



Bilaga till rapport

1 (13)

Främjande av psykiskt välbefinnande hos barn och ungdomar / Promoting mental well-being in children and adolescents, rapport nr 350 (2022)

Bilaga 11 Inkluderade implementeringsstudier

Appendix 11 Included implementation studies

Table 1 Facilitating and hindering factors in the implementation of programs to promote the mental health of children and young people

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Author | Johnson |
| Year | 2018 |
| Ref | [1] |
| Program | PAX-GBG |
| Setting | Setting: 12 schools in the US. Phase: The study was conducted after the program was implemented. |
| Facilitating factors | Coaching in the form of modelling Coaching in the form of needs assessment |
| Barriers | Check-ins with the primary goal of verifying that the teacher was implementing the program components |
| Comment | RCT of PAX-GBG, with and without PATHS. |
| | |
| Author | Dijkman |
| Year | 2017 |
| Ref | [2] |
| Program | Good Behavior Game |
| Setting | Setting: 17 primary schools in Amsterdam Phase: Sustainability |
| Facilitating factors | School management with strong leadership, commitment and support Mature organizational structure Low staff turnover Formally appointed programme coordinator Integration of the programme into school activities Local adaptation of the programme The perception that the programme was effective |

| | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <p>The perception that the programme was modifiable and adaptable</p> <p>High programme fidelity</p> |
| Barriers | <p>Programme coordinators not formally appointed</p> <p>Programme coordinators are not given enough time to implement the programme</p> <p>Staff turnover, which can lead to new teachers not perceiving that they need the programme</p> <p>Weak school management</p> <p>Schools encountering problems discontinue implementation of the programme rather than adapt it</p> |
| Comment | <p>Maintenance of GBG was evaluated in a non-experimental (mixed methods) study in which quantitative and qualitative data were collected simultaneously.</p> |
| | |
| Author | Dijkman |
| Year | 2015 |
| Ref | [3] |
| Program | Good Behavior Game |
| Setting | <p>Setting: 17 primary schools in Amsterdam</p> <p>Phase: The study was conducted after the programme had been implemented.</p> |
| Facilitating factors | <p>The interventions were designed according to the specific needs and problems of the schools</p> <p>Problems were formulated in educational terms rather than health terms</p> <p>The visibility of the relative benefits of the positive effects of the programme</p> |
| Barriers | <p>Competing programmes in schools</p> <p>Not knowing of favourable funding opportunities (*specific to this study - not possible to generalize)</p> |
| Comment | <p>Mixed-methods observational study. The study aimed to provide a theory-based description of the process of GBG adaptation and to examine factors that influenced this process.</p> |

| | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | In contrast to previous studies, "time investment" did not play a constraining role. |
| | |
| Author | Buchanan |
| Year | 2009 |
| Ref | [4] |
| Program | SEL |
| Setting | 263 elementary school teachers in the United States. Phase: Nearly half of the teachers were implementing a SEL program. Two-thirds of teachers reported that SEL programs were being implemented in their classrooms (suggesting that teachers were not always responsible for implementation). |
| Facilitating factors | Teachers felt that they would be more motivated to implement an SEL programme if they could see clear improvements in students' academic performance and behaviour and if they could get sufficient support from the school administration. This reasoning suggests that implementation is facilitated by: - visible results; and - relative advantage (Rogers, 2003). |
| Barriers | Lack of time to prepare SEL lessons Lack of time to implement SEL lessons Teacher training in SEL Resources to purchase working materials |
| Comment | Survey |
| | |
| Author | Clarke |
| Year | 2010 |
| Ref | [5] |
| Program | Zippy's friends |
| Setting | Setting: 2 schools in Ireland (with very different conditions) Phase: The study was conducted when half of the programme had been implemented. |

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Facilitating factors | It is difficult to come to any conclusions about the factors influencing implementation, based on this study. |
| Barriers | It is difficult to come to any conclusions about the factors influencing implementation, based on this study. |
| Comment | Two schools that themselves chose to participate in case studies. |
| | |
| Author | Becker |
| Year | 2014 |
| Ref | [6] |
| Program | PATHS and Pax GBG |
| Setting | Setting: 45 primary school teachers underwent a 31-week online training in PATHS and Pax GBG, which included personal coaching. Phase: The study was conducted immediately after completion of the training. |
| Facilitating factors | The opportunity to ask questions about the implementation increases the teachers' understanding of the method and their confidence to implement the method. |
| Barriers | Lack of opportunities for problem solving and in-depth discussion of the programme. |
| Comment | The study examined the perceived feasibility of an online training for teachers implementing an integrated intervention of PATHS and PAX GBG. Teachers who took part in online training and face-to-face coaching had the same quality of implementation of the intervention as those who took part in face-to-face training and face-to-face coaching. |
| | |
| Author | Wanless |
| Year | 2012;2013 |
| Ref | [7] |
| Program | SEL-program Responsive Classroom |
| Setting | Setting: The study was conducted in the United States. 33 third grade teachers and 50 fourth grade teachers. Phase: Third grade teachers: after the first year of implementation of Responsive Classroom (an SEL intervention). |

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Fourth grade teachers: after the second year of Responsive Classroom implementation. |
| Facilitating factors | Access to coaches Confirmation from the environment, the possibility to work at your own pace and social support |
| Barriers | Lack of commitment of the principal (the principal should facilitate the implementation by providing books, materials and time) |
| Comment | The researchers used mixed methods to examine the relationship between school-level factors and the implementation of an SEL intervention. |
| | |
| Author | Voith |
| Year | 2019;2020 |
| Ref | [8] |
| Program | SEL-program The Peace Program |
| Setting | Context: The study was conducted in the United States. Schools implementing the PEACE program participated in the study: one charter school (n = 12 classrooms), one public school (n = 8 classrooms), and one private school (n = 12 classrooms). Interviews with 22 teachers in three focus groups. Semi-structured interviews with two principals. Three classroom observations per classroom/teacher over one year. Surveys of 287 primary school pupils. Phase: at the end of the school year after almost one year of implementation of the programme. |
| Facilitating factors | Although the results mainly show that the effects of the intervention are greater among younger children, the results can also be interpreted as early interventions promoting implementation. |
| Barriers | Nothing of interest |
| Comment | Studied the feasibility of The Peace Program (an SEL program) in a mixed methods study. Interviews with 22 teachers in three focus groups. Semi-structured interviews with two principals. Three classroom observations per classroom/teacher over one year. Surveys of 287 primary school students. |
| | |

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Author | Westerlund |
| Year | 2017 |
| Ref | [9] |
| Program | International Child Development Programme (ICDP) |
| Setting | Setting: Sweden. 82 people in different positions within the Primary care Phase: From preparation to initial implementation |
| Facilitating factors | Implementation is facilitated by a careful review of the intervention and the target context Relative advantage of the method Effective communication and information Goals and visions of the intervention Table 3 lists some 20 additional factors that were considered important in implementation, but the list of factors is based on the statement of at least one participant (which makes generalisation difficult) . |
| Barriers | A large number of stakeholders with different responsibilities combined with insufficient communication is an obstacle in the initial implementation. |
| Comment | A mixed-method case study combining quantitative and qualitative data from questionnaires and interviews. The study focused on the initial implementation of the International Child Development Programme (ICDP) in primary care. The aim was to examine the stakeholders' views on factors that may influence implementation and the strategies used to address them. |
| | |
| Author | Nylén |
| Year | 2021 |
| Ref | [10] |
| Program | SWPBS |
| Setting | Context: 9 schools in Sweden Phase: |

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | During early implementation (after a few months of implementation) |
| Facilitating factors | <p>Knowledge and experience from implementation of previous programmes</p> <p>The programme contributes to building consensus among staff</p> <p>Understanding of the objectives of the intervention</p> <p>Patience and reasonable expectations</p> <p>Intervention meets perceived needs and is consistent with staff values</p> <p>Social skills of those responsible for implementation</p> <p>Time and organisational conditions</p> <p>Leadership capacity</p> |
| Barriers | <p>Frustration when results are delayed or absent</p> <p>Reorganisation and changes in the workforce</p> <p>Unclear roles in implementation</p> |
| Comment | Focus group interviews with nine teams responsible for implementation at each school. |
| | |
| Author | Larsen |
| Year | 2008 |
| Ref | [11] |
| Program | Second Step |
| Setting | <p>Setting: Four primary schools, four principals and 17 teachers in Norway.</p> <p>Phase: Implementation had been going on for more than four years.</p> |
| Facilitating factors | <p>Leadership of the principal</p> <p>Careful preparation</p> <p>Allocation of resources</p> <p>Anchoring with staff</p> <p>Follow-up from principal</p> <p>Principal's focus on creating a common understanding and culture</p> |

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Integration of the intervention into the regular activities |
| Barriers | Lack of focus and lack of a common vision |
| Comment | Case study from Norway. The results are mainly based on the interviews with the four principals. |
| | |
| Author | Larsen |
| Year | 2007 |
| Ref | [12] |
| Program | Second Step |
| Setting | Setting: Four primary schools and 17 teachers in Norway. Phase: The implementation had been going on for more than three years. |
| Facilitating factors | Organization Training in the programme Motivation to use the programme Staff experience and confidence Adaptations of the programme Combination with other activities |
| Barriers | Shortcomings in the programme |
| Comment | Case study from Norway. The results are based on interviews with teachers. |
| | |
| Author | Blewitt |
| Year | 2021 |
| Ref | [13] |
| Program | SEL |
| Setting | Context: 30 people who worked in childcare in Australia. The study included both individual in-depth telephone interviews (n = 13) and on-site focus group discussions (n = 17). Phase: Ongoing activity. |

