CRD summary
The authors concluded that programmes to enhance resilience among school staff and students were generally effective. A lack of detail about the interventions and limitations in the synthesis make it difficult to assess the reliability of the authors' conclusions and limit the usefulness of the review.

Authors' objectives
To evaluate the effectiveness of school-based health promotion interventions relating to resilience.

Searching
CINAHL, The Cochrane Library, Health Reference Center, Informit Search, MEDLINE, ProQuest, PsycINFO, PubMed, Science Direct, Scopus, Social Services Abstracts and Web of Science were searched to September 2011. Reference lists were searched. No language restrictions were applied.

Study selection
Controlled studies and before-and-after studies that evaluated school-based interventions on resilience involving health-promoting activities in the areas of the school ethos and/or environment, the curriculum or family and/or community were eligible for inclusion. Studies had to provide information about the components and delivery of the intervention and report all evaluated outcomes.

Studies were conducted in Germany and Switzerland (one study), Australia (one study) and China (four studies). The minimum intervention period was four minutes and the maximum was two years. One study surveyed only students, two surveyed school staff, one surveyed teachers and students, one surveyed teachers and parents and one included students, teachers and parents.

It was not clearly stated but it was likely that more than one reviewer selected articles for inclusion.

Assessment of study quality
Study quality was assessed using the Effective Public Health Practice Project quality assessment tool for quantitative studies.

The authors did not state how many reviewers assessed study quality.

Data extraction
Study characteristics and main outcome data were extracted.

The authors did not state how many reviewers extracted data.

Methods of synthesis
A narrative synthesis was presented.

Results of the review
Six studies (13,947 students, 3,499 teaching and non-teaching staff and 5,809 parents) were included in the review. Two studies were randomised controlled trials, two studies were matched controlled trials, one study was a before-and-after design and one study was a comparison on two cohorts. Only one study reported on a process evaluation. Five studies were judged to be of moderate quality. One study was judged to be of weak quality.

Staff in health-promoting schools reported improved feelings of trust, safety and tolerance, felt more positive about their schools, achieved more and had higher resilience scores than non-health-promoting school teachers.

Students in health-promoting schools reported improved resilience scores in their perceptions of peer support, feeling
that they are making a difference, self-esteem and overall feelings of happiness. There was a decrease in psychosomatic complaints, school stress, mental pressure and negative emotions.

**Authors' conclusions**
A limited number of studies have been undertaken to promote resilience using a health-promoting school approach; in general programmes to enhance resilience among school staff and students were considered to be effective, but the impact on parents needs more consideration.

**CRD commentary**
The review question and inclusion criteria were clear. Several relevant databases were searched and no language restrictions were applied. It was unclear whether sufficient attempts were made to reduce the potential for error in the review process. This may be particularly important since the lead reviewer was also an author on five of the six included studies that showed positive results. A narrative synthesis was appropriate given the differences between the included studies but the synthesis was very limited and there was a lack of detail about the interventions.

A lack of detail about the interventions and limitations in the synthesis make it difficult to assess the reliability of the authors' conclusions and limit the usefulness of the review.

**Implications of the review for practice and research**

**Practice**: Researchers should ensure a holistic socio-ecological approach that includes school staff (teaching and non-teaching), students, and parents, and that parents should be more involved in resilience-enhancing programmes.

**Research**: The authors stated that long-term evaluations of health-promoting school-based interventions focused on resilience were required as comprehensive changes in resilience require adequate time to take place. Process evaluations were required and the costs and benefits of health promotion programmes promoting resilience needed investigation.

**Funding**
Not stated.

**Bibliographic details**

**DOI**
10.1080/14623730.2013.770319

**Original Paper URL**
http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14623730.2013.770319#.U1Z6qFdrWow

**Indexing Status**
Subject indexing assigned by CRD

**MeSH**
Child; Humans; School Health Services; Schools; Health Promotion

**AccessionNumber**
12013047835

**Date bibliographic record published**
18/09/2013

**Date abstract record published**
22/04/2014
Record Status
This is a critical abstract of a systematic review that meets the criteria for inclusion on DARE. Each critical abstract contains a brief summary of the review methods, results and conclusions followed by a detailed critical assessment on the reliability of the review and the conclusions drawn.