Implementation of a national mental health intervention in educational communities: What do successful teams do differently?

Loreto Leiva | Gloria Zavala-Villalón | Andrés Antivilo-Bruna | Betzabe Torres | Catalina Ganga-León

Departamento de Psicología, Facultad de Ciencias Sociales, Universidad de Chile, Ñuñoa, Chile

Correspondence
Loreto Leiva, Departamento de Psicología, Facultad de Ciencias Sociales, Universidad de Chile, Ñuñoa 6850331, Chile.
Email: loretoleivab@u.uchile.cl

Funding information
National Scientific and Technological Development Fund under the Grant Fondecyt Regular Project No. 1171634

The peer review history for this article is available at https://publons.com/publon/10.1002/jcop.22370

Abstract

This study aimed to identify the elements that characterize local teams which implement a nationwide preventive mental health intervention in schools and achieve better results. A mixed-methods sequential explanatory design was conducted in two phases: (a) teams were characterized according to their level of achievement in the preventive intervention through latent class analysis; and (b) case studies of three teams with different implementation results were conducted by performing content analysis on interviews, observations, and documents. It was established that the more effective teams have better planning, the more they are familiar with the intervention, and more aware of their strengths and weaknesses. This team also implement culturally pertinent actions aimed at increasing knowl-

1 | INTRODUCTION

Over the last few years, the field of school mental health (SMH) has expanded in connection with promotional and preventive initiatives (Kutcher, Wei, & Weist, 2015). This is because schools are community settings that provide a suitable context for solving issues related to the psychological well-being of children and adolescents, making it possible to improve their health in several areas (Langford et al., 2014; Power, 2003; Vicente et al., 2012; Weist, Lever, Bradshaw, & Sarno, 2014).

In this regard, it is not only relevant to evaluate the effectiveness of these interventions but also to properly transfer and maintain the contexts in which they were conducted (Durlak & DuPre, 2008), to avoid any discrepancies between what studies report about effective interventions and the actual event. Since, this usually affects what beneficiaries eventually receive (Proctor et al., 2009).

Thus, some authors focus on program implementation to describe and identify elements which are believed to result in effectiveness, while also generating practical mechanisms to apply them (Damschroder et al., 2009; Glasgow, Vogt, & Boles, 1999; Proctor et al., 2009). This is known as Implementation Science, where research–practice transference and on the development of methods for guaranteeing that evidence-based strategies and interventions can be effectively applied and used in the "real world" (Bhattacharyya, Reeves, & Zwarenstein, 2009; Curran, Bauer, Mittman, Pyne, & Stetler, 2012; Newhouse, Bobay, Dykes, Stevens, & Titler, 2013).

In this regard, evidence indicates that, for an intervention to succeed and achieve the expected results, certain elements must be present in teams (Laska, Gurman, & Wampold, 2014; Lundh, 2017). These factors can be strategic (general strategies) or technical (specific skills or procedures) (Lundh, 2017).

Executing teams are a major factor in intervention success, however, they can vary in terms of technical and academic abilities. Although teams are generally regarded as cooperative; their time constraints, aims, and strategies differ (Paternite, 2005).

In this context, it is important to understand that SMH programs are implemented in educational communities by teams composed of a variety of professionals, which may affect the execution due to a lack of shared competences (Ball, Anderson-Butcher, Mellin, & Green, 2010). Therefore, it is necessary to identify the characteristics that teams must have for interventions to achieve their expected results. In this regard, recent findings show that SMH teams must follow certain general strategies (Weist et al., 2014, 2005) or develop specific competences (Ball et al., 2010) to succeed.

In this context, Weist et al. (2005) list 10 principles associated with the best practices in teams: (a) enabling participants to use the program even if they cannot afford it; (b) addressing the needs of students, families, schools and communities; (c) grounding the intervention in evidence; (d) actively engaging students, families and teachers in program development and evaluation; (e) generating program feedback through quality evaluations and activity improvement assessments; (f) offering a variety of measures, such as promotion, early intervention and mental health treatments; (g) adopting high ethical standards, committing to students' and families' well-being alongside acting flexibly, sensitively and proactively; (h) respecting students' developmental, cultural and personal differences as well as those of school personnel; (i) establishing solid relationships with other professionals working at the school and striving to collaborate with them; and (j) coordinating the team's efforts with those of other related programs.

Likewise, Ball et al (2010) identify several competences required to reduce differences in execution among professionals implementing SMH programs. These competences are grouped into the following areas: key policies and laws; interprofessional collaboration; collaboration among interconnected systems; support for academic, socioemotional, and behavioral learning; evidence-oriented decision-making; personal and professional growth and well-being; and cultural competence.

Literature indicates that while intervening in the real context, if they want to maintain the fidelity of the implementation (defined as the degree to which an intervention is executed following its model or theory of change),

teams should take into account the results of the evidence (Bond, Evans, Salyers, Williams, & Kim, 2000; Gresham, 2009; Perepletchikova, 2011; Sanetti, & Kratochwill, 2009; Schulte, Easton, & Parker, 2009; Slaughter, Hill, & Snelgrove-Clarke, 2015). In this regard, authors highlight the importance of adhering to the core components of the intervention essential for obtaining the expected results without losing effectiveness (Carvalho et al., 2013; Mier, Ory, & Medina, 2010). This is relevant because, in the school domain, expected aims are not always met as a result of not executing actions faithfully (DuPaul, 2009; Durlak & DuPre, 2008; Owens et al., 2014). However, if adaptations are implemented, they should be fully evidence-based to avoid errors (Fixsen, Naoom, Blase, Friedman, & Wallace, 2005).

In addition, these teams should also (a) be able to identify the educational community's needs and strengths by applying participative strategies based on each school's specific traits (Weist et al., 2005) and (b) conduct continuous evaluation and improvement processes to detect deficiencies and develop future practices (Ball et al., 2010).

Likewise, teams are expected to implement culturally-pertinent interventions, which appropriately address language and origin differences, promote tolerance and respect, and developing specific strategies to deal with ethnic backgrounds, and cultural barriers (Ball et al., 2010; Weist et al., 2005, 2009). Teams should network with related programs to increase communication among all stakeholders for the community's mental health (Mellin & Weist, 2011) and help strengthen relationships with the community.

