### Summary of PRP Studies

**Penn Resiliency Program: findings from 13 evaluations** (From Gillham, Brunwasser, & Freres, 2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empirical Paper Citation(s)</th>
<th>Setting &amp; Sample</th>
<th>Design &amp; Length of Follow-up</th>
<th>Improvement / Prevention of Depression Symptoms?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Initial evaluation**  | Targeted<sup>2</sup>  
School  
N = 143  
5<sup>th</sup> & 6<sup>th</sup> graders | PRP (3 versions) vs. Control  
Matched control design  
36-month follow-up | Yes |
| (Jaycox et al., 1994; Gillham, 1994; Study 1; Gillham et al., 1995; Reivich 1996; Gillham & Reivich, 1999; Zubernis et al., 1999) | | | |
| **2. First parent program pilot** | Universal  
School  
N = 108  
5<sup>th</sup> & 6<sup>th</sup> graders | PRP vs. PRP + parent component vs. Control  
Random assignment by school  
6-month follow-up reported for cohort 1 sample | PPR vs. Control – Yes  
PRP + parent vs. Control – No |
| (Gillham, 1994; Study 2) | | | |
| **3. Effectiveness and specificity study** | Universal  
School  
N = 152  
6<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> graders | PRP vs. alternate intervention vs. control  
RCT<sup>3</sup>  
12-month follow-up | Yes |
| (Reivich, 1996; Shatté, 1997) | | | |
| **4. Incarcerated adolescents study** | Targeted  
Juvenile detention center  
N = 56  
14-18 year olds, predominantly male | PRP vs. Control  
Randomized within one of the two juvenile detention centers. In second center, all participants were assigned to the control condition.  
Post | No |
| (Miller, 1999) | | | |
| **5. First Australian study** | Universal  
School  
N = 66  
5<sup>th</sup> & 6<sup>th</sup> graders | PRP vs. Reverse PRP vs. attention control vs. control  
Most participants randomly assigned, but control condition also included participants not randomized to condition.  
8-month follow-up | No |
| (Pattison & Lynd-Stevenson, 2001) | | | |
| **6. Australian girls’ school study** | Universal  
School  
N = 47  
7<sup>th</sup> grade girls | PRP vs. control  
RCT  
6-month follow-up | Mixed  
No at post  
Yes at 6-month follow-up |
<p>| (Quayle et al., 2001) | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Description</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Intervention Comparison</th>
<th>Randomized Control Trial (RCT)</th>
<th>Follow-Up Duration</th>
<th>Effectiveness Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Inner city study</strong> (Cardemil et al., 2002; Cardemil et al., 2007)</td>
<td>Universal School N = 168</td>
<td>PRP vs. control RCT 24-month follow-up</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Yes, in Latino sample No, in African American sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. PRP in Beijing, China</strong> (Yu &amp; Seligman, 2002)</td>
<td>Targeted School N = 220</td>
<td>PRP vs. Control RCT 6-month follow-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Rural Australian study</strong> (Roberts et al., 2003, 2004)</td>
<td>Targeted School N = