

Summary of Research on Ripple Effects Software

Study	San Francisco, CA	New York, NY	Kentucky	Oakland, CA	Humboldt County, CA	San Mateo, CA	Bibb County, GA
Date	1999	2000	2001-2002	2003-2008	2003-2008	2005-2006	2005-2007
Investigators	Ray, Ripple Effects Silver, UCLA	Stern, Columbia U. Repa, NYU	Joyce Renfro, Eastern Kentucky U.	Ray, Ripple Effects, Rockman et al	Ray, Ripple Effects, Rockman et al	Bo De Long Cotty West Ed	Carol Norris, Norris Consulting Patterson, BCPS
Research Question re effects of software	Increase assertiveness? Decrease aggression?	Reduce aggression? Improve academic achievement?	Reduce school violence?	Use with fidelity? Improve school outcomes? Strengthen norms about substance abuse and locus of control?	Use with fidelity? Improve school outcomes? Strengthen norms about substance abuse and locus of control?	Improve social-emotional competency? Raise academic performance?	Reduce repeat referrals to ISS and impact attendance?
Intervention	5 lessons over 50 minutes	24 lessons over 12 weeks	Multiple, used RE with ISS offenders	Self-regulated use of 42 tutorials	Self-regulated use of 42 tutorials	42 lessons over 8 weeks	6-24 lessons, based on offense
Participants	n= 34 9th & 10th, urban ethnically diverse, gender balanced	n=54 7th & 8th urban ethnically diverse, gender balanced	n=420 3 high schools mostly white, rural gender balanced	N=231, 4 schools, mostly African American and Latino, low SES, multiple risk factors	N=90, 2 schools, rural, mostly Caucasian, some Native American, gender balanced	n=154, 6th grade urban/suburban ethnically diverse gender balanced	n=4790 ISS referrals in 40 elementary, middle and high schools
Method	Random assignment of class, experimental and comparison groups, pre-post test (CABS survey)	Random assignment, 3 groups: control, plus 1 with and 1 w/o adult facilitation, post test observation & admin records	Repeated measures design, using self-reports, with two baseline scores and two intervention scores, used during a two year period	RCT, repeated measures, 3 process measures, 5 school outcome measures, 2 self-report measures.	RCT, repeated measures, 3 process measures, 5 school outcome measures, 2 self-report measures.	Randomized with control groups; 1 pre and 1 post survey; administrative data from each school	Quasi-experimental; administrative data from each school first semester compared to 2nd
Results	Statistically significant reductions in aggressiveness, trend toward reduction in passivity	Clinical significance. Reduced summer school referrals. Increased pro social behavior Decreased anti-social behavior	Statistically significant decrease in reports of perpetration and increase in knowledge and skills to implement violence prevention	Statistically significant improvements in GPA, attendance, fewer suspensions, no impact on attitudes	Statistically significant improvements in GPA, strengthened norms against alcohol, CG increased internal locus of control	Statistically significant increase in empathy, problem solving, connectedness to school	At least 28% reduction in repeat referrals to ISS, 2 nd semester compared to first.
Notes and Unexpected findings	Very short intervention showed significant results. Will it last?	Students w/o adult guidance had 2x level of observed behavioral change as those who also had counselor facilitated sessions	Couldn't separate effects of software from other elements of intervention	Capacity of non-professionals to implement with fidelity; positive impact on GPA across settings	GPA increased when software used in lieu of academics	Measurable positive change in school climate per teacher's perception	Students asking to use program before they got in trouble; measurable change in school climate