As cited above, although researchers have identified certain characteristics that executing teams should have to implement interventions correctly, there is no information linking successful interventions to team characteristics. No studies have explored whether teams that are identified as successful achieve better results when implementing interventions and are identified as successful possess elements differentiating them from others. The current study addresses this issue, as it seeks to recognize these characteristics.

While integrating guidelines from the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR; Damschroder et al., 2009), we sought to identify the elements that characterized the better performing teams in a nationwide preventive SMH intervention titled 'Skills for Life Program' (Programa Habilidades para la Vida, HpV. The CFIR is characterized by its community-focused socio-ecological approach, high degree of flexibility (Tabak, Khoong, Chambers, & Brownson, 2012), and its pragmatic structure for addressing the complexity and multi-level interaction involved in the implementation of real-world interventions.

1.1 | Skills for life: Promotion and prevention programs

Skills for Life (henceforth SfL) is a large-scale SMH program implemented in all regions of Chile (Leiva et al., 2015; Leiva, George, Squicciarini, Simonsohn, & Guzmán, 2015; Murphy, Abel, Hoover, Jellinek, & Fazel, 2017) that became one of the world's largest SMH initiative in 2015 (Murphy et al., 2017).

To implement the preventive strategy of the SfL program, teams first screen the student population to identify those who are at risk. To do this, they use the Teacher Observation of Classroom Adaptation (TOCA-RR) scale (Leiva et al., 2015) to identify students who display specific risks associated with maladaptive behaviors in school and to detect their level of school maladjustment. This universal detection makes it possible to identify students who should attend the preventive intervention. This intervention is aimed at modifying the trajectory of the risk detected, so that early measures can be taken to tackle risk behaviors that might lead to future mental disorders.

The preventive intervention is implemented by teams formed in each of the municipalities participating in this nationwide program, which are trained in the application of the SfL model. However, it has been suggested that the success of this intervention can vary depending on the implementation carried out by these teams (Leiva et al., 2015). Therefore, this study sought to identify the characteristics of those teams which (a) achieved good results on the standardized measures used in the preventive intervention and (b) were also identified as successful by their coordinators, in light of the general domains proposed in the CFIR model (Damschroder et al., 2009).

At an administrative level, the program comprises three levels, which results in interactions between the Agency of Student Support and Scholarships (henceforth JUNAEB) and local municipal governments. The first level is occupied by JUNAEB's National Office; which designs, monitors, evaluates, and controls the program's execution. The second level by JUNAEB's Regional Office supervises, who implement follow-up measures and provides executing entities with administrative and technical support. The third level by municipalities or local governments that coordinate initiatives alongside schools, school officials, and other stakeholders of the local network. Municipalities are in charge of administering the operations and overseeing the program's technical team.

Executing teams, which implement the program in schools, are part of the third level. They are under the administrative authority of the municipality and under the technical authority of JUNAEB's regional offices. Team members range from two to 12 depending on each municipality's size, budget and the number of schools to be served. In addition, there is one coordinator per municipality (a professionals from the intervention team and/or a municipal official).

2 | METHOD

2.1 | Participants

Chile is made up of 16 regions (akin to states in the United States) and is distributed over 4,200 kilometers. According to the Census carried out in 2017, almost the 70% of the population (n = 11,645,801) lives in the five central regions of the country that include its largest city (Santiago). To keep the travel costs to a minimum, the current study confined itself to students attending schools located in any of these Regions: Coquimbo, Valparaíso, Metropolitana, O'Higgins y Maule. Students considered in the study were those who entered first grade in 2014 and completed third grade in 2016. The final sample comprised 24,203 first grade children, representing 64.4% of the total number of students who participated in SfL program in 2014 (n = 37,575). These students attended 968 schools located in 85 municipalities belonging to five regions of Chile. As shown in Table 1, most cases originated in schools were located in the XIII region, which is consistent with the distribution of educational centers in Chile.

The last column of Table 1 specifies the total percentage of executing teams included in the study, considering the region where they operated. It should be noted that each executing team is responsible for all the schools located in a given municipality; therefore, for the purposes of this study, a total of 85 executing teams were examined. The percentage of executing teams in the Coquimbo Region was small (3.5%), as only 3 municipalities were included, whereas the Metropolitan Region, which contributed 37 municipalities to the study, significantly increased the number of teams in the study (representing 43.5% of the total).

Afterwards, the study focused on the executing teams. Case studies on three teams were conducted, which made it possible to further examine the characteristics of the implementation of the SfL program in depth. It should be noted that the cases analyzed included not only the professionals belonging to the executing teams, but also

TABLE 1 SfL program participants by region and municipality

Region	Participants	No. of municipalities	No. of schools	% of SfL teams
IV	290	3	19	3.5
V	4,605	15	230	17.6
VI	3,085	13	120	15.3
VII	3,264	17	159	20.0
XIII	12,959	37	440	43.5

Source: own work.

several educational community actors, such as members of the technical-pedagogical unit, which coordinates and supervises the implementation of curricular and pedagogical guidelines of each school, along with counselors and principals.

2.2 | Design

A mixed-methods sequential explanatory design was used (Creswell, 2014; Creswell & Plano, 2018; Curry & Nunez-Smith, 2015), which made it possible to capture and expand on our understanding of the elements that characterize a successful team.

2.3 | Procedure

We worked with both, the executing teams and the educational community taking part in the program. To undertake this study, two concatenated phases were carried out which are described below.

2.3.1 | Phase 1: Identification of teams according to their results in the preventive intervention of the SfL program

This phase made it possible to identify and select the three teams to be analyzed as case studies. The first inclusion criterion was having the experience of implementing the program. For this reason, we only selected teams that had carried out interventions during the last 2 years at least, since this period was considered sufficient to gain an adequate understanding of the model. Of the teams that met this requirement, we selected those that displayed dissimilar results after the implementation (successful changes, relatively successful changes, no changes). This selection was performed using the Latent Class Analysis (LCA) and will be described in more detail below.

