclusion on policy agendas (Baker, 2020). Men's health may be perceived as less important than other groups with views that; men experience more privilege in terms of opportunities and access to resources and; by focusing in this area the healthcare of women and children may be further compromised (Carson, 2020). However, the process of improving men's health in fact contributes towards greater gender equality in health as it not only benefits men but also has a profound impact on women, children and society (Carson, 2020). By increasing attention to men's health in addition to women's and children's health, there could be a reduction in healthcare costs by preventing chronic and advanced disease while reducing time lost from work, disability, and financial stresses on the family. Within the Irish context there have been progressive movements to advancing men's health equality. This is evident in a rich landscape of men's health research and practice work that has emerged within Ireland in recent years (Baker, 2015), underpinned by a national men's health policy (Department of Health and Children, 2008; Department of Health, 2016) and the roll-out of a national men's health training programme (Lefkowich, Richardson, Brennan, Lambe, & Carroll, 2018; Osborne et al., 2016). These serve as an important back- drop for men's health promotion.



Community-based men's health and wellbeing programmes have shown particular promise in engaging men with health and wellbeing through a gendered approach that delivers targeted health promotion within safe and familiar environments (Milligan et al., 2016). It is imperative to men's health equity that effective strategies such as these are well documented and evaluated to promote systematic knowledge translation for practitioners and policy makers (Baker, White & Morgan, 2020).

### 2.2 The burden of ill-health in men

Robust evidence has demonstrated persistent trends that health outcomes among males are generally worse than females globally, with females outliving males by an average of four years (Baker, White & Morgan, 2020). While there have been improvements in survival across the age spectrum in the past seven decades males continue to have a lower life expectancy compared to females. In Ireland, most recent provisional data suggests the average male life expectancy is 3.6 years below their female counterparts at 80.4 years and 84 years respectively (Department of Health, 2019). While the life expectancy gap is narrowing, men in Ireland continue to suffer a higher mortality rate from almost all leading causes of death with women typically still experiencing a higher number of healthy life years than men (Health Service Executive, 2016; Department of Health, 2019). Men are more likely to die prematurely from cardiovascular disease than women, more likely to be overweight, twice as likely to have diabetes, have a higher chance of dying from non-gender specific cancers, and are four and half times more likely to die from suicide (White et al., 2011; WHO, 2018). Premature deaths from non-communicable diseases such as cancers, chronic respiratory disease and diabetes mellitus have, as international figures suggest, been in decline since the mid-2000s (WHO, 2017). Yet, male mortality rates remain consistently higher than female mortality with noncommunicable diseases accounting for over four million males deaths in the European Region between 2000 and 2015 (WHO, 2018). Data from Ireland outlines the four main causes of male mortality to be invasive cancers, circulatory system disease, respiratory system diseases and external causes of injury and poisoning (Devine & Early, 2020). While women too experience disparities in health, there exists an excess burden of ill-health in men with males experiencing poorer health outcomes compared to females. The higher risk for premature mortality and large differences between subpopulations of men has long been documented across countries and at times regarded as a natural phenomenon (WHO, 2018). This elementary view of men's health further exacerbates gender inequalities in health and it is important to investigate the causes that lead to differences in health outcomes between genders for advancing the population health of both men and women (Baker, 2020).



## 2.3 What influences men's health?

Biology indeed has a role to play in influencing the aetiology of disease in men differential to women (Regitz-Zagrosek, 2012). Sex differences in disease prevalence, manifestation, and response to treatment are rooted in the genetic differences between men and women. However, biology alone cannot explain health inequities and the need to take account of sex and gender in relation to the health of both men and women is well established in the literature (Baker, 2018; WHO 2018). Many of the disparities in the health gap between genders is equated to preventable lifestyle and risk factors such as; alcohol and drug use, physical activity, diet, exposure to risk and risk taking behaviour, with evidence suggesting that up to 50% of premature male mortality is preventable (WHO, 2018; White, 2011). These modifiable lifestyle and preventable risk factors are closely linked to chronic health issues such as obesity, diabetes, hypertension and high cholesterol and are the principle causes of mortality including respiratory diseases, cardiovascular diseases and some cancers (Ng, Sutradhar, Yao, Wodchis, & Rosella, 2020). Yet, it is a host of complex biopsychosocial factors that contribute to these health inequities rooted within a complex interaction between individual, behavioural, social and structural factors in society which shape the health behaviours of men (Salgado et al., 2019; Seidler, Dawes, Rice, Oliffe, & Dhillon, 2016; Yousaf, Grunfeld, & Hunter, 2015). Individual behaviours contribute to an excess burden of ill-health in men. However, it is crucially important to understand that lifestyles are not simply the product of individual choice. Health studies in the last number of years have moved away from explaining differences in men's health based on these behaviours (White et al., 2011). Rather, studies have investigated the underlying causes framed within the social determinants of health and how gender relates to equity, exploring masculinity and how it impacts men's health, particularly in the case of more marginalised male subpopulations (Bruce, Griffith & Thorpe, 2015; WHO, 2018). Manifestations of gender are largely influenced by learning and adopting different behaviours (Martin & Ruble, 2010). Men and women are strongly influenced by their social context which, in turn, influences gender identity and roles, with early gender-normative influences of parents and peers having multiple and differing health consequences for girls and boys (Weber et al., 2019). Gender, unlike sex, is defined by sociocultural norms and what may be considered masculine or feminine behaviour may vary depending on cultural context (Keizer, Helmerhorst, & van Rijn-van Gelderen, 2019). Gender is therefore socially determined by a complexity of sociocultural factors (Vlassoff, 2007). This also underscores a crucial factor for consideration in health promotion and gender equity in health; that men are not a



homogenous group and there are significant differences in the circumstances of males' lives, their health behaviours and their health outcomes impacted by behavioural, social and structural factors such as; age, ethnicity, culture, sexual orientation, socio-economic status and access to employment, education and policies to support male wellbeing (Weber et al., 2019; WHO, 2018). It is the intersection of gender within these other socio-demographic variables that contributes to the wide-ranging health outcomes experienced by men. This strongly influences the gender gap in health in terms of morbidity and mortality and also the gap within and between genders in the same country (WHO, 2018).

## 2.3 Wellbeing and masculinity

Norms of masculinity can exert significant influence on the wellbeing of men (Fleming, Lee, & Dworkin, 2014). These masculinities present as a set of attributes values, functions and behaviours that are assumed to be essential to men in a specific culture (Kachel, Steffens, & Niedlich, 2016). However, men who are socialised in more traditional beliefs about manhood or dominants norms of masculinity can engage in poorer health behaviours and experience greater health risks (Fleming et al., 2014). Prevailing cultural beliefs that men are independent, self-reliant, strong and resilient interact with other factors to influence attitudes towards health behaviour in men that may explain reasons as to why lifestyle and individual behaviour is heavily influenced by gender (Hooker, Wilcox, Burroughs, Rheaume, & Courtenay, 2012). Men who endorse dominant traits of masculinity are less likely than women to; perceive themselves at risk for illness; believe they have internal control over their health; contemplate changing unhealthy habits; and utilise health care (WHO, 2018b). Indeed, men access primary services far less than women and take far longer to receive or present with a diagnosis (Höhn, Gampe, Lindahl-Jacobsen, Christensen, & Oksuyzan, 2020). Part of the issue for men accessing healthcare may be cultural, as adult males lose continuity of healthcare compared to women who stay in the system more consistently due to contraception and childbearing (Carson, 2020). However men's general help-seeking patterns for physical, social or emotional issues that impact their wellbeing is influenced by masculinities and its intersection with other identities such as age, race, ethnicity and sexual orientation (Vogel & Heath, 2016). Societal factors that exert influence on men's help seeking can manifest behaviours that are not conducive to seeking help such as; restrictive emotional expression, the perception that help-seeking is weak and embarrassing, the need for independence and control, gender role conflict, anxiety, fear and distress about using formal health services, poor communication and the perceived cost (time and monetary) in engaging with health services (Yousaf et al., 2015). These barriers towards men's help seeking are indeed largely equated to deep-rooted



social constructs of masculinity where gendered practices and behaviours conflict with reasons to seek help (O'Brien, Hunt, & Hart, 2005).

## 2.4 Engaging hard-to-reach men

Men who tend to be more isolated from or reticent about accessing formal health services or social support networks due to geography, experiences of mental health issues, social disadvantage, unemployment, low educational attainment or changes in life course are considered 'hard-to-reach' (HTR) in health endeavours and are at an increased risk of poorer health outcomes (WHO, 2018; Lefkowich & Richardson, 2016). Men from more socially disadvantaged backgrounds may indeed be more likely to fall victim of negative masculine traits associated with 'reputational masculinity' - forms of masculine attributes to maintain and express masculine self-esteem which are not conducive towards health promoting behaviour (Kogan et al., 2017). Recent research has demonstrated that men displaying high traditional masculinity, defined as overacting male roles, showed significantly higher suicide rates. Males displaying high traditional masculinity were more likely to be; socially disadvantaged, white, younger, less close to their fathers, more likely to run away from home, get into fights, act delinquently, engage in problem drinking and drug use, complete less schooling and be less likely to marry (Feigelman, Coleman, & Rosen, 2021). Socio economic status indeed exacerbates the cause of all male morbidity and mortality and places HTR groups of men at a disadvantage in terms of health and life expectancy (Department of Health, 2017). The life expectancy gap between genders in fact widens across lower socio-economic groups (Baker, 2015). Baker (2015) discusses how the national statistics on life expectancy in Ireland may mask the reality that life expectancy for men is in fact far less as the level of deprivation increases. It is important to note that overly focusing on problems associated with masculinity can reinforce negative stereotypes and further exclude men from health engagement by leading to practitioner biases (Mahalik, Good, Tager, Levant, & Mackowiak, 2012). The concept of masculinity should be considered within a more complex model of gender hierarchy, recognising men and the variations in masculine identities as not hermetically sealed while also emphasising the interplay of geography of masculinities as well as the agency of women (Connell, 2012). Waling (2018) argues that while there have been a number of important issues regarding men and masculinities highlighted, they overlook the role of agency and reflexivity in these experiences. This is a concept vital to feminist research, and it is important that studies on masculinity move away from theorising masculinity as something which men are victims of, but rather focus on men's agentive and reflex engagement with masculinity. A more recent framework 'positive masculinity' suggests that masculine qualities



such as self-reliance and responsibility can be valued and in fact helpful when dealing health issues (Sagar-Ouriaghli et al., 2019). At a systems level, change is needed by incorporating more gender-equal social norms and male-centred services. Designing models of care that are accessible to men-and addressing the impact of masculinity across their lives-can reach out to at-risk and HTR men while simultaneously acknowledging their diversity (WHO, 2018). Currently health services aren't adequately versed in gendered health services, nor do their resources reflect consideration of gender influences on health (Morgan et al., 2018). For instance despite the known outcomes of higher burden of disease, male specific literature is significantly under-represented in health care facilities - a missed opportunity to provide targeted male health education and improve male health literacy (Whitehead, Ng Chok, Whitehead, & Luck, 2020). In the case of older men, aversion to health care may be compounded by its digitisation which may increase inequality between generations and among older men while increasing inequality in access to public services (Pirhonen, Lolich, Tuominen, Jolanki, & Timonen, 2020). At policy level- issues surrounding men's health often fail to receive adequate attention with issues of gender equality largely focusing on women (Baker, 2020). Efforts to address gender issues at a health policy level have more typically fallen short in accounting for a true understanding of gender within policy design (Connell, 2012). These systemic issues and failure to account for men across structural and social environments significantly impact men's ability to engage with health services. The COVID-19 pandemic in particular has drawn attention to historical neglect of men's health at policy level, globally, nationally, and locally, showcasing how men have been disproportionately impacted by the virus which has been linked to men's lower immune responses and higher rates or preexisting co-morbidities combined with gendered practices and behaviours related to masculinity (Baker, 2020). The gender and health literature highlights the importance of recognising gender in the context of the design, development and implementation of genderspecific programmes targeting men, with particular attention to understanding male attitudes towards health behaviours. A "one size fits all approach" towards health planning is not effective and there is an increasing need for gender-specific health promotion strategies that target lifestyle and health behaviour change in men (Robertson & Baker, 2016)

## 2.5 Gender Transformative Approaches

Understanding how gender shapes men's health practices is a critical first step in developing effective health promotion strategies that might appeal to men (WHO, 2018). Past research into men's health highlighted men's avoidance of health promotion and health systems as a consequence of men aligning to traits of masculinity such as stoicism, self-reliance and

www.menssheds.ie



competiveness (Oliffe et al., 2019). More recently, the responses have been focused on the underlying factors that contribute to these behaviours impacting health and the subsequent strategies to address them driven by a growing body of evidence that advocates for understanding of how gender intersects with economic, political, environmental and social determinants of health and their influence on exposure to risk factors and engagement with health and wellbeing (Robertson & Baker, 2016). Responses that have emerged at policy level are underpinned by evidence that the burden of ill health in men is caused by multiple factors that cut across all rungs of the social ladder but are exacerbated for vulnerable groups of socially disadvantaged or HTR men (Health Service Executive, 2017). Understanding the complexities of masculinities within the health systems and how men engage with and are impacted by them has determined a need for gender-specific approaches towards engaging men with health at policy and programme level, with a particular focus required on tailored and targeted interventions that encourage engagement of men (Baker et al., 2020; Lefkowich et al., 2015). Within health-care systems, unconscious gender biases, heuristics based on gender stereotypes, and blatant sexism all affect engagement with health, resulting in differential health outcomes for men, women, and gender minorities (Heise et al., 2019). It is important that programmes move away from a 'one size fits all' approach, and that men are not seen as a homogenous group; instead programmes should be designed with suitable flexibility to engage with different subpopulations of men, as well as men as individuals. Robertson et al. (2016) suggests that when gender-specific strategies are embedded as part of the process, men can and will engage with health services. The task for men's health promotion is to challenge the paradoxes in men's health where; men who are most in need of health behaviour and lifestyle intervention are least likely to engage with healthcare services and; where men have worse health outcomes than women, but current support systems exist for promoting women's but not men's health (Nuzzo, 2020; Richardson & Carroll, 2018).

There is an urgency to address gender inequality in health which is often unbalanced in its focus on women's health. Evidence demonstrates that improving the health of men will also improve the health of women and children, thereby enhancing gender equality (Baker, 2018; Carson, 2020). The focus on addressing gender inequality in health programming has become more clearly conceptualised as a gender-transformative approach (Ruane-McAteer et al., 2019). Gender-transformative approaches benefit men in broadening the interpretation of masculinity and the socially acceptable ways in which masculinity can be expressed. The WHO (2018) recognise gender-transformative health promotion as a means to improve health outcomes by redefining harmful gender norms, challenging gender stereotypes and developing more equitable gender roles and relationships. Masculine norms, where men's reasons for health-care utilisation (or underutilisation), seem in large part to emerge because



of their perceptions of male gender roles (Novak, Peak, Gast, & Arnell, 2019). Men have long been perceived as unwilling to utilise health services and this perceived unwillingness to engage in health promotion programmes also reflects a failure to account for gender as a key driver of health behaviours, including the need for gender-specific approaches to effectively engage men with health (Baker, 2018). Research contrary to this perception highlights that in the right environment where gender is considered within the strategy or programme design, men will demonstrate a willingness to engage with health (Carroll, Kirwan, & Lambe, 2014; Lefkowich et al., 2015; Robertson et al., 2014). In the case of HTR men it is also important to acknowledge barriers that, despite an initial ambition to participate, may impact men's sustained engagement such as economic, environmental and social barriers (Curran, Drust, Murphy, Pringle, & Richardson, 2016). Baker (2018) argues that gender-specific strategies responding to men's health should focus on a 'whole systems' partnership approach which includes contributions from health providers as well as from workplaces and education, housing and transport services among others. This approach already underpins Ireland's national men's health policy where in particular community engagement has been cited as a catalyst for creation of sustainable health promotion activities that appeal to men (Department of Health and Children, 2008). Baker, White and Morgan (2020) also highlight that policies and programmes that are aligned to existing public health priorities such as the Sustainable Development Goals or that reduce the burden on health systems and costs are strategic in gaining momentum and support from policy makers and funders.

### 2.6 The Men's Sheds as a setting to engage men

The community as a setting for health promotion demonstrates the potential to implement preventative health strategies and interventions that can ease the burden on health systems while employing gender-specific strategies that effectively engage vulnerable male populations with health (Oliffe et al., 2019). This setting allows a bottom-up, strengths-based, multi-sectoral approach that can effectively tackle the influence of male-gendering on men's health behaviours in what men may consider a safe and familiar environment (Milligan et al., 2013). Indeed, the non-clinical setting that can be offered in the community has been recognised by men as a facilitator towards their engagement in health promotion programmes (Caroll, Kirwan & Lambe, 2014). Implementing gendered strategies such as; engaging men as partners, creating safe, non-clinical and familiar environments, delivery of key messages through informal approaches, identifying and utilising a 'hook' to engage men at buy-in stage and the promotion of positive social interaction and support, while drawing on language and styles that are relatable, have shown significant promise particularly at community level (Patrick & Robertson, 2016; Lefkowich, Richardson & Robertson, 2017; Robertson et al.,



2015). These strategies are reflected in a host of community based men's health programmes such as; Men on the Move (Kelly et al., 2019), the HATRICK programme (Caperchione et al., 2017), Famers have Hearts (van Doorn et al., 2020) and Football Fans in Training (Wyke et al., 2015). When drawing from what works in other men' health programmes such as those mentioned above to inform strengths-based and gendered approaches, the Men's Sheds setting is well-positioned to deliver tailored, targeted health promotion initiatives to an accessible group of men who may otherwise be hard-to-reach (Bergin & Richardson, 2020). Prior to the development of a more structured and tailored intervention with the SFL ten week programme, the Sheds had long been recognised as a suitable setting in which to actively promote and engage men with health but also in which health promoting qualities were already inherent and organic (Wilson & Cordier, 2013). The Men's Sheds are autonomous grass roots spaces which offer men a safe and familiar environment which fosters a sense of social support, sense of belonging and camaraderie and offers sense of purpose through developing new skills, shared projects, activities, goals and decision making (Lefkowich & Richardson, 2015). All of these factors are conducive towards enhancing the health and wellbeing of the men who attend with social support being one of the most frequently reported facilitators associated with men's help-seeking (Fish et al., 2015). Moreover, previous research in the Sheds suggests that the non-conventional setting of the Shed appeals to typically HTR men by normalising male gender roles and with social identity and belongingness positively reinforced within them. Furthermore, it is suggested that vulnerable men at risk of depression report minimal depressive symptoms while attending their shed (Ford, Lu & Scholz, 2015; Culph et al., 2015). This is also reflective in more recent research which suggests that the Sheds are a protective factor against loneliness, with Shed members who fell into the lonely category during Shed closures due to COVID-19 at 29.7%, a stark increase from 1.4% when they had their Shed to attend prior to closures (McGrath, Murphy & Richardson, 2020).

Having first originated in Australia, before their establishment in Ireland during the economic recession in 2009, research now spanning over a decade has shone light on the benefit of Men's Sheds for the wellbeing of men. It also became apparent that there was a level of agency and appetite for health promotion in the Sheds where, in addition to health promotion resources distributed by the Men's Sheds associations, specific health promotion activities such as prostate education began to be initiated from an individual Shed level (Wilson, Cordier, Doma, Misan, & Vaz, 2015). Research also demonstrated that participating in traditionally male activities allows Men's Shed members permission to become more open with each other in discussions (Milligan et al., 2016). This suggests that through Sheds engaging men in traditionally 'manly' activities, there is encouragement of companionship and



openness which suggests complex masculine practices where members foster positive masculinity and feel empowered to express themselves within the safe environment of the Shed (Mackenzie et al., 2017; Golding, 2015). In the case of older men, Sheds have been noted to be effective in reducing isolation, forming friendships and engaging in continued learning with notable health enhancing benefits (Nurmi et al., 2018). Sheds have also elicited feelings of inclusivity and equality particularly for men with long-term disabilities where men can partake in enabling activities, enjoy active retirement and enjoy the company of other men, enhancing their sense of belonging and social inclusion, potentially combating the social determinants of chronic disability (Hansji, Wilson, & Cordier, 2015; Wilson, Cordier, Parsons, Vaz, & Buchanan, 2016; Wilson, Stancliffe, et al., 2015). Moreover, research suggests that Sheds are effective in engaging HTR men, attracting men that are older, retired, with lower educational attainment from lower socioeconomic backgrounds with knowledge deficits in the areas of psychological and sexual health (Misan, Oosterbroek, & Wilson, 2017).

In the Irish context, Men's Sheds have grown exponentially since their conception on the Island with over 450 Sheds and up to 10,000 members (Bergin & Richardson, 2020). Sheds have also been recognised within policy as an effective route to engaging HTR men and promoting men's health and wellbeing (Department of Health and Children, 2008; Health Service Executive, 2016). Research on Irish Men's Sheds has mirrored many of the findings internationally in that Sheds enrich the lives of their members through meaningful participation and continued learning, with an important role in supporting older men through difficult life transitions such as retirement and loss of a loved one (Carragher & Golding, 2015). The Sheds therefore present a strong foundation through their inherent health promoting qualities, upon which to build structured health promotion programmes that engage HTR men in an accessible setting. However recent research has highlighted the potential tension that may arise from imposing formal healthcare upon the informal setting of the Sheds, where its informality is an integral element to its inherent health promotion (Bergin & Richardson, 2020). Lefkowich & Richardson (2016) highlight that while Sheds contribute to men's overall wellbeing, community services need to be cautious in providing pathways for men to access support without compromising the integrity of the Sheds as peer run spaces. Shed members are also guarded about Sheds being stigmatised or labelled as spaces for those with mental health issues and care should be taken by practitioners in viewing Sheds as settings that patients should be prescribed to (Mackenzie et al., 2017; Nurmi et al., 2018). Practitioners and overseeing bodies of Sheds should also be mindful of how they brand and market Sheds generally in order to create spaces that are welcoming to new and diverse members while sustaining existing members and limiting attendance and barriers (Nurmi et al., 2018). While Shed members have



demonstrated an appetite for health promotion in Sheds and research suggests that the time is ripe to capitalise on this opportunity, it is critical that these endeavours do not erode the ethos of the Shed environment but rather enrich it and for this to happen programmes need to be pragmatically evaluated with Shed members at the centre of decision making (Bergin & Richardson, 2020; Kelly, Teasdale, Steiner, & Mason, 2021). In addition, to date their remains limited high-quality or empirical research evidencing the links between Sheds and health and wellbeing which has been a noted limitation in assessing the Shed-health link, which suggests further research is needed in this area to demonstrate the impact of Men's Sheds on health outcomes (Bergin & Richardson, 2020; Wilson & Cordier, 2013)

# 2.7 The importance of evaluating community-based programmes to promote systematic uptake

Beyond the need to strategically evaluate health promotion programmes in the Sheds to maintain the integrity of the Shed environment and uphold the autonomy and respect of its members, there is a knowledge gap in the documentation and dissemination of effective gender-sensitive-interventions that promote health. There is also a need to address the underrepresentation of men in health promotion programmes and increase the availability of research that can act as a blueprint for practitioners and policy makers with few "men friendly" settings-based health promotion programmes having been formally evaluated to date (Oliffe et al., 2020; Robertson & Baker, 2017). Furthermore, there is also a lack of practical guidance on how to effectively plan, implement and scale up health interventions and strategic and pragmatic evaluation endeavours encourage systematic uptake of effective interventions into real world settings such as the Sheds through limiting translation issues that can typically occur and prevent wider implementation of efficacious trials (Peters, Adam, Alonge, Agyepong, & Tran, 2013). The challenges of implementing and sustaining health interventions often emerge after tightly controlled efficacy trials are complete and conditions to disseminate and scale-up the interventions become much more variable (Bauer et al., 2015). In public health and health promotion research to date, barriers and facilitators to implementation in practice, such as the delivery capacity of partners and organisations, are often only addressed once the intervention is ready for wider implementation (Rapport et al., 2017). This can often result in efficacious interventions failing to be adopted when applied to real-world settings. There have been calls for research to begin to address this failure of translating evidence to practice by shifting the focus from tightly controlled interventions to evaluating those capable of implementation and scale-up from the outset (Koorts et al, 2018). The use of implementation science in evaluation of health programmes can be valuable in identifying barriers and



facilitators towards effective implementation. By employing an iterative and collaborative process, through working with all key stakeholders across the implementation environment, it becomes more feasible to transcend barriers and translation issues in a pragmatic and dynamic way (Koorts et al., 2018). The potential effectiveness of health interventions is often reduced or poorly adopted because of multiple contextual factors which act against its implementation in real-life settings. Therefore, it should not be enough to know if a health intervention is effective, but a focus should also be on understanding why and how it is effective to ensure that the model can be translated across implementation settings (Proctor et al., 2011). Hybrid-typology evaluation designs can therefore be a useful guide towards the dual testing of both clinical and implementation effectiveness particularly for community-based and real-world projects that can benefit from more rapid translational gains, more effective implementation strategies, and more useful information for decision makers (Curran et al., 2012). Incorporating implementation science into the evaluation of community-based men's health promotion can therefore effectively address knowledge gaps in how to scale-up efficacious health interventions as well in gender-specific approaches to engage HTR men.

## 2.5 Summary and Rationale

The literature presented demonstrates a clear burden of ill health in men caused by a multitude of complex biopsychosocial factors. These yield wider ramifications beyond the health of men and in order to address gender inequality in health, positive movements towards the development of health promoting strategies, intervention and policy that account for the diversity within and between genders are critical to advancing population health. Evidence suggests that significant improvements can be achieved if there is a focus on priority areas such as diet, physical activity, mental health and wellbeing, where multiple outcome measures are factored into the intervention design (Health Service Executive, 2016; WHO, 2018, Wyke et al., 2015). Underpinning these priority areas is an impetus to understand the complex ways in which gender influences men's health behaviours and gendered approaches to engage men with health are therefore a vital foundational layer that must form the basis for men's health promotion. Interventions that assimilate gender transformative approaches and normalise help seeking within the spectrum of masculinities are particularly progressive in advancing gender equality in health for both men and women (WHO, 2018). Effective men's health programmes to date have also highlighted that, in order to engage men, and particularly those who are HTR, health promotion endeavours must include men in their decision making and encourage a collaborative process involving all key stakeholders; researchers, practitioners, participants and policy makers (Thorpe & Haltikis, 2016). An implementation science approach engages



all key stakeholders in the development, testing and implementation of an intervention. The SFL evaluation is therefore grounded in implementation science. It aims to investigate both the process and effectiveness of the SFL intervention with a focus on the key strategies involved in implementation and future scale-up to maximise reach to "hard-to-reach" men within the non-conventional settings of the Sheds. The evaluation focuses on early prioritisation of intervention planning and implementation outcomes while including active engagement from key stakeholders and assessing the intervention effects of SFL. This aims to encourage intervention development and adaptation of SFL that ensures broad and sustained implementation. Findings will have a significant role in determining the effectiveness, sustainability, and potential scale-up of the SFL initiative and, more broadly, in terms of the wider rollout of community-based programmes targeted at men. This report highlights the impact of SFL on participants' health and wellbeing outcomes.

It is pertinent to note that this report has been produced during the COVID-19 pandemic which has also shone a light on the need for emphasis on men's health promotion programmes in the wake of COVID-19. Evidence is already demonstrating that COVID-19 is disproportionately affecting males, particularly those from more vulnerable cohorts (Smith et al., 2020). Baker, White and Morgan (2020) argue that pre-existing conditions and comorbidities that are more prevalent in men and that are linked to gendered practices and behaviours, have long been neglected at policy level. In essence, Baker and colleagues argue that these issues have been a problem hiding in plain sight and have led to men now being disproportionately impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. Pragmatic responses which seek to engage men with health and wellbeing and address gender inequalities in health will be needed more than ever in the aftermath of COVID-19. Research has already demonstrated the impact COVID-19 can have on Shed members and that programmes such as SFL are needed to encourage resilience and re-engage men with health (McGrath, Murphy & Richardson, 2020). The SFL evaluation employs a pragmatic approach using implementation frameworks and through its collaborative process will aim to respond to the evolving needs of Shed members in the wake of COVID-19.



# **3.0 Methodology**

# 3.1 SFL Programme Design

### 3.1.1 Background of SFL

Sheds for Life was first developed in 2016 in response to an expressed need by Men's Shed members for tailored health promotion alongside the vision of the IMSA to address the need for gender-specific responses for men that tackle the excess burden of ill health in men. It is supported by the IMSA, its board of management and advisory group and works in collaboration with policy makers and allied health organisations. The Sheds setting was identified as a key setting which reaches a captive audience of vulnerable and older men. Prior to the launching of the 10-week SFL programme, the IMSA embarked on scoping work at various Shed Cluster meetings to engage with Men's Shed members so that Shedders could identify their own needs in relation to men's health and the IMSA could respond accordingly. Determining that there was an appetite from Shed members for more structured health promotion programmes that built on the inherent health promoting qualities of the Shed, the IMSA engaged with and formed partnerships with other health related organisations who shared the vision of reaching men in their health promoting endeavours and could deliver health and wellbeing components in the Sheds setting. In order to ensure that the goals of the IMSA and partner organisations aligned with Shedder's needs, research was conducted in the Sheds to seek consensus on an acceptable and respectful approach to deliver SFL in the Sheds (Bergin & Richardson, 2020). The research found that respecting the Sheds environment and its inherent health promoting values was critical to the acceptability of SFL. Involving Shed members in the decision making process of SFL as well as respecting the autonomy of the Sheds and tailoring SFL to the variable and individual settings of the Sheds would be key to its success. A fundamental requirement was a clear strategy and "rules of engagement" for implementing SFL and that those delivering elements of SFL understood and valued the ethos of the Sheds and its members (Bergin & Richardson, 2020). Informed by this research, the IMSA developed the Guidance for Effective Engagement with Men's Sheds strategy to support health promoting organisations and professionals to respond and engage effectively with Men's Sheds members through SFL (IMSA, 2018). In June 2018 the Irish Research Council awarded an Employment-Based postgraduate scholarship to support the formal evaluation of SFL by a PhD student supported by Waterford Institute of Technology



and Institute of Technology Carlow. The research team, the IMSA and partner organisations involved in SFL then began a collaborative process to structure SFL into a ten-week programme and prepare for its roll out across four counties in 2019.

#### 3.1.2 Format and Structure of the ten-week SFL programme

Phase one of SFL was structured as a ten-week men's health programme that delivers a number of targeted and tailored wellbeing and life skill components to the Sheds. There were four core components to SFL and several supplementary components which Sheds self-select into (See Tables 1 & 2). SFL was structured as a ten-week programme in order to test its impact and to allow time to embed the programme in the Shed environment while encouraging real and sustained behaviour change. Elements of SFL were also developed based on the structure and format of other successful community-based men's health programmes (Richardson, Dunne & Clarke, 2010; Kelly et al., 2019). The elements of SFL were developed in collaboration with partner organisations and in response to the requests of Shed members. SFL components also aimed to align with the national Healthy Ireland Framework and address men's health across a broad spectrum of policy areas such as healthy eating, physical activity and mental health in a targeted way (Health Service Executive, 2017). SFL began with a health check to act as "hook" to engage the men and motivate participation as well as potentially identifying health indicators that may signify an underlying condition. The Mental Health component was originally tested as a supplementary component but in response to explicit needs of the participants, this component became a core element of SFL for autumn 2019 delivery (See Table 1 for a details on the structure of SFL).

Programme Component	Description	Duration	Provider
Health check	Blood pressure check Pulse check	30 minutes once off health	
	Cholesterol	check with a nurse delivered in	Irish Heart
	Blood Glucose	a mobile health unit	Foundation
	Carbon Monoxide		
	Weight measurement and Body Mass Index		

#### Table 1: Core components of SFL



Healthy Food Made Easy	Basic nutrition & cookery course provided by the HSE	2.5 hour workshops for 6 weeks	Feidhmeannacht na Seirbhíse Sláinte Health Service Executive
	Sheds choose one of the two following fitness programmes:		
Exercise for Shedders	Maintain & improve posture, strength, flexibility, balance & general physical capabilities	1 hour exercise class for 10 weeks	
OR			
Sheds ag Siúl	Walking for fitness programme aimed at all ability levels	1.5 hours every second week across the 10 week programme	Get Ireland Walking
Mental Health & Wellbeing in the Community	Equips participants with the knowledge and understanding necessary to foster and enhance mental health and wellbeing.	4 hour workshop (Available in 2 x 2 hour session format)	Mental Health Ireland

### Table 2: Supplementary components of SFL in phase one

	inontary componente er e		0 0110
Programme Component	Description	Duration	Provider
Diabetes: Living Well, Being Well Workshop	Covers how to prevent and manage diabetes	1.5 hours	Diabetes
'Hands for Life' CPR Training	CPR basics	1 hour	<b>Irish Heart</b> Foundation



Irish Men's Sneds Association – Sneds for Life Impact Re
--

Oral Health	Provides an understanding of the connection between the mouth & body and importance of maintaining oral health.	1 hour	Dental Health
			Ireland
Cancer Awareness	Interactive workshop to reduce the risk of male- related cancer	1 hour	Marie Keating FOUNDATION
safeTALK	Interactive workshop to prepare Shedders to identify people with thoughts of suicide & connect them to suicide first aid resources.	3.5 hours	National Office for Suicide Prevention
Getting Online Computer Training	A complete beginner's course to getting online. (Viewing websites, sending & receiving emails.)	5 x 2 hour sessions	Age Action For all older people
Note: SFL has since been adapted in response to men's shed members to include a dementia awareness component delivered by the Alzheimer's society and Understand Together			

## 3.1.3 Gender Specific Strategies of SFL

The previous piloting of SFL components in the Sheds leant insights into the strategies that work well when engaging Men's Shed Members in the programme. Further insights during testing of the ten-week SFL format also assisted in identifying acceptable and appropriate means of engaging participants with SFL. These insights accompanied by findings from research that engage HTR men formed the basis of the gender-specific strategies upon which SFL is built upon (See Table 3)



# Table 3: Facilitators to effective participant engagement in SFL

Implementation Strategy	Aim
Participatory Research Approach:	Promote adoption of SFL
SFL is "internally" developed using a participatory research approach where all key stakeholders (participants, providers, organisation, and academics) are decision makers in its design and implementation. SFL is based upon evidence-based practice that engages men at community level, previous piloting of SFL informed the current strategy. A participatory research approach is used, informed by the PRACTIS guide to outline clear steps to implementation and limit perceived difficulty among stakeholders.	Ensure intervention characteristics are evidence- based
Allied Partnership Approach: SFL responds to the increasing calls by national policies to implement gender- specific strategies that engage HTR men with health. SFL engages partners at the systems level and SFL components also align with the key pillars of the Healthy Ireland Framework, including healthy eating, physical activity and mental health SFL is delivered and designed in collaboration with partner organisations who clearly perceived the advantage of implementing SFL through a shared vision, aligning with their organisation in accessing a HTR group of men. Partner organisations involved in delivery respect the ethos and environment of the Shed, through capacity building. The SFL partnership networks evolves in response to needs of SFL participants. Partner organisations recognise SFL as a routine part of their service delivery.	Tackle gender inequalities that exist in health through gender-sensitive approaches Promote adoption of SFL at provider level Ensure service providers are suitable and acceptable by participants Promote the systematic uptake of SFL at provider level
<i>Tailored Intervention:</i> SFL is a tailored intervention which	Give participants a sense of ownership and control and encourage buy-in
adheres to core components but allows autonomous decision making over adaptable or supplementary elements. the	Tailor SFL to respond to the different Shed environment and Shedders
Sheds can "self-select" into and is continually designed and refined in	Ensure that SFL remains an appropriate model that can effectively respond to the needs of men



collaboration with shed members to	
Targeted Intervention:	Encourage sense of safety and familiarity
rargeted intervention.	Encourage sense of safety and farmanty.
SFL is delivered in a targeted way by bringing SFL to the Sheds and delivering the majority of its components directly in the Sheds natural environment or other local community setting, which are viewed as familiar, safe and non-clinical,	Remove barriers towards participation. Make participation convenient. Enrich the inherent health promotion qualities of the Shed
environments for Sned members.	observe elements of SFL in real time which may encourage participation
Credibility of Service Providers:	Credibility adds to the sense of safety in the Shed environment
The IMSA has developed a partnership network of allied organisations who deliver components of SFL bringing expertise from a variety of credible and informed sources.	Engaging facilitators promote acceptability and satisfaction among participants
<b>Co-Design Process:</b> SFL is described to prospective participants as a programme "for Shedders by Shedders". Prospective participants are encouraged to see	Reinforcing Shed members' sense of ownership of the programme is designed to build safety and trust, and to reassure participants that SFL is not being implemented to undermine the routine environment and ethos of the Sheds
themselves as pioneers, actively shaping the programme through their participation and paving the way for future delivery and scale-up of the programme	Involving shed members in the implementation process also facilitates access to local knowledge and resources for SFL implementation
	Building relationships enhances the sense of social capital and can positively influence implementation.
Respecting the Sheds environment:	Prevent participants feeling overwhelmed by SFL.
The central goal of SFL is to enrich, not undermine the Sheds already health enhancing environment and so alongside ongoing collaboration with Shed members, participants of SFL are also guided not to overburden themselves by committing to too many SFL components. They are also recommended to select a day to dedicate to SFL so that it does not encroach into typical routine of the Shed. A readiness assessment also informs whether SFL is suitable for a Shed at that time. SFL also aims to be implemented during times that are conducive with the Shed environment such as Spring or Autumn avoiding busier project periods for the Sheds such as Christmas or Summer.	Uphold acceptability of SFL by preventing it from disrupting other important Shed activities and projects.
Costs:	Highlight SFL as good value for money. Identify sustainable funding source.


SFL is assessed for cost-effectiveness to	
promote investment and appropriate	
allocation of resources.	Removal of cost allows SFL to be accessed by
	more vulnerable men and incentivises
SFL is delivered free of charge for	participation
participants	
Engaging loaders and champions:	Designated contact points in each Shad act as a
Engaging leaders and champions.	conduit between Shed members and programme
SEL aims to identify and engage Shed	delivery
leaders who buy into the SEL message	delivery
and communicate key messages about	Leaders in the Shed motivate other participants to
SFL at ground level	stav engaged
Autonomous Participation	Give participants a sense of autonomy and
	control of SFL.
Sheds "express interest" via a discussion	
process and an expression of interest	Respect the ethos and environment of the Shed
application in participating in SFL it is	and independence of Shed members.
never forced upon them.	
	Ensure Shed members do not feel burdened by
Individual Shed members are asked to	the commitment of SFL.
participate in as much of SFL as possible	
while recognising and respecting that	
other life commitments happen.	
Active Recruitment:	Help participants to fully understand the process
Once Shade express interest in	OFFL.
Drice Sheus express interest in	Help participants not to feel overwhelmed by SEI
health and wellbeing team visit the Sheds	Theip participants not to reer over wheimed by Sr E.
to discuss SEL in an informal way building	Build a sense of credibility and trust to enhance
trust and safety and recruit individual Shed	acceptability of SFL.
members to participate.	
Structure, Clarity & Supportive	
Resources:	Prompts and reminders limit non-attendance and
	motivates participants to attend.
Participants receive supportive resources	
during SFL such as dedicated SFL and	
Healthy Food Made Easy handbooks as	To provide guidance documents to support
well as material on mental health and	participants in adopting and practicing new skills.
other various components.	
	I o encourage maintenance of knowledge and
Participants are visited by the IMSA team	benaviour change.
to explain the process of SFL and also	Participants have a conse of control and
SEL delivery along with programme	understand what to expect from SEL limiting
calondars	appropagation about the programme
	apprenension about the programme.
	Clarity around scheduling enhances reach and
	attendance.
Use of "Hooks":	The Health Check is an important element of SFL
	that can highlight underlying health issues while
The use of a free comprehensive health	incentivising participation in SFL



incentive to engage men in the SFL programme alongside other life-skill components such as CPR.	Non-typical health related components such as digital literacy and CPR as additional hooks to engage those less reluctant to sign up to a more conventional health programme
Strengths-Based Approach: SFL aims to be delivered using a strengths based approach where facilitators utilise the capacity, skills and knowledge of the men while demonstrating empathy and respect and using positive, non- stigmatising or non-judgemental language and tone.	The facilitator can create a positive group dynamic where men are more willing to be open about their experiences. Using the men's knowledge and experience creates a sense of shared autonomy over SFL and encourages peer support and normalisation of conversations about health in the Shed. Men who feel respected, not labelled or stigmatised, will be more likely to stay engaged and become active not passive participants
Informal Delivery Style & Trust Building:	Informal delivery respects the ethos of the Sheds and facilitates comfort and active participation.
<ul><li>SFL is delivered in an informal, interactive and relaxed way with a conversational tone.</li><li>Providers of SFL spend time building rapport and trust with participants prior to</li></ul>	Trust facilitates sense of safety and a positive dynamic where participants can be open and honest.
delivery of SFL components.	
Social Support: SFL capitalises on the organic health promotion that occurs through the already existing social support between Shed members in Sheds.	Sned members support and motivate one another to participate in SFL. Camaraderie and banter enrich the experience of SFL.
Male specific:	Promote sense of safety and relatability.
SFL is delivered in a male only- environment with the company of like- minded men.	

## 3.2 Study Design

The overall research employs an implementation science focus to promote the systematic uptake of SFL in the real world context of the Sheds and wider setting. The aim of this approach is to incorporate a broader scope than traditional clinical effectiveness alone, to focus not only on individual or participant level but also at the provider organisation and wider systems levels that impact implementation of SFL (Bauer, Damschroder, Hagedorn, Smith, & Kilbourne, 2015). Successful implementation should be considered in light of a variety of different factors including the effectiveness of the intervention to be implemented alongside implementation outcomes (Proctor et al., 2011). For this reason, the research employs a



hybrid type-two effectiveness-implementation study design meaning dual testing of effect and implementation outcomes of SFL in order to pragmatically promote translation into the real world context from the outset while also providing more valid estimates of potential effectiveness in the implementation settings/Sheds (Curran, Bauer, Mittman, Pyne, & Stetler, 2012). In order to assess implementation outcomes and address barriers and facilitators towards effective implementation, key stakeholders across implementation levels (individual, provider, organisational) are involved in the research process through a community-based participatory research approach with Shedders being active participants in both the SFL intervention and evaluation, as well as engagement with partner organisations who deliver the various components of SFL (Koorts et al., 2018). A mixed methods approach is applied to the research to assess both implementation and effectiveness outcomes.

#### 3.2.1 Implementation Testing

A combination of implementation and evaluation frameworks are used to guide the implementation testing and evaluation of SFL. The Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research is used to characterise and understand the domains which interact in complex ways to influence implementation effectiveness such as the intervention, inner and outer setting, the individuals involved and the process of implementation (See Figure 1) (Damschroder et al., 2009).



www.menssheds.ie



# Figure 1: Consolidated Framework for implementation research domains and constructs

The PRACTIS guide is also used in an iterative process to practically guide the implementation process and evaluation in collaboration with key stakeholders to promote successful implementation and scale-up of SFL, through characterising the parameters of the implementation setting, identifying and engaging key stakeholders, identifying implementation barriers and facilitators and addressing potential barriers to implementation across individual, provider, organisational and systems level (See Figure 2) (Koorts et al., 2018). A taxonomy of implementation outcomes (acceptability, adoption, appropriateness, feasibility, fidelity, implementation costs, penetration and sustainability) are assessed using mixed methods to measure implementation effect (Proctor et al., 2011).

Community/Systems level (Community characteristics) Collective Community efficacy competence Organizational level (Setting characteristics) Prog. Org. Community Funding goals, vision Org. structure commitment readiness Imp. climate Shared decision for prev. making Provider level Integration (Implementer characteristics) new program Social Shared vision capital Admin. Org. Attitude/ Education Politics support motivation leadership Knowledge Org. climate Culture. beliefs Skills Individual Level norms, Imp. Peer (User characteristics) Personal Previous values readiness pressure Policy attributes experience Champion Org. support Self-Identification for imp. Size, efficacy Perceived with org. infrastructure Formulation Community benefits/need Prevention Networks, tasks capacity Stage of change communication research Coordination system Skills planning other Innovation implementation agencies specific Patient/user /evaluation characteristics centeredness Cosmopolitanism External Community policies/incentives empowerment



## Figure 2: An Ecological model of potential influences on implementation in practice (Koorts et al., 2018).

**Note:** The focus of this report is on the effectiveness level of the evaluation, highlighting the impact of SFL at participant (Shedder) level during phase one implementation of SFL, reflected in the presented results. Assessment of implementation outcomes are ongoing. The study protocol for Sheds for Life has been published in the BMC Public Health (McGrath, Murphy & Richardson, 2021).

#### 3.2.2 Effectiveness Testing Methodology

#### **Data collection and Design**

A mixed methods approach was applied to assess the impact of SFL phase one implementation on participants.

Focus groups (n=8) and short interviews (n=16) were conducted with Shedders at the end of the ten weeks to assess implementation outcomes as well as tracking changes in knowledge, attitudes and behaviours post SFL. These were based on semi-structured topic guides designed on CFIR constructs and the taxonomy of implementation outcomes where applicable (Proctor et al., 2011; Damschroder et al., 2009), with room for themes to emerge as the participants explored them. A flavour of the qualitative findings will be presented in the results to support the quantitative findings from questionnaires.

#### 3.2.3 Questionnaire Design

Questionnaires were developed based on previously validated scales and in collaboration with partner organisations to test effect of SFL at participant level via self-reported outcomes. Questionnaires were administered at baseline (T1) 3 month (T2) 6 month (T3) and 12 month (T4) follow up. Questionnaires were administered one-to-one to limit literacy issues, prevent burn-out and build rapport and trust between the researchers and Shedders. Participant demographics were recorded at baseline including date of birth, living situation, educational attainment, employment status relationship and ethnicity. Participants were also asked how long they have been a shed member and how often they attended the shed. At all-time points all participants were asked on a single question Likert scale if they like to find out different information about their health. Self-rated health was also measured using a single question Likert scale with high reliability among older men (Lunderberg and Manderbacka, 1996). The single item walking measure was used to record days walking on an 8-point scale (0-7), average minutes walking were also recorded and the single-item PA measure was used to



record PA levels (Milton, Bull and Bauman, 2011). The Self-Efficacy for Exercise Scale (SEE) was used to measure physical activity self-efficacy (Resnick and Jenkins, 2000). Life worth and satisfaction were recorded using the Office of National Statistics subjective wellbeing 11point scales (ONS, 2015). Mental wellbeing was measured using the Short Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale (SWEMWBS) with raw to metric score conversion where a change of 2+ is considered relevant (Stewart-Brown et al., 2009). In response to the Mental Health Workshop with Mental Health Ireland participants were asked at T1 to T4 to rate their certainty across three constructs including their understanding of their mental health and wellbeing, their comfort in having a conversation about their mental health and practical supports to maintain and enhance their mental wellbeing rated on a five point Likert scale from "Very certain" to "Very uncertain". Loneliness was measured at all-time points via the UCLA 3-item scale measuring three dimensions of loneliness; relational connectedness, social connectedness and self-perceived isolation, with participants also asked to retrospectively rate their loneliness prior to joining the shed at baseline. (Russell, 1996). Social Capital was measured based on relevant recommendations from WhatWorksWellbeing (2018), capturing trust, belonging and close support. Interpersonal trust was measured using the Office of National Statistics 11-point scale (ONS, 2016). Close support and belonging were measured on a Likert scale from the Community Life Survey 2016 (Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport, 2017), with the belonging construct stating "Shed" rather than "neighbourhood" for relevance and relatability.

The SF-6D was used at T1 to T4 for assessing cost effectiveness of SFL. It is a preferencebased measure of health with a six-dimensional health status classification: physical functioning, role functioning, social functioning, pain and discomfort, mental health and vitality. It was derived from the SF-36. The subjects select one of the levels (up to level 4 or level 6) in each dimension which best describes their current health status (Brazier, Roberts & Deverill, 2002). The cost-effectiveness of SFL will be determined by comparing the costs (direct and indirect) of SFL to its benefits which will be captured as the impact on quality-adjusted lifeyears (QALYs) derived from the short form-6D algorithm

Lifestyle behaviours were also recorded (smoking (number smoked per day) and alcohol consumption (days drinking and units consumed per drinking session).

Assessments of cooking and healthy eating behaviours were developed in conjunction with the partner organisation delivering the Healthy Food Made Easy component of SFL. Participants were asked about their levels of daily fruit and vegetable consumption, cooking



style, cooking frequency and willingness to cook. Confidence constructs around cooking and healthy eating were measured via a 12 item Likert scale ranging from "not at all confident" to "very confident". The questions were adapted from the Garcia et al., (2017) protocol for community-based cooking interventions which were developed at a lower literacy level with varying levels of literacy in mind among participants. The constructs used to assess cooking and healthy eating were previously validated (Barton, Wrieden and Anderson, 2008).

#### 3.2.4 Supplementary Components

#### **Diabetes awareness**

Diabetes constructs were adapted with partner organisation Diabetes Ireland and constructs used were previously validated, from the diabetes knowledge questionnaire (Garcia et al., 2001), participants were asked 7 items at T1, T2, T3 with "yes", "no" or "don't know" answer options. Higher scores across items indicate improved diabetes knowledge. Participants were also asked to rate their perceived risk of getting type 2 Diabetes from low to high.

#### safeTALK

Assessment of the impact of safeTALK on participant confidence and willingness to engage with the topic of suicide were developed with the National Office of Suicide Prevention in response to safeTALK's learning objectives. Participants were asked to rate their confidence in dealing with the needs of someone who may be suicidal and identifying appropriate services on five-point Likert scales ranging from "not at all confident" to "strongly confident". Participants were also asked to rate their willingness and confidence to engage with the topic of suicide on five-point Likert scales ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". These were assessed at T1, T2 & T3.

