

Bilaga 5. Beskrivning av ingående studier

Ingår i Folkhälsomyndighetens publikation "Rökfria miljöer i skolan. Hinder och möjligheter– en systematisk litteraturoversikt av kvalitativa studier" (2020).

First author Year Country	Aim of study Underpinning theory	Perspectives	Setting Participants	Sampling	Data collection	Analysis
Gordon 2003 Scotland	<p>The aim of the study To identify various issues that hinder staff intervention when confronted with pupil smoking.</p> <p>Underpinning theory Not described</p> <p>Part of a larger study aiming to explore if and how school characteristics or pupil factors could explain differences in the smoking profiles of secondary school</p>	School staff	<p>Setting Two secondary schools (11-18 years)with no-smoking policies and with different smoking rates</p> <p>Participants 27 members of school personnel: Senior management team (SMT), teachers, support staff, and school nurses</p> <p><i>Same study setting as Turner 2004a</i></p>	<p>Sampling method Purposeful sample</p> <p>Inclusion criteria School: Smoking prevalence Socioeconomy Participants: Different staff groups</p>	<p>Data collection method Semi-structured, face-to-face interviews</p> <p>Interviewer The authors</p>	<p>Analysis methods Thematic analysis, inductive</p> <p>Analysts Not described</p>

First author Year Country	Aim of study Underpinning theory	Perspectives	Setting Participants	Sampling	Data collection	Analysis
Nilsson 2010 Sweden	<p>The aim of the study To explore the role of smoking for young smokers by focusing on the mechanisms that facilitate young people starting to smoke as well as what could have prevented them from starting.</p> <p>Underpinning theory Not described</p>	Pupils	<p>Setting Four primary schools in urban and rural settings</p> <p>Participants 23 boys and 21 girls (n=44), 15-16 years of age, who smoke</p>	<p>Sampling method Purposeful sampling to capture diversity</p> <p>Inclusion criteria School: urban/rural socioeconomic</p> <p>Participants: Girls and boys who were smoking</p>	<p>Data collection method Eight single-sex focus group discussions lasting 55 to 90 minutes.</p> <p>Interviewer First author</p>	<p>Analysis methods Latent qualitative content analysis</p> <p>Analysts First author and the research team</p>

First author Year Country	Aim of study Underpinning theory	Perspectives	Setting Participants	Sampling	Data collection	Analysis
Plano Clark 2002 USA	<p>The aim of the study To explore how adolescents talk about tobacco use.</p> <p>Two parts focus on tobacco in school and how students feel about school policies against smoking</p> <p>Underpinning theory Not described</p>	Pupils	<p>Setting 4 high schools with smoke ban policies</p> <p>Participants 205 students, smokers (34%) and non-smokers</p>	<p>Sampling method Purposeful sampling of schools</p> <p>Inclusion criteria Criteria of accessibility, interest in participation in the study, and diversity of setting.</p> <p>The students recruited should represent a variety of perspectives</p>	<p>Data collection method 31 focus group discussions, 6-10 in each group.</p> <p>Interviewer Sixty-six students in four high schools became co-researchers</p>	<p>Analysis methods Thematic analysis, inductive</p> <p>Analysts Not clear</p>

First author Year Country	Aim of study Underpinning theory	Perspectives	Setting Participants	Sampling	Data collection	Analysis
Rozema 2018a NL	<p>The aim of the study To elucidate the perceived barriers and facilitators to sustainability of an outdoor smoking ban at secondary schools.</p> <p>Underpinning theory Implementation theory</p> <p>Part of a larger study evaluating smoke-free school grounds in NL</p>	School staff	<p>Setting Secondary school with outdoor school ground smoking ban</p> <p>Participants 15 school directors</p> <p><i>Same study setting as Rozema 2018b.</i></p>	<p>Sampling method Random selection of school directors (who expressed their willingness to participate in a questionnaire)</p> <p>Inclusion criteria Selection stratified by school, size and education type.</p>	<p>Data collection method Semi-structured face to face interviews</p> <p>A mixed-method design was used, only the qualitative part is included in the review</p> <p>Interviewer The first author</p>	<p>Analysis methods Thematic approach using a conceptual framework (deductive)</p> <p>Analysts First author and research team (parallel coding and consensus)</p>

First author Year Country	Aim of study Underpinning theory	Perspectives	Setting Participants	Sampling	Data collection	Analysis
Rozema 2018b NL	<p>The aim of the study To evaluate the implementation process of tobacco control policies by identifying important factors.</p> <p>Underpinning theory Implementation theory</p> <p>Part of a larger study evaluating smoke-free school grounds in NL</p>	School staff	<p>Setting Secondary school with outdoor school ground smoking ban</p> <p>Participants 24 school directors</p> <p><i>Same study setting as Rozema 2018a.</i></p>	<p>Sampling method 87 schools in 6 regions were contacted, 24 agreed to participate</p> <p>Inclusion criteria Directors from secondary schools that had decided to implement an outdoor school ground smoking ban</p>	<p>Data collection method Semistructured face to face interviews</p> <p>Observations (on the school ground) were made 2 times before implementation and about 4 weeks after the start of the implementation of the school ban policy.</p> <p>Interviewer and observer Researchers employed by Public Health Services</p>	<p>Analysis methods Thematic approach using a conceptual framework (deductive)</p> <p>Analysts First author and research team (parallel coding and consensus)</p>

First author Year Country	Aim of study Underpinning theory	Perspectives	Setting Participants	Sampling	Data collection	Analysis
Turner 2004 Scotland	<p>The aim of the study To present pupils' views on the extent to which staff could, and should, enforce smoking restrictions.</p> <p>Underpinning theory Not described</p> <p>Part of a larger study aiming to explore if and how school characteristics or pupil factors could explain differences in the smoking profiles of secondary school</p>	Pupils	<p>Setting Two secondary schools in deprived communities with no-smoking policies</p> <p>Participants 13-year-old pupils</p> <p>Same study setting as Gordon 2003</p>	<p>Sampling method Purposeful sampling (pupils) Friendship-based groups</p> <p>Inclusion criteria Pupils: Not described Schools: Schools with high and low smoking rate in deprived areas with no-smoking policies</p>	<p>Data collection method 25 single-sex discussion groups, 3-8 in each group.</p>	<p>Analysis methods Thematic analysis, inductive</p> <p>Analysts First author</p>