2.3.2 | Phase 2: Case studies

A qualitative, analytical study was conducted. This made it possible to examine, identify and select the general domains and the local dimensions of the implementation process involved in the execution of the intervention (Damschroder et al., 2009). To do this, were conducted three cases studies (Yin, 2009), focused on as many executing teams. After identifying the executing teams according to their success as shown by the degree of improvement in the TOCA-RR scores, three teams were randomly selected.

The information collection techniques used in these case studies were: (a) semistructured interviews, (b) systematic and protocolized observations, and (c) documentary information analysis. Interviews were held with various members of the educational community and the executing teams.

The semistructured interviews were conducted by members of the executing team, and the participating schools, selected through purposive sampling; using a thematic guideline based on the CFIR framework.

The members of the executing team consisted of a Regional Coordinator (responsible for the supervision, monitoring and management control of the local execution units of the program), a Municipal Coordinator (responsible for technical and administrative management at the local level), and the Executors (responsible for coordinating actions with the educational community and local network stakeholders and for compliance with the programmatic technical model). The members of the participating schools consisted of interviewed Managers (key stakeholders related to the implementation of the intervention) and Teachers in the intervention.

TABLE 2 Interviews Conducted

	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Regional coordinator	1	1	1
Municipal coordinator	1	1	1
Executor	2	2	2
School official	1	1	2
Teacher	2	2	1
Total no. of interviews	7	7	7
Schools cover	23	6	18

Table 2 presents the specific number of interviews conducted and schools cover.

The above was complemented by protocolized observations of one of the technical meetings of each executing team. Lastly, we collected documentary information from the progress and final reports submitted to JUNAEB by each team, since we regarded them as useful for triangulating the cases through a pre-established protocol.

The techniques used made it possible to explore the particularities of each case (Flick, 2012). Validity and reliability were ensured following the guidelines advanced by Yin (2009). The information collected was systematized using the ATLAS.ti.8.3.1 software package. A directed content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005) was performed with the preset categories of constructs and domains of the CFIR model (Damschroder et al., 2009). The coding of the constructs was guided by the inclusion and exclusion criteria specified in the Code Book of the CFIR and the qualification of data by the CFIR Qualification Rules (Damschroder et al., 2009). The coding and analysis of data was triangulated with the participation of five social researchers, all arriving at the same results.

2.4 | Ethical considerations

Since the SfL program has an impact on the whole of Chile's school community, action criteria and methodologies are thoroughly informed and presented to all participants before each annual implementation. This study benefited from the support of the National Administrative Office of JUNAEB's Student Health Program and the National Coordination Agency of the SfL program. In addition, the study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Social Sciences at the Universidad de Chile, the institution to which all the authors belong.

3 | RESULTS

3.1 | Phase 1: initial analysis and case selection

The 3 executing teams were selected as follows:

(1) Based on students' scores on the universal screening measures administered each year and considering only the cases identified as at-risk that took part in the preventive strategy in 2014, we established the participants' scores on the four factors measured with the TOCA-RR (Leiva et al., 2015);

These scores were compared with the scores on the same four factors, 2 years later (in SfL schools, all students are post tested on the same measures at the end of the third grade). Based on the magnitude of the differences observed, the result of the intervention was categorized as either “successful” or “unsuccessful” for

each dimension, considering whether the pre and post difference was smaller or bigger than the median of its dimension.

Then, given that it is possible to determine the number of classes needed to explain response patterns on a series of indicators, a LCA was performed. This was pertinent since the LCA rests on the notion that there exists an unobserved categorical variable that divides a population into latent classes that are mutually exclusive and exhaustive (Collins & Lanza, 2010; Lanza & Rhoades, 2013).

This procedure was used to classify and identify the executing teams according to the success of the interventions carried out by them in the municipalities belonging to the participating regions. The analysis was performed using the poLCA software package (Linzer & Lewis, 2011) which makes it possible to estimate the latent class models for dichotomous and polytomous indicators. Solutions with two, three, and four latent groups were tested.

Thus, based on the differences observed in the Akaike information criterion (AIC) and the Bayesian information criterion (BIC) fit indexes for the three solutions, it was possible to establish an adequate fit for the model comprising three groups of executing teams: (a) teams that improved all the factors evaluated with the TOCA-RR and had a high success rate; (b) teams that improved at least three of the factors evaluated; and (c) teams that improved two factors at most, which represented a low success rate with the intervention results.

(2) Since each executing team is led by a regional coordinator who is in charge of ensuring the correct implementation of the program, they were asked to identify (based on their experience and expertise in the program) the teams according to their level of success in the intervention (successful, partial success or low success). This selection strategy rested on the assumption that coordinators will be able to assess the results achieved by the teams with a high level of accuracy.

Based on the fact that LCA allows both, the AIC and BIC, to develop typologies for the understanding of the data and its use in predictive models (Collins & Lanza, 2010; Schreiber, 2016), the information yielded by the LCA facilitated in establishing which teams had common characteristics to be identified as "successful." At the same time, through the application of a brief survey, the regional coordinators established the main characteristics that the teams needed to present to be qualified as "successful."The results observed in LCA were triangulated and validated with the information obtained from the regional coordinators. Thus, three teams were identified as successful, based on the characteristics they displayed.

3.2 | Phase 2: Case studies

The identified teams became the unit of analysis. We examined and analyzed the elements that characterized the implementation of the SMH intervention implemented by each team according to their level of success, following the guidelines of the CFIR model (Damschroder et al., 2009). It should be noted that the five macro dimensions of this model (intervention characteristics, context/external adjustments, etc.) and the subdimensions under each of them are mentioned in Table 3, along with the ways in which they are/are not present in the teams representing each of the success levels.

3.2.1 | Characteristics of the intervention

A core aspect of the intervention is that it can be regarded as an element that either belongs to the educational community or is external to it. This is (Damschroder et al., 2009) defined as the *source* of the intervention. Thus, the implementation success will be associated with the schools' perception of the intervention being an internal part of them.

