Supplementary Information

Evaluation of an online training course for educational professionals on depression and mental health in childhood and adolescence

Journal: School Mental Health

Ann-Kathrin Saffenreuther [1a], Ellen Greimel [1,2], Regine Primbs [1], Lucia Iglhaut [1], Sara Kaubisch [1], Gerd Schulte-Körne [1,2], & Lisa Feldmann [1,2]

[1]Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, Psychosomatics and Psychotherapy, LMU University Hospital, Ludwig-Maximilians-University (LMU) Munich, Munich, Germany

[2]German Center for Mental Health (DZPG), Partner Site Munich-Augsburg, Munich, Germany

[a]**Corresponding author**

Corresponding author: Annkathrin.Saffenreuther@med.uni-muenchen.de

Table A.1

Results of the assessment of the quality of the training (in %)

Items	Response option 1	Response option 2	Response option 3	Response option 4	Response option 5	Response option 6
How high was your interest in the "training on depression and mental health in schools" at the beginning of the event?	Very low (0)	Low (1.1)	Medium (7.4)	High (42.6)	*Very high (48.9)*	
How much prior knowledge did you have in this subject area?	Very low (0)	Low (2.1)	*Medium (64.9)*	High (27.7)	Very high (5.3)	
The information content of the "training on depression and mental health in schools" was:	Very low (0)	Low (1.1)	Medium (19.1)	*High (60.6)*	Very high (19.1)	
The length of the "training on depression and mental health in schools" was:	Far too short (2.1)	Slightly too short (24.5)	*Just right (68.1)*	Slightly too long (5.3)	Far too long (0)	
The scope of the content of the "training on depression and mental health in schools" was:	Far too little (3.2)	Slightly too little (35.1)	*Just right (60.6)*	Slightly too big (1.1)	Far too big (0)	
The number of slides was:	Far too small (0)	Slightly too small (10.6)	*Just right (88.3)*	Slightly too large (1.1)	Far too large (0)	
The "training on depression and mental health in schools" has a high practical relevance for me:	Strongly disagree (1.1)	Somewhat agree (14.9)	*Mostly agree (53.2)*	Strongly agree (30.9)		
In the future, I plan to apply the content of the "training on depression and mental health in schools" in everyday school life:	Strongly disagree (0)	Somewhat agree (14.9)	*Mostly agree (42.6)*	*Strongly agree (42.6)*		
The slides were well-designed and visually appealing	Strongly disagree (1.1)	Somewhat agree (13.8)	*Mostly agree (50.0)*	Strongly agree (35.1)		

The content of the training was well structured	Strongly disagree (0)	Somewhat agree (3.2)	Mostly agree (40.4)	*Strongly agree (56.4)*		
I had the opportunity to ask questions	Not at all true (0)	Somewhat true (1.1)	Mostly true (10.6)	*Fully true (88.3)*		
The lecturer expressed herself clearly and comprehensibly	Not at all true (0)	Somewhat true (2.1)	Mostly true (12.8)	*Fully true (85.1)*		
The lecturer made the course engaging and diverse	Strongly disagree (0)	Somewhat agree (10.6)	Mostly agree (34.0)	*Strongly agree (55.3)*		
How would you rate the overall impression of the "training on depression and mental health in schools"?	Insufficient (0)	Poor (1.1)	Sufficient (3.2)	Satisfactory (9.6)	*Good (59.6)*	Very good (26.6)

Note: n=94; the highest percentage is written in italics.

Table A.2

Spearman rho correlation of General Self-Efficacy Expectation Scale (SWE) and knowledge acquisition

This table shows spearman rho correlations for the association between SWE and knowledge acquisition (knowledge at post - knowledge at pre; knowledge at follow-up - knowledge at pre)

Variable	Knowledge acquisition (post-pre)	Knowledge acquisition (follow-up-pre)	SWE
Knowledge acquisition (post-pre)	1	.669***	-.015
Knowledge acquisition (follow-up-pre)	.669***	1	.031
SWE	-.015	.031	1

Note: ***p<.001.

Table A.3

Spearman rho correlation of Teacher Emotions Scale (TES) and behaviour

This table shows spearman rho correlations for an association between negative emotions (TES anger and anxiety scales) experienced by the teachers in the classroom and change of reported helping behaviour (reported helping behaviour follow-up – reported helping behaviour pre).

Variable	TES Anger	TES Anxiety	Behaviour (follow-up-pre)
TES Anger	1	.373***	-.191
TES Anxiety	.373***	1	.066
Behaviour (follow-up-pre)	-.191	.066	1

*Note: ***p<.001.*

Table A.4

Questionnaire data

Variable/*M*(*SD*) *M*(*SD*)%	Pre	Post	Follow-up
Knowledge	11.15 (2.40) 61.94 (13.33)%	14.12 (2.42) 78.44 (13.44)%	13.54 (2.29) 75.22 (12.72)%
Stigma	4.87 (3.35)	3.66 (3.23)	4.63 (3.77)
Confidence	10.92 (2.78)	12.63 (2.41)	12.77 (2.10)

*Note: N*pre=97; *n*post=95 for knowledge; *n*post=94; *n*follow-up=79.

Table A.5

Sensitivity analyses paired t-test

This table presents exploratory sensitivity analyses for the two primary outcome measures (knowledge and stigma) and the secondary outcome (confidence) separately for those who reported having visited the website (*n*=18) and those who reported not having visited the website (*n*=26).

Model	*t*-value (pre-post)	*p*-value (pre-post)	Effect size *d* (pre-post)	*t*-value (post-follow-up)	*p*-value (post-follow-up)	Effect size *d* (post-follow-up)	*t*-value (pre-follow-up)	*p*-value (pre-follow-up)	Effect size *d* (pre-follow-up)
Knowledge (based on full sample as reported in the manuscript)	12.29	<.001* (post > pre)	2.33	-2.80	.007* (post > follow-up)	2.25	6.80	<.001* (follow-up > pre)	3.00
Model 1: Visited website[1]	3.95	.001* (post > pre)	2.58	-1.61	*.127*	2.26	2.74	.014* (follow-up > pre)	2.76
Model 2: Did not visit website[2]	6.46	<.001* (post > pre)	2.55	-3.43	.002* (post > follow-up)	1.66	3.81	<.001* (follow-up > pre)	2.83

*Note: N*pre=97; *n*post=95 for knowledge; *n*follow-up=79; *significance level was set to <.05; [1] *n* pre-post and post-follow-up=17, *n* pre-follow-up=18; [2]*n*=26; The difference revealed in the sensitivity analyses compared to the original model is written in italics.