#### **Digital Literacy**

Constructs of digital literacy measured at T1 to T3 were developed in response to Age Action's learning objectives. Participants were asked six constructs around accessing websites, sending and receiving emails, using social media, staying connected with family and friends online, online services and smart phone apps rating their certainty in each on five-point Likert scales from "very certain" to "very uncertain".

#### **Oral Health**

Assessment of oral health awareness measured at T1 to T3 were offered by the Dental Health Foundation. Participants were asked to rate the health of their gums and teeth and the level of perceived importance and confidence in looking after their oral health and visiting their



dentist on five-point Likert scales ranging from "very important" to "unimportant" and "strongly confident" to "not at all confident".

#### **Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation**

Measures to assess confidence in CPR constructs were developed in consultation with the Irish Heart Foundation who delivered the "Hands for Life" CPR workshop. Participants were asked from T1 to T3 how confident they felt recognising cardiac arrest and calling the emergency services, operating an AED and performing chest compressions on a five-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly confident" to "not at all confident".

#### Cancer awareness

Measures to evaluate the cancer awareness workshop were agreed upon with National Screening Service in line with their objectives. Participants at T1 to T3 were asked to rate their understanding of cancer related early detection signs, cancers common in men, cancer screening options and the importance of bowel screening and retina screening (if diabetic) on a five point Likert scale from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree"

#### 3.2.5 COVID-19 adjustments

Following assessment of the implementation environment of SFL, namely the capacity and resource constraints of partner organisations to deliver SFL along with the nuances, ethos and autonomy of the inner (Sheds) setting, the SFL ten-week intervention was implemented on a phased basis across two cohorts with two counties per cohort. This meant that at T3 and T4 follow up in Cohort 2, participants were actively experiencing COVID-19 restrictions whereas Cohort 1 were not as there follow up points were prior to COVID-19 and therefore some outcomes will be presented by cohort at different time points where relevant. This also meant due to COVID-19 restrictions at T3 and T4, questionnaires were completed via phone. Questionnaires for Cohort 2 at T3 and T4 were adjusted and include assessment of COVID-19 on relevant outcomes and the impact of COVID-19 on SFL participants has been assessed elsewhere (McGrath, Murphy & Richardson, 2020).

#### 3.2.6 Participants and Sampling

Respecting the autonomous and informal environment of the Sheds is an important factor in delivering health promotion through Sheds (Lefkowich & Richardson, 2018; Bergin & Richardson, 2020). Therefore, Sheds were recruited to participate in SFL via an expression of



interest process with the objective to deliver SFL in diverse settings based on Shed size and geographical location (urban/rural). Individual Shedders within Shed settings participated in the SFL programme and evaluation on a voluntary basis and provided informed consent. The first SFL programme delivery (Cohort1) was delivered over two counties comprising of 12 delivery settings and individual Shedders (n=212) in March to May 2019. The two counties were County Kildare, in Ireland's Mid-East region with a population of circa 222,504, and Waterford in Ireland's South-East Region with a population of 116,176 (CSO, 2016). The second SFL programme delivery (Cohort 2) was similarly delivered from September to November 2019 over two counties comprising of nine delivery settings and individual Shedders (n=209). These two counties included; Co. Limerick, in Ireland's South-West region with a population of 194,899 and Co. Louth in Ireland's Mid-East Region with a population of 128,884 (CSO, 2016). Questionnaires were administered with Shedders at baseline (T1; n=198), 3 months (T2; n=123), 6 months (T3; n=65) and 12 months (T4; n=156) in the Cohort 1. Due to constraints associated with research capacity, specifically in terms of aligning data collection with shed opening hours, follow up rates vary and rescheduling of data collection was not possible. At T3 in Cohort 1 a sub sample of 6 out of 13 sheds were followed up with where 65 out of a potential 93 Shedders were present to complete follow up i.e. 70%. Follow up rates at T2, T3 and T4 were therefore 62, 70 and 80% respectively. Absence of data for participants does not necessarily indicate drop out, with overall reach rates across Cohorts 1 and 2 estimated at 73% (see Reach). Baseline (T1; n=185), 3 month (T2; n=106) 6 month (T3; n=146) and 12 month (T4; n=129) data were collected in Cohort 2. Follow up rates were 57%, 79% and 62% respectively.

#### 3.2.7 Data Analysis

Data were analysed using Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences (SPSS V 24). Descriptive statistics for each variable were calculated and data collected across time points were compared using inferential tests to identify potential significant differences between points in time in the two cohorts combined and also differences between cohorts where relevant. Focus groups and interviews were transcribed verbatim and analysed using thematic content analysis with themes then categorised into implementation and impact outcomes.



# 4.0 Results

## 4.1 Shed and Shedder Characteristics

## Cohorts

**Cohort 1**: Cohort one (n=212, 50.4%) participated in SFL in March 2019 across Waterford and Kildare in n= 13 sheds.

**Cohort 2:** Cohort 2 (n=209, 49.6%) participated in SFL in September 2019 across Louth and Limerick in n= 9 sheds.

#### Participants per shed

Participant numbers per shed ranged from 8-37 with a mean of  $19.182 \pm 7.853$ .

SFL by county breakdown:

"One thing that was good was the groups coming together over the last couple of weeks and forming a bond. Normally we are sent on these courses by your doctor and stuff and everyone is a bit quiet with one another and it's hard to get involved but the atmosphere between us all here in the couple of weeks was tremendous. Everyone got on and there was no bitching and we had a laugh and a joke and the whole lot. I thought it was a great Initiative for the men's shed."

- George Sheds for Life participant

# Table 4: SFL by count breakdown

County	N=	N%
Waterford	57	13.5
Kildare	155	36.8
Limerick	105	24.9
Louth	104	24.7
Total	421	100.0



## Geographical Spread

In terms of geographical spread, n=14 (64%) Sheds were in urban areas with n=8 (36%) in rural areas. The urban areas consisted of n=312 (74.1%) of participants with n=109 (25.9%) in rural areas.

## Age

The age of SFL participants ranged from 27-90 years (n=383) with a mean age of 69.1  $\pm$  9.136 years.

## Ethnicity

The majority of Shedders were "White Irish" (n=380, 99.3%) while 0.7% (n=3) categorised themselves as "other" categorising themselves as Australian, British and South African.

## Education

Educational attainment across SFL participants varied with 24.9% (n=95) reporting completing some or all of primary education only, 52.1% (n=199) completing some or all of secondary education, n=78 (20.4%) completing some or all of a third level education and 2.6% (n=10) completing some or all of a postgraduate education.

#### **Marital Status**

Table 5 outlines the martial status of SFL participants, with majority (73.4%) reporting as married/cohabiting.

## Table 5: Martial status of participants

Marital Status	N=	N%
Married/Cohabiting	281	73.4
Widowed	36	9.4
In a relationship	3	.8
Separated/divorced	22	5.7
Single	41	10.7
Total	383	100.0



## **Living Situation**

The number of participants who reported living alone at baseline amounted to 17.8% (n=68) with 81.7% (n=312) reporting that they lived with their family, wife or partner and 0.5% (n=2) reporting that they lived with friends.

## **Employment Status**

The majority of participants (n=308, 80.4%) categorised themselves as being retired with 1.6% (n=6) reporting themselves as being unemployed or looking for work, 11.8% (n=45) reporting themselves as being employed either full-time, part-time or looking after the home or family and 4.7% (n=18) reporting themselves as being unable to work due to long-term illness or disability.

## **Shed Attendance**

Participants were asked at baseline how often they attended their shed with 64.0% (n=245) responding "more than twice a week", 30.3% (n=116) responding "once a week", with 5.7% (n=22) attending their shed fortnightly or less.

## Health Rating Baseline

Table 6 describes the self-reported health rating of participants at baseline, with 75% reporting "good" health or better.

#### Table 6: Self-rated health rating at baseline

Self-Rated Health	N=	N%
Excellent	29	7.6
Very good	109	28.5
Good	152	39.8
Average	78	20.4
Poor	14	3.7
Total	382	100.0

## **Membership length**

The mean duration of shed membership was 2.748 years  $\pm$  2.060, with a range of 0 to 9 years (n=379).



#### Family History of heart disease, stroke or diabetes

During the health check participants were asked about whether they had a family history of heart disease, stroke or diabetes. Some (52.9%, n=190) reported having a family history of heart disease, with 21.3% (n=76) reporting a family history of stroke and 28.0% (n=100) a family history of diabetes.

Health screening results at baseline

Table 7 details the various health screening results of participants at baseline.

Health Indicator	N=	Range Mean			Std. Deviation
Systolic BP*	384	66.00 - 206.00		139.9036	19.44218
Diastolic BP*	384	38.00 - 114.00		81.4661	11.04696
Pulse	383	45.00 - 180.00		13.75521	
Total Cholesterol	382	2.50 - 7.55		1.02816	
LDL	331	0.00 - 5.4		0.91078	
HDL	381	0.39-2.59	1.1015		0.399
Triglycerides	382	0.15 to 7.14	1.66		1.026
Glucose	380	.28 – 17.30		6.1278	
Waist (inches)	383	26.00 to 67.00	41.5997		5.42307
Height (cm)	385	145.00- 190.50		172.4432	
Weight (KGs)	385	52.00- 172.00	89.0099		17.47755
BMI	378	18.00- 53.57		29.9120	5.40975
Cigarettes/day	79	0.0-40.00		7.4091	9.980
Carbon monoxide (PPM)	56	0.0-36.00		15.947	12.011
Units Alcohol/day	251	0.0-68.00		8.0916	10.06834

## Table 7: Participant health screening results at baseline



Stress	Not at	Only a	To some	Often	Very often			
	all	little	extent					
N= (%)	106	129	74	29	15			
	(25.2%)	(30.6%)	(17.6%)	(6.9%)	(3.6%)			
**PA for				N=	N%			
30mins + p/day								
Yes				245	71.2			
No				99	28.8			
PA for 5				N=	N%			
days/week								
Yes				227	66			
No				117	34			
Smoker				N=	N%			
Yes				33	7.8			
No				312	90.4			
Drink Alcohol				N=	N%			
Yes				210	62.5			
No				126	37.5			
Referred to GP				N=	N%			
Yes				223	79.6			
No				57	20.4			
*Blood Pressure **Physically active								

#### **Self-Reported Health Rating**

Cohorts one and two were analysed separately for self-reported health rating to account for COVID-19 impact. Both cohorts experienced an increase in self-rated health after SFL (T2; post SFL z=- 3.822 p<.0005). Cohort one continued to increase significantly at T3 (Wilcoxon matched pairs test; z=-3.460 p<0.005; See Table 8), with a reduction at T4 but remaining significant higher than baseline. By contrast there was no significant difference in Cohort 2 thereafter with no significant change in self-reported health between baseline and T2, T3 or T4.



### Table 8: Self- Reported Health Ratings by Cohort one across T1 to T4

(N=383) %		Cohort 1				C	ohort 2	
	T1	T2	Т3	Τ4	T1	T2	T3 (During COVID)	T4 (During COVID)
Health	N=	N=	N=	N=	N=	N=	N=	N=
Rating	N%	N%	N%	N%	N%	N%	N%	N%
Excellent	18	19	18	21	11	11	18	13
	9.1%	14.6%	26.1%	14.7%	5.9%	10.3%	12.4%	10.2%
Very Good	54	40	30	43	55	50	40	37
	27.4%	30.8%	43.5%	20.3%	29.7%	46.7%	27.6%	29.1%
Good	77	44	16	66	75	34	58	55
	39.1%	33.8%	23.2%	46.2%	40.5%	31.8%	40.0%	43.3%
Average	43	25	5	11	35	11	27	18
	21.8%	19.2%	7.2%	7.7%	18.9%	10.3%	18.6%	14.2%
Poor         5         2         0         2         9         1         2         4           2.5%         1.5%         0.0%         1.4%         4.9%         0.9%         1.4%         3.1%								
*** T1 & T2,T3,T4						***	T1 & T2	·
***Significant difference at p<0.001 ** Significant difference at p<0.005 *Significant difference at p<0.05								

#### Are you someone who likes to find out information about your health?

There was a significant increase in those who expressed an interest in seeking information about their health from T1 to T2 in Cohort 1 (z=3.355, p=0.001) and Cohort 2 (z=3.087, p=0.002), these changes were sustained at T3 and T4 (no significant difference after T2, See Table 9).

(N=383) %	Cohort 1 Cohort 2							
	T1	T2	Т3	T4	T1	T2	Т3	T4
Seek health information	N=	N=	N=	N=	N=	N=	N=	N=
	N%	N%	N%	N%	N%	N%	N%	N%
Often	73	81	57	91	83	77	100	74
	37.1%	62.3%	82.6%	64.1%	45.1%	72%	69%	58.%
Sometimes	89	37	8	36	69	23	37	41
	45.2%	28.5%	11.6%	25.4%	37.5%	21.5%	25.5%	32.3%

#### Table 9: Seeking health information by cohort from T1-T4



Rarely	26	9	3	6	22	5	8	10
	13.2%	6.9%	4.3%	4.2%	12.0%	4.7%	5.5%	7.9%
Never	9	3	1	9	10	2	0	2
	4.6%	2.3%	1.4%	6.3%	5.4%	1.9%	0%	1.6%
	*** T1& T2 *** T1 & T2							
***Significant difference at p<0.001 ** Significant difference at p<0.005 *Significant								
difference at p<0.05								

#### **GP** referral

Of those advised to visit their GP at T1 health check, 41.7% (n=95) reported visiting the GP at T2. Notably 58.3% (n=133) stating they had not.

## **4.2 Physical Activity**

Ten sheds participated in the walking component n=7 in Cohort 1 and n=3 in Cohort 2. Twelve sheds participated in the exercise for Shedders classes, n=6 in Cohort 1 and n=6 in Cohort 2. **Table 10: Physical Activity outcomes from T1 to T4** 

Physical Activity Outcomes						
	T1	T2	T3	T4		
Mean Days PA for 30+ mins	3.068	4.319	3.578	3.777		
(Mean+SD)	±	±	±	±		
	2.570	2.859	2.557	2.432		
	(n=381)	(n=232)	(n=213)	(n=262)		
	*** T1 & T2,T3,T4 *T2&T3					
Not meeting PA guidelines	(n=223)	(n=98)	(n=102)	(n=150)		
	68.8%	48.5%	63.7%	57.3%		
Meeting PA Guidelines	(n=101)	(n=104)	(n=58)	(n=112)		
	31.2%	51.5%	36.3%	42.7%		
			<b>.</b>			
	*** 11& 12					
Days walking for 10+ mins	4.139	5.275	5.107	4.872		
(Mean+SD)	±	±	±	±		
	2.783	2.294	2.285	2.527		
	(n=381)	(n=236)	(n=214)	(n=266)		
		***				
		11&12,	13 "	11&14		
Minutes Walking per day	33.381	38.059	39.821	35.600		
(Mean+SD)	±	±	±	±		
	27.31	28.10	28.15	23.086		
	(n=375)	(n=236)	(n=212)	(n=256)		
	=0.40=	04.046	07.046	05.047		
PA Self-Efficacy	53.167	64.846	67.318	65.847		
(Mean+SD)	±	±	±	±		
	20.991	19.672	17.338	20.225		



	(n=378)	(n=233) ***	(n=207)	(n=255)			
	*** T1 & T2,T3 & T4						
***Significant difference at p<0.001 ** Significant difference at p<0.005							
Significant difference at p<0.05							

#### Days physically active for 30 minutes or more

Overall, paired samples t-tests showed an increase in days active increased from 2.795 at T1 to 4.348 days at T2, a mean increase of  $1.552 \pm 3.415$  (t=6.587, p=0.000). There was a significant reduction from T2 to T3 from 4.452 to 3.578 days, a mean reduction of -0.874  $\pm$  3.714 (t=-2.734, p= 0.007). Days active increased again at T4 from T3 to 3.826  $\pm$  2.442 but the difference was not significant. However, mean days active for 30 minutes or more per week remained significantly higher across T2, T3 and T4 compared to baseline (T1).

#### Meeting the PA guidelines

At baseline (T1) 31.2% (n=101) of participants were meeting the PA guidelines. There was a significant increase in those meeting the PA guidelines in both cohorts from T1 to T2 (p<0.001). Changes were sustained with no significant difference thereafter.

# Days walking for ten minutes of more for leisure or transport

"My mobility has improved an awful lot. We are even talking about the fact that the fitness, it was so good that we would do it every two weeks if we even had to pay for it ourselves. We think it's brilliant. They put us through the ropes but it was excellent." -William- Sheds for Life Participant

There was a significant increase in days walking per week from baseline (T1) across all time points (T2: T=5.439, 95% CI; 1.522 to 0.713 p=0.000, T3: t=4.426, 95% CI; 1.453 to 0.557, p=0.000 and T4: t=2.479, 95% CI; 0.926 to 0.106, p=0.014), with no significant difference between subsequent time points.

#### Minutes walking per day

A paired samples t-test determined mean minutes walking increased from  $35.004 \pm 28.826$  at T1 to  $38.639 \pm 28.375$  at T2, a mean increase of 3.345 minutes, results were not significant with no significant change at subsequent points (T3 and T4).



#### PA Self-Efficacy scores

A repeated measures ANOVA determined there was a significant change in PA self-efficacy scores between time points. There was a statistically significant increase between T1 and T2 (95% CI, 49.001 to 56.270), p <0.0005, T1 and T3 (95% CI, 65.830 to 72.068), p<0.000 and T1 and T4 (95% CI, 14.108 to 7.983), p<0.000, with results significantly higher at all-time points post baseline.

#### **PA confidence**

Participants were asked to rate from 0-10 how confident they would be in maintaining their SFL exercise routine at T2 ( $8.390 \pm 2.217$ , n=229), at T3 ( $7.460 \pm 2.769$ , n=190) and at T4 ( $7.831 \pm 2.831$ , n=242). Paired samples t-tests found no significant changes in mean PA confidence ratings between follow-up points.

## 4.3 Subjective Wellbeing

#### Life Satisfaction

In the combined cohorts a repeated measures ANOVA (n=126) determined life satisfaction increased significantly at T1 from 7.936  $\pm$  1.628 (CI95% 7.4649 to 8.224) to 8.674  $\pm$  1.337

"Before I didn't want to talk about it, something that has happened to me. But I realise today that it could happen to any of us and we need to talk about it. They can ask me about it now and we can talk to each other about it, we correspond." - Mark Sheds for Life participant (C95% 8.439 to 8.910) at T2 p<0.0001. Life satisfaction decreased significantly from T2 to T3 (7.976  $\pm$  1.689, CI95% 7.678 to 8.274, p<0.001) when analysing both cohorts together, with no significant difference from T3 to T4 (7.945  $\pm$  1.610, n=182)

In Cohort 1 life satisfaction increased significantly from T1 ( $8.073 \pm 1.780$ , n=123) to T2 ( $8.463 \pm 1.553$ , n=123) (p<0.005) with changes sustained at T3 and T4.

In Cohort 2, life satisfaction increased significantly from T1 (7.912  $\pm$  1.465, n=91) to T2 (8.681  $\pm$  1.298, n=91) (p<0.001) and decreased significantly from T2 to T3 (7.828  $\pm$  1.697, n=145) (p<0.001) with no change



thereafter at T4 (7.789  $\pm$  1.775, n=123), with T3 and T4 during COVID-19 restrictions. See Figure 1 for a representation of Life Satisfaction scores between cohorts across time points.





#### Life Worthwhile Ratings

In both cohorts a repeated measures ANOVA with pairwise comparison applying a Bonferroni adjustment (n=125), determined the extent of which Shedders felt the things they do in life are worthwhile increased from T1 ( $8.232 \pm 1.597$ , Cl 95% 7.949 to 8.515) to ( $8.896 \pm 1.313$ ) at T2 (p=0.000) changes remained sustained at T3 ( $8.704 \pm 1.4200$ ) and T4 ( $8.417 \pm 1.473$ ). There was a significant difference in scores from baseline at T2 and T3 but not at T4 (See Figure 4).





## Figure 4: Perceived participant ratings of life worth in Cohorts 1 & 2 across T1 to T4

## 4.4 Mental Wellbeing

A repeated measures ANOVA with n=85 eligible participants determined that there was significant difference in SWEBMWS scores between baseline (T1:  $26.362 \pm 4.548$ ) and all other time points (T2:  $30.915 \pm 4.189$ , T3:  $31.846 \pm 4.805$  and T4:  $30.0212 \pm 4.1617$ ), p=0.000.

	Cohort 1					Cohort 2			
	T1	T2	T3	T4	T1	T2	T3	T4	
Mental	26.640	29.916	31.561	29.915	26.949	31.735	30.657	28.239	
Wellbeing (Mean+SD)	± 4.758 (n=122)	± 5.130 (n=122)	± 4.230 (n=69)	± 4.061 (n=58)	± 4.670 (n=91)	± 4.018 (n=91)	± 3.865 (n=86	± 5.001 (n=124)	
	*** T1 & T2,T3,T4 ** T3 & T4 *** T1 & T2,T3 *** T2 to T4						to T4		
***Significa	nt differen	ce at p<0.	001 ** Si	gnificant	difference	e at p<0.0	05 *Sigr	nificant	
			amerenc	e ai p<0.0	JO				

### Table 11: SWEMEBS scores by cohort across T1 to T4

In Cohort 1 there was a significant increase in SWEBMWS from T1 to T2. SWEBMWS increased at T3 and there was reduction in scores at T4 back to T2 level. Scores remained significantly higher across all time points from baseline (See Table 11).

In Cohort 2, there was a significant increase in SWEBMWS from T1 to T2 scores reduced at T3 and again at T4, remaining significantly higher at all-time points post baseline up to T4, with a significant decline in scores from T2 to T4 during COVID-19 restrictions.

## Mental health workshop

The Mental health workshop was an elective component in Cohort 1, of which n=7 Sheds participated. At Cohort 2 implementation, the Mental Health workshop was a core component of which all (n=9) sheds participated (See table 12 for changes in mental health outcomes from the mental health workshops).



## Table 12: Mental Health outcomes from Mind your Mental Health Workshopacross T1 to T4

How certain are you about the following:	T1	T2	Т3	T4				
I have a good understanding about how to manage my mental health and wellbeing								
Very Certain	30.6%	73.3%	56.9%	47.9%				
	N=83	N=126	N=112	N=128				
Certain	36.2%	18.6%	31.5%	34.5%				
	N=98	N=32	N=62	N=92				
Somewhat certain	25.1%	5.2%	10.2%	11.6%				
	N=68	N=9	N=20	N=31				
Uncertain	7.0%	2.9%	1.5%	4.9%				
	N=19	N=5	N=3	N=13				
Very uncertain	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%				
	N=3	N=0	N=0	N=3				
*** T1 & T2,T3,T4	** T3 &	T4	1	1				
I am comfortable that I could have a conversation	on about m	y mental he	alth					
Very Certain	33.6%	72.7%	59.4%	57.7%				
	IN=91	IN=125	N=117	IN=154				
Certain	38.4%	19.2%	26.9%	31.5%				
	N=104	N=33	N=53	N=84				
Somewhat certain	18.1%	6.4%	11.7%	7.5%				
	N=49	N=11	N=23	N=20				
Uncertain	6.6%	1.2%	2.0%	2.2%				
	N=18	N=2	N=4	N=6				
Very uncertain	3.3%	0.6%	0.0%	1.1%				
	N=9	N=1	N=0	N=3				
*** T1 & T2	,T3,T4		1	1				
I feel equipped with practical supports to mainta	in and enh	ance my m	ental wellbe	eing				
Very Certain	24.4%	68.6%	47.4%	44.0%				
	N=66	N=118	N=93	N=117				
Certain	33.3%	20.3%	32.1%	30.1%				
	N=90	N=35	N=63	N=80				
Somewhat certain	26.6%	9.9%	13.3%	16.2%				
	N=72	N=17	N=26	N=43				
Uncertain	12.9%	1.2%	7.1%	8.3%				
	N=35	N=2	N=14	N=22				



Very uncertain	3.0% N=8	0.0% N=0	0.0% N=0	1.5% N=4			
*** T1 & T2 ,T3							
***Significant difference at p<0.001 ** Significant difference at p<0.005 *Significant difference at p<0.05							

#### Understanding about how to manage mental health and wellbeing

Overall, there was a significant difference from T1 to T2 in those who reported having a good understanding about how to manage their mental health and wellbeing (Z=-6.253<sup>b,</sup> p=0.000). There was also a significant difference between T1 and T3 (Z=-5.291<sup>b</sup>, p=0.000) and T1 and T4 (Z=-3.270<sup>b</sup>, p=0.001), meaning results remained significantly higher than baseline.

In Cohort 1, there was a significant improvement in scores from baseline (T1) at T2, T3 and T4, with no significant change thereafter between T2, T3 or T4.

In Cohort 2, there was a significant improvement in scores from baseline (T1) at T2, T3 and T4 but there was a significant reduction from T2 to T3 (Z=- $2.136^{\circ}$ , p=0.03) and T3 to T4 (Z=- $2.932^{\circ}$ , p=0.03).

#### Comfort having a conversation about mental health

There was a significant increase from T1 to T2 in those who said they were comfortable having a conversation about their mental health (Z=- $5.759^{b}$ , p=0.000). There was also a significant difference between T1 and T3 (Z=- $5.940^{b}$ , p=0.000) and T1 and T4 (Z=- $5.840^{b}$ , p=0.000), meaning results remained significantly higher than baseline.