TABLE 3 Comparison among teams

Domain	Dimension	Successful team	Partially successful team	Unsuccessful team
Intervention characteristics	Intervention source	• They implement active engagement actions. There is a clear plan and strategy • Their relationships with the school and within the team are characterized by familiarity and consistency. • They manage to incorporate the program in school dynamics. Schools regard the program as internal to them (part of them)	• They find it hard to incorporate the program in school dynamics • They encounter more problems to make schools regard the program as an internal intervention that does not disrupt their dynamics	
	Adaptability	• They have more in-depth knowledge of the Program's aims and model and the preventive intervention • They generate a situational diagnosis of the municipal context and perform a prior evaluation of the pertinence of any adaptations	• They perform adaptations to achieve the aims of the intervention and involve teachers and school officials, but without diagnosing the situation	• They make few adaptations, stressing their complexity, because they must be authorized by the technical authority.
	Complexity	• They generate strategies to reduce complexity with the school's support	• They highlight the complexity of the structure to which the program belongs in terms of the number and size of the organizational units involved, which they feel hinders their actions	• They display more elements that increase complexity, such as a large number of schools served, high turnover of team members, limited resources, and several types of users in the school community
Context/external adjustments	Needs and resources of the people served	• They make situational diagnoses that enable them to collect information about the needs of schools and their members • They are able to coordinate and visualize school factors that will either improve or worsen the effect of the intervention	• Scarce knowledge about the schools' needs	

TABLE 3 (Continued)

Domain	Dimension	Successful team	Partially successful team	Unsuccessful team
Context/internal adjustments	Structural characteristics	• They have a municipal coordinator who is a team member (not an external actor), which enables them to (a) have a direct relationship with the executing entity and (b) implement follow-up measures developed by the executors • They have more experienced professionals and less turnover		• The municipal coordinator is not part of the team, only an administrative official • More turnover
	Networks and communications	• They establish formal communication and feedback mechanisms within the team and with schools	• There are no formal technical meetings, only informal information exchanges during day-to-day work • They establish poor communication channels with schools in terms of program development	
	Culture	• They value technical expertise, proactivity, creativity, and respect for program guidelines • As a team, they have a democratic leadership style • Limited politicization of the team in response to government changes		• They value hierarchy • They have an authoritarian leadership style
	Implementation climate	• They implement involvement strategies aimed at harmonizing the intervention with the goals set by schools • They display active communication with schools regarding the aims of the intervention • They implement feedback mechanisms within the team and with schools • They have a positive climate at the team level • They try out new ways of doing things and solving problems	• There are no in-team or team-school feedback mechanisms	• There are no in-team or team-school feedback mechanisms • They implement activities that are perceived as an increase in workload • Difficulties aligning the program's aims with those of educational communities

(Continues)

TABLE 3 (Continued)

Domain	Dimension	Successful team	Partially successful team	Unsuccessful team
	Available resources	• Resources are considered to be adequate	• Human and material resources are found to be insufficient relative to the workload, affecting the implementation	• Human and material resources are insufficient. Scarcity of material resources, which must often be complemented with personal resources
Characteristics of the individuals involved	Knowledge and beliefs about the intervention	• They have more in-depth knowledge about the program and the intervention in particular • They implement active measures to increase schools' knowledge about the program • They conduct better planned and more systematic activities • They inform schools about the program's aims and school officials recognize and disseminate information about the program		• Lack of rigor in the team's implementation • Limited commitment and knowledge about the program
	Self-efficacy	• They are confident in their technical-professional competences and knowledge about their strengths and weaknesses • They display more self-efficacy	• They are confident in their technical-professional competences.But as a result of feedback from intervention beneficiaries and their prior experience • They do not regard themselves as necessarily self-efficacious	• They display low self-efficacy and confidence in their technical-professional activities • They have a limited command of the technical aspects of the program
Implementation process	Planning	• They make diagnoses of the school and its members in a proactive, well-planned, and systematic manner • They explore and go beyond the technical guidelines of the program and the intervention	• Proactive	

TABLE 3 (Continued)

Domain	Dimension	Successful team	Partially successful team	Unsuccessful team
	Involvement	• They formally identify implementation "leaders". In addition, they mention municipal and regional coordinators as actors who disseminate information and generate commitment to schools • They generate networks and involvement measures according to a plan • There is more involvement with the school and from the school	• They generate involvement networks only contingently and in response to present needs, without prior planning	• They generate networks and involvement measures reactively, mainly due to criticism of their work • Team members' involvement strategies are less developed and only consist in information delivery
	Reflection and evaluation	• They conduct reflection and evaluation actions proactively	• Reflection and evaluation actions are implemented to meet the organization's demands and not as a result of a proactive reflection/evaluation process	

The successful team is thus considered a part of the school's dynamics and structure, displaying planned involvement initiatives aimed at the educational community, in turn nurturing their relationship overtime, leading to the view that the team is internal (Table 4, quote 1).

As for the degree to which the intervention can be adapted in response to the context, it is remarkable that even though all the teams make adaptations, the successful team displays more knowledge about the program and generates a situational diagnosis of the context. This enables it to adapt the intervention in a way that suits the real situation of schools (quote 2).

In contrast, the team that achieved a partial level of success made more adaptations to engage school stakeholders. Lastly, the unsuccessful team made few adaptations. Members stressed that this was a result of the need to have them approved by the technical authority, which limited their autonomy.