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Facilitating factors | Interaction between the organisation and the home |
| Barriers | Lack of time Large groups of children Lack of staff training Changes in staffing levels Difficulties in cooperation between the organization and homes |
| Comment | The study included individual in-depth interviews (n = 13) and focus group interviews (n = 17). |
| | |
| Author | Mishara |
| Year | 2020 |
| Ref | [14] |
| Program | Passport: Skills for Life |
| Setting | Setting: 90 schools and 1,492 children in grades 3 to 6, in Canada. Phase: During and after implementation. |
| Facilitating factors | Perceived effects of the programme Support material/manual that is clear and easy to understand |
| Barriers | Lack of time |
| Comment | An RCT with pretest, post-test and 1-year follow-up. |
| | |
| Author | Humphrey |
| Year | 2010 |
| Ref | [15] |
| Program | SEAL |
| Setting | Setting: 41 secondary schools in the UK. Phase: Before, during and after implementation. |

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Facilitating factors | Knowledge and skills of staff Time and resources Commitment of school management Preparation and planning Staff commitment Skilled coordinators |
| Barriers | Lack of staff awareness and commitment Unrealistic goals |
| Comment | Quasi experimental study. |

References

1. Johnson SR, Pas ET, Bradshaw CP, Ialongo NS. Promoting Teachers' Implementation of Classroom-Based Prevention Programming Through Coaching: The Mediating Role of the Coach-Teacher Relationship. *Adm Policy Ment Health*. 2018;45(3):404-16. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-017-0832-z>.
2. Dijkman MA, Harting J, van Tol L, van der Wal MF. Sustainability of the good behaviour game in Dutch primary schools. *Health Promot Int*. 2017;32(1):79-90. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1093/heapro/dav055>.
3. Dijkman MAM, Harting J, Van Der Wal MF. Adoption of the good behaviour game: An evidence-based intervention for the prevention of behaviour problems. *Health Educ J*. 2015;74(2):168-82. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0017896914522234>.
4. Buchanan R, Gueldner BA, Tran OK, Merrell KW. Social and emotional learning in classrooms: A survey of teachers' knowledge, perceptions, and practices. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*. 2009;25(2):187-203. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15377900802487078>.
5. Clarke AM, Marks R, O'Sullivan M, Barry MM. Context matters in programme implementation. *Health Educ*. 2010;110(4):273-93. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1108/09654281011052637>.
6. Becker KD, Bohnenkamp J, Domitrovich C, Keperling JP, Ialongo NS. Online Training for Teachers Delivering Evidence-Based Preventive Interventions. *School Mental Health*. 2014;6(4):225-36. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-014-9124-x>.
7. Wanless SB, Patton CL, Rimm-Kaufman SE, Deutsch NL. Setting-level influences on implementation of the responsive classroom approach. *Prev Sci*. 2013;14(1):40-51. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-012-0294-1>.
8. Voith LA, Yoon S, Topitzes J, Brondino MJ. A Feasibility Study of a School-Based Social Emotional Learning Program: Informing Program Development and Evaluation. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*. 2020;37(3):329-42. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10560-019-00634-7>.
9. Westerlund A, Garvare R, Nystrom ME, Eurenus E, Lindkvist M, Ivarsson A. Managing the initiation and early implementation of health promotion interventions: a study of a parental support programme in primary care. *Scand J Caring Sci*. 2017;31(1):128-38. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/scs.12329>.
10. Nylén K, Karlberg M, Klang N, Ogden T. Knowledge and Will: An Explorative Study on the Implementation of School-Wide Positive Behavior Support in Sweden. *Front Psychol*. 2021;12:618099. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.618099>.
11. Larsen T, Samdal O. Facilitating the implementation and sustainability of Second Step. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*. 2008;52(2):187-204. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313830801915820>.
12. Larsen T, Samdal O. Implementing Second Step: Balancing fidelity and program adaptation. *Journal of Educational & Psychological Consultation*. 2007;17(1):1-29. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532768Xjepc1701_1.
13. Blewitt C, O'Connor A, Morris H, Nolan A, Mousa A, Green R, et al. "It's Embedded in What We Do for Every Child": A Qualitative Exploration of Early Childhood Educators' Perspectives on Supporting Children's Social and Emotional Learning. *Int J*

- Environ Res Public Health. 2021;18(4):1-16. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18041530>.
14. Mishara BL, Dufour S. Randomized Control Study of the Implementation and Effects of a New Mental Health Promotion Program to Improve Coping Skills in 9 to 11 Year Old Children: Passport: Skills for Life. *Front Psychol.* 2020;11:573342. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.573342>.
 15. Humphrey N, Lendrum A, Wigelsworth M. Secondary social and emotional aspects of learning (SEAL): National evaluation. Nottingham: Department for Education; 2010. [accessed Apr 7 2010]. Available from: <https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/11567/1/DFE-RR049.pdf>.