"Sheds for life has been a lifeline for me, for all of us" – Jim Sheds for Life participant

# Feeling equipped with practical supports to maintain and enhance mental health

There was a significant difference from T1 to T2 in those who said they felt equipped with practical supports to maintain and enhance their wellbeing (Z=-6.577<sup>b</sup>, p=0.000). There was also a significant difference between T1 and T3 (Z= -4.722<sup>b</sup>, p=0.000) and T1 and T4 (Z=- $3.432^{b}$ , p=0.001). Scored declined between T2 and T3 (Z=- $2.806^{\circ}$ , p=0.005) with no significant change between T3 and T4. Results were statistically similar between cohorts besides T2 and T3 differences. On analysing Cohorts 1 and 2 separately, in Cohort 1 there



was no significant difference between T2 and T3 p>0.05 and no significant difference thereafter at T4. In Cohort 2 there was a significant difference between T2 and T3 (Z=- $3.065^{\circ}$ , p=0.002). Results remained significantly higher than baseline overall.

### 4.5 Loneliness

Cohorts one and two's loneliness scores were analysed separately to account for Cohort two actively experiencing COVID restrictions at T3 and T4. Shedders were asked to rate their loneliness before joining a shed, and again at T1, T2, T3 & T4. Shedders reported increased feelings of loneliness prior to joining the shed compared to T1 with a statistically significant decrease in scores at T1. Similar mean scores were maintained until Shed closures at T3 in Cohort 2 where there was a statistically significant increase in loneliness scores of 1.489 (95% CI -1.775 to -1.230) t=10.306, p<.0005. Scores continued to significantly increase at T4 in Cohort 2 (t=2.107, p=0.04). (See Table 13 and Figure 5)

Cohort 1 Loneliness (Mean ± SD)				Cohort 2 Loneliness (Mean ± SD)					
Pre Shed	T1	T2	Т3	T4	Pre Shed	T1	T2	Т3	Τ4
4.810 ± 2.146 (n=196)	3.316 ± 0.868 (n=196)	3.463± 1.018 (n=123)	3.088 ± 0.510 (n=68)	3.484 ± 1.029 (n=132)	4.810 ± 2.146 (n=185)	3.297 ± 0.916 (n=185)	3.264 ± 0.800 (n=145)	4.788 ± 1.890 (n=85)	5.300 ± 2.175 (n=125)
*** Pre S	*** Pre Shed & T1 ** T2 & T3 ** T3& T4 *** Pre Shed & T1 *** T2 & T3 ***T1 & T3,T4 T3&T4								
***Sig	***Significant difference at p<0.001 ** Significant difference at p<0.005 *Significant difference at p<0.05								

#### Table 13: UCLA loneliness scores for Cohorts 1 and 2 from T1 to T4



Irish Men's Sheds Association – Sheds for Life Impact Report





## 4.6 Social Capital

#### Belonging

Overall in both cohorts there was a significant increase from T1 (baseline) to T2 (3 month follow up) in those who felt like they belonged to their shed (p=0.001). There was no significant change from T2 at T3 or T4. Results were statistically similar between cohorts (See Table 14).

"The facilitators gave us confidence. I didn't see one person who was intimidated not to ask a question. We men normally wouldn't be great for that. In other things you find there may be only two or three that would ask a question but at the end of the session everyone had the confidence to get involved and I can see the improvement in the mental wellbeing of the shed for that."

- Michael Sheds for Life Participant

55



## Table 14: Sense of belonging across T1 to T4

Sense of belonging	Cohorts 1 & 2						
n% (n=)	T1	T2	Т3	Τ4			
Strongly	71.6%	89%	90.7%	86.4%			
Agree	N=272	N=211	N=194	N=228			
Agree	25.3%	10.5%	8.4%	13.6%			
	N=96	N=25	N=18	N=36			
Disagree	2.9%	0.4%	0.5%	0.0%			
	N=11	N=1	N=1	N=0			
Strongly	0.3%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%			
Disagree	N=1	N=0	N=1	N=0			
*** T1 & T2							
***Significant difference at p<0.001 ** Significant difference at p<0.005 *Significant difference at p<0.05							

## **Close Support**

Overall there was a significant increase in the participants belief they had close support from baseline (T1) to T2 follow-up (Z=-4.064b, p=0.000). There was no significant difference from T2 at T3 and T4. Results were statistically similar in both cohorts (See Table 15).

## Table 15: Sense of close support across T1 and T4

Cohorts 1&2							
Close Support N%	T1	T2	Т3	Τ4			
(=) Strongly	73.4%	90.7%	93.4%	89.8%			
Agree	N=279	N=215	N=199	N=238			
Agree	25.0%	8%	6.1%	7.2%			
	N=95	N=19	N=13	N=19			
Disagree	0.8%	1.3%	0.5%	1.9%			



	N=3	N=3	N=1	N=5			
Strongly	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%			
Disagree	N=3	N=0	N=0	N=3			
*** T1 & T2							
***Significant difference at p<0.001 ** Significant difference at p<0.005 *Significant							
difference at p<0.05							

### Trust

Both cohorts experienced significant increases in trust ratings from baseline (T1; 6.962  $\pm$  2.016, n =380) to follow-up (T2; 7.504  $\pm$  1.891, n=236) with a mean increase of 0.5189 (Cl 95% 0.8146 to 0.2231, t= 3.458, p= 0.001). Scores were sustained beyond T2 with no significant change at T3 (7.475  $\pm$  1.819, n=214) or T4 (7.576  $\pm$  1.610, n=267). Results were statistically similar between cohorts.

## 4.7 Cost Analysis: The SF-6D

#### Table 16: Results of the SF-6D across time points

Physical Functioning	T1	T2	Т3	T4
Your health does not limit you in vigorous	34.3%	50.6%	54.2%	52.6
activities	N=130	N=120	N=116	N=140
Your health limits you a little in vigorous	29.8%	35.4%	36.9%	29.7%
activities	N=113	N=84	N=79	N=79
Your health limits you a little in moderate	23.2%	8.0%	4.7%	11.7%
activities	N=88	N=19	N=10	N=31
Your health limits you a lot in moderate	1.6%	5.5%	3.7%	3.4%
activities	N=6	N=13	N=8	N=9
Your health limits you a little in bathing and	0.8%	0.4%	0.5%	2.6%
dressing	N=3	N=1	N=1	N=7
Your health limits you a lot in bathing and	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
dressing	N=0	N=0	N=0	N=0
	*** T1 & T2			
Role limitation	T1	T2	T3	T4



You have no problems with your work or other regular daily activities as a result of your physical health or any emotional problems	61.6% N=234	73.7% N=174	81.1% N=172	76.7% N=201
You are limited in the kind of work or other activities as a result of your physical health	31.1% N=118	21.6% N=51	15.6% N=33	22.1% N=58
You accomplish less than you would like as a result of emotional problems	3.9% N=15	3.4% N=8	1.4% N=3	1.1% N=3
You are limited in the kind of work or other activities as a result of your physical health and accomplish less than you would like as a result of emotional problems	3.4% N=13	1.3% N=3	1.9% N=4	0.0% N=0
		** T1&	T2	
Social Functioning "Your health limits you in social activities…"	T1	** T18 T2	T2 T3	T4
Social Functioning "Your health limits you in social activities" None of the time	T1 74.3% N=284	** T1& T2 79.3% N=188	T2 T3 86.9% N=186	T4 82.0% N=219
Social Functioning "Your health limits you in social activities" None of the time A little of the time	T1 74.3% N=284 13.6% N=52	** T18 T2 79.3% N=188 13.5% N=32	T2 T3 86.9% N=186 8.4% N=18	T4 82.0% N=219 9.0% N=24
Social Functioning "Your health limits you in social activities" None of the time A little of the time Some of the time	T1 74.3% N=284 13.6% N=52 9.4% N=36	** T18 T2 79.3% N=188 13.5% N=32 5.5% N=13	T2 T3 86.9% N=186 8.4% N=18 4.7% N=10	T4 82.0% N=219 9.0% N=24 7.9% N=21
Social Functioning "Your health limits you in social activities"         None of the time         A little of the time         Some of the time         Most of the time	T1 74.3% N=284 13.6% N=52 9.4% N=36 2.1% N=8	** T18 T2 79.3% N=188 13.5% N=32 5.5% N=13 1.3% N=3	T2 T3 86.9% N=186 8.4% N=18 4.7% N=10 0.0% N=0	T4 82.0% N=219 9.0% N=24 7.9% N=21 1.1% N=3
Social Functioning "Your health limits you in social activities"         None of the time         A little of the time         Some of the time         Most of the time         All of the time	T1 74.3% N=284 13.6% N=52 9.4% N=36 2.1% N=8 0.5% N=2	** T18 T2 79.3% N=188 13.5% N=32 5.5% N=13 1.3% N=3 0.4% N=1	T2 T3 86.9% N=186 8.4% N=18 4.7% N=10 0.0% N=0 0.0% N=0	T4 82.0% N=219 9.0% N=24 7.9% N=21 1.1% N=3 0.0% N=0

58



	1	1		
You have no pain	47.9%	49.4%	60.6%	55.5%
	N=183	N=117	N=129	N=147
It does not interfere	19.6%	21.9%	15.5%	23.4%
	N=75	N=52	N=33	N=62
A little bit	18.3%	17.7%	11.7%	14.7%
	N=70	N=42	N=25	N=39
Moderately	6.5%	6.8%	7.0%	3.8%
	N=25	N=16	N=15	N=10
Quite a bit	7.3%	3.4%	4.2%	1.9%
	N=28	N=8	N=9	N=5
Extremely	0.3%	0.8%	0.9%	0.8%
	N=1	N=2	N=2	N=2
Mental Health "you feel tense or	T1	T2	Т3	T4
downhearted and low"				
None of the time	30.7%	42.8%	35.7%	31.1%
	N=117	N=101	N=76	N=83
A little of the time	30.4%	31.4%	44.1%	40.4%
	N=116	N=74	N=94	N=108
Some of the time	34.4%	22.9%	16.9%	27.0%
	N=131	N=54	N=36	N=72
Most of the time	2.4%	2.5%	2.8%	1.1%
	N=9	N=6	N=6	N=3
All of the time	2.1%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%
	N=8	N=1	N=1	N=1
		*** T18	&T2	
Vitality "You have a lot of energy"	T1	T2	Т3	T4
None of the time	2.6%	3.0%	1.4%	1.1%
	N=10	N=7	N=3	N=3
A little of the time	16.8%	5.9%	8.0%	7.9%
	N=64	N=14	N=17	N=21
Some of the time	24.1%	21.6%	18.3%	21.0%
	N=92	N=51	N=39	N=56

59



Most of the time	45.9%	50.4%	61.5%	60.3%		
	N=175	N=119	N=131	N=161		
All of the time	10.5%	19.1%	10.8%	9.7%		
	N=40	N=45	N=23	N=26		
	*** T1&T2					

\*\*\*Significant difference at p<0.001 \*\* Significant difference at p<0.005 \*Significant difference at p<0.05

## **Physical Functioning**

There was a significant increase in physical functioning ratings from baseline (T1) to followup (T2, Z=-5.598, p=0.000), there was no significant change thereafter at T3 and T4, results were statistically similar between cohorts 1 and 2.

"The programme [Sheds for Life] is helping men to trust their own experience and their expertise. Helping men to trust themselves to help one another."

> John Sheds for Life Participant

## **Role Limitation**

There was a significant improvement in role limitation ratings from baseline (T1) to post SFL (T2, Z=-3.145, p= 0.002), there was no significant change thereafter at T3 and T4. In Cohort 1 the change between T1 and T2 was not significant p>0.05. In Cohort 2 the change between T1 and T2 was significant (Z=-2.620, p=0.009). There was no significant change thereafter at T3 and T4 in either cohort.

## **Social Functioning**

There was no significant change in social functioning ratings across time points results were statistically similar between the two cohorts.

#### Pain

There were no significant differences between pain ratings across time points. Results were statistically similar (Wilcoxon signed ranks tests) between cohorts.



#### **Mental Health**

There was a significant improvement in self-rated mental health status within the SF-6D from baseline (T1) to T2 follow-up (Z=-4.440<sup>b</sup>, p=0.000). There was no significant change thereafter at T3 or T4. Results were statistically similar between the two cohorts.

#### Vitality

There was a significant improvement in vitality ratings overall from baseline (T1) to post SFL (T2, Z=-4.255<sup>b</sup>, p= 0.000), there was no significant change thereafter at T3 and T4. In Cohort 1 the change between T1 and T2 was not significant p>0.05. In Cohort 2 the change between T1 and T2 was significant (Z=-4.154<sup>b</sup>, p=0.000). There was no significant change thereafter at T3 and T4 in either cohort.

#### **Cost effectiveness**

Costs analysis of SFL is currently ongoing. Preliminarily results have highlighted a significant gain in quality adjusted life years (QALYS). Analysis of costs have also demonstrated that SFL has delivered a cost per QALY ratio which is very cost effective when compared to generally accepted thresholds in Ireland the UK.

## 4.8 Smoking and Alcohol

#### Smoking

At baseline, a small percentage (8.4%, n=32) were reported to smoke with 49.7% (n=189) stating that they never smoked and 41.8% (n=159) stating that they were former smokers. Of those who smoked, the number smoked per day ranged from 0 to 40 at T1 with a mean of  $2.932 \pm 7.097$ , 0 to 30 at T2 with "Sheds for Life worked because it came to us. We probably wouldn't be as forthcoming as to go it. That's men for you."

- Michael Sheds for Life Participant

a mean of  $0.807 \pm 3.541$ , 0 to 50.00 at T3 with a mean of  $1.958 \pm 7.046$  and ranged from 0 to 45.00 with a mean of 7.906  $\pm$  11.898. There was a significant decrease in the mean amount smoked per day from T1 to T2 (t=2.411, CI 95% 0.153 to 1.621, p=0.019). There was no significant change thereafter.



#### Alcohol

At baseline, 68.3% (n=263) reported they drank alcohol. Mean days per week drinking alcohol was  $1.608 \pm 1.756$  at T1,  $1.220 \pm 1.593$  at T2,  $1.605 \pm 1.680$  at T3 and  $2.093 \pm 1.855$  at T4. Mean units per session were  $5.796 \pm 8.080$  at T1,  $3.595 \pm 3.965$  at T2,  $4.366 \pm 3.448$  at T3 and  $6.302 \pm 4.854$  at T4. There was a significant decrease in days drinking per week (t=-2.231, p=0.027) and units per session (t=-3.165, p=0.002) from T1 to T2. There was no significant

"I think the bottom line is when people get together like they have in this programme and start supporting each other, we feel better in ourselves, mentally we feel better, and physically we feel better. Then we don't have to go to our GPs had hospitals, we can come here so we are saving money there. That's the bottom line the way I look at it."

> Vincent Sheds for Life Participant

change thereafter at T3 but a significant increase in units per session at T4 (t=2.862, p=0.005). A repeated measures ANOVA did not find a significant difference between baseline (T1) and T3 or T4 for days drinking per week. There was also no significant difference between T1 and T3 or T4 for units of alcohol consumed per session.

## 4.9 Dietary habits and cooking skills

#### Fruit and Vegetable Consumption

The mean number of portions of fruit and vegetables consumed the previous day at T1 was  $3.361 \pm 1.764$  (n=382) with  $3.875 \pm 1.773$  (n=233) at T2,  $3.883 \pm 1.728$  (n=214) at T3 and  $3.710 \pm 1.709$  (n=264). There was no significant change in the number of fruit and vegetables consumed across time points.



## **Cooking Habits**

There was a significant improvement in cooking preparation techniques from (Baseline) T1 to

T2 (z=-2.262<sup>b</sup>, p=0.024), T3 (Z=-2.177<sup>b</sup>, p=0.029) and T4  $(Z=-2.700^{b}, p=0.007)$  there was no significant difference between T2 and T3 or T3 and T4. There was also a significant increase in cooking frequency from T1 to T2 (Z=-3.122<sup>c</sup>, p=0.002), T3 (Z=-1.954<sup>c</sup>, p=0.051) and T4 (Z=-2.544<sup>c</sup>, p=0.011) with no significant change at subsequent time points. Similarly there was as a significant difference in willingness to cook from T1 at T2 (Z=-2.381<sup>c</sup>, p=0.017),

"She showed us how to cook with no oil with minimal butter with no cream or fat and all the curries and sauces she made were very nice and really tasty so I think we all learned from her very much so. Usually when you're learning to cook and you have an instructor there they normally stick to the rules and they don't deviate from them and they don't really discuss anything beyond that. She actually worked well with all of us. There was no bitchiness or anything like that. We were all on the same level which was great to see like. Pity there isn't more like that."

-Glenn Sheds for Life participant

T3 (Z=-2.077<sup>c</sup>, p= 0.038) and T4 (Z=-2.316<sup>c</sup>, p=0.021) with no significant change between T2 and T3 or T3 and T4 (See Table 17).

Cooking preparation	T1	T2	Т3	<b>T</b> 4
Don't cook at all	32.8%	27.7%	24.9%	21.5%
	N=125	N=58	N=53	N=57
Put ready meals in the microwave	4.7%	5.5%	4.7%	1.5%
	N=18	N=13	N=10	N=4
Put together readymade ingredients	8.9%	3.0%	0.9%	5.7%
to make a meal	N=34	N=7	N=2	N=15
Prepare meals from scratch	53.5%	66.8%	69.5%	71.3%
	N=204	N=157	N=148	N=189

## Table 17: Cooking frequency, style and willingness across time points



	* T1 & T2			
Cooking frequency	T1	T2	Т3	T4
Often	42.4%	48.1%	44.8%	46.6%
	N=162	N=113	N=95	N=123
Sometimes	18.8%	23.8%	27.8%	29.2%
	N=72	N=56	N=59	N=77
Rarely	22.8%	19.1%	17.9%	14.4%
	N=87	N=45	N=38	N=38
Never	16.0%	8.9%	9.4%	9.8%
	N=61	N=21	N=20	N=26
	** T1 & T2			
Willingness to cook	T1	T2	Т3	Т4
Extremely willing	35.5%	45.7%	41.5%	43.3%
	N=134	N=106	N=88	N=114
Very willing	25.3%	23.7%	25.5%	27.7%
	N= 96	N=55	N=54	N=65
Somewhat willing	32.6%	23.7%	24.5%	27.4%
	N=124	N=55	N=52	N=72
Not at all willing	6.6%	6.9%	8.5%	4.6%
	N=25	N=16	N=18	N=12
	* T1 & T2			
***Significant difference at p<0.001 ** Significant difference at p<0.005 *Significant difference at p<0.05				

#### Confidence in cooking ability and healthy eating confidence

There was a significant difference between T1 and T2 across all confidence constructs; cooking using raw ingredients (z=-5.150<sup>b</sup> p=0.000), following a simple recipe (z=-6.108<sup>b</sup> p=0.000), planning meals before shopping (z=-5.792<sup>b</sup> p=0.000), shopping for food on a budget (z=-5.567<sup>b</sup> p=0.000), shopping for healthier food to eat (z=5.948<sup>b</sup> p=0.000), cooking new foods (z=-4.546<sup>b</sup> p=0.000), cooking healthier foods (z=-6.835<sup>b</sup> p=0.000), storing food safely (z=-6.115<sup>b</sup> p=0.000), using leftovers to cook other meals (z=-6.067<sup>b</sup> p=0.000), cooking whole raw chicken from scratch (z=-4.941<sup>b</sup> p=0.000), reading food labels (z=-5.708<sup>b</sup> p=0.000) and food hygiene (z=-5.513<sup>b</sup> p=0.000). Changes after T2 were sustained with no significant difference



thereafter between T2 and T3 and T3 and T4. There was also a significant difference (p<0.05) between T1 and T3 and T1 and T4 across all 12 items, meaning improvements were sustained. Results were statistically similar between both cohorts (See Table 18).

### Table 18: Confidence scores for cooking and healthy eating across T1 to T4

How confident do you feel about the following	T1	T2	Т3	T4
Cooking using raw ingredients				
Not at all confident	13.1%	5.2%	3.3%	5.3%
	N=50	N=12	N=7	N=14
Somewhat confident	21.2%	13.4%	9.5%	9.5%
	N=81	N=31	N=20	N=25
Confident	23.0%	21.6%	24.3%	23.1%
	N=88	N=50	N=51	N=61
Very Confident	42.7%	59.9%	62.9%	62.1%
	N=163	N=139	N=132	N=164
	*** T1 & T2			
Following a simple recipe	T1	T2	Т3	T4
Not at all confident	13.1%	4.3%	5.2%	6.4%
	N=50	N=10	N=11	N=17
Somewhat confident	22.3%	10.8%	12.8%	14.0%
	N=85	N=25	N=27	N=37
Confident	28.5%	26.3%	27.5%	25.0%
	N-100	N-61	N-58	N-66
	11-109	11-01	11-00	11-00
Very Confident	36.1%	58.6%	54.5%	54.5%
Very Confident	36.1% N=382	58.6% N=136	54.5% N=115	54.5% N=144
Very Confident	36.1% N=382 *** T1 8	58.6% N=136	54.5% N=115	54.5% N=144
Planning meals before shopping	36.1% N=382 *** T1 8	58.6% N=136 T2 T2	54.5% N=115	54.5% N=144
Very Confident Planning meals before shopping Not at all confident	36.1% N=382 *** T1 8 T1 24.9%	58.6% N=136 T2 T2 9.9%	54.5% N=115 T3 13.3%	54.5%       N=144       T4       16.7%
Very Confident         Planning meals before shopping         Not at all confident	N=103 36.1% N=382 *** T1 8 T1 24.9% N=95	58.6% N=136 T2 T2 9.9% N=23	54.5%         N=115         T3         13.3%         N=28	54.5%       N=144       T4       16.7%       N=44



	N=56	N=34	N=27	N=33
Confident	25.1%	27.6%	24.6%	22.8%
	N=96	N=64	N=52	N=60
Very Confident	27.5%	47.8%	49.3%	47.9%
	N=105	N=111	N=104	N=126
	*** T1 & T2			
Shopping for food on a budget	T1	T2	Т3	T4
Not at all confident	20.3%	9.5%	12.4%	11.9%
	N=77	N=22	N=26	N=31
Somewhat confident	21.6%	13.4%	11.4%	14.9%
	N=82	N=31	N=24	N=39
Confident	28.2%	25.0%	23.8%	23.0%
	N=107	N=58	N=50	N=60
Very Confident	30.0%	52.2%	52.4%	50.2%
	N=114	N=121	N=110	N=131
	*** T1 & T2			
Shopping for healthier food to eat	T1	T2	Т3	T4
Not at all confident	17.0%	6.0%	9.5%	10.3%
	N=65	N=14	N=20	N=27
Somewhat confident	24.6%	11.2%	17.5%	12.5%
	N=94	N=26	N=37	N=33
Confident	28.8%	35.3%	25.1%	25.9%
	N=110	N=82	N=53	N=68
Very Confident	29.6%	47.3%	47.9%	51.3%
	N=113	N=110	N=101	N=135
	*** T1 & T2			
Cooking new foods	110			
	T1	T2	Т3	T4
Not at all confident	T1 31.2%	T2 14.0%	T3 10.9%	T4 12.5%
Not at all confident	T1 31.2% N=119	T2 14.0% N=32	T3 10.9% 23	T4 12.5% N=33
Not at all confident Somewhat confident	T1 31.2% N=119 22.3%	T2 14.0% N=32 21.4%	T3       10.9%       23       19.9%	T4 12.5% N=33 19.7%
Not at all confident Somewhat confident	T1 31.2% N=119 22.3% N=85	T2 14.0% N=32 21.4% N=49	T3 10.9% 23 19.9% N=42	T4 12.5% N=33 19.7% N=52
Not at all confident Somewhat confident Confident	T1 31.2% N=119 22.3% N=85 20.2%	T2 14.0% N=32 21.4% N=49 24.5%	T3         10.9%         23         19.9%         N=42         23.7%	T4 12.5% N=33 19.7% N=52 26.1%



Very Confident	26.4%	40.2%	45.5%	41.7%
	N=101 N=92 N=96 N=110			
	*** T1 & T2			
Cooking heathier foods	T1	T2	Т3	T4
Not at all confident	16.8%	4.7%	9.0%	8.4%
	N=64	N=11	N=19	N=22
Somewhat confident	24.4%	11.2%	15.6%	13.3%
	N=93	N=26	N=33	N=35
Confident	29.7%	33.2%	26.1%	28.9%
	N=113	N=77	N=55	N=76
Very Confident	29.1%	50.9%	49.3%	49.4%
	N=111	N=118	N=104	N=130
	*** T1 & T2			
Storing food safely	T1	T2	Т3	T4
Not at all confident	9.2%	2.6%	2.4%	2.3%
	N=35	N=6	N=5	N=6
Somewhat confident	16.5%	6.5%	6.7%	7.6%
	N=63	N=15	N=14	N=20
Confident	32.7%	26.7%	28.6%	25.4%
	N=125	N=62	N=60	N=67
Very Confident	41.6%	64.2%	62.4%	64.8%
	N=159	N=149	N=131	N=171
	*** T1 8	*** T1 & T2		
Using leftovers to cook other meals	T1	T2	Т3	T4
Not at all confident	22.6%	9.9%	10.5%	10.7%
	N=86	N=23	N=22	N=28
Somewhat confident	23.1%	14.2%	14.3%	12.6%
	N=88	N=33	N=30	N=33
Confident	26.0%	26.7%	21.4%	20.6%
	N=99	N=62	N=45	N=54
Very Confident	28.3%	49.1%	53.8%	56.1%
	N=108	N=114	N=113	N=147
	*** T1 & T2			


Cooking whole raw chicken from scratch	T1	T2	Т3	T4
Not at all confident	22.5%	10.3%	8.5%	9.5%
	N=86	N=24	N=18	N=25
Somewhat confident	16.5%	10.8%	13.7%	10.2%
	N=63	N=25	N=29	N=27
Confident	21.7%	23.3%	17.5%	17.4%
	N=83	N=54	N=37	N=46
Very Confident	39.3%	55.6%	60.2%	62.9%
	N=150	N=129	N=127	N=166
	*** T1 8	T2	1	1
Reading food labels	T1	T2	Т3	T4
Not at all confident	23.6%	7.8%	4.3%	11.7%
	N=90	N=18	N=9	N=31
Somewhat confident	21.5%	12.1%	13.3%	14.8%
	N=82	N=28	N=28	N=39
Confident	23.8%	28.4%	25.6%	20.5%
	N=91	N=66	N=54	N=54
Very Confident	31.2%	51.7%	56.9%	53.0%
	N=119	N=120	N=120	N=140
	*** T1 8	. T2	1	I
Food Hygiene	T1	T2	Т3	T4
Not at all confident	7.1%	1.7%	1.9%	1.1%
	N=27	N=4	N=4	N=3
Somewhat confident	14.7%	5.2%	7.1%	6.8%
	N=56	N=12	N=15	N=18
Confident	33.0%	28.1%	26.1%	24.2%
	N=126	N=65	N=55	N=64
Very Confident	45.3%	64.9%	64.9%	67.8%
	N=173	N=150	N=137	N=179
***Significant difference at p<0.001 ** Significant difference at p<0.005 *Significant difference at p<0.05	*** T1 8	а Т2		

# 4.10 Supplementary Components



## 4.10.1 Diabetes Awareness

Nine Sheds participated in the Diabetes Awareness component, n=6 in Cohort 1 and n=3 in Cohort 2. Of those who participated in the Diabetes workshop, 17.8% (n=30) reported having diabetes at T1 with 7.1% (n=2) having type 1 and 92.9% (n=26) with type 2 diabetes. All participants were asked if they thought they were "low", "moderate" or "high" risk of getting type 2 diabetes of which 56.6% (n=82) considered themselves low risk, 32.4% (n=47) moderate risk and 11% (n=16) high risk. There was no significant change in perceived risk of getting type 2 diabetes from T1 to T2.

## Table 19: Mean Diabetes Knowledge Scores across T1 to T3

Diabetes Knowledge Constructs	T1	T2	Т3		
	(Mean ±	(Mean ±	(Mean ± SD)		
	SD)	SD)	1		
Medication is more important than diet and ex	2.796 ±	2.893 ±	2.897 ±		
ercise to control diabetes.	0.599	0.441	0.446		
	(n=103)	(n=103)	(n=58)		
The way I prepare my food is as important as	2.572 ±	2.786 ±	2.896 ±		
the foods I eat.	0.812	0.621	0.446		
	(n=103)	(n=103)	(n=58)		
* T1 & T2 (CI 95% 0.040 to 0.876, t=2.317, p= 0.23)					
Shaking and sweating are signs of high blood	1.765	2.402 ±	2.435 ±		
sugar.	±0.935	0.895	0.896		
	(n=103)	(n=103)	(n=58)		
*** T1 & T2 (CI 95% 0.398 to	0.876, t=5.290	), p= 0.000)			
Regular Exercise will reduce the risk of	2.690 ±	2.864 ±	2.862 ±		
diabetes	0.728	0.486	0.511		
	(n=103)	(n=103)	(n=58)		
* T1 & T2 (CI 95% 0.119 to	0.338, t=2.128	p=0.036)			
Diabetes can damage your kidneys and other	2.563 ±	2.884 ±	2.791 ±		
organs	0.825	0.471	0.676		
	(n=103)	(n=103)	(n=58)		
*** T1 & T2 (CI 95% 0.140 to	0.500, t=3.532	2, p=0.001)			



on	Irish Men's	Sheds	Association	<ul> <li>Sheds for</li> </ul>	or Life l	mpact Report

Frequent urination may be a sign of diabetes	$2.177 \pm 0.989$	$2.725 \pm$ 0.691	$2.667 \pm 0.761$		
*** T1 & T2 (CI 95% 0.327 to	0.771, t=4.901	, p= 0.000)	(11=30)		
Diabetes often causes poor circulation	2.284 ± 0.958 (n=102)	2.804 ± 0.581 (n=102)	2.583 ± 0.830 (n=58)		
*** T1 & T2 (CI 95% 0.333 to 0.706, t=5.515 p=0.000)					
***Significant difference at p<0.001 ** Significant difference at p<0.005 *Significant difference at p<0.05 Higher mean scores indicate improved diabetes knowledge					

Paired samples t-tests determined there was a significant increase in diabetes knowledge scores across 6 out of the 7 measured constructs between T1 and T2 and no significant decrease thereafter at T3. Results were statistically similar between cohorts (see Table 19).

At T2, participants were asked if they found the diabetes workshop improved their understanding of diabetes prevention and management. The overwhelming consensus among those who responded (n=76) - 85.5% (n=65) "strongly Agree" and 14.5% (n=11) "agree" - that the diabetes workshop improved their understanding of diabetes prevention and management.

An objective of the Diabetes workshop was to encourage annual blood tests. For this reason, participants were asked at T4 if they had their bloods checked in the past year of which 87.5% (n=231) stating that they had done so.

4.10.2 safeTALK-Suicide Awareness "The diabetes talk was excellent. The speaker was brilliant. We were very lucky the people we had everyone one of them were very, very good. That made a big difference I think like there was no boredom or anything going on. They were able to engage well and that made a huge difference. There was a lot of humour in it. It was a lot of fun. There was none of this kind of looking down thing."

- James Sheds for Life Participant



Six sheds participated (Cohort 1 n=4, Cohort 2 n=2) in the safeTALK workshop. Participants were asked questions on safeTALK impact up to T3.

# Table 20: Outcomes from safeTALK across T1 to T3

	T1	T2	Т3
How confident are you in dealing with the needs of			
someone who may be suicidal?			
Strongly Confident	8.7%	23.7%	32.8%
	N=9	N=14	N=20
Very Confident	24.3%	30.5%	31.1%
	N=25	N=18	N=19
Somewhat Confident	33.0%	35.6%	27.9%
	N=34	N=21	N=17
A little confident	13.6%	3.4%	3.3%
	N=14	N=2	N=2
Not at all confident	20.4%	6.8%	4.9%
	N=21	N=4	N=3
	***T	1 & T2, T	3
How confident are you in identifying appropriate	T1	T2	Т3
services that individuals in distress could be referred on			
to?			
Strongly Confident	5.8%	25.4%	39.3%
	N=6	N=15	N=24
Very Confident	20.4%	40.7%	36.1%
	N=21	N=24	N=22
Somewhat Confident	33.0%	23.7%	19.7%
	N=34	N=14	N=12
A little confident	19.4%	3.4%	0.0%
	N=20	N=2	N=0
Not at all confident	21.4%	6.8%	4.9%
	N=22	N=4	N=3



I would be willing to talk openly and directly about	T1	Т2	Т3
suicide			
Strongly Agree	37.9%	52.5%	60.7%
	N=39	N=31	N=37
Agree	40.8%	33.9%	23.0%
	N=42	N=20	N=14
Neither agree/disagree	15.5%	10.2%	9.8%
	N=16	N=6	N=6
Disagree	3.9%	1.7%	4.9%
	N=4	N=1	N=3
Strongly disagree	1.9%	1.7%	1.6%
	N=2	N=1	N=1
	* -	T1 & T3	
I feel prepared to talk directly and openly to a person	T1	Т2	Т3
I feel prepared to talk directly and openly to a person about suicide	T1	T2	Т3
I feel prepared to talk directly and openly to a person about suicide Strongly Agree	T1 25.0%	T2 49.2%	T3 60.7%
I feel prepared to talk directly and openly to a person about suicide Strongly Agree	T1 25.0% N=26	T2 49.2% N=29	T3 60.7% N=37
I feel prepared to talk directly and openly to a person about suicide Strongly Agree Agree	T1 25.0% N=26 30.8%	T2 49.2% N=29 33.9%	T3 60.7% N=37 23.0%
I feel prepared to talk directly and openly to a person about suicide Strongly Agree Agree	T1 25.0% N=26 30.8% N=32	T2 49.2% N=29 33.9% N=20	T3 60.7% N=37 23.0% N=14
I feel prepared to talk directly and openly to a person about suicide Strongly Agree Agree Neither agree/disagree	T1 25.0% N=26 30.8% N=32 21.2%	T2 49.2% N=29 33.9% N=20 13.6%	T3 60.7% N=37 23.0% N=14 8.2%
I feel prepared to talk directly and openly to a person about suicide Strongly Agree Agree Neither agree/disagree	T1 25.0% N=26 30.8% N=32 21.2% N=22	T2 49.2% N=29 33.9% N=20 13.6% N=8	T3 60.7% N=37 23.0% N=14 8.2% N=5
I feel prepared to talk directly and openly to a person about suicide Strongly Agree Agree Neither agree/disagree Disagree	T1 25.0% N=26 30.8% N=32 21.2% N=22 9.6%	T2 49.2% N=29 33.9% N=20 13.6% N=8 1.7%	T3 60.7% N=37 23.0% N=14 8.2% N=5 4.9%
I feel prepared to talk directly and openly to a person about suicide Strongly Agree Agree Neither agree/disagree Disagree	T1 25.0% N=26 30.8% N=32 21.2% N=22 9.6% N=10	T2 49.2% N=29 33.9% N=20 13.6% N=8 1.7% N=1	T3 60.7% N=37 23.0% N=14 8.2% N=5 4.9% N=3
I feel prepared to talk directly and openly to a person about suicide Strongly Agree Agree Neither agree/disagree Disagree Strongly disagree	T1 25.0% N=26 30.8% N=32 21.2% N=22 9.6% N=10 12.5%	T2 49.2% N=29 33.9% N=20 13.6% N=8 1.7% N=1 1.7%	T3 60.7% N=37 23.0% N=14 8.2% N=5 4.9% N=3 3.3%
I feel prepared to talk directly and openly to a person about suicide Strongly Agree Agree Neither agree/disagree Disagree Strongly disagree	T1 25.0% N=26 30.8% N=32 21.2% N=22 9.6% N=10 12.5% N=13	T2 49.2% N=29 33.9% N=20 13.6% N=8 1.7% N=1 1.7% N=1	T3 60.7% N=37 23.0% N=14 8.2% N=5 4.9% N=3 3.3% N=2

# Confidence in dealing with the needs of someone who may be suicidal

There was a significant increase in confidence ratings when dealing with the needs of someone who may be suicidal between T1 and T2 (Z=- $3.239^{b}$ , p=0.001) and T1 and T3 (Z=- $4.197^{b}$ , p=0.000). Changes were sustained with no significant difference between T2 and T3.



## Confidence in identifying appropriate services for someone in distress

"I found that I couldn't actually believe that the time was gone you know because it was very interesting. Like I suppose when it was out first of all people sort of shied away from it, "suicide well that's a bit depressing" but it was actually presented in a very good way and there was a bit of... I won't say laughter, but it was light and there was no one came away and felt depressed and it's certainly opened our eyes, ears and mouths to a few things"

- Roy Sheds for Life Participant

There was a significant increase in confidence ratings when identifying appropriate services for someone in distress between T1 and T2 (Z=-4.127b, p=0.000) and T1 and T3 (Z=-5.373b, p=0.000). There was no significant difference between T2 and T3.

# Willingness to talk openly and directly to a person about suicide

There was no significant change in willingness to talk openly and

directly to a person about suicide from T1 to T2. There was a significant increase in willingness between T1 and T3 (Z=-2.238b, p=0.025), and no significant difference between T2 and T3.

## Feeling prepared to talk openly and directly to a person about suicide

There was a significant increase in those who agreed they felt prepared to talk openly and directly to a person about suicide from T1 to T2 (Z=-3.119b, p=0.002) and T1 and T3 (Z=-4.331b, p=0.000). There was no significant difference between T2 and T3.



## 4.10.3 Digital Literacy

Nine sheds participated in the Digital Literacy component of SFL, with n=8 in Cohort 1 and n=1 in Cohort 2. There was a significant increase in certainty around accessing a website to source information from T1 to T2 (Z=- $3.510^{\text{b}}$ , p=0.000) and T1 and T3 (Z=- $3.251^{\text{b}}$ , p=0.001). There was no significant difference between T2 and T3. There was also a significant difference in certainty around sending and receiving an email from T1 to T2 (Z=- $3.255^{\text{b}}$ , p=0.001) and T1 and T3 (Z=- $3.491^{\text{b}}$ , p= 0.000) with no significant difference between T2 and T3. Similarly there

"It (Sheds for Life) brought us close together and interacting together and we became more outgoing about speaking in a group because of our group sessions. And that interaction and that facility to share our thoughts is better and makes life better"

> James Sheds for Life Participant

was a significant difference in certainty around staying connected with family and friends online from T1 to T2 (Z=-3.090<sup>b</sup>, p=0.002) and T1 and T3 (Z=-4.809<sup>b</sup>, p=0.000), with no significant difference between T2 and T3. With online banking, shopping and motor tax renewal, confidence levels significantly increasing from T1 to T2 (Z=-2.007<sup>b</sup>, p=0.045) and T1 and T3 (Z=-4.269<sup>b</sup>, p=0.000). There was no significant decline between T2 and T3. In relation to getting online with apps on a smartphone there was a significant increase in certainty levels from T1 to T2 (Z=-3.122<sup>b</sup>, p=0.002) and T1 and T3 (Z=-3.912<sup>b</sup>, p=0.000) with no significant decrease between T2 and T3 (see Table 21).

How certain are you that you would succeed in the	T1	T2	Т3
following:			
Accessing a website to source information	T1	T2	Т3
Very Certain	45.3%	55.7%	66.0%
	N=63	N=49	N=33
Certain	18.0%	14.8%	10.0%
	N=25	N=13	N=5
Somewhat Certain	10.1%	19.3%	18.0%
	N=14	N=17	N=9

#### Table 21: Changes digital literacy constructs from T1 to T3



Uncertain	7.2%	4.5%	4.0%
	N=10	N=4	N=2
Very Uncertain	19.4%	5.7%	2.0%
	N=27	N=5	N=1
	***	T1 & T2,	Т3
Sending and receiving an email	T1	T2	Т3
Very Certain	45.7%	58.0%	68.0%
	N=64	N=51	N=34
Certain	15.0%	15.9%	10.0%
	N=21	N=14	N=5
Somewhat Certain	9.3%	11.4%	14.0%
	N=13	N=10	N=7
Uncertain	8.6%	9.1%	6.0%
	N=12	N=8	N=3
Very Uncertain	21.4%	5.7%	2.0%
	N=30	N=5	N=1
	***		то
		TT&TZ,	13
Using social media	T1	T2	T3
Using social media Very Certain	T1 34.3%	T2 48.9%	T3 T3 64.0%
Using social media Very Certain	T1 34.3% N=48	T2 48.9% N=43	T3 T3 64.0% N=32
Using social media Very Certain Certain	T1 34.3% N=48 15.7%	T2 48.9% N=43 14.8%	T3 64.0% N=32 12.0%
Using social media Very Certain Certain	T1 34.3% N=48 15.7% N=22	T2 48.9% N=43 14.8% N=13	T3 64.0% N=32 12.0% N=6
Using social media Very Certain Certain Somewhat Certain	T1 34.3% N=48 15.7% N=22 3.6%	T2 48.9% N=43 14.8% N=13 17.0%	T3 64.0% N=32 12.0% N=6 16.0%
Using social media         Very Certain         Certain         Somewhat Certain	T1 34.3% N=48 15.7% N=22 3.6% N=5	T2 48.9% N=43 14.8% N=13 17.0% N=15	T3 64.0% N=32 12.0% N=6 16.0% N=8
Using social media         Very Certain         Certain         Somewhat Certain         Uncertain	T1 34.3% N=48 15.7% N=22 3.6% N=5 15.0%	T2 48.9% N=43 14.8% N=13 17.0% N=15 10.2%	T3 64.0% N=32 12.0% N=6 16.0% N=8 4.0%
Using social media         Very Certain         Certain         Somewhat Certain         Uncertain	T1 34.3% N=48 15.7% N=22 3.6% N=5 15.0% N=21	T2 48.9% N=43 14.8% N=13 17.0% N=15 10.2% N=9	T3 64.0% N=32 12.0% N=6 16.0% N=8 4.0% N=2
Using social media         Very Certain         Certain         Somewhat Certain         Uncertain         Very Uncertain	T1 34.3% N=48 15.7% N=22 3.6% N=5 15.0% N=21 31.4%	T2 48.9% N=43 14.8% N=13 17.0% N=15 10.2% N=9 9.1%	T3 64.0% N=32 12.0% N=6 16.0% N=8 4.0% N=2 4.0%
Using social media         Very Certain         Certain         Somewhat Certain         Uncertain         Very Uncertain	T1 34.3% N=48 15.7% N=22 3.6% N=5 15.0% N=21 31.4% N=44	T2 48.9% N=43 14.8% N=13 17.0% N=15 10.2% N=9 9.1% N=8	T3 64.0% N=32 12.0% N=6 16.0% N=8 4.0% N=2 4.0% N=2
Using social media         Very Certain         Certain         Somewhat Certain         Uncertain         Very Uncertain	T1 34.3% N=48 15.7% N=22 3.6% N=5 15.0% N=21 31.4% N=44	T2 48.9% N=43 14.8% N=13 17.0% N=15 10.2% N=9 9.1% N=8 T1 & T2,	T3 64.0% N=32 12.0% N=6 16.0% N=8 4.0% N=2 4.0% N=2 T3
Using social media         Very Certain         Certain         Somewhat Certain         Uncertain         Very Uncertain         Staying connected with family and friends online	T1 34.3% N=48 15.7% N=22 3.6% N=5 15.0% N=21 31.4% N=44 ×***	T2 48.9% N=43 14.8% N=13 17.0% N=15 10.2% N=9 9.1% N=8 T1 & T2, T2	T3 64.0% N=32 12.0% N=6 16.0% N=8 4.0% N=2 4.0% N=2 T3 T3
Using social media         Very Certain         Certain         Somewhat Certain         Uncertain         Very Uncertain         Staying connected with family and friends online         Very Certain	T1 34.3% N=48 15.7% N=22 3.6% N=5 15.0% N=21 31.4% N=44 ×*** T1 38.6%	T2 48.9% N=43 14.8% N=13 17.0% N=15 10.2% N=9 9.1% N=8 T1 & T2, T2 46.6%	T3 64.0% N=32 12.0% N=6 16.0% N=8 4.0% N=2 4.0% N=2 T3 T3 T3 62.0%
Using social media         Very Certain         Certain         Somewhat Certain         Uncertain         Very Uncertain         Staying connected with family and friends online         Very Certain	T1 34.3% N=48 15.7% N=22 3.6% N=5 15.0% N=21 31.4% N=44 **** T1 38.6% N=54	T2 48.9% N=43 14.8% N=13 17.0% N=15 10.2% N=9 9.1% N=8 T1 & T2, T2 46.6% N=41	T3         64.0%         N=32         12.0%         N=6         16.0%         N=8         4.0%         N=2         4.0%         N=2         4.0%         N=2         4.0%         N=2         4.0%         N=2         4.0%         N=2         Max         N=3



	N=19	N=17	N=7
Somewhat Certain	6.4%	12.5%	14.0%
	N=9	N=11	N=7
Uncertain	15.0%	14.8%	8.0%
	N=21	N=13	N=4
Very Uncertain	26.4%	6.8%	2.0%
	N=37	N=6	N=1
	***	T1 & T2,	Т3
Online banking, shopping and motor tax renewal	T1	T2	Т3
Very Certain	40.0%	43.2%	60.0%
	N=56	N=38	N=30
Certain	10.0%	15.9%	8.0%
	N=14	N=14	N=4
Somewhat Certain	7.9%	17.0%	24.0%
	N=11	N=15	N=12
Uncertain	13.6%	14.8%	6.0%
	N=19	N=13	N=3
Very Uncertain	28.6%	9.1%	2.0%
	N=40	N=8	N=1
	* T1 &	T2 *** <sup>-</sup>	T1 & T3
Getting online and using apps on your smartphone	T1	T2	Т3
Very Certain	40.0%	48.9%	58.0%
	N=56	N=43	N=29
Certain	8.6%	21.6%	12.0%
	N=12	N=19	N=6
Somewhat Certain	9.3%	11.4%	24.0%
	N=13	N=10	N=12
Uncertain	14.3%	10.2%	4.0%
	N=20	N=9	N=2
Very Uncertain	27.9%	8.0%	2.0%
	N=39	N=7	N=1
p<0.005 *Significant difference at p<0.001 ** Significant difference at p<0.05	***	T1 & T2,	Т3



## 4.10.4 Oral Health

Three Sheds selected the oral health workshop with n=2 Sheds completing it, both from Cohort 1. Of those who participated, outcomes were assessed at T1, T2 and T3. Participants were asked to rate the health of their gums and teeth at T1 with 3.9% (n=2) saying "excellent", 25.5% (n=13) saying "very Good", 33.3% (n=17) saying "good", 19.6% (n=10) saying "average", 15.7% (n=8) saying "poor" and 2.0% (n=1) saying "very poor". Results were statistically similar across T2 and T3 with no significant change. Participants were also asked to rate their perceived importance of oral health with 66.7% (n=34) saying "very important", 19.6% (n=10) saying "important", 9.8% (n=5) saying "moderately important" and 3.9% (n=2) saying "of little importance". Results were statistically similar across time points with no significant change. Participants in the oral health workshop were also asked to rate their confidence in looking after their oral health of which 31.4% (n=16) responded "strongly confident", 23.5% (n=12) "very confident", 41.2% "somewhat confident", 2% (n=1) "a little confident" and 2% (n=1) "not at all confident". Results were statistically similar at T2 and T3 with no significant change. Participants were also asked to rate their level of agreeance with the statement "It is important to brush my teeth twice a day" of which at baseline 66.7% (n=34) strongly agreed, 19.6% (n=10) agreed, 11.8% (n=6) stating neither agreed nor disagreed and 2% (n=2) disagreed. Results were statistically similar at T2 and T2 with no significant change. Participants were also asked to rate their perceived level of importance to visit a dentist once a year of which 37.3% (n=19) said "very important", 19.6% (n=10) said "important", 19.6% n=10 said "moderately important", 15.7% (n=8) said "of little importance" and 7.8% (n=4) said "unimportant". There was a significant increase in perceived importance visiting a dentist once a year at T2 with 90.9% (n=20) saying "very important" and 9.1% (n=2) saying "of little importance", (Z=-2.299<sup>b</sup>, p=0.022). Participants of the oral health workshop were asked at T2 if the workshop improved their understanding of how to manage and maintain their oral health of which 77.8% strongly agreed and 22.2% agreed.

## 4.10.5 Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation Training

Eighteen sheds selected CPR as an elective component with n=10 in Cohort 1 and n=8 in Cohort 2. Outcomes were assessed at T1, T2 and T3.