TABLE 4 Quotes from the executing teams

Quote 1	Internal…I mean, though we are external, all our actions are part of the school's operation, I mean it's the school that implements the workshop through [the Program], it is the school that supports teachers through [the Program], and so on and so forth…so I always say, "use us", "make use of us" (Municipal Coordinator, successful team).
Quote 2	…our children don't perform too well if you ask them to sit down and listen to a story, they need to be challenged, that's why we used these activities, we kept a structure that is aligned with the intervention model, but we tried to bring this structure down to earth, adapting it to the local context…we look at our teachers, at our children, at our schools (Executor 2, successful team).
Quote 3	This year, we started planning our workshop with a diagnosis…we used an activity where we planned that teachers should be able to identify their needs and their own self-care practices (Executor 2, successful team).
Quote 4	If there's a school that doesn't perform well, or if there is a homeroom teacher who has not been informed, then I try to talk with my colleague…and then we give each other feedback so we can solve the needs that we detect during the process (Executor 2, successful team).
Quote 5	There, our work is almost like a crisis intervention, it's like "Okay, what happened?" "This, this, and that". And we analyze what we can do to improve or how we can help a colleague who had a problem, or a school that had this or that issue. So, we do this to determine our future steps (Municipal coordinator, successful team).
Quote 6	As a team, we work together, we know each other, and we all know, it's really clear to us, I think we know what each of us brings to the table. [The municipal coordinator] is like the team's mother, she supports us, like a hen, she guides us, tells us where to go, and then we act. [Executor X] brings us all down to earth with his attitude, [executor Y] generates ideas, [executor Z] starts shaping everything, she's lie "come on, people". How do I contribute? Maybe I say "I don't know, I'm no good at creating ideas", but I take advantage of what we have, I mold it, I polish it, "Oh! that's an idea right there…" (Executor 2).
Quote 7	…to work in a school, to succeed, we need this, there must be a schedule. You can't improvise, because schools have everything planned, so when there's an external program, it must work with the school, as a team. When [the Program] comes to talk to me it's not only the [municipal coordinator], it's all of them…so I can talk with all of them, and they all have schedules…I show them my schedules. So that coordination and that willingness to coordinate, because this also involves some compromises, that attitude has allowed the program to be successful. They are really organized, they all come here with their folders, their schedules, all the dates clearly set, and we know those dates too (School principal, successful team).
Quote 8	So we get together to review each session of the preventive workshop, we take out some activities and add others, we see if they worked or not, actually, we've used this procedure to remove many activities, but we've also added others, and so some have remained and they are safe bets, because they work quite well (Executor 2, successful team).

Concerning the perceived difficulty of the intervention itself, it is observed that the greater the number of elements that increase complexity, the lower the success rate during equipment implementation. The more people/schools there are to be served (mainly in cases where there are fewer executors); the more radical, alien, and disruptive is the intervention implemented (as perceived by the school, mainly due to turnover in the teams, which prevents the generation of long-term work and bonds). In turn, more steps required on the decisional chain to access resources, more difficulties for teams eventually resulting in poor implementation results.

However, the impact of these aspects on the implementation success depends on the way in which the executing team and the school deal with these situations: successful team manage to generate complexity reduction strategies.

3.2.2 | Context/external adjustments

Regarding the economic, political, and social context, successful team know how to prioritize the needs and resources of the educational community. In this team, both the professionals in charge of the implementation and school officials, emphasize on the relevance of the school's characteristics and make it a priority to address its needs. This translates in the generation of systematic situational diagnoses (quote 3). In addition, this team have more coordination capabilities, which enable them to visualize school factors that will either improve or worsen the effect of the intervention. These practices were not present in the moderately successful and unsuccessful teams, which explored schools' needs informally and intuitively.

Thus, attaining deep and systematic knowledge about the community's needs and resources and prioritizing them within the program guidelines will facilitate implementation (and hinder it if such needs and resources are overlooked).

3.2.3 | Context/internal adjustments

Includes the following dimensions: structural characteristics, networks and communications, culture, implementation climate, and preparation for implementation.

Structural characteristics involve an organization's social architecture, age, maturity, and size (Damschroder et al., 2009). They indicate that successful team have municipal coordinators within them, which validate them in the eyes of the executing entity. As for the executing entities to which the program is administratively associated, they have power and scope within the municipality, thus facilitating interaction with the schools. In addition, successful team is formed by experienced professionals.

In the networks and communications dimension, the main aspect that separates a successful team from the rest is the existence of formal communication and feedback mechanisms. These include regional meetings and traineeships aimed at sharing the best practices, technical team meetings and direct coordination with a program official formally selected by the school to facilitate implementation.

The cultural dimension refers to the organization's norms, values, and basic assumptions; which can either be explicit or implicit (Damschroder et al., 2009). In this study, we considered the values according to Rokeach's definition (in Enríquez, 2007), regarding them as mental representations that define what is desirable and valuable for a group or organization. Some major differences were observed in this regard as the successful team displayed values linked to the appreciation of technical expertise, proactivity, creativity, acceptance of the program's guidelines, a democratic leadership style and after government changes that affected the executing entity.

In contrast, the unsuccessful team valued hierarchy and displayed an authoritarian leadership style that politicized the functioning of the program. One of its most salient elements is the importance attached to following guidelines based on the desire to avoid punishment.

Regarding the educational community's overall level of receptiveness to the implementation of the intervention, two actions conducted by the team were found to increase the level of success achieved: (a) inducting schools to the aims of the intervention and (b) developing engagement strategies to harmonize these aims with those schools.In addition, the successful team established feedback mechanisms (both internal and involving schools), which made it possible to align all the stakeholders' aims and practices.For instance, team members should be able to share opinions about their practices among each other (quote 4).

With respect to the degree to which practices and beliefs about the possibility of learning are manifested, a link was observed between success and positive practices and between beliefs about learning displayed by team members and the school. The atmosphere created by a successful team promotes learning by giving participants the freedom to do things and solve problems using new approaches (quote 5). In contrast, the unsuccessful team displays a punishing climate which negatively affects the development of psychological safety to innovate.

Resource availability is another sensitive aspect of the external context since it can prevent a planned program implementation and cause it to be unsuccessful. Specifically, the successful team appeared to benefit from the amount of resources available alongside the ease to be as able to access them. In this regard, it was observed that more scarcity and difficulty were associated with less success and vice-versa.

3.2.4 | Characteristics of the individuals involved

This refers to the personal characteristics of the people involved in the intervention (Damschroder et al., 2009). These being: knowledge and beliefs about the intervention and with self-efficacy.

Knowledge and beliefs about the intervention refer to individuals' attitudes toward the intervention, the value they attach to it and their familiarity with events related to it (Damschroder et al., 2009). Differences were observed between the successful team and the unsuccessful teams. The successful team was better acquainted with the program, adopted measures to induct the whole educational community about the program's aims and implemented better planned and more systematic activities.

