

Frameworks for Mental Health and Well-Being Impact Assessments

Donald Ewen Cameron*

Department of Psychology, University of Dublin, Dublin, Ireland

Description

Because mental health is largely influenced by the environments in which people live their daily lives, positive aspects of mental health emphasize the significance of feeling good and functioning effectively. Measuring the broad actions required to promote mental health across multiple sectors can be challenging. A variety of Impact Assessment (IA) frameworks make it possible to have a systematic method for evaluating policy actions at various levels. A systematic review examined the mental health and mental well-being IA frameworks and their applications. 145 records from the databases were discovered. Six additional studies were included through citation chaining and a reference list in addition to the nine articles that were included in the review. The majority of the contexts in which five distinct IA frameworks related to mental health were utilized involved evaluating community actions. A narrative synopsis provided a summary of the 15 articles included. The findings emphasize the necessity of participatory approaches in IA, which also serve to encourage mental health inclusion in policymaking and provide information for the IA evaluation. However, it is essential to ensure that IA frameworks are time- and cost-effectively operational and intended for use by laypeople in a wide range of industries.

Mental health is significantly influenced by social, economic, and physical environments [1,2]. People are beginning to recognize mental health as a problem that affects everyone rather than just one person and that the healthcare system should address [3]. Positive aspects of mental health have also received more attention, indicating a strategy that emphasizes the importance of feeling good and functioning well in addition to the treatment or prevention of mental health disorders [6]. The definition of (positive) mental health is "a state of well-being in which every individual realizes his or her own potential, can cope with the normal stresses of life, can work productively and fruitfully, and is able to make a contribution to her or his community"[4]. This definition departs from a clinical definition of mental health and emphasizes the significance of everyday environments, despite the possibility that it is culturally determined [8]. Mental health promotion can occur at the individual, community, and structural levels [9]. Positive mental health interventions can be evaluated on an individual level using tools like the WHO-5 and the Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale (WEMWBS). However, community-based actions like restricting access to leisure activities, closing a primary school, or altering national policy can be more difficult to measure.

The term "the process of identifying the future consequences of a current or proposed action with the 'impact' being the difference between what would happen with the action and what would happen without it" can be used to describe approaches to impact assessment (IA), which have their

roots in environmental impact assessment (EIA). An effort has been made to approach this intricate relationship methodically, despite the fact that it is frequently impossible to quantify this difference in a precise or linear manner. For instance, the Health Impact Assessment (HIA) is a method for evaluating the health-related effects of decisions made through a participatory process [5]. People still don't know how to use them or how to do it, even though HIA practice has changed over the past two decades. This prevents the attention of novel concepts. One of the HIA's offshoots is an IA framework that focuses specifically on the effects on mental health. Despite the fact that mental health has an impact on population health, mental health IA has received relatively less attention than other types of IA, such as HIA or Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). Other approaches argue that specific, individualized frameworks are required to increase both interest and adherence, despite the fact that the variety of IA frameworks has been cited as a potential source of confusion. In order to be used in policymaking, IA frameworks need to be clear and easy to find. The effectiveness of various IA frameworks can be categorized as follows, according to Chanchitpricha and Bond: a) "Procedural effectiveness" refers to practice and whether or not it is clear why and how IA is done; (b) "substantive effectiveness" refers to performance, decision-making integration, and achievement of objectives; c) The term "transactive effectiveness" refers to competence and resource management efficiency; and (d) "normative effectiveness" This framework, which is still in its infancy, provides some guidelines for assessing the appropriateness of various IA frameworks [5].

It would appear that there is insufficient information regarding the accessibility of mental health-related IA tools. The purpose of this research is to conduct a systematic review of existing IA frameworks regarding their effects on mental health and wellbeing. In addition, it will investigate the kinds of IA frameworks that have been used, and how much, in all age groups, countries, and contexts. This article uses the term "mental health IA" to refer to IA approaches that emphasize mental health in general and encompass both mental health continuums, including mental health disorders and difficulties to mental wellbeing. Each part of this umbrella term, like mental health disorders or mental wellbeing, will have its own definition.

Acknowledgement

None.

Conflict of Interest

None.

References

1. Huppert, Felicia A and Timothy TC So. "Flourishing across Europe: Application of a new conceptual framework for defining well-being." *Social indica res* 110 (2013): 837-861.
2. World Health Organization. Promoting mental health: Concepts, emerging evidence, practice: Summary report, WHO, 2004.
3. Purtle, Jonathan, Katherine L. Nelson, Nathaniel Z. Counts, and Michael Yudell. "Population-based approaches to mental health: history, strategies, and evidence." *Ann rev pub health* 41 (2020): 201.

*Address for Correspondence: Donald Ewen Cameron, Department of Psychology, University of Dublin, Dublin, Ireland, E-mail: ewencameron@donals.ir

Copyright: © 2022 Cameron DE. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Received: 24 October, 2022, Manuscript No. jmt-23-85852; **Editor assigned:** 26 October, 2022, Pre QC No. P-85852; **Reviewed:** 09 November, 2022, QC No. Q-85852; **Revised:** 16 November, 2022, Manuscript No. R-85852; **Published:** 24 November, 2022, DOI: 10.37421/2471-271X.2022.08.242

4. Forsman, Anna K, Kristian Wahlbeck, Leif Edvard Aarø and Graça Cardoso, et al. "Research priorities for public mental health in Europe: recommendations of the ROAMER project." *Europ J Pub Health* 25 (2015): 249-254.
5. Wahlbeck, Kristian. "Public mental health: The time is ripe for translation of evidence into practice." *World Psychiatry* 14 (2015): 36-42.

How to cite this article: Cameron, Donald Ewen. "Frameworks for Mental Health and Well-Being Impact Assessments." *J Ment Disord Treat* 08 (2022): 242.