Table 22: CPR confidence ratings across T1, T2 and T3



How confident do you feel in recognising cardiac arrest	T1	T2	Т3
and calling the emergency services?			
Strongly confident	16.7%	57.3%	55.4%
	n=53	n=102	n=72
Very confident	20.8%	23.6%	21.5%
	n=66	n=42	n=28
Somewhat confident	26.7%	12.4%	17.7%
	n=85	n=22	n=23
A little confident	12.6%	2.8%	4.6%
	n=40	n=5	n=6
Not at all confident	23.3%	3.9%	0.8%
	n=74	n=7	n=1
*** T1 & T2, T3	I	1	
How confident do you feel operating an AED?	T1	T2	Т3
Strongly confident	7.9%	57.9%	38.5%
	n=25	n=103	n=50
Very confident	13.2%	26.4%	26.2%
	n=42	n=47	n=34
Somewhat confident	14.2%	5.6%	17.7%
	n=45	n=10	n=23
A little confident	9.4%	5.1%	3.8%
	n=30	n=9	n=5
Not at all confident	55.3%	5.1%	13.8%
	n=176	n=9	n=18
*** T1 & T2,T3 ***T2 & T3			
How confident do you feel performing chest	T1	T2	Т3
compressions?			
Strongly confident	10.4%	46.6%	41.5%
	n=33	n=83	n=54
Very confident	19.9%	21.3%	38.5%
	n=63	n=38	n=50
Somewhat confident	20.2%	15.2%	8.5%
	n=64	n=27	n=11



ion	Irish Men's Sheds	Association –	Sheds for	Life Impact	Report

A little confident	12.3%	5.6%	3.8%
	n=39	n=10	n=5
Not at all confident	37.2%	11.2%	7.7%
	n=118	n=20	n=10
***Significant difference at p<0.001 ** Significant difference at p<0.005 *Significant difference at p<0.05	*** T1 & T	<sup>-</sup> 2, T3	

Of those who participated in the CPR component there was a significant increase in confidence ratings for recognising a cardiac arrest from T1 to T2 (Z=-8.170<sup>b</sup>, p=0.000) and from T1 to T3 (Z=-6.611<sup>b</sup>, p=0.000) there was no significant decrease between T2 and T3. There was also a significant increase in confidence performing chest compressions from T1 to T2 (Z=-7.478<sup>b</sup>, p=0.000) and from T1 to T2 (Z=-7.640<sup>b</sup>, p=0.000) there was no significant difference between T2 and T3. There was a significant increase in confidence in confidence using an AED from T1 to T2 (Z=-9.612<sup>b</sup>, p=0.000) and from T1 to T3 (Z=-7.456<sup>b</sup>, p=0.000). There was also a significant difference from T2 to T3 (-4.101<sup>c</sup>, p=0.000). (See Table 22).

## 4.10.6 Cancer Awareness

Ten sheds chose to participate in the cancer awareness workshop of which n=7 were in Cohort 1 and n=3 were in Cohort 2. Outcomes were assessed at T1, T2 and T3. There was a significant increase in reported understanding of cancer related early detection signs from T1 to T2 (Z=-5.616<sup>b</sup>, p=0.000) and from T1 to T3 (Z=-4.377<sup>b</sup>, p=0.000) with no significant decrease between T2 and T3. There was a reported significant increase in understanding of the cancers most prevalent in men among participants from T1 to T2 (Z=-5.814<sup>b</sup>, p=0.000) and T1 and T3 (Z=-4.456<sup>b</sup>, p=0.000), with no significant decrease between T2 and T3. There

*"I think I'm surprised we all took so much to the programme. In the beginning I was reluctant to take on the programme because I thought I would only get two or three men. But an average 12-14 came every day."* 

- Paul Sheds for Life

was also a significant increase in the reported understanding of cancer screening services in Ireland from T1 to T2 (Z=-5.814<sup>b</sup>, p=0.000) and T1 to T3 (Z=-3.461<sup>b</sup>, p=0.001), with no significant change from T2 to T3. The perceived importance of bowel screen, screening service also significantly increased from T1 to T2 (Z=-3.901<sup>b</sup>, p=0.000). The increase in importance was also significant from baseline (T1) to T3 (Z=-2.944<sup>b</sup>, p=0.003).



There was no significant change from T2 to T3. The perceived importance of retina screen for applicable participants with a diabetes diagnosis had no significant difference across time points (See Table 23).

## Table 23: Cancer Awareness outcomes across T1, T2 and T3

Understanding of cancer related early detection	T1	T2	Т3	
Strongly agree	21.2%	53.2%	50.6%	
	n=38	n=50	n=40	
Agree	25.1%	30.9%	29.1%	
	n=45	n=29	n=23	
Somewhat agree	25.1%	8.5%	13.9%	
	n=45	n=8	n=11	
Disagree	19.6%	7.4%	5.1%	
	n=35	n=7	n=4	
Strongly disagree	8.9%	0.0%	1.3%	
	n=16	n=0	n=1	
	*** T1 & T2, T3			
Understanding of cancers most prevalent in men	T1	T2	T3	
Strongly agree	24.7%	47.9%	59.2%	
	n=44	n=45	n=42	
Agree	34.3%	43.6%	28.2%	
	n=61	n=41	n=20	
Somewhat agree	26.4%	6.4%	9.9%	
	n=47	n=6	n=7	
Disagree	9.0%	2.1%	1.4%	
	n=16	n=2	n=1	
Strongly disagree	5.6%	0.0%	1.4%	
	n=10	n=0	n=1	
	*** T1 & T2, T3			
Understanding of cancer screening in Ireland	T1	T2	T3	



Strongly agree	19.7%	50.5%	77.3%
	n=35	n=47	n=17
Agree	21.9%	33.3%	22.7%
	n=39	n=31	n=5
Somewhat agree	23.0%	10.8%	0.0%
	n=41	n=10	n=0
Disagree	29.2%	5.4%	0.0%
	n=52	n=5	n=0
Strongly disagree	6.2%	0.0%	0.0%
	n=11	n=0	n=0
	*** T1 & T2, T3		
Important to attend Bowel Screen	T1	T2	Т3
Strongly agree	43.5%	60.2%	90.9%
	n=77	n=56	n=20
Agree	31.1	32.3%	9.1%
	n=55	n=30	n=2
Somewhat agree	14.7%	5.4%	0.0%
	n=26	n=5	n=0
Disagree	9.6%	2.2%	0.0%
	n=17	n=2	n=0
Strongly disagree	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%
	n=2	n=0	n=0
	*** T1 & T2,T3		
Important to attend Retina Screen (if diabetic)	T1	Т2	Т3
Strongly agree	63.2%	68.8%	100.0%
	n=24	n=11	n=5
Agree	18.4%	25.0%	0.0%
	n=7	n=4	n=0
Somewhat agree	13.2%	6.3%	0.0%
	n=5	n=1	n=0
Disagree	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%
	n=1	n=0	n=0



Strongly disagree	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%		
	n=1	n=0	n=0		
***Significant difference at p<0.001 ** Significant difference at p<0.005 *Significant					
difference at p<0.05					

# 4.11 Reach and Attendance

An estimated reach rate calculated on proportion of Shedders eligible to attend SFL (n=565) against numbers who enrolled in SFL (n=421), along with mean attendance rates of SFL components was estimated at 73% across Cohort 1 and 2. (Numbers eligible to attend were based on the number of men's shed members in the sheds at the time of SFL implementation).

Attendance rates are based on the number of Shedders who signed up to each component and were estimated based on a combination of attendance records captured by SFL deliverers and self-reported attendance by participants. Estimated percentage attendance rates for physical activity components was 85.7%. Estimated percentage rates for the Mental Health workshop was 73.2%. For Healthy Food Made Easy estimated attendance rates overall were 72.86%. The Diabetes workshop had an estimated attendance of 74.0%. The safeTALK workshop had an estimated attendance of 73.0%. The Digital Literacy classes had an estimated attendance rate of 61.6%. The Oral Health workshop had an estimated percentage attendance of 62.1%. The CPR workshop had an estimated percentage attendance of 76.2%. The Cancer awareness workshop had an estimated percentage attendance of 73.45. Overall mean percentage attendance rates for the 10-week programme were estimated at 72.46%.



"The key learning I gained from Sheds for life is people. About people. How they interact together. The perception out there is that men don't talk. They do. My experience is that I've talked to a few people and even on a one-toone somebody will start talking about something they have a problem with. People will talk. Men will talk. In the right environment." - Nigel Sheds for Life Participant



# **5.0 Discussion**

The purpose of this element of the SFL evaluation was to understand the impact the SFL model had on the health and wellbeing outcomes of the men who engaged with it with a view to; examining the effectiveness of SFL and strengthening future implementation of SFL to encourage sustainability and scalability. Questionnaires administered to participants (n=421) over the course of 12 months (T1 to T4) capturing a range of health and wellbeing outcomes form the basis of these findings. The strong theoretical underpinnings of this implementation study, coupled with the longitudinal data captured, provides valuable, key insights into the health and wellbeing of SFL participants and the potential impact SFL has had upon them. The findings suggest there is a unique and strong potential for SFL to engage and contribute to enhanced wellbeing outcomes among "hard to reach" groups of men (Bergin and Richardson, 2020).

# Profile of the participants in the Sheds for Life intervention

The Men's Shed members who participated in SFL were spread across four counties (Waterford, Kildare, Limerick and Louth) representing a total of 421 men who originally signed up to participate in both the SFL programme and evaluation. There was a relatively even representation of urban and rural Sheds that chose to participate in SFL. It is noteworthy that almost all (99.3%) of the participants of SFL categorised themselves as "White" or "White Irish". However the mean age of participants was 69 years and the aging population of Ireland does not have a large representation of different ethnicities with ethnic diversity generally found in younger generations in Ireland. For instance in latest CSO data, males who classified themselves of African descent over the age of 65 made up 0.1% of the population (CSO, 2016). The majority (80.4%) of SFL participants were also retired men and this is reflective of the cohort of men in Ireland and beyond who generally attend the Sheds. The Sheds are spaces that are open to all men of age or background but can particularly appeal to men of retirement age for a multitude of reasons. Men, prior to retirement are more likely to be occupied with employment, raising families, sports and other activities and the Sheds maybe therefore more appealing to those who are retired for the social support, sense of purpose, continued learning and navigation through difficult life transitions such as retirement (Nurmi et al., 2018; Carragher & Golding, 2015). It has been noted however that diversity in terms of



age and ethnicity offer opportunities for richer learning experiences and care should be taken in how Men's Sheds are branded in order to create spaces for new and diverse members and prevent Shed members feeling stigmatised or labelled (Nurmi et al., 2018). A Quarter (24.9%) of participants reported completing some or part primary education only with over half (52.1%) completing some or part of a secondary education, with the remainder going on to participate in some form of third level education. It is largely understood that lower educational attainment is a predictor of poorer health engagement and outcomes as well as overall quality of life (Zajacova & Lawerence, 2018; Chen & Hu, 2018) and it is beneficial that SFL could engage a cohort of men across the educational strata to promote positive health outcomes. Men are more at risk of poorer health outcomes and co-morbidities due to lifestyle and other risk factors, particularly in the area of cardiovascular related diseases and primary prevention strategies, such as adoption of healthy lifestyle behaviours and use of proven treatments, are more frequent in women than men (Walli-Attaei et al., 2020). There is a need to engage men with health and wellbeing due to this increased risk and average baseline health screening results of participants suggest that this cohort of men fall into an at risk group in terms of their health parameters alongside the percentage of those with family history of heart disease (52.9%), stroke (21.3%) and diabetes (28.0%) with mean blood pressure (140/81) approaching hypertensive levels, mean total cholesterol (4.2 mmol/l) on the higher end of normal parameters along with total glucose (6.217 mmol/l), mean waist circumference (41.6 inches) over the recommended healthy waist measurement of 37 inches and average BMI (29.9) falling into the higher end of the overweight category and approaching obesity levels. The characteristics of the SFL participants suggest that a large representation fall into an at risk group in some capacity and would therefore be indicative that SFL has successfully reached its target group of men.

## **Self-Rated Health**

The use of the single-item self-rated health measure is recognised as a reliable way of measuring health despite potential discrepancies in one's internal view of their health misaligning with medical diagnoses (Cislaghi & Cisliaghi, 2019). Research has however demonstrated that self-rated health is largely consistent with objective health status (Wu et al., 2013). The significant increase in positive self-rated health ratings from baseline (T1) to post SFL (T2) suggests that the SFL intervention had a positive impact on objective and subjective feelings of wellbeing. This was particularly true of Cohort one who maintained higher levels of self-rated health post baseline up to 12 months (T4). Cohort two also experienced a significant increase in self-rated health post SFL but actively experiencing COVID-19 restrictions during



T3 and T4 may have influenced self-rated health thereafter (McGrath, Murphy & Richardson, 2020).

# Seeking health information

Research indicates that men can have a low propensity to find out information about their health (White et al., 2011). Male disinclination towards seeking information about their health is an extension of their help-seeking behaviour which can often be delayed and is influenced by cultural masculinity norms such as; aversion to emotional expression or expressing concerns about health, embarrassment, anxiety and fear and poor communication with health-care professionals (Osasumwen Olanrewaju et al., 2019; Yusaf, Grunfeld & Hunter, 2013). The significant and sustained increase in those reporting they like find out about their health post

the SFL intervention is a positive indication that the gendersensitive approaches implemented by SFL such as the informal, non-clinical, safe environment conducive were potentially towards mitigating against past poor experiences related to information and help seeking, perhaps encouraging positive and proactive movements to actively seek information about health. Male patients are also more likely to



default on follow up appointments than female patients with females more likely to visit their GP in response to health concerns than men (Thompson et al., 2016). Of the participants advised to visit their GP at their baseline health check, 41.7% reported following up with their GP which considering the cohort of potentially HTR men, is a positive response towards health engagement and the health checks are a positive contender in promoting engagement with health and addressing health concerns.



# **Physical Activity**

The Irish Longitudinal Study on Ageing (TILDA) found that 42% of men over 50 years reach the recommended PA guidelines (Donoghue, O'Connell and Kenny, 2016). Only 31.2% of SFL participants were reported to meet the PA guidelines at baseline. It is therefore feasible to



suggest that SFL succeeded in reaching its target population of inactive men with 68.8% not achieving 30 minutes or more PA on at least five days per week. The number of participants meeting the PA guidelines significantly increased post the SFL intervention, and

similarly to other research engaging men in PA interventions, the mean days PA for 30 minutes or more remained significantly higher post baseline up to 12 months (Kelly et al., 2019). While there was no significant increase in minutes walking with the mean already above 30 minutes per walking session, the sustained increase in number of days walking post baseline suggests that the SFL intervention was successful in the promotion of walking. While days active and

days walking remained significantly higher post baseline up to 12 months, there was a slight decline at the 12 month point suggesting that a follow up to encourage sustained change may be beneficial to participants. As research highlights that physical activity self-



efficacy is a stronger predictor of sustained engagement with physical activity compared to self-rated physical activity, as well as being strongly and independently associated with cardiovascular events in men (Bergström, Börjesson, & Schmidt, 2015), it is a positive outcome that physical activity self-efficacy scores significantly increased from baseline up to



12 months post SFL alongside participants reporting high levels of confidence in maintaining their exercise routine at all-time points.

# **Subjective Wellbeing**

Subjective well-being reflects an overall evaluation of the quality of a person's life from their own perspective and measures that capture subjective wellbeing are valuable as subjective evaluations of quality of life reflect idiosyncratic reactions to objective life circumstances in ways that alternative measurement approaches cannot (Diener, Lucas & Oishi, 2018). Life satisfaction measures how people evaluate their lives generally rather than current feelings (OECD, 2013). Research indicates that men tend to report lower life satisfaction scores compared to women, but that life satisfaction increases for men in later years (Joshanloo & Jovanovic, 2019). The life satisfaction of SFL participants at baseline (7.94) was slighter higher than ratings for adults over fifty years in Ireland of 7.56 (OECD, 2020). Life satisfaction continued to increase significantly and remained higher than baseline up to 12 months in Cohort one. This is a positive finding suggesting the benefits of SFL may have increased life satisfaction for SFL participants. The baseline scores may also be related to the inherent health promoting qualities of the Shed as previous work also highlights that Shedders are motivated to participate in their Shed by a need for peer support and meaningful engagement, with 97% of men reporting enhancements in their wellbeing simply by having their shed to attend (Carragher & Golding, 2015). This hypothesis that the Sheds enhance life satisfaction for Shedders is further corroborated by the decline in life satisfaction in the cohort experiencing the loss of their shed due to COVID-19 at T3 and T4 follow up (McGrath, Murphy & Richardson, 2020). The sense that one is living a worthwhile and meaningful life is fundamental to subjective-wellbeing (Steptoe & Fancourt, 2018). Similarly to life satisfaction, there was a significant increase in the extent shed members felt the things they do in life are worthwhile post SFL. This was sustained in Cohort 1 and decreased in Cohort 2 during T3 and T4 perhaps due to COVID impact but overall remained higher than baseline. The increase in scores is suggestive that SFL was positive in enriching the sense of meaning and variety of worthwhile activities within the Shed environment. Worthwhile ratings are correlated to time spent in social activities and predict positive changes in health and behavioural outcomes (Steptoe & Fancourt, 2018). The social opportunities offered by the Shed and the SFL programme may have been conducive to increasing feelings of life being worthwhile, with worthwhile activities on offer within the sheds and SFL programme promoting healthy aging and encouraging the sustenance of meaningful social relationships (Steptoe & Fancourt, 2018)



# Mental Wellbeing

Similarly to previous research engaging hard-to-reach men at community level (Kelly et al., 2019; Wyke et al., 2015), the SFL intervention achieved a positive mental health effect with significant increases in SWEMEBS scores that are considered clinically meaningful and maintained them up to 12 months post baseline (Stewart-Brown, 2008) .The significant increase in mental wellbeing scores highlights the potential of SFL to enhance the mental wellbeing of SFL participants through direct and indirect elements such as the enhanced sense of social support, physical activity and social engagement opportunities and the mental health workshop. The slight decline in scores for Cohort two may have been a consequence of COVID-19 but scores remained higher than baseline and may suggest that some effect from the SFL intervention was maintained. It is widely recognised that men can struggle with engaging with conversations around mental health which can be exacerbated by gendered behaviours relating to masculinity (King et al, 2020). Research highlights however, that when men are familiar with problem-solving strategies to maintain their mental health they are open to using them but barriers towards identifying and engaging with professional health services exist which are often compounded by health literacy issues (Proudfoot et al., 2015; Milner, Shields & King, 2019). The significant and sustained improvement in participants' certainty; about how to maintain their personal mental health, around having a conversation about their mental health and feeling equipped with supports to maintain and enhance their mental health demonstrates the strength of the SFL intervention in encouraging positive mental health behaviours for men.

# Loneliness

As the Shed environment is recognised as a setting which promotes social support and thus combats against subjective feelings of isolation and loneliness (Moylan et al., 2015) it was anticipated that participants of SFL would have already potentially benefited from the



social support offered in the Sheds which would be reflected in loneliness scores. This view was supported by the significant reduction in loneliness scores reported at baseline (T1)



compared to before SFL participants had joined their shed. SFL in fact did not have a significant impact on loneliness scores rather the social support already inherent in the Shed helped to facilitate elements of SFL. The scores in both cohorts remained statistically similar and significantly lower up to T3, highlighting the importance of the Shed to protect against feelings of loneliness. This is further underlined by the stark increase in loneliness scores in Cohort 2 at T3 and T4 when they were actively experiencing COVID-19 and at the loss of their shed as a social and emotional outlet (McGrath, Murphy & Richardson, 2020). These findings suggest that Sheds are protective against loneliness, and the loss of the Shed during COVID-19 as well as other meaningful social interactions are correlated with the increased feelings of loneliness. This highlights the need for and the value of tailored interventions such as SFL to ameliorate the impact of loneliness among the vulnerable cohort of men within Sheds.

# **Social Capital**

Research implies that older men who are more vulnerable, such as those who live alone, are at risk of depressive symptoms due to lower levels of sense of belonging (McLaren, 2018). The significant increase in those who felt like they belonged to their Shed post SFL highlights the potential of the SFL intervention to build upon and enhance the social support previously mentioned and further strengthen the Sheds environment so that more members feel like they belong to their Shed, offering them a sense of purpose and social capital which is supportive

of positive wellbeing. Research also discusses the relationship between social capital and wellbeing as well as its influence on health behaviours. such as physical activity, and engagement with health (Ueshima et al., 2010;



Emmering et al., 2018). Social capital is strengthened by networks among individuals such as those within the Shed, alongside norms of reciprocity and trust between them (Emmering et al., 2018). Alongside the significant improvement in belongingness, SFL participants also experienced a significant enhancement in feelings of close support and general trust, suggesting that SFL had a positive impact on social capital which may have also encouraged engagement with other positive health behaviours and practices within SFL.



# **Cost Analysis**

Evaluating implementation costs is valuable to determine cost-effectiveness of the SFL intervention to justify resources as well as allocate them accordingly. Brazier et al., (2002)

developed the SF-36 to perform economic evaluations of health interventions. The SF-6D is a shortened, less model complex for application in broader evaluations measuring six dimensions of health with the potential to define up to 18,000 states of health. Similarly to the Men on the Move programme



assessment, cost-effectiveness of SFL will be determined by comparing the costs (direct and indirect) of the programme to its benefits, which are captured as the impact on quality-adjusted life-years (QALYs) using the SF-6D.The assessment of the cost effectiveness of the SFL intervention will be an important determinant in scalability of SFL. Preliminary assessment of the SF-6D constructs using inferential tests so far has demonstrated a significant and sustained improvement in physical functioning, role limitation, mental health and vitality. Furthermore, results have highlighted a significant gain in quality adjusted life years (QALYS). Analysis of costs have also demonstrated that SFL has delivered a cost per QALY ratio which is very cost effective when compared to generally accepted thresholds in Ireland the UK. Alongside these findings, and the noted wider improvement in health outcomes post SFL, the demonstration of the Men on the Move programme's cost-effectiveness (Kelly et al., 2020), a similar community model to SFL, supports the hypothesis that SFL is a cost-effective model which is good value for money particularly considering its reach in accessing a typically HTR group.



# **Smoking and Alcohol**

Smoking remains a major public health issue worldwide with a general trend of smoking prevalence being higher among men (Kodriati, Pursell & Hayati, 2019). However, reductions in smoking prevalence among men have been noted in high-income countries and it is positive to note that a small proportion (8.4%) of SFL participants were reported to smoke at baseline with those who did smoke decreasing the amount smoked per day post SFL. This suggests that SFL may have had a modest positive impact on smoking behaviours. Based on the recent reduction of men who smoke in the Irish population to 19% (Health Service Executive, 2019), the modifications in the external environment such as increasing taxes, restricted marketing and smoking-bans are likely to have been a factor in encouraging a percentage of SFL participants (41.8%) quitting tobacco use.

Overall alcohol consumption and frequency of binge drinking is higher in men than in women with up to 54% of Irish men classified as heavy episodic drinkers (Health Service Executive, 2017; Manthey et al., 2019). Results of SFL suggest that 68.3% of participants consumed alcohol which is less than the national figures for adult males of 79% (Department of Health, 2017). The lower rates of alcohol usage and consumption may be due to the age profile of the SFL participants but nonetheless a positive one with the SFL intervention potentially having a positive effect on alcohol consumption highlighted in the reduction in days drinking and units consumed post SFL. COVID restrictions may also have had an influence on alcohol behaviours (McGrath, Murphy & Richardson, 2020) and while units of alcohol consumed did increase at 12 months, albeit not significantly higher than baseline, it may warrant targeted intervention on alcohol behaviours in SFL to sustain positive change.



# **Dietary Habits and Cooking Skills**

Alongside active living, healthy eating is a key priority of the Healthy Ireland Men's action plan with many diseases related to the excess burden of ill health in men being preventable and increased morbidity and mortality rates linked to life-style based determinants such as eating behaviours (Health Service Executive, 2017). Men are more vulnerable to poor nutrition due to a variety of social determinants such as food shopping, preparation and cooking traditionally organised by women, with advertising, health literacy and health promotion messages related

to healthy eating targeted towards, and subsequently

engaging, more women. This is particularly the case for more vulnerable men such as those who are older, live alone, or have lower



educational attainment (Taylor et al., 2013; Stephens et al., 2018). Similar to the HATRICK approach which uses informal environments and social engagement opportunities to deliver messages around healthy eating, while also appealing to practical elements of cooking for men (Capperchione et al., 2017), SFL has demonstrated a positive and sustained change in attitudes towards cooking such as willingness to cook and confidence related to constructs around food shopping and preparation as well as increased confidence in healthier cooking methods. The positive outcomes post SFL in relation to healthy eating and cooking behaviours suggest that the Healthy Food Made Easy programme within SFL has been successful in engaging men with messages around healthy eating behaviours and encouraging positive and lasting changes.



# Supplementary components

#### **Diabetes Awareness**

Both biological and psychosocial factors are responsible for sex and gender differences in diabetes risk and outcomes with men suffering an excess burden of diabetes morbidity (Kautzky, Harreiter & Pacini, 2016). Research demonstrates that targeted training on diabetes can lead to health benefits alongside motivational nutrition and physical activity programmes

with the latter being factors in the prevention of type 2 diabetes (Onofrio et al., 2018). The improvement in 6 out of 7 measured constructs relating diabetes to alongside the awareness, nutritional and physical activity components of SFL suggests that SFL has a



positive impact on diabetes awareness and risk. Moreover, the fact that 100% of respondents either "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that the diabetes component successfully improved their understanding of diabetes prevention, suggests that the workshop was successful in meeting its core objective and was also successful in engaging SFL participants.

## safeTALK- Suicide prevention and awareness

Suicide rates are predominantly higher in men and largely influenced by gender and masculinity roles, with suicide being a preventable and avoidable mortality risk that needs a gendered approach in its prevention (O'Donnell & Richardson, 2018; King et al., 2020). The safeTALK training has been noted to improve participants' self-assessed abilities to recognise when someone has thoughts of suicide and take appropriate steps in connecting them to safety (Kaplan, 2018). The fact that men have a reticence at times around discussing mental health and suicide often fuelled by a lack of understanding about how to broach these sensitive subjects, makes this element of SFL a particularly valuable asset to SFL participants. The safeTALK intervention coupled with the gendered approach of providing homogeneity and safety in the shed, appear as demonstrated in the results, to have been effective in improving confidence in dealing with others who may be suicidal as a well as identifying appropriate



services and increasing confidence talking about suicide. These findings are extremely positive considering the breadth of literature that highlights men's difficulties in engaging with sensitive health topics (Yousaf, Grunfeld & Hunter, 2013). There was no significant change in willingness to talk openly and directly to a person about suicide, rather confidence to do so improved and this may be due to the fact that that Sheds organically promote an environment of openness and social support (Bergin & Richardson, 2020).