In addition, this team displayed a positive view of the program, a trait that is also associated with the characteristics of the executing entity. In contrast, the unsuccessful team, despite valuing the program, mentioned that it was hindered by a historic lack of professionalism that must be repaired.

In the case study of the successful team, school officials reported being aware of the program's aims and credited the team's dissemination efforts which made it possible for them to prioritize program participants.

With respect to self-efficacy, the successful team stood out due to (a) its technical competences and (b) awareness about their strengths and weaknesses through regular meetings aimed at facilitating reflection. This gave the team additional trust in its abilities and encouraged collaborative work (quote 6).

The moderately successful team displayed trust in its skill set, but only as a result of user feedback and prior experience in the program, not due to reflection within the group. Lastly, the unsuccessful team displayed low self-efficacy regarding the technical aspects of the program. In this context, team success appears to be related to self-efficacy.

3.2.5 | Implementation process

This refers to the interrelated actions focused on ensuring the effective implementation of the initiative (Damschroder et al., 2009), including aspects such as planning, involving, reflection and evaluation.

With respect to planning, it is the degree to which a model or method for implementing an intervention is applied in advance, while also considering the quality of this process (Damschroder et al., 2009). The successful team performs proactive, well-planned and systematic diagnoses of the educational community, surpassing the

program's technical guidelines. This planning is associated with successes or difficulties that will appear during the implementation. Orderly and systematic planning is reported as facilitating implementation (quote 7).

Involvement refers to the strategies aimed at attracting the right people to the implementation process and observing the results of these efforts. We observed that the successful team was characterized by the presence of formally selected implementation "leaders"- people who were formally tasked with directing the implementation. Specifically, in this study, there emerged figures such as municipal coordinators and their counterparts from the participating institutions, such as school officials. In the successful team, municipal coordination generates networks and involvement initiatives across all levels in a planned manner, all of which seek to communicate the program's characteristics and advantages, aligned with its stated aims. Such an approach has an impact on the executors, who actively implement similar initiatives at the school level.

As the level of success decreases, these initiatives become contingent, varying according to the needs at a given moment, with no planning. In the unsuccessful team, the coordinator becomes a reactive actor, who only operates as a mediator when the program is criticized. Similarly, the team's engagement strategies are less detailed and only involve information delivery.

As for school counterparts, a similar mode of operation is observed, with involvement actions increasing in more successful team. This could also be interpreted as a response from the school to the actions of coordinators.

Regarding reflection and evaluation, it is worth noting that the successful team has a system for assessing the interventions conducted and strives to reflect on its practices. This has a positive influence on implementation, because it enables the team to make timely adjustments to address the school's needs and ensure the achievement of the program's goals (quote 8).

In contrast, the less successful team generate few reflection activities and instead focus on delivering the evaluation reports requested by the program's national coordination office.

Given these results, it can be presumed that teams that engage in more constructive criticism and reflection, achieve better results.

4 | DISCUSSION

Teams implementing interventions in natural and real settings must contend with two challenges: following the original plan and ensuring the achievement of the intended results. To improve program effectiveness, it is relevant to identify the difference between expected and actual outcomes (Wandersman et al., 2008).

This is even more difficult when working with vulnerable communities and limited resources, two common situations in poor countries or those with unequal income distribution, such as Chile. Since, the health care systems in low and middle-income countries have less resources and very limited access to services (Pantoja et al., 2017); it is necessary to ensure the proper implementation of interventions aimed at improving people's well-being.

It is also highly relevant to identify team characteristics necessary to execute such interventions correctly, given that these characteristics have commonly been linked to "best practices" without necessarily establishing a direct association with the results achieved. It is assumed that the best practices lead to success, which might not always be the case.

More specifically, this study showed that the team that achieved better results and was regarded as successful by their coordinators, possessed characteristics differentiating them from the rest, which might explain their success.

Results make it possible to conclude that the actions of successful team is oriented toward aspects related to (a) internal functioning, (b) the relationship dynamics established with schools, and (c) the general context in which the intervention is carried out.

The practices identified in the successful team in this study make it possible to generate unified criteria about the characteristics that other teams might want to develop in the hope of achieving better results. Also considering

that, as pointed out by Ball et al. (2010), community-based SMH interventions tend to be implemented by professionals from various fields. However, it is relevant to consider that due to the number of cases included, the results should be interpreted with caution. Therefore, it is suggested that these findings be complemented with future research that incorporates a more significant number of cases

(1) Regarding the internal functioning of successful team, they benefit from having a municipal coordinator whose leadership is validated by team members, who is solidly committed to the intervention, and who has a democratic decision-making style.

As for the structure of the successful team, it is familiar with the intervention and has experience and expertise to manage the program's aims and model, all of which results in more consistency and less member turnover. In line with the literature (Ball et al., 2010), the above is associated with strong reflection and self-evaluation capabilities regarding their own practices, which is conducive to professional growth. In addition, successful team value their technical expertise, proactivity, creativity, and respect for program guidelines.

Their key competences include systematic and well-planned actions, good problem-solving skills, proactivity and the ability to reflect on their actions as a group. Regarding the latter, it is relevant to note that they engage in internal feedback sessions, reflection-focused meetings, proactive evaluations and new ways of operating.

(2) These characteristics may have enabled the successful team, as opposed to the less successful team, to generate relationships with schools characterized by familiarity and consistency over time.

Successful team strive to establish and preserve solid and active relationships with the educational community, develop communication, generate networks, and aiming to harmonize the intervention with the school's aims and work methods. This allows them to establish shared agreements, meanings and feelings of affiliation, while also properly regulating schedules and activities (Markle, Splett, Maras, & Weston, 2014; Nellis, 2012). In addition, this makes it possible to construct interpersonal relationships geared toward collaboration among professionals (Ball et al., 2010) by creating formal communication opportunities.

It is also worth noting that the more successful team standout due to the strategic focus of their interventions, which require systematic planning and evaluation of the needs of schools and their members. In turn, this requires that the team to evaluate the pertinence of any adaptations to the intervention.

