Effectiveness Studies Summary
Research Methods and Results

Ripple Effects Whole Spectrum Intervention System

Table of Contents

Summary of Research Methodology

Over 10 years, eight randomized, controlled trials, and three quasi-experimental, school-based evaluations have examined the impact of Ripple Effects on internal and external outcomes for 4,700 students, most of whom had multiple risk factors for school failure and delinquency. The studies also examined implementation process outcomes. Government agencies and foundations funded them.

Each study examined different, culturally competent configurations of Ripple Effects *Whole Spectrum Intervention System* (WSIS), which were adapted – without loss of fidelity – to specific cultural contexts and physical, social and educational constraints. Each was conducted in "real-world" circumstances. With the exception of the first pilot (which involved the program developer), teachers, social workers, and non-professional school staff, with no more than three hours of training, delivered the intervention in some of the most challenged schools in the United States.

Participants were drawn from 51 elementary, middle, and high schools, in urban, rural, and suburban settings, in three regions of the United States. These students represented all ethnic/racial groups, and included special education students. The population was weighted toward African American and Latino adolescents with multiple risk factors.

Two quasi-experimental studies tested the impact of Ripple Effects as a tertiary intervention. The first measured impact on depression scores among youth involved in, or at risk of, gang activity, using the Beck Depression Inventory. The second measured impact on disciplinary referrals and in-school suspension rates, using school administrative data. That study also used computer generated usage data to measure voluntary use of Ripple Effects to access guidance on personal issues. Both used time periods as comparison conditions.

Seven longitudinal randomized controlled trials (RCTs) examined the use of Ripple Effects for secondary prevention. Six, two-armed studies used Monitoring the Future survey data to assess attitudes about alcohol and drug use, and the Multi-Dimensional Health Locus of Control (MHLC) scale to measure perceived locus of control. They also used district administrative data to assess outcomes related to school behavior and academic performance. The seventh, a three-armed study, analyzed data collected by blind observers with high inter-rater reliability, to measure social behavior, and administrative data on remedial summer school referrals to measure academic impact.

One quasi-experimental study, and one RCT measured Ripple Effects for primary prevention. The first, a pilot, measured impact on short-term assertiveness scores on the Children's Assertiveness Behavior Scale, after a one-hour intervention. The second examined impact on resilience assets, before and after a seven-week intervention, and again at five months, using the California Health Kids Survey as a measure.

Eight studies included calibrated measures of attrition, compliance and dosage. All included qualitative process measures. The following statistically significant positive impacts were documented. Possible attrition bias and/or lack of data on baseline equivalence diminish confidence in some, but by no means all of these results. Manuscripts with complete descriptions of the theory, research design, conditions of use, participants, methods of data collection and analysis, as well as outcomes, are included in five volumes, covering primary, secondary, and tertiary outcomes, summary findings, and implementation process evaluations.

Summary of significant positive findings

Primary Intervention: Universally building strengths	Secondary Intervention: Targeting group-level risks	Tertiary Intervention: Positive individualized support
▪ Greater assertiveness ▪ Reduced aggressiveness ▪ Greater empathy ▪ Improved problem solving	▪ Higher grades ▪ Fewer out-of-school suspensions ▪ Reduced absenteeism ▪ Less tardiness ▪ Greater retention in school at 1-year follow-up (after previous failure) ▪ Stronger attitudes against alcohol	▪ Reduced depression ▪ Fewer in-school suspensions ▪ High rates of voluntary use for personal guidance

A series of summary charts with greater detail on the design, methods and outcomes for each study follow.