## **Digital Literacy**

Digital Literacy was added as a supplementary component to Sheds for Life in partnership with Age Action for the men who may identify themselves as requiring it. The component covers basic digital skills to help participants get online and was recognised as a valuable element to the programme responding to the growing digital divide that leaves those who do not have the capacity to get online, due to skills or resource at further risk of isolation and

exclusion. Research indicates that only 49% of people aged 50 or over in the EU use the internet and age has ล differentiating effect with the likelihood of internet usage decreasing by 8% per year of age leading to



considerable inequalities in those of 65-90 years (Seifert, Hofer & Rossel, 2019; Friemel, 2014). Activities of everyday are becoming increasingly digitised and it is therefore positive that those who participated in the digital literacy component of SFL experienced significant improvements in all measured constructs pertaining to basic internet usage skills such as accessing a website, sending an email and accessing online banking. There has been an exponential increase in the use of the digital forum in everyday life during COVID-19 which has left those unable to get online at further risk of exclusion and social isolation. Prior to COVID-19 9 out of the 22 sheds participating in SFL opted for the digital literacy training. It may be more pertinent now in the wake of COVID-19 for more sheds to avail of this training considering the increasing reliance on digital platforms in today's society. SFL may also need



to respond to the needs of Shed members by considering the broader social determinants beyond skills training that exacerbate the digital divide such as lack of affordability, accessibility, willingness and fear of the unknown (Seifert, Cotton, & Xie, 2020).

### **Oral Health**

Oral diseases are a major global public health problem affecting over 3.5 billion people (Watt et al., 2019). Moreover, there has been increasing evidence that health starts from the mouth, with poorer oral health causing multi-organ systemic implications ranging from insulin resistance, cardiovascular disease, cancers and neurodegenerative pathologies (Fiorollo, 2019). Despite this knowledge, of the greater systemic impact of oral health, there appears to be lack of recognition or awareness of this link among health providers and the general population (Kane, 2017). In high-income countries, current treatment-dominated specialised

approaches have been criticised for not addressing inequalities in oral health highlighting the urgent need for more proactive responses to prevent pathologies that impact population health (Watt et al., 2019).



The Oral Health component of SFL appeared to have a positive impact on participant's knowledge and awareness reflected in the results, particularly around the willingness and understanding of the importance of annual oral health checks. However, there was a lower uptake of this component with n=2 Sheds participating, perhaps reflecting the wider lack of awareness about the importance of oral health for overall wellbeing. Research also highlights how socioeconomic status is linked with oral pathologies such as oral cancer, dental caries, tooth loss and traumatic dental injuries (Singh, Peres & Watt, 2019). SFL may therefore benefit from further highlighting the importance of this component to improve uptake, particularly in the case of more at risk cohorts within the Sheds.



## **Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation Training**

The CPR component of SFL was agreed upon collaboratively with stakeholders as a valuable component to SFL in response to evidence of the high rates of out-of-hospital cardiac arrest morality and the need for increased rates of lay population training, where only an estimated 25% of victims currently receive CPR (Villalobos et al., 2019). Moreover, with the knowledge that ; 70-85% of cardiac arrests occur at home; victims of cardiac arrest have better survival outcomes and quality of life when they receive CPR by a trained bystander; the age demographic of those in the Sheds and their partner's likely being of increased risk of a cardiovascular event (Villalobos et al., 2019), CPR training was identified as an empowering and efficacy-building element of SFL that appealed to participants through their desire to protect those close to them. In addition, SFL recognised that Shed members enjoy hands-on learning opportunities, particularly those that are practical and skills-based that add value to the lives and experiences of men beyond work (Carragher & Golding, 2015). The CPR component was therefore pre-empted to be a popular component of SFL and an additional engagement hook for the wider programme. As perceived, the CPR component proved to have popular uptake with 18 out of 22 Sheds participating. Moreover, there was significant and sustained improved in constructs around recognising cardiac events, performing chest compressions and using AEDs, suggesting that the CPR element of SFL was successful in enhancing the efficacy and confidence of participants.

#### **Cancer Awareness**

Considering that as many as 1 in 2 people receive cancer diagnoses in their lifetime, the relevance of a cancer awareness component to SFL or any health promotion intervention requires little explanation. However, there is an excess burden of cancer-related risk and mortality for men which requires gender-specific response. A report by Drummond et al. (2017) also highlights that men are more passive recipients of information on cancer and there exists a multitude of barriers to information seeking and engagement by men in relation to male-specific cancers such as; information overload, social norms and beliefs, literacy levels, lack of awareness of screening opportunities, lack of trust, limited access and financial barriers. Utilising social networks and ease of access to information however were noted facilitators. The context in which men receive information is highlighted as being as important as the format of the information with small groups where men gather notably conducive to active engagement with cancer awareness information. The environment of the Shed was therefore identified by stakeholders as an important setting to promote cancer awareness and screening



messages and the workshop appears to have been effective in enhancing knowledge relating to cancer awareness evident in the reported increases in understanding of; cancer-related early detection signs, cancers most prevalent in men and cancer screening services.

# **Reach of Sheds for Life**

Sheds for Life sought to engage a cohort of men's shed members with those considered "hardto-reach" a key consideration. Considering the baseline objective health measures and demographical characteristics of the cohort of SFL participants it would appear that within the cohort of participants SFL was effective in engaging at risk groups of men. This is a similar finding to the Men on the Move programme which was successful in engaging a group of men where the majority were inactive, overweight or obese with multiple cardiovascular disease risk factors (Kelly et al., 2018). Findings from Kelly et al. (2018) also highlighted the need for more targeted approaches that engage "hard-to-reach" groups of men. While the SFL recruitment was similar to Kelly et al. (2018) in that participants were predominately white (99.3%) and cohabiting (73.4%), SFL did reach a cohort of men who were older (69.1  $\pm$  9.136 years), where less than an quarter (23%) attended third level education with a minority (11.8%) in active employment. Alongside this, the cohort of SFL participants fit the criteria of "at-risk" in terms of health with the majority being overweight or obese with an average BMI of 29.9, higher than recommended waist circumference with a mean of 41.6 inches, not eating the recommended five portions of fruit and vegetables per day with a mean of 3.36 portions, blood pressure levels (mean 140/81) in the at-risk category, and the majority (68.5%) not meeting the physical activity guidelines. These findings suggest that SFL was effective in targeting a more harder to reach group and while there is a need to reach more diverse groups in terms of ethnicity and age, this cohort are reflective of the demographic in the Sheds and as previously mentioned also reflect the lower prevalence of diverse ethnicity in Ireland generally in older populations. It is also worth noting that the diverse background of the men in relation to their socioeconomic status, educational attainment and living situation was also conducive towards enriching the learning and engagement of participants particularly for more at-risk men within the implementation environment. The overall estimated representativeness of those who were eligible (n=565) to participate versus those who enrolled at baseline (n=421)of 73% is positive considering the cohort of HTR men and highlights the effectiveness of the engagement process employed in SFL. The overall mean attendance was similar at 72.46% and also a positive finding suggesting that similar to Kelly et al. (2018) SFL demonstrates that gender-specific programmes can effectively engage at risk men in health interventions.



# **6.0 Conclusion**

# 6.1 Limitations

As with every study, limitations exist, notably the subjective nature of the data and the inherent bias in the self-report format as well as inconsistencies in follow-up points. There may also have been an element of participant bias where rapport with the researcher may have influenced participant responses. However, it is worth noting that constructs of wellbeing and perceived health status are subjective in their own right and the evaluation is pragmatic in its approach, capturing insights from Shedders in the real world context of a typically close-knit setting. Due to social restrictions during COVID-19, 6 and 12 month follow ups for Cohort two were also moved from being conducted in person to phone administered. However, every effort was made to communicate questions and responses clearly and ensure participants responded independently. Moreover, Shedders would have completed the questionnaire on at least two previous occasions meaning that they were familiar with the researchers, process and format. Finally, the impact of COVID-19 during follow up influenced the trajectory of participant wellbeing outcomes in Cohort 2 meaning it was necessary, in the case of relevant outcomes, to analyse the two cohorts separately reducing sample size in some instances. However the assessment of these outcomes during COVID-19 has provided valuable insights into the impact of COVID-19 on the wellbeing outcomes of SFL participants (McGrath, Murphy & Richardson, 2020).

## 6.2 Conclusion

Phase one implementation has demonstrated that SFL is an effective model that engages Men's Shed members with health and wellbeing and encourages positive and sustained change in terms of health and wellbeing outcomes. It has highlighted the conducive environment of the Sheds as settings in which to activate gender-specific approaches built upon the organic health promotion qualities of the Shed, that effectively engage men in a safe, familiar and informal way while providing opportunities for structured health and wellbeing initiatives through this inclusive, community-based approach. The collaborative partnership approach enriches the depth and quality offered within SFL adding credibility to the intervention which also enhances engagement among participants. The sustained effect



across implementation environments highlights the capability of the SFL approach to be transferrable across multiple and variable Shed settings. It is important that SFL remains true to its ethos as it evolves over time to respect the environment of the Sheds and continually respond to needs of Shed members. The wider evaluation will aim to protect the integrity of SFL in its wider roll-out by assessing implementation outcomes and adapting SFL in collaboration with key stakeholders while ensuring fidelity to uphold and strengthen impact. As SFL progresses it is also important to refresh its elements and revisit past participants to encourage sustained impact and maintenance of positive behaviour change. The SFL programme has highlighted the potential that tailored and targeted men's health interventions have for addressing gender inequalities in health and can inform health promotion strategies in Sheds as well as other community-based settings that engage men with health.

## 6.3 Recommendations

The following recommendations have emerged in response to the research findings of phase one implementation of SFL. They also consider the future trajectory of SFL informed by the broader evaluation and consider key stakeholders across the implementation environment; individual, partner, organisation and systems level. (i) Individual level- continue to implement SFL to engage more at risk men with health and promote change in attitudes, beliefs and behaviours that enhance the physical, mental and social health of men; (ii) Partner Level-Continue to evolve and strengthen the partnership approach that adds credibility and enriches SFL while also enhancing potential for sustainability and scale up; (iii) Organisation Level – The IMSA to continue to be ambassadors for SFL while communicating with local resources to implement SFL at local level; (iv) Systems level- Use key insights from SFL to lobby funding for its sustainability and inform policy for community-based men's health approaches more broadly.

## R1: Respond to the evolving needs of Shed Members

A central tenet to the SFL programme is its goal to respond directly to the needs of the Shed members and men more broadly. In order to enhance acceptability and adherence to SFL participants should feel catered for and also feel that their input matters. Moreover, as society evolves and responds to the changing social climate, it is important that SFL follows suit. COVID-19 in particular has highlighted how the needs of populations can change over time and the importance of responding to those needs. A key recommendation for the SFL programme is to continually monitor the broader implementation environment and perform



needs assessments with the Shed members to ensure that SFL is meeting their needs in relation to health and wellbeing.

# R2: Make provision for follow-on supports post SFL

Once SFL establishes itself and becomes embedded into the routine environment of the Sheds and wider implementation environment, it is important for the programme to develop the capability to revisit past participants to encourage maintenance of positive behaviours. For this to happen it will be necessary to adapt and refresh SFL's content in order to deliver a follow-on or step down approach for participants who have completed the ten-week programme. This will not only encourage individual maintenance but will help SFL to become a routine and stable element to the Sheds environment.

# R3: Ensure that engagement is based on informed choices

The ethos of SFL is to promote positive health and well-being in a way that respects the autonomy of Shed members and enriches, not undermines, the environment of the Sheds. The optional components of SFL give participants a sense of autonomy and control over their choices which is an important recruitment facilitator. It is also important when self-selecting into components of SFL that Shed members recognise the value of these components and how they may enhance their wellbeing. It is necessary therefore to balance the sense of autonomy for Shed members with evidence of the importance of SFL components to prevent what may be an important addition to certain Sheds being overlooked by promoting informed decision making.

# R4: Maintain and strengthen partnerships

The partnership approach between the IMSA and organisations who deliver SFL has increased the strength, sustainability and acceptability of the programme. These partnerships which were fostered over time recognise the need to address gender inequalities in health, and the need to reach and engage this cohort of men in a way that it is gender-sensitive and respects the Sheds environment. This approach enhances the capacity of SFL to deliver through a greater pool of resources and expertise across the implementation climate. It is vital to the success of SFL that these partnerships are respected and maintained while also seeking out new alliances that recognise the value of SFL, have similar values and vision and that can respond to the needs of Shed members through the gender-specific strategies of SFL.

![](_page_106_Picture_0.jpeg)

## R5: Maintain a collaborative approach with Shed members

The collaborative nature of SFL facilitates sharing of key insights that inform facilitators and barriers to implementation of SFL. Working collaboratively at partner level ensures transparency and open communication which encourages adoption of SFL at partner level. Collaboration at individual level with Men's Shed members, fosters a sense of reciprocity that enhances acceptability of SFL while also ensuring that SFL is an appropriate model in terms of its content and delivery that effectively responds to the needs of participants. Collaboration at individual level also informs the identification of leaders or health champions within the Sheds who are instrumental in communicating messages about SFL and encouraging engagement and participation at ground level.

## R6: Assess for Cost-effectiveness

SFL has demonstrated that it is a model which has positive and sustained effect on health and wellbeing outcomes of participants. Preliminary evidence also suggests that it is demonstrating value for money by being one of few successful interventions that engage HTR men and by improving health outcomes that will determine quality adjusted life years. In order to clearly demonstrate that SFL is cost saving to decision makers who may support SFL, it is important to disseminate findings from the cost analysis of SFL.

## R7: Inform implementation outcomes for scale-up

The broader evaluation's hybrid approach towards assessing implementation and effectiveness outcomes aims to blend these two lines of research to encourage more rapid translational gains into the real-world and variable settings of the Sheds and encourage more effective implementation. The current SFL model has demonstrated effect and implementation outcomes critically need to be informed to understand the method of implementation that incurred effect in order to strengthen this approach as well maintain fidelity to the implementation strategy to ensure integrity of SFL is maintained during wider implementation. Assessing the variable contextual factors of the implementation setting may mean adaptations to the SFL model may be necessary but it is critical that outcomes are informed to maintain fidelity to SFL's core objectives while adapting to suit the local context. It is important that methods to measure these outcomes are accurate and consistent to produce a high quality evaluation that informs decision making going forward. The implementation science approach

![](_page_107_Picture_0.jpeg)

will identify barriers and facilitators towards effective implementation in an iterative process and provide clear differentiation of implementation outcomes from clinical outcomes which form a blueprint to scale-up SFL ensuring that effect is maintained at scale.

# R8: Disseminate SFL findings to key stakeholders

Dissemination of SFL research findings which highlight the success of a gender-specific community based men's health programme that also provides a blueprint for practical application will be a valuable addition to other researchers, practitioners and the wider community. SFL research findings will have a key role to play in the sustainability of SFL but will also help to inform men's health programmes more broadly. These findings will also have practical applications that can help to inform men's health policy and tackle the excess burden of ill-health and mortality for men. Widely disseminating the research findings of SFL will also be instrumental in lobbying support of funders to ensure its sustainability and wider-roll out.

Funding Statement: This work was supported by the Irish Research Council [Project ID EBPPG/2018/256]


## 7.0 References

Baker, P. (2015) Review of the National Men's Health Policy and Action Plan 2008-2013: Final Report for the Health Service Executive

Baker, P. (2016). Men's health: a global problem requiring global solutions. *Trends In Urology & Men's Health*, *7*(3), 11-14.

Baker, P. (2018). Men's health: time for a new approach. *Physical Therapy Reviews, 23*(2), 144-150. doi:10.1080/10833196.2018.1452562

Baker, P. (2020). From the Margins to the Mainstream: Advocating the inclusion of men's health in policy. A SCOPING STUDY. Retrieved from https://gamh.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/From-the-Margins-to-The-Mainstream-Report.pdf

Baker, P., White, A., & Morgan, R. (2020). Men's health: COVID-19 pandemic highlights need for overdue policy action. *The Lancet, 395*(10241), 1886-1888. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31303-9

Barton, K., Wrieden, W. & Anderson, A., 2011. Validity and reliability of a short questionnaire for assessing the impact of cooking skills interventions. *Journal of Human Nutrition and Dietetics*, 24(6), pp.588-595.

Bauer, M., Damschroder, L., Hagedorn, H., Smith, J. & Kilbourne, A., (2015). An introduction to implementation science for the non-specialist. *BMC Psychology*, 3(1).

Bergin, M. and Richardson, N. (2020) 'Sheds for Life': getting the balance right in delivering health promotion through Sheds in Ireland. Health Promotion International, daaa082.

Bergström, G., Börjesson, M., & Schmidt, C. (2015). Self-efficacy regarding physical activity is superior to self-assessed activity level, in long-term prediction of cardiovascular events in middle-aged men. *BMC Public Health*, *15*(1). doi: 10.1186/s12889-015-2140-4

Brazier, J., Roberts, J., & Deverill, M. (2002). The estimation of a preference-based measure of health from the SF-36. *Journal Of Health Economics*, *21*(2), 271-292. doi: 10.1016/s0167-6296(01)00130-8

Caperchione, C.M., Bottorff, J.L., Oliffe, J.L., Johnson, S.T., Hunt, K., Sharp, P., Fitzpatrick, K.M., Price, R., & Goldenberg, S.L. (2017). The HAT TRICK programme for improving physical activity, healthy eating and connectedness among overweight, inactive men: study protocol of a pragmatic feasibility trial. *BMJ Open 6*(7), e016940.

Carragher, L., & Golding, B. (2015). Older Men as Learners. *Adult Education Quarterly*, *65*(2), 152-168. doi: 10.1177/0741713615570894

Carragher, L., & Golding, B. (2015). Older Men as Learners: Irish Men's Sheds as an Intervention. *Adult Education Quarterly, 65*(2), 152-168. doi:10.1177/0741713615570894



Carroll, P., Kirwan, L., & Lambe, B. (2014). Engaging 'hard to reach' men in communitybased health promotions. *International Journal Of Health Promotion And Education*, *52*(3), 120-130.

Carson, C. (2020). Why men's health? Postgraduate Medicine, 132(sup4), 1-3. doi:10.1080/00325481.2020.1805867

Central Statistics Office. (2016) *Census of Population 2016 - Profile 2 Population Distribution and Movements*. https://www.cso.ie/en/releasesandpublications/ep/p-cp2tc/cp2pdm/pd/ (last accessed 20 July 2020).

Central Statistics Office. (2016). *Census of Population 2016- Profile 8 Irish Travellers, Ethnicity and Religion*. https://www.cso.ie/en/releasesandpublications/ep/p-cp8iter/p8ier/p8e/ (last accessed 25 November 2020)

Central Statistics Office. (2019) *Urban and Rural Life in Ireland, 2019*. https://www.cso.ie/en/releasesandpublications/ep/p-urli/urbanandrurallifeinireland2019 (last accessed 6 August 2020).

Chen, H., & Hu, H. (2018). The relationship and mechanism between education and functional health status transition among older persons in China. *BMC geriatrics*, *18*(1), 89. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-018-0785-4

Cislaghi, B., & Cislaghi, C. (2019). Self-rated health as a valid indicator for health-equity analyses: evidence from the Italian health interview survey. *BMC Public Health*, *19*(1). doi: 10.1186/s12889-019-6839-5

Connell, R. (2012). Gender, health and theory: Conceptualizing the issue, in local and world perspective. *Social Science & Medicine, 74*(11), 1675-1683. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.06.006

Culph, J., Wilson, N., Cordier, R., & Stancliffe, R. (2015). Men's Sheds and the experience of depression in older Australian men. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal*, *62*(5), 306-315.

Curran, G., Bauer, M., Mittman, B., Pyne, J., & Stetler, C. (2012) Effectivenessimplementation hybrid designs. Medical Care, 50, 217–226.

Curran, K., Drust, B., Murphy, R., Pringle, A., & Richardson, D. (2016). The challenge and impact of engaging hard-to-reach populations in regular physical activity and health behaviours: an examination of an English Premier League 'Football in the Community' men's health programme. *Public Health*, *135*, 14-22. doi:10.1016/j.puhe.2016.02.008

Damschroder, L., Aron, D., Keith, R., Kirsh, S., Alexander, J., & Lowery, J. (2009) Fostering implementation of health services research findings into practice: a consolidated framework for advancing implementation science. Implementation Science, 4.,50.

Department of Health (2016). National Men's Health Action Plan: Healthy Ireland – Men HI-M 2017-2021. Working with men in Ireland to achieve optimum health and wellbeing

Department of Health (2019). Health in Ireland: Key Trends 2019. Government of Ireland. Retrieved from: https://www.drugsandalcohol.ie/31508/1/Health\_in\_Ireland-Key\_Trends\_2019.pdf



Department of Health and Children (2008) National Men's Health Policy 2008–2013: working with men in Ireland to achieve optimum health and wellbeing, Dublin: Department of Health and Children Stationery Office

Devine, P., & Early, E. (2020). *Men's Health in Numbers TRENDS ON THE ISLAND OF* IRELAND. Retrieved from https://www.mhfi.org/MensHealthInNumbers1.pdf

Di Onofrio, V., Gallé, F., Di Dio, M., Belfiore, P., & Liguori, G. (2018). Effects of nutrition motivational intervention in patients affected by type 2 diabetes mellitus: a longitudinal study in Naples, South Italy. *BMC Public Health*, *18*(1). doi: 10.1186/s12889-018-6101-6

Diener, Ed., Richard, E.L., & Shigehiro, O.(2018). Advances and open questions in the Science of Subjective Well-Being. *Collabra: Psychology 4*(1):15.

Donoghue, O., O'Connell, M., & Kenny, R. (2016). *WELLBEING: Physical Activity, Social Participation and Psychological Health in Irish Adults Aged 50 Years and Older*. Dublin: TILDA.

Drummond, FJ., Reidy, M., Drennan, J., Murphy, M., Fowler, C., VonWagner, C., Murphy, D., McNamara, A., Ryan, H., Saab, M., O'Mahony, M., & Hegarty, J. (2017). Men's Cancer Prevention and Health Literacy. The MeCHanic Study. Irish Cancer Society.

Emmering, S., Astroth, K., Woith, W., Dyck, M., & Kim, M. (2018). Social capital, health, health behavior, and utilization of healthcare services among older adults: A conceptual framework. *Nursing Forum*, *53*(4), 416-424. doi: 10.1111/nuf.12268

Feigelman, W., Coleman, D., & Rosen, Z. (2021). Examining the social origins and young adult life trajectories of high traditional masculinity (HTM) males: A group at elevated suicide risk. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior, n/a*(n/a). doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/sltb.12753

Fiorillo. L. (2019). Oral Health: The First Step to Well-Being. *Medicina*, *55*(10), 676. doi: 10.3390/medicina55100676

Fish, J., Prichard, I., Ettridge, K., Grunfeld, E., & Wilson, C. (2015). Psychosocial factors that influence men's help-seeking for cancer symptoms: a systematic synthesis of mixed methods research. *Psycho-Oncology*, *24*(10), 1222-1232.

Fleming, P. J., Lee, J. G. L., & Dworkin, S. L. (2014). "Real men don't": constructions of masculinity and inadvertent harm in public health interventions. American journal of public health, 104(6), 1029-1035. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2013.301820

Ford, S., Scholz, B., & Lu, V. (2015). Social shedding: Identification and health of men's sheds users. *Health Psychology*, *34*(7), 775-778.

Friemel, T. (2014). The digital divide has grown old: Determinants of a digital divide among seniors. *New Media & Society*, *18*(2), 313-331. doi: 10.1177/1461444814538648

Garcia, A. L., Reardon, R., Hammond, E., Parrett, A., & Gebbie-Diben, A. (2017). Evaluation of the "Eat Better Feel Better" Cooking Programme to Tackle Barriers to Healthy Eating. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *14*(4), 380. Garcia, AA., Villagomez, ET., Brown, SA., Kouzekanani K, & Hanis CL. The Starr County Diabetes Education Study: development of the Spanish-language diabetes knowledge questionnaire. *Diabetes Care*. 2001 Jan;24(1):16-21. doi: 10.2337/diacare.24.1.16.



Golding, B. (2015). The Men's Shed Movement: The Company of Men. Common Ground Publishing

Griffith, D., Bruce, M., & Thorpe, R. (2019). Men's Health Equity. doi:10.4324/9781315167428

Hansji, N. L., Wilson, N. J., & Cordier, R. (2015). Men's Sheds: enabling environments for Australian men living with and without long-term disabilities. *Health & Social Care in the Community, 23*(3), 272-281. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/hsc.12140

Health Service Executive. (2016) *Healthy Ireland – Men. HI-M 2017 – 2021. National Men's Health Action Plan.* https://www.hse.ie/eng/services/publications/healthyirelandmen.pdf (last accessed November 2020).