(3) Lastly, the context in which interventions are implemented is also relevant, especially in developing countries, where several situations can hinder the process. In addition, in this study, the contexts in which the teams implemented the intervention were highly varied, which required practices that reacted to and addressed a wide range of realities.

Thus, the most successful team studied in this project is characterized by their situational diagnosis. This team give importance to the context in which the intervention is to be carried out, striving to identify the characteristics of the educational community and adapting activities to ensure their cultural pertinence. This enables them to meet participants' needs (Weist et al., 2005) by developing better adaptive capabilities in response to community values (Varsi, Ekstedt, Gammon, & Ruland, 2015). Adopting such an approach makes it possible for the school to experience the program as part of its community, since it becomes a part of its regular dynamics. This results in reciprocity, a relevant practice in teams working with vulnerable communities, since it generates a culture of exchange and integration of multiple perspectives that brings the program closer to the school (Minas, Ribeiro, & Anglin, 2019). All these are aspects that must be protected to ensure that an intervention will be successfully implemented.

ORCID

Loreto Leiva https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0837-3699
Gloria Zavala-Villalón https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3732-4602
Andrés Antivilo-Bruna https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8326-8226

Betzabe Torres https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6815-4186
Catalina Ganga-León https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3054-4522

REFERENCES

Ball, A., Anderson-Butcher, D., Mellin, E. A., & Green, J. H. (2010). A cross-walk of professional competencies involved in expanded school mental health: An exploratory study. *School Mental Health: A Multidisciplinary Research and Practice Journal*, *2*(3), 114–124. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-010-9039-0

Bhattacharyya, O., Reeves, S., & Zwarenstein, M. (2009). What is implementation research? *Research on Social Work Practice*, *19*(5), 491–502. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731509335528

Bond, G. R., Evans, L., Salyers, M. P., Williams, J., & Kim, H. W. (2000). Measurement of fidelity in psychiatric rehabilitation. *Mental Health Services Research*, *2*(2), 75–87. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010153020697

Carvalho, M. L., Honeycutt, S., Escoffery, C., Glanz, K., Sabbs, D., & Kegler, M. C. (2013). Balancing fidelity and adaptation. *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice*, *19*(4), 348–356. https://doi.org/10.1097/PHH.0b013e31826d80ebCFIR

Collins, L. M., & Lanza, S. T. (2010). *Latent class and latent transition analysis: With applications in the social, behavioral, and health sciences*. John Wiley and Sons Inc. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470567333

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Curran, G. M., Bauer, M., Mittman, B., Pyne, J. M., & Stetler, C. (2012). Effectiveness-implementation hybrid designs. Combining elements of clinical effectiveness and implementation research to enhance public health impact. *Medical Care*, *50*(3), 217–226. https://doi.org/10.1097/MLR.0b013e3182408812

Curry, L., & Nunez-Smith, M. (2015). *Mixed methods in health sciences research: A practical primer*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483390659

Damschroder, L. J., Aron, D. C., Keith, R. E., Kirsh, S. R., Alexander, J. A., & Lowery, J. C. (2009). Fostering implementation of health services research findings into practice: A consolidated framework for advancing implementation science. *Implementation Science*, *4*(1), 50. https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-4-50

DuPaul, G. J. (2009). Assessing integrity of intervention implementation: Critical factors and future directions. *School Mental Health*, *1*(3), 154–157. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-009-9016-7

Durlak, J. A., & DuPre, E. P. (2008). Implementation matters: A review of research on the influence of implementation on program outcomes and the factors affecting implementation. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *41*(3–4), 327–350. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-008-9165-0

Enríquez, Á. (2007). La significación en la cultura: Concepto base para el aprendizaje organizacional. *Universitas Psychologica*, *6*(1), 155–162.

Fixsen, D. L., Naoom, S. F., Blase, K. A., Friedman, R. M., & Wallace, F. (2005). *Implementation research: A synthesis of the literature*. Tampa, FL: University of South Florida, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, The National Implementation Research Network.

Flick, U. (2012). *Introducción a la investigación cualitativa*. Madrid: SAGE.

Glasgow, R. E., Vogt, T. M., & Boles, S. M. (1999). Evaluating the public health impact of health promotion interventions: The RE-AIM framework. *American Journal of Public Health*, *89*(9), 1322–1327. https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.89.9.1322

Gresham, F. (2009). Evolution of the treatment integrity concept: Current status and future directions. *School Psychology Review*, *38*(4), 533–540.

Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, *15*(9), 1277–1288. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687

Kutcher, S., Wei, Y., & Weist, M. (2015). *School mental health. Global challenge and opportunities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Langford, R., Bonell, C. P., Jones, H. E., Pouliou, T., Murphy, S. M., Waters, E., & Campbell, R. (2014). The WHO Health Promoting School framework for improving the health and well-being of students and their academic achievement. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, 4. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD008958.pub2

Lanza, S. T., & Rhoades, B. L. (2013). Latent Class Analysis: An Alternative Perspective on Subgroup Analysis in Prevention and Treatment. *Prevention Science*, *14*(2), 157–168. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-011-0201-1

Laska, K. M., Gurman, A. S., & Wampold, B. E. (2014). Expanding the lens of evidence-based practice in psychotherapy: A common factors perspective. *Psychotherapy*, *51*(4), 467–481. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034332

Leiva, L., George, M., Antivilo, A., Squicciarini, A. M., Simonsohn, A., Vargas, B., & Guzmán, J. (2015). Salud mental escolar: Logros de una intervención preventiva en salud mental en niños y niñas del primer ciclo de enseñanza básica.