Goals, Time Frames, Researchers & Funders

Study #	Goals	Time Frame	Researchers	Funder(s)
1	Measure impact of Ripple Effects (RE) on depression	2006-2008	Koffman, Albarran, Vasquez	LAUSD, LAPD, CSU
2	Measure impact of RE on resilience, school outcomes	2005-2008	De Long-Cotty, WestEd	Lucille Packard Foundation for Children's Health
3	Measure use of RE to individualize therapeutic sanctions in discipline settings, and impact on discipline-related outcomes	2004-2007	Norris Consulting	Safe Schools/Healthy Students Grant
4	Measure impact of RE on school outcomes, locus of control, and attitudes towards alcohol and marijuana, in chaotic and unsafe alternative school	2003-2008	Bass, Perry, Ray, Berg	National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA)
5	Measure impact of RE on school outcomes, locus of control, and attitudes towards alcohol and marijuana, in continuation high school	2003-2008	Bass, Perry, Ray, Berg	National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA)
6	Measure impact of RE on school outcomes, locus of control, and attitudes towards alcohol and marijuana, for rural early adolescents	2003-2008	Bass, Perry, Ray, Berg	National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA)
7	Measure impact of RE on school outcomes, locus of control, and attitudes towards alcohol and marijuana, for rural adolescents	2003-2008	Bass, Perry, Ray, Berg	National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA)
8	Measure impact of RE on school outcomes, locus of control, and attitudes towards alcohol and marijuana, when implemented in lieu of academics	2003-2008	Bass, Perry, Ray, Berg	National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA)
9	Measure impact of RE on school outcomes, locus of control, and attitudes towards alcohol and marijuana, when implemented by non-professionals	2003-2008	Bass, Perry, Ray, Berg	National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA)
10	Measure impact of RE on school outcomes, locus of control, and attitudes towards alcohol and marijuana: Summary of six studies	2003-2008	Bass, Perry, Ray, Berg	National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA)
11	Measure efficacy of RE in increasing prosocial behavior, reducing aggressive behavior, improving school outcomes	1999-2000	Stern (Columbia), & Repa (NYU)	University-based Researchers
12	Measure efficacy of RE in strengthening assertiveness	1999	Ray, Silver	Ripple Effects
Notes				

Research Designs

Study #	Design		Unit of Analysis		Cohorts	Longitudinal, repeated measures				Statistical methods	IRB
	RCT	QE	Individuals	Groups		Baseline	Pre-Post	Follow-Up	Time series		
1		✔		✔	4		✔		✔	T-test[1]	N/A
2	✔		✔			✔	✔	✔		ANOVA[2]	✔
3		✔		✔	3		✔		✔	Descriptive statistics	N/A
4	✔		✔			✔	✔	✔		ANOVA[2] T-test[1]	✔
5	✔[3]		✔			✔	✔	✔		ANOVA T-test	✔
6	✔[3]		✔				✔			ANOVA T-test	✔
7	✔		✔				✔			ANOVA T-test	✔
8	✔		✔			✔	✔	✔		ANOVA T-test	✔
9	✔		✔				✔			ANOVA T-test	✔
10	✔		✔				✔			ANOVA T-test	✔
11	✔[4]		✔				✔			T-tests, Chi Square	✔
12		✔[5]	✔				✔			Wilcoxon Signed-Ranks test	N/A

Notes

Design

RCT = Randomized Controlled Trial, QE = Quasi-Experimental

[1] Independent samples t-tests

[2] Analyses of variance

[3] RCT with reservations, due to randomization procedures

[4] Three-arm study, 2 treatment groups (TG), one control group (CG). All other studies were two-arm, 1 TG, 1 CG.

[5] QE matched comparison group design. Experimental and comparison classes chosen by the flip of a coin.

Measures & Data Collection

Study #	Process & Fidelity			Internal Outcomes				External Outcomes			
	Attrition	Compliance	Dosage	Concept Mastery	Attitudes	Skills	INSTRU-MENT	Attendance	Behavior	Academics	Enrollment
1	SD	ACD	×	×	PS	×	BDI[1]	SD	SD	SD	×
2	SD, CS	ACD	ACD	ACD	×	CS	CHK-RYDM[2]	SD	SD	SD	×
3	×	×	ACD	×	×	×	×	×	SD	×	×
4	SD, CS	ACD	ACD	ACD	CS	×	MHLC[3] MTF[4]	SD	SD	SD	SD
5	SD, CS	ACD	ACD	ACD	CS	×	MHLC[3] MTF[4]	SD	SD	SD	SD
6	SD, CS	ACD	ACD	ACD	CS	×	MHLC[3] MTF[4]	SD	SD	SD	×
7	SD, CS	ACD	ACD	ACD	CS	×	MHLC[3] MTF[4]	SD	SD	SD	×
8	SD, CS	ACD	ACD	ACD	CS	×	MHLC[3] MTF[4]	SD	SD	SD	SD
9	SD, CS	ACD	ACD	ACD	CS	×	MHLC[3] MTF[4]	SD	SD	SD	×
10	SD, CS	ACD	ACD	ACD	CS	×	MHLC[3] MTF[4]	SD	SD	SD	×
11	SD	ACD	ACD	×	×	DO	SAOT[5]	×	SD	SD	×
12	SD	ACD	ACD	×	×	PS	CABS[6]	×	×	×	×

Notes

Measures and Data Collection Codes:
SD = School/District Archival Admin. Data (Enrollment, GPA, Tardies, etc)
ACD = Automated, Computer Data
CS = Computerized Surveys
PS = Paper-based, adult-delivered survey
DO = Direct observation by trained, blind observers, tested for IRR

Instruments: 1= Beck Depression Inventory, validated depression measure 2 = Adapted from California Healthy Kids, Resilience & Youth Development Module, validated instrument 3 = Adapted from the Multi-Dimensional Health Locus of Control Scales, a validated instrument 4 = Adapted from the Monitoring the Future survey on attitudes towards drugs and alcohol 5 = Student Observation Assessment Tracking, a behavior observation scale measured for reliability and validity 6 = Children's Assertiveness Behavior Scale, validated measure of passivity, assertiveness, and aggression.

Settings

Study #	Region	Urbanicity	School type	# Schools	Specific context
1	West Coast	Urban	High school	1	School-based, after-school and weekend supplemental intervention
2	West Coast	Suburban	Middle schools	2	computer class, life skills class
3	South	Urban, Suburban, Rural	Elementary, Middle, High	40	Office referrals, In-school suspension
4	West Coast	Urban	Alternative middle school	1	Advisory period
5	West Coast	Urban	Continuation School	1	Advisory, plus free time during other classes
6	West Coast	Rural	Elementary school	1	Pulled from language arts
7	West Coast	Rural	High school	1	Computer or English class, instead of regular instruction
8	West Coast	Urban	Alternative middle school	1	Pulled from language arts or math class
9	West Coast	Urban	Charter school	1	Advisory period
10	West Coast	Urban, Rural	Elementary, Middle, High	6	Advisory, in lieu of academic subjects, or computer class
11	East Coast	Urban	Middle school	1	During free class time
12	West Coast	Urban	High school	1	During a single class period
Notes					

Participants

Study #	Sub-group chosen	N =	Demographics											Inc. Spec. Ed?	Additional Known Risk Factors	
			Af. Am.	Hisp./ Latino	Asian/ PI	Native Am.	Cauc.	Other	M	F	Age (range /ave)	% ELL	% Low SES		Internal	Exter-nal
1	All partici-pants	163	6%	91%	2%	0%	<1%	<1%	71%	29%	10-17/ 15	91%	100%	Y	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8,	10, 11, 12
2	All 6th graders	154	4%	26%	19%	0%	52%	0%	51%	49%	DK	17%	31%	Y		10
3	All referred students	3685	73%	2%	1%	0%	23%	1%	DK	DK	7-18/ DK	DK	70%	Y	1, 3, 4, 6, 9	10, 11
4	All 8th graders	117	67%	29%	2%	0%	2%	0%	73%	27%	12-16/ 13.7	27%	80%	Y	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8	10, 11, 12
5	Subset of 9th-12th graders	177	72%	17%	10%	0%	1%	0%	59%	41%	16-19/ 16.6	24%	61%	Y	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8	10, 11, 12
6	All 7th graders	53	2%	0%	2%	9%	87%	0%	58%	42%	11-13/ 11.9	0%	36%	Y	5	10
7	All 8th & 9th graders	107	2%	3%	1%	2%	91%	0%	46%	54%	12-15/ 13.4	0%	31%	Y	5	10, 11
8	All 8th graders	31	78%	18%	4%	0%	0%	0%	54%	46%	13-15/ 14.3	19%	100%	Y	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8	10, 11, 12
9	All 6th graders	120	17%	83%	0%	0%	0%	0%	49%	51%	9-12/ 10.8	83%	94%	Y	1, 5, 8	10, 11, 12
10	6th-12th	605	31%	32%	6%	1%	30%	0%	57%	43%	10-19/ 13.5	30%	60%	Y	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8	10, 11, 12
11	2 7th & 8th grade classes	57	25%	23%	26%	0%	26%	0%	54%	46%	DK	DK	DK	Y		10, 12
12	2 classes of 9th graders	41	11%	13%	51%	<1%	25%	0%	52%	48%	DK	DK	DK	N		10, 12

Notes

Risk Factor Codes: Internal 1= School problems (discipline, behind grade level, dropped out, etc); 2 = teen parent; 3 = exposed to serious trauma; 4 = engaged in early, illegal substance use; 5 = easy access to alcohol, drugs and weapons, 6 = history of aggression/violence, attention problems, learning disorders; 7= delinquent behavior (breaking civil laws)/ having involvement with juvenile justice system; 8= involved in or living near gang activity; 9 = engaging in sexual activity/ especially exploitative activity; **External** 10 = Demographic factors–being a member of a racial or ethnic minority, being an English language learner; coming from a low income household; 11= Family factors–having family problems, such as parental addiction, mental-emotional disorders, and discipline-related abuse; 12 = Community factors - neighborhood, gang violence.

Intervention Descriptions & Core Components

Study #	Goals	Lesson Content		Learning process		Scope	Duration	Staff Training
		Group mandated	Individual choice	Group mandated	Individual choice	Lessons, hours		
1	**S & T:**–YGI, D, TE, AD, MH	Personal strengths, risk & protective factors	After finishing required	ILM + DISC	PLM	30, 7.5 hrs	30-45 mins a wk, 12 weeks	3 hrs
2	**P:** MH, TE, AD	Resilience (emotional regulation, belonging, problems solving, empathy, agency)	6 lessons	ILM	PLM	42, 12 hrs	2x/wk for 7 wks	3 hrs
3	**T**: D, V, ATD, AD, FF, TE, SA/E, MH	Lessons based upon disciplinary offense	After finishing required	ILM	PLM	1 to 8, 2.3 hrs	15 mins to 2.5 hrs, 1-3 sessions	3 hrs
4	**S:** D, ATD, AD, MH	Self-efficacy, school achievement, substance abuse	After finishing required	ILM	PLM	42, 12 hrs	4x/wk over 6 weeks	3 hrs
5	**P:** D, ATD, AD, MH	Self-efficacy, school achievement, substance abuse	After finishing required	ILM	PLM	36, 12 hrs	4x/wk over 6 weeks	3 hrs
6	**S:** D, ATD, AD, MH	Self-efficacy, school achievement, substance abuse	After finishing required	ILM	PLM	44, 14 hrs	2x/wk for 7 wks	3 hrs
7	**S:** D, ATD, AD, MH	Self-efficacy, school achievement, substance abuse	After finishing required	ILM	PLM	42, 12 hrs	2-3x/wk for 6 wks	3 hrs
8	**S**: D, ATD, AD, MH	Self-efficacy, school achievement, substance abuse	After finishing required	ILM	PLM	42, 14 hrs	45 mins, 3x/wk for 7 wks	3 hrs
9	**S**: D, ATD, AD, MH	Self-efficacy, school achievement, substance abuse	After finishing required	ILM	PLM	36-44, 12 hrs	4x/wk for 7 wks	3 hrs
10	**S:** D, ATD, AD, MH	Self-efficacy, school achievement, substance abuse	After finishing required	ILM	PLM	See 6 above	2-4x/wk, for 6 to 7 wks	3 hrs
11	**S:** D, AD	Prosocial behavior	None	A) ILM B) ILM + DISC/RP	PLM	24 lessons	2-3 times/wk over 12 weeks	2 hrs
12	**P:** D	Assertiveness	None	ILM+ 2 PLM[1]	remaining PLM	6, 1 hr	1 hour	N/A

Notes

Levels of intervention:
P = Primary Prevention
S = Secondary Prevention
T = Tertiary Intervention

Intervention goals:
D = Delinquency
V = Violence
YGI = Youth Gang Involvement
ATD = Alcohol, tobacco, drug use
AD = Academic difficulties
FF = Family functioning
TE= Trauma exposure
SA/E = Sexual activity/exploitation
MH = Mental health issues

Intervention core components
ILM = 3 **Interactive Learning Modes** per lesson: Brain Journal, Profile, and Got It. Completion of these is tracked automatically in the software.
PLM = From 7 to 9 **Passive Learning Modes**.
DISC = Adult facilitated discussion session
RP = Adult facilitated role-play drawn from lesson
1 = Info and How to were the two mandated PLMs

Conditions of Use

Study #	Treatment Condition			Comparison Condition[1]
	Facilitators	Facilitator role	Student: computer ratio and location	
1	Graduate students, teacher, Special Ed. coordinator, Vice Principal/LCSW	Assigned lessons, monitored completion, led follow-up discussion	1:1, computer lab	Time period
2	Librarian, life skills teacher	Assigned lessons, monitored completion, assisted with technical issues	1:1, computer lab	Computer or life skills Instruction
3	ISS teachers, counselors	Assigned lessons, monitored completion	1:1, laptops, ISS room	Time period
4	Advisory teacher	Customized scope & sequence, assigned lessons, monitored completion	1:1, in computer lab	Advisory instruction
5	Advisory teacher	Customized scope & sequence, assigned lessons, monitored completion	1:1, in classroom	Advisory instruction
6	Math teacher	Customized scope & sequence, assigned lessons, monitored completion	1:1, in computer lab	Language arts instruction
7	Special Ed, English teachers	Customized scope & sequence, assigned lessons, monitored completion	1:1, in library	Computer or English instruction
8	Social worker	Customized scope & sequence, assigned lessons, monitored completion	1:1, in computer lab	Language arts or math instruction
9	School secretary, cafeteria aide, facility manager, parent volunteer	Customized scope & sequence, assigned lessons, monitored completion	1:1, in computer lab; 1:1.2 on laptops	Advisory instruction
10	A range of trained and non-professional school staff	Customized scope & sequence, assigned lessons, monitored completion	1:1 laptops, computer labs, in classroom	Instruction
11	Teacher, counselor	Assigned lessons, monitored completion, led follow-up role-play and discussion	1:1, rotated through 4 CPUs, back of class	Instruction
12	Program developer	Assigned lessons, monitored completion	3:1, in computer lab	Instruction

Notes

Comparison Condition:

[1] = All instruction was "as usual", meaning students in the comparison condition continued to receive standard instruction for the setting: problem-solving in Advisory, Language arts instruction in Language Arts, etc.

Results: Baseline Equivalence & Process Results

Study #	Baseline Equivalence			Attrition					Compliance & Dosage		
				Enrollment		Study		Inter-vention	% complied	Average dosage level – %, hrs	% self-selected
	Attitudes/ skills	Behavior	School Outcomes	Overall	Diff.[1]	Overall	Diff.[1]				
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	40%[2]					100%	NM	NM
2	Y	NM	Y	.6% post, 8% FU	NM	3% post, 11% FU[5]	NM	13%	87%	88% 12 hrs	100%
3	N/A	N/A	N/A	NM	NM	NM	NM	NM	N/A	2 hrs	NM[6]
4	Y	NM	NM[3]	7%	0%	1%	-2%	63%[4]	37%	68% 9 hrs	100%
5	Y	NM	NM[3]	13%	-2%	0%	0%	41%[4]	59%	56% 7 hrs	96%
6	Y	NM	NM	2%	-4%	0%	0%	12%[4]	88%	94% 14 hrs	87%
7	Y	NM	NM	1%	2%	22%	16%	39%[4]	61%	74% 10 hrs	95%
8	Y	NM	Y	10%	-6%	0%	0%	0%[4]	100%	98% 14 hrs	100%
9	Y	NM	NM	2%	3%	0%	0%	20%[4]	80%	75% 11 hrs	100%
10	Y	NM	NM[3]	6%	-2%	4%	3%	35%[4]	65%	77% 11 hrs	96%
11	NM	NM	NM	32% TG A, 15% TG B, 0% CG					100%	NM	N/A
12	Y	NM	NM	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100% 1 hr	N/A

Notes

Results Baseline Equivalence & Process Results

NM = not measured; Enrollment = % moved or left school; Study = % students who withdrew consent; Intervention = % students who did have sufficient exposure to intervention. Dosage = % of total assigned lessons that students completed. % Self selected = % compliant students who chose to explore lessons beyond those assigned.

[1]Differences in attrition between treatment/control groups. [2]This study tracked students who dropped from JIPP. All who finished JIPP, did 100% of RE. [3]Some baseline data on GPA and attendance were available. No significant differences were found, but sample size was too small to confirm groups were equivalent on school measures at baseline. [4] Students who completed < 30% or 3 hrs were considered noncompliant. [5] 5-month follow-up. [6]34% of topics chosen were risk factors. This study did not track usage by student, so we cannot say what % of students explored on their own.

Outcomes

Study #	Significant Outcomes[1]							Trends
	Self-reported Attitudes or Skills	Behavior	School Performance					
		Referrals, Behavior-related GPA or Observed behaviors	GPA	Absences	Tardies	Suspen-sions	12-mth Enrollmt	
1	Depression ↓	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	attendance ↑, suspensions ↓, reading, math test scores ↑
2	empathy ↑ problem solving ↑ **CG** connectedness ↑	NS	NS	↑	NS	NS	NM	
3	NM	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	referrals to ISS ↓ 30% Yr 1, ↓ 26% Yr 2; mean referrals/ student ↓ 41% from baseline
4	NS	NS	↑	↓	NS	NS	NS	Tardies ↓ 54%, Discipline referrals ↓ 67%
5	NS	NS	↑	NS	NS	NS	↑	Suspensions ↓
6	NS	NS	↑	NS	NS	NS	NM	Tardies ↓ 20%, Discipline referrals ↓ 21%
7	alcohol norms/risks ↑[2] Internal LOC ↓[2]	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	Tardies ↑ 74%, Discipline referrals ↓ 22%
8	NS	NS	↑	NS	↓	NS	↑	Discipline referrals ↓ 57%
9	NS	GPA - personal responsibility ↑, GPA - social responsibility ↑	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	Absences ↓ 40%. Tardies ↓ 32%, Discipline referrals ↓ 50%
10	fatalism ↑[2] mariiuana risk ↓[2,3]	NS	↑	NS	NS	↓	NM	50% ↓ discipline referrals
11	NM	antisocial "resolving conflict" ↓, unkindness ↓, respect ↑	NM	NM	NM	NM	NM	prosocial behaviors ↑ 72%, antisocial behaviors ↓ 32%, remedial summer school referrals ↓ 42%
12	assertiveness ↑ aggressiveness ↓	NM	NM	NM	NM	NM	NM	

Notes

Results: Outcomes

NM = Not measured
NA = Not analyzed for significance
NS = Not significant

[1] = All values significant at p <.05 or lower. All refer to the treatment group, unless noted.

[2] = Attrition of >50% on the self-report surveys resulted in a risk of attrition bias in 5 of the 6 studies that used these self-report measures. This did not effect analysis of behavior or school outcomes efficacy, which included all remaining students after enrollment and study attrition, whether or not they completed both pre and posttests.

[3] = Perceived risk of marijuana declined for one ethnic group only, African Americans.

Articles and Presentations

Study #	
1	Koffman, S., Ray, A., Albarran, N., & Vasquez, M. (2008) *Impact of Computer-Based, Psycho-Social Training on Depression, Among Youth At Risk for Gang Involvement and Other Forms of Delinquency.* Manuscript in review.
2	De Long-Cotty, B. (2008). *Can computer-based training enhance adolescents' resilience? Results of a randomized control trial.* Manuscript in preparation. Expanded from poster presentation at the 2007 Annual Meeting of the Society for Prevention Research.
3	Ray, A. Patterson, V., & Berg, S. (2008) *Impact of a District-wide Individualized, Computerized, Positive Behavioral Intervention on Discipline Referrals, In-School Suspensions and Out of School Suspensions.* Manuscript in preparation. Ray, A. Patterson, V., & Berg, S. (2008) *What are they looking for? Risk factors students privately address on the computer in discipline settings*. Manuscript in preparation.
4	Perry, S.M., Bass, K, Ray, A. & Berg, S. (2008) *Potential and Limitations of Ripple Effects Self-Regulated, Computerized, Social-Emotional Training to Improve Outcomes Among Students Behind Grade Level in an Unsafe and Chaotic School.* Unpublished manuscript.
5	Bass, K, Perry, S.M., Ray, A. & Berg, S. (2008). *Impact of a Self-Regulated, Computerized, Social-Emotional Learning Intervention on Disengaged and Delinquent Students at a Continuation High School*. Unpublished manuscript.
6	Perry, S.M., Bass, K, Ray, A. & Berg, S. (2008). *Impact of Ripple Effects Computer-Based, Social-Emotional Learning Intervention on School Outcomes Among Rural Early Adolescents.* In review.
7	Bass, K, Perry, S.M., Ray, A. & Berg, S. (2008*). Impact Of Self-Regulated Use Of Computer-Based Social-Emotional Learning On Rural Adolescents At Risk For Alcohol Abuse.* Unpublished manuscript.
8	Perry, S.M., Bass, K, Ray, A. & Berg, S. (2008). *Impact of a Computerized Social-Emotional Learning Intervention on African American and Latino Students When Implemented In Lieu Of Academic Instruction: A Randomized Controlled Trial.* Manuscript in preparation.
9	Bass, K, Perry, S.M., Ray, A. & Berg, S. (2008). *Impact of a Computer-Based, Social-Emotional Intervention on Outcomes Among Latino Students When Adult Monitors of the Student Training Are Non-professionals: A Randomized Controlled Trial.* Manuscript in preparation.
10	Perry, S.M., Bass, K, Ray, A. & Berg, S. (2008) *Impact of a computer-based social-emotional learning intervention on objective school outcomes among diverse adolescents: A summary analyses of six randomized controlled trials*. Manuscript in preparation. Expanded from poster presentation at the 2007 Annual Meeting of the Society for Prevention Research.
11	Stern, R. & Repa, J. T. (2000). *A study of the efficacy of computerized skill building for adolescents: Reducing aggression and increasing pro-social behavior.* Unpublished manuscript.
12	Ray, A. (1999). Impact on passivity-assertiveness-aggression of short-term, computer-based, skill building in assertiveness: A pilot study. Expanded from poster presentation at CDC/DASH National Leadership Conference to Strengthen HIV/AIDS Education and Coordinated School Health Programs.
Notes	**Selected additional articles and presentations:** Ray, A. (2008). Unexpected findings on the impact of computerized social-emotional learning: Implications for research and practice. Paper presented at the 2008 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Ray, A., & Berg, S. (2008). *Factors in compliance rates with self-regulated use of Ripple Effects computer-based intervention for social-emotional learning.* Submitted to the 2009 Annual Meeting of the AERA. Ray, A., Berg, S. (2008). Impact of content adaptations with a computerized SEL training program for primary, secondary and tertiary interventions across 50 real world settings. Unpublished manuscript.

RIPPLE EFFECTS
Software to positively change behavior

88 First St., Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94105
Phone: (415) 227-1669 Fax: (415) 227-4998
info@rippleeffects.com www.rippleeffects.com