Heise, L., Greene, M. E., Opper, N., Stavropoulou, M., Harper, C., Nascimento, M., . . . Rao Gupta, G. (2019). Gender inequality and restrictive gender norms: framing the challenges to health. The Lancet, 393(10189), 2440-2454. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(19)30652-X

Höhn, A., Gampe, J., Lindahl-Jacobsen, R., Christensen, K., & Oksuyzan, A. (2020). Do men avoid seeking medical advice? A register-based analysis of gender-specific changes in primary healthcare use after first hospitalisation at ages 60+ in Denmark. *Journal of epidemiology and community health*, *74*(7), 573-579. doi:10.1136/jech-2019-213435

Hooker, S. P., Wilcox, S., Burroughs, E. L., Rheaume, C. E., & Courtenay, W. (2012). The potential influence of masculine identity on health-improving behavior in midlife and older African American men. *Journal* 

Irish Men's Sheds Association (2018). Guidance for Effective Engagement with Men's Sheds: Training Manual.

Joshanloo, M., & Jovanović, V. (2020). The relationship between gender and life satisfaction: analysis across demographic groups and global regions. Arch Womens Ment Health 23, 331–338. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00737-019-00998-w

Kachel, S., Steffens, M. C., & Niedlich, C. (2016). Traditional Masculinity and Femininity: Validation of a New Scale Assessing Gender Roles. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *7*(956). doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00956

Kane, S.F. (2017). The effects of oral health on systemic health. *General Dentistry* 149 (411), 30-35.

Kaplan, G. (2018). A Formative Evaluation of the safeTALK Training in Manitoba. https://www.pc.gov.au/\_\_data/assets/pdf\_file/0004/250915/sub796-mental-health.pdf.

Kautzky-Willer, A., Harreiter, J., & Pacini, G. (2016). Sex and Gender Differences in Risk, Pathophysiology and Complications of Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus. *Endocrine reviews*, *37*(3), 278–316. https://doi.org/10.1210/er.2015-1137

Keizer, R., Helmerhorst, K. O. W., & van Rijn-van Gelderen, L. (2019). Perceived Quality of the Mother–Adolescent and Father–Adolescent Attachment Relationship and Adolescents' Self-Esteem. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 48*(6), 1203-1217. doi:10.1007/s10964-019-01007-0



Kelly, D., Steiner, A., Mason, H., & Teasdale, S. (2021). Men's sheds as an alternative healthcare route? A qualitative study of the impact of Men's sheds on user's health improvement behaviours. *BMC Public Health*, *21*(1), 553. doi:10.1186/s12889-021-10585-3

Kelly, L., Harrison, M., Richardson, N., Carroll, P., Robertson, S., Keohane, A., & Donohoe, A. (2019). Reaching beyond the 'worried well': pre-adoption characteristics of participants in 'Men on the Move', a community-based physical activity programme. *Journal Of Public Health*, *41*(2), e192-e202. doi: 10.1093/pubmed/fdy134

Kelly, L., Harrison, M., Richardson, N., Carroll, P., Robertson, S., Keohane, A., & Donohoe, A. (2018). Reaching beyond the 'worried well': pre-adoption characteristics of participants in 'Men on the Move', a community-based physical activity programme. *Journal Of Public Health*, *41*(2), e192-e202. doi: 10.1093/pubmed/fdy134

King, K., Dow, B., Keogh, L., Feldman, P., Milner, A., & Pierce, D. et al. (2020). "Is Life Worth Living?": The Role of Masculinity in the Way Men Aged Over 80 Talk About Living, Dying, and Suicide. *American Journal Of Men's Health*, *14*(5), 155798832096654. doi: 10.1177/1557988320966540

Kodriati, N., Pursell, L., & Hayati EN. (2018) A scoping review of men, masculinities, and smoking behavior: *The importance of settings. Glob Health Action.* 2018;11(sup3):1589763.

Kogan, S. M., Cho, J., Barton, A. W., Duprey, E. B., Hicks, M. R., & Brown, G. L. (2017). The Influence of Community Disadvantage and Masculinity Ideology on Number of Sexual Partners: A Prospective Analysis of Young Adult, Rural Black Men. *Journal of sex research*, *54*(6), 795-801. doi:10.1080/00224499.2016.1223798

Koorts, H., Eakin, E., Estabrooks, P., Timperio, A., Salmon, J., & Bauman, A. (2018) Implementation and scale up of population physical activity interventions for clinical and community settings: the PRACTIS guide. International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity, 15, 51.

Layte, R., & Banks, J. (2016). Socioeconomic differentials in mortality by cause of death in the Republic of Ireland, 1984-2008. *The European Journal of Public Health*, 26(3), 451-458.

Lefkowich, M. and Richardson, N. (2015) Men's health in alternative spaces: exploring men's sheds in Ireland. Health Promotion International, 33, 525–535.

Lefkowich, M., Richardson, N., & Robertson, S. (2017). "If We Want to Get Men in, Then We Need to Ask Men What They Want": Pathways to Effective Health Programing for Men. *American Journal Of Men's Health, 11*(5), 1512-1524.

Lefkowich, M., Richardson, N., Brennan, L., Lambe, B., & Carroll, P. (2018). A process evaluation of a Training of Trainers (TOT) model of men's health training. *Health Promot Int, 33*(1), 60-70. doi:10.1093/heapro/daw056

Lundberg, O., & Manderbacka, K. (1996) Assessing reliability of a measure of self-rated health. *Scandinavian Journal of Social Medicine*, 24, 218–224.



Mackenzie, C. S., Roger, K., Robertson, S., Oliffe, J. L., Nurmi, M. A., & Urquhart, J. (2017). Counter and Complicit Masculine Discourse Among Men's Shed Members. *American journal* of men's health, *11*(4), 1224-1236. doi:10.1177/1557988316685618

Mahalik, J. R., Good, G. E., Tager, D., Levant, R. F., & Mackowiak, C. (2012). Developing a taxonomy of helpful and harmful practices for clinical work with boys and men. *J Couns Psychol*, *59*(4), 591-603. doi:10.1037/a0030130

Manthey, J., Shield, K., Rylett, M., Hasan, O., Probst, C., & Rehm, J. (2019). Global alcohol exposure between 1990 and 2017 and forecasts until 2030: a modelling study. *The Lancet*, *393*(10190), 2493-2502. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(18)32744-2

Martin, C. L., & Ruble, D. N. (2010). Patterns of gender development. *Annual review of psychology, 61*, 353-381. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.093008.100511

McGrath, A. (2020) *The Impact of COVID-19 on Irish Men's Sheds Members and Their Sheds.* https://menssheds.ie/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/Impact-of-Covid-19-on-Irish-Mens-Sheds-AMCGRATH2020.pdf (last accessed 6 August 2020).

McGrath, A., Murphy, N. and Richardson, N. (2020) The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the wellbeing of Irish Men's Shed members. *Health Promotion International. DOI: 10.1093/heapro/daaa113* 

McGrath, A., Murphy, N., & Richardson, N. (2021). Study protocol: evaluation of sheds for life (SFL): a community-based men's health initiative designed "for shedders by shedders" in Irish Men's sheds using a hybrid effectiveness-implementation design. BMC Public Health, 21(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-10823-8

McLaren, S. (2018). The Relationship between living alone, sense of belonging, and depressive symptoms among older men: the moderating role of sexual orientation. *Aging & Mental Health*, *24*(1), 103-109. doi: 10.1080/13607863.2018.1531373

Milligan, C., Neary, D., Payne, S., Hanratty, B., Irwin, P., & Dowrick, C. (2016). Older men and social activity: a scoping review of Men's Sheds and other gendered interventions. Ageing and Society, 36(5), 895-923. doi:10.1017/S0144686X14001524

Milner, A., Shields, M., & King, T. (2019). The Influence of Masculine Norms and Mental Health on Health Literacy Among Men: Evidence From the Ten to Men Study. *American journal of men's health*, *13*(5), 1557988319873532. https://doi.org/10.1177/1557988319873532

Milton, K., Bull, F., & Bauman, A. (2011) Reliability and validity testing of a single-item physical activity measure. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 45, 203–208.

Misan, G. M., Oosterbroek, C., & Wilson, N. J. (2017). Informing health promotion in rural men's sheds by examination of participant health status, concerns, interests, knowledge and behaviours (Vol. 28): Copyright Agency.

Morgan, R., Ayiasi, R. M., Barman, D., Buzuzi, S., Ssemugabo, C., Ezumah, N., . . . Waldman, L. (2018). Gendered health systems: evidence from low- and middle-income countries. Health Research Policy and Systems, 16(1), 58. doi:10.1186/s12961-018-0338-5



Moylan, M., Carey, L., Blackburn, R., Hayes, R., & Robinson, P. (2013). The Men's Shed: Providing Biopsychosocial and Spiritual Support. *Journal Of Religion And Health*, *54*(1), 221-234. doi: 10.1007/s10943-013-9804-0

Ng, R., Sutradhar, R., Yao, Z., Wodchis, W. P., & Rosella, L. C. (2020). Smoking, drinking, diet and physical activity-modifiable lifestyle risk factors and their associations with age to first chronic disease. Int J Epidemiol, 49(1), 113-130. doi:10.1093/ije/dyz078

Novak, J. R., Peak, T., Gast, J., & Arnell, M. (2019). Associations Between Masculine Norms and Health-Care Utilization in Highly Religious, Heterosexual Men. *American journal of men's health, 13*(3), 1557988319856739-1557988319856739. doi:10.1177/1557988319856739

Nurmi, M. A., Mackenzie, C. S., Roger, K., Reynolds, K., & Urquhart, J. (2018). Older men's perceptions of the need for and access to male-focused community programmes such as Men's Sheds. *Ageing and Society*, *38*(4), 794-816. doi:10.1017/S0144686X16001331

Nuzzo, J. L. (2020). Men's health in the United States: a national health paradox. *The Aging Male, 23*(1), 42-52. doi:10.1080/13685538.2019.1645109

O'Donnell, S., & Richardson, N. (2018). Middle Aged Men and Suicide in Ireland: Men's Health Forum in Ireland Report.

O'Brien, R., Hunt, K., & Hart, G. (2005). 'It's caveman stuff, but that is to a certain extent how guys still operate': men's accounts of masculinity and help seeking. *Soc Sci Med*, *61*(3), 503-516. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2004.12.008

OECD (2013). OECD Guidelines on Measuring Subjective Well-Being. Paris: OECD Publishing, doi: 10.1787/9789264191655-en

OECD (2020). How's Life? 2020: Measuring Well-being, Paris: OECD Publishing.

Office for National Statistics. (2015) Harmonised Concepts and Questions for Social Data Sources Interim Harmonised Principle: Personal Well-being. Crown, Fareham. https://gss.civilservice.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/ S14-INTERIM-PRINCIPLE-Personal-Well-being-V1.1-June-16.pdf (last accessed 6 August 2020).

Olanrewaju, F., Ajayi, L., Loromeke, E., Olanrewaju, A., Allo, T., & Nwannebuife, O. (2019). Masculinity and men's health-seeking behaviour in Nigerian academia. *Cogent Social Sciences*, *5*(1). doi: 10.1080/23311886.2019.1682111

Oliffe, J., Rossnagel, E., Bottorff, J., Chambers, S., Caperchione, C., & Rice, S. (2019). Community-based men's health promotion programs: eight lessons learnt and their caveats. *Health Promotion International*, *35*(5), 1230-1240. doi: 10.1093/heapro/daz101

Oliffe, J., Rossnagel, E., Kelly, M., Bottorff, J., Seaton, C., & Darroch, F. (2019). Men's health literacy: a review and recommendations. *Health Promotion International*, *35*(5), 1037-1051. doi: 10.1093/heapro/daz077



Osborne, A., Carroll, P., Richardson, N., Doheny, M., Brennan, L., & Lambe, B. (2016). From training to practice: the impact of ENGAGE, Ireland's national men's health training programme. Health Promotion International, 33(3), 458-467. doi:10.1093/heapro/daw100

Patrick, S., & Robertson, S. (2016). Mental health and wellbeing: focus on men's health. British Journal of Nursing, 25(21), 1163-1169. doi:10.12968/bjon.2016.25.21.1163

Peters, D., Adam, T., Alonge, O., Agyepong, I., & Tran, N. (2014). Republished research: Implementation research: what it is and how to do it. *British Journal Of Sports Medicine*, *48*(8), 731-736. doi: 10.1136/bmj.f6753

Pirhonen, J., Lolich, L., Tuominen, K., Jolanki, O., & Timonen, V. (2020). "These devices have not been made for older people's needs" – Older adults' perceptions of digital technologies in Finland and Ireland. Technology in Society, 62, 101287. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2020.101287

Proctor, E., Silmere, H., Raghavan, R., Hovmand, P., Aarons, G., Bunger, A. et al. (2011) Outcomes for implementation research: conceptual distinctions, measurement challenges, and research agenda. Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research, 38, 65–76.

Proudfoot, J., Fogarty, A. S., McTigue, I., Nathan, S., Whittle, E. L., Christensen, H., Player, M. J., Hadzi-Pavlovic, D., & Wilhelm, K. (2015). Positive strategies men regularly use to prevent and manage depression: a national survey of Australian men. *BMC public health*, *15*, 1135

Rapport, F., Clay-Williams, R., Churruca, K., Shih, P., Hogden, A., & Braithwaite, J. (2017). The struggle of translating science into action: Foundational concepts of implementation science. *Journal Of Evaluation In Clinical Practice*, *24*(1), 117-126. doi: 10.1111/jep.12741

Regitz-Zagrosek, V. (2012). Sex and gender differences in health. EMBO reports, 13(7), 596-603. doi:https://doi.org/10.1038/embor.2012.87

Resnick, B., & Jenkins, L. (2000) Testing the reliability and validity of the self-efficacy for exercise scale. *Nursing Research*, 49, 154–159.

Richardson N., Dunne N. & Clarke N. (2010). The Larkin Unemployment Centre: Men's Health and Wellbeing Programme Evaluation Report. Centre for Men's Health, IT Carlow.

Richardson, N., & Carroll, P. (2018). It's Not Rocket Science: The Case from Ireland for a Policy Focus on Men's Health. Men's Health, Social and Community Health, 1. doi:https://doi.org/10.22374/ijmsch.v1iSP1.4

Richardson, N., Smith, J.A., Robertson, S., & Baker, P. (2019) Global men's health policy. In: Griffith, D.M., Bruce, M.A. and Thorpe, R.J., (eds.) Men's Health Equity: A Handbook. Routledge , pp. 203-224. ISBN 9781138052963

Robertson, S, White, A, Gough, B. (2015) Promoting Mental Health and Wellbeing with Men and Boys: What Works? Leeds: Centre for Men's Health, Leeds Beckett University



Robertson, S., & Baker, P. (2016). Men and health promotion in the United Kingdom: 20 years further forward? Health Education Journal, 76(1), 102-113. doi:10.1177/0017896916645558

Ruane-McAteer, E., Amin, A., Hanratty, J., Lynn, F., Corbijn van Willenswaard, K., Reid, E., . . . Lohan, M. (2019). Interventions addressing men, masculinities and gender equality in sexual and reproductive health and rights: an evidence and gap map and systematic review of reviews. *BMJ Global Health, 4*(5), e001634. doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2019-001634

Russell, D. (1996) UCLA Loneliness Scale (Version 3): reliability, validity, and factor structure. Journal of Personality Assessment, 66, 20–40.

Sagar-Ouriaghli, I., Godfrey, E., Bridge, L., Meade, L., & Brown, J. S. L. (2019). Improving Mental Health Service Utilization Among Men: A Systematic Review and Synthesis of Behavior Change Techniques Within Interventions Targeting Help-Seeking. *American journal of men's health, 13*(3), 1557988319857009-1557988319857009. doi:10.1177/1557988319857009

Salgado, D. M., Knowlton, A. L., & Johnson, B. L. (2019). Men's health-risk and protective behaviors: The effects of masculinity and masculine norms. *Psychology of Men & Masculinities, 20*(2), 266-275. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/men0000211

Seidler, Z., Dawes, A., Rice, S., Oliffe, J., & Dhillon, H. (2016). The role of masculinity in men's help-seeking for depression: A systematic review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *49*, 106-118. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2016.09.002

Seifert, A., Cotten, S., & Xie, B. (2020). A Double Burden of Exclusion? Digital and Social Exclusion of Older Adults in Times of COVID-19. *The Journals Of Gerontology: Series B.* doi: 10.1093/geronb/gbaa098

Seifert, A., Hofer, M., & Rössel, J. (2019): Older adults' perceived sense of social exclusion from the digital world, *Educational Gerontology*, DOI: 10.1080/03601277.2019.1574415

Singh, A., Peres, M., & Watt, R. (2019). The Relationship between Income and Oral Health: A Critical Review. *Journal Of Dental Research*, *98*(8), 853-860. doi: 10.1177/0022034519849557

Smith, J. A., Watkins, D. C., & Griffith, D. M. (2020). Equity, gender and health: New directions for global men's health promotion. Health Promotion Journal of Australia, 31(2), 161-165. doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/hpja.337

Smith, J., Griffith, D., White, A., Baker, P., Watkins, D., Drummond, M., & Semlow, A.,2020. COVID-19, Equity and Men's Health. *International Journal of Mens Social and Community Health*, 3(1), pp.e48-e64.

Stephens, L., Crawford, D., Thornton, L., Olstad, D., Morgan, P., van Lenthe, F., & Ball, K. (2018). A qualitative study of the drivers of socioeconomic inequalities in men's eating behaviours. *BMC Public Health*, *18*(1). doi: 10.1186/s12889-018-6162-6

Steptoe, A., & Fancourt, D. (2019). Leading a meaningful life at older ages and its relationship with social engagement, prosperity, health, biology, and time use. *Proceedings Of The National Academy Of Sciences*, *116*(4), 1207-1212. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1814723116



113

Stewart-Brown, S., Tennant, A., Tennant, R., Platt, S., Parkinson, J. and Weich, S., 2009. Internal construct validity of the Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS): a Rasch analysis using data from the Scottish Health Education Population Survey. Health and Quality of Life Outcomes, 7(1).

Taylor, P. J., Kolt, G. S., Vandelanotte, C., Caperchione, C. M., Mummery, W. K., George, E. S., Karunanithi, M., & Noakes, M. J. (2013). A review of the nature and effectiveness of nutrition interventions in adult males--a guide for intervention strategies. *The international journal of behavioral nutrition and physical activity*, *10*, 13. https://doi.org/10.1186/1479-5868-10-13

The Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (2017). The Community Life Survey 2016-2017. Retrieved from: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/community-life-survey-2016-17. Accessed: 25/11/2020

Thompson, A., Anisimowicz, Y., Miedema, B., Hogg, W., Wodchis, W., & Aubrey-Bassler, K. (2016). The influence of gender and other patient characteristics on health care-seeking behaviour: a QUALICOPC study. *BMC Family Practice*, *17*(1). doi: 10.1186/s12875-016-0440-0

Thorpe, R. J., Jr, & Halkitis, P. N. (2016). Biopsychosocial Determinants of the Health of Boys and Men Across the Lifespan. *Behavioral medicine (Washington, D.C.)*, *4*2(3), 129–131. https://doi.org/10.1080/08964289.2016.1191231

Ueshima K, Fujiwara T, Takao S, et al. (2010) Does social capital promote physical activity? A population-based study in Japan. PLoS ONE. 2010;5:e12135.

Van Doorn, D., Richardson, N., Meredith, D., McNamara, J., Osborne, A., & Blake, C. (2020). Farmers Have Hearts Cardiovascular Health Programme: Detailed Baseline Report: TEAGASC. Retrieved from:

https://www.teagasc.ie/media/website/publications/2020/Farmers-Have-Hearts---Detailed-Baseline-Report.pdf

Villalobos, F., Del Pozo, A., Rey-Reñones, C., Granado-Font, E., Sabaté-Lissner, D., Poblet-Calaf, C., Basora, J., Castro, A., & Flores-Mateo, G. (2019). Lay People Training in CPR and in the Use of an Automated External Defibrillator, and Its Social Impact: A Community Health Study. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *16*(16), 2870. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16162870

Vlassoff, C. (2007). Gender differences in determinants and consequences of health and illness. Journal of health, population, and nutrition, 25(1), 47-61. Retrieved from https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17615903

Vogel, D. L., & Heath, P. J. (2016). Men, masculinities, and help-seeking patterns. In APA handbook of men and masculinities. (pp. 685-707). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.

Waling, A. (2018). Rethinking Masculinity Studies: Feminism, Masculinity, and Poststructural Accounts of Agency and Emotional Reflexivity. The Journal of Men's Studies, 27(1), 89-107. doi:10.1177/1060826518782980

Walli-Attaei, M., Joseph, P., Rosengren, A., Chow, C., Rangarajan, S., & Lear, S. et al. (2020). Variations between women and men in risk factors, treatments, cardiovascular disease incidence, and death in 27 high-income, middle-income, and low-income countries



(PURE): a prospective cohort study. *The Lancet*, *396*(10244), 97-109. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(20)30543-2

Watt, R., Daly, B., Allison, P., Macpherson, L., Venturelli, R., & Listl, S. et al. (2019). Ending the neglect of global oral health: time for radical action. *The Lancet*, *394*(10194), 261-272. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(19)31133-x

Weber, A. M., Cislaghi, B., Meausoone, V., Abdalla, S., Mejía-Guevara, I., Loftus, P., . . . Rao Gupta, G. (2019). Gender norms and health: insights from global survey data. *The Lancet, 393*(10189), 2455-2468. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(19)30765-2

WhatworksWellbeing (2018) How to measure wellbeing: Recommended Questions. https://measure.whatworkswellbeing.org/homepage/recommended-questions/ (last accessed 25 November 2020)

White, A. (2011). The State of Men's Health in Europe. Extended Report. European Commission; Brussels, Belgium

White, A., de Sousa, B., de Visser, R., Hogston, R., Madsen, S., Makara, P., . . . Zatonski, W. (2011). *The State of Men's Health in Europe*. Retrieved from

Whitehead, M., Ng Chok, H., Whitehead, C., & Luck, L. (2020). Men's health promotion in waiting rooms: an observational study. *European Journal of Public Health, 30*(Supplement\_5). doi:10.1093/eurpub/ckaa166.360

WHO Regional Office for Europe (2017). Fact sheets on Sustainable Development Goals: Health Targets: Non Communicable Diseases. Copenhagen: The World Health Organisation

WHO Regional Office for Europe (2018b). The health and well-being of men in the WHO European Region: better health through a gender approach. Copenhagen: The World Health Organisation

Wilson, N. J., Cordier, R., Doma, K., Misan, G., & Vaz, S. (2015). Men's Sheds function and philosophy: towards a framework for future research and men's health promotion. Health Promotion Journal of Australia, 26(2), 133-141. doi:https://doi.org/10.1071/HE14052

Wilson, N. J., Cordier, R., Parsons, R., Vaz, S., & Buchanan, A. (2016). Men with disabilities – A cross sectional survey of health promotion, social inclusion and participation at community Men's Sheds. *Disability and Health Journal, 9*(1), 118-126. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dhjo.2015.08.013

Wilson, N. J., Stancliffe, R. J., Gambin, N., Craig, D., Bigby, C., & Balandin, S. (2015). A case study about the supported participation of older men with lifelong disability at Australian community-based Men's Sheds. *Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disability, 40*(4), 330-341. doi:10.3109/13668250.2015.1051522

Wilson, N., & Cordier, R. (2013). A narrative review of Men's Sheds literature: reducing social isolation and promoting men's health and well-being. *Health & Social Care In The Community*, *21*(5), 451-463.

World Health Organization (2018) *The health and wellbeing of men in the WHO European Region: better health through a gender approach.* WHO Regional Office for Europe, Copenhagen.



Wu, S,, Wang, R,. Zhao, Y., Ma, X., Wu, M., & Yan X, et al. (2013). The relationship between self-rated health and objective health status: a population-based study. *BMC Public Health.* 13(320):1–9.

Wyke, S., Hunt, K., Gray, C., Fenwick, E., Bunn, C., & Donnan, P. et al. (2015). Football Fans in Training (FFIT): a randomised controlled trial of a gender-sensitised weight loss and healthy living programme for men – end of study report. *Public Health Research, 3*(2), 1-130.

Yousaf, O., Grunfeld, E. A., & Hunter, M. S. (2015). A systematic review of the factors associated with delays in medical and psychological help-seeking among men. *Health Psychol Rev, 9*(2), 264-276.

## Sheds for Life Impact Report: The Impact of Implementation Phase one on the health and wellbeing outcomes of participants

Prepared by: Aisling McGrath, Prof Niamh Murphy and Dr Noel Richardson 2021





ISBN: 978-1-8384706-09

Irish Men's Sheds Association, Irish Farm Centre, Naas Rd, Drimnagh, Dublin 12, D12 YXW5. Telephone: 01 891 6150 Email: wellbeing@menssheds.ie
Website: www.menssheds.ie | www.malehealth.ie @IrishSheds

**f** www.facebook.com/Irishmensshedassociation