Psicoperspectivas. Individuo y Sociedad, *14*(1), 31–41. https://doi.org/10.5027/psicoperspectivas-Vol14-Issue1-fulltext-508

Leiva, L., George, M., Squicciarini, A. M., Simonsohn, A., & Guzmán, J. (2015). Intervención preventiva de salud mental escolar en adolescentes: Desafíos para un programa público en comunidades educativas. *Universitas Psychologica*, *14*(4), 1285. https://doi.org/10.11144/Javeriana.upsy14-4.ipsm

Linzer, D. A., & Lewis, J. B. (2011). poLCA: An R package for polytomous variable latent class analysis. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *42*(10), https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v042.i10

Lundh, L. G. (2017). Relation and technique in psychotherapy: Two partly overlapping categories. *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration*, *27*(1), 59–78. https://doi.org/10.1037/int0000068

Markle, R. S., Splett, J. W., Maras, M. A., & Weston, K. J. (2014). Effective school teams: Benefits, barriers, and best practices. In M. Weist, N. Lever, C. Bradshaw & J. Owens (Eds.), *Handbook of school mental health. Issues in clinical child psychology* (pp. 59–73). Boston, MA: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-7624-5_5

Mellin, E. A., & Weist, M. D. (2011). Exploring school mental health collaboration in an urban community: A social capital perspective. *School Mental Health*, *3*(2), 81–92. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-011-9049-6

Mier, N., Ory, M. G., & Medina, A. A. (2010). Anatomy of culturally sensitive interventions promoting nutrition and exercise in hispanics: A critical examination of existing literature. *Health Promotion Practice*, *11*(4), 541–554. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524839908328991

Minas, M., Ribeiro, M. T., & Anglin, J. P. (2019). Social and community program approaches to participants: Exploring best practices. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *47*(2), 398–413. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.22128

Murphy, J. M., Abel, M. R., Hoover, S., Jellinek, M., & Fazel, M. (2017). Scope, scale, and dose of the world's largest school-based mental health programs. *Harvard Review of Psychiatry*, *25*(5), 218–228. https://doi.org/10.1097/HRP.0000000000000149

Nellis, L. M. (2012). Maximizing the effectiveness of building teams in response to intervention implementation. *Psychology in the Schools*, *49*(3), 245–256. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.21594

Newhouse, R., Bobay, K., Dykes, P. C., Stevens, K. R., & Titler, M. (2013). Methodology issues in implementation science. *Medical Care*, *51*, S32–S40. https://doi.org/10.1097/MLR.0b013e31827feeca

Owens, J. S., Lyon, A. R., Brandt, N. E., Masia Warner, C., Nadeem, E., Spiel, C., & Wagner, M. (2014). Implementation science in school mental health: Key constructs in a developing research agenda. *School Mental Health*, *6*(2), 99–111. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-013-9115-3

Pantoja, T., Opiyo, N., Lewin, S., Paulsen, E., Ciapponi, A., Wiysonge, C. S., & Oxman, A. D. (2017). Implementation strategies for health systems in low-income countries: An overview of systematic reviews. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD011086.pub2

Paternite, C. E. (2005). School-based mental health programs and services: Overview and introduction to the special issue. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *33*(6), 657–663. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-005-7645-3

Perepletchikova, F. (2011). On the topic of treatment integrity. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, *18*(2), 148–153. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2850.2011.01246.x

Power, T. (2003). Promoting children's mental health: Reform through interdisciplinary and community partnerships. *School Psychology Review*, *32*(1), 3–16.

Proctor, E. K., Landsverk, J., Aarons, G., Chambers, D., Glisson, C., & Mittman, B. (2009). Implementation research in mental health services: An emerging science with conceptual, methodological, and training challenges. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health*, *36*(1), 24–34. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-008-0197-4

Sanetti, L., & Kratochwill, T. (2009). Toward developing a science of treatment integrity: Introducción to the special series. *School Psychology Review*, *38*(4), 445–459.

Schreiber, J. B. (2016). Latent class analysis: An example for reporting result. *Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy*, *13*(6), 1196–1201. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sapharm.2016.11.011

Schulte, A., Easton, J., & Parker, J. (2009). Advances in treatment integrity research: Multidisciplinary perspectives on the conceptualization, measurement, and enhancement of treatment integrity. *School Psychology Review*, *38*(4), 460–475.

Slaughter, S. E., Hill, J. N., & Snelgrove-Clarke, E. (2015). What is the extent and quality of documentation and reporting of fidelity to implementation strategies: A scoping review. *Implementation Science*, *10*(1), 129. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-015-0320-3

Tabak, R. G., Khoong, E. C., Chambers, D. A., & Brownson, R. C. (2012). Bridging research and practice. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, *43*(3), 337–350. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2012.05.024

Varsi, C., Ekstedt, M., Gammon, D., & Ruland, C. M. (2015). Using the consolidated framework for implementation research to identify barriers and facilitators for the implementation of an internet-based patient-provider communication service in five settings: A qualitative study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, *17*(11), e262. https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.5091

Vicente, B., Saldivia, S., de la Barra, F., Melipillán, R., Valdivia, M., & Kohn, R. (2012). Salud mental infanto-juvenil en Chile y brechas de atención sanitarias. *Revista médica de Chile*, *140*(4), 447–457. https://doi.org/10.4067/S0034-98872012000400005

Wandersman, A., Duffy, J., Flaspohler, P., Noonan, R., Lubell, K., Stillman, L., & Saul, J. (2008). Bridging the gap between prevention research and practice: The interactive systems framework for dissemination and implementation. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *41*, 171–181. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-008-9174-z

Weist, M. D., Lever, N., Bradshaw, C. P., & Sarno, J. (2014). Further advancing the field of school mental health. In J. Weist, M. D. Lever, N. Bradshaw, C. P & Sarno (Eds.), *Handbook of school mental health. Research, training, practice and police* (pp. 1–14). New York, NY: Springer.

Weist, M. D., Sander, M. A., Walrath, C., Link, B., Nabors, L., Adelsheim, S., & Carrillo, K. (2005). Developing principles for best practice in expanded school mental health. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *34*(1), 7–13. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-005-1331-1

Weist, M., Lever, N., Stephan, S., Youngstrom, E., Moore, E., Harrison, B., & Stiegler, K. (2009). Formative evaluation of a framework for high quality, evidence-based services in school mental health. *School Mental Health*, *1*(4), 196–211. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-009-9018-5

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Applied social research methods series (4th Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

How to cite this article: Leiva L, Zavala-Villalón G, Antivilo-Bruna A, Torres B, Ganga-León C. Implementation of a national mental health intervention in educational communities: What do successful teams do differently? *J Community Psychol*. 2020;1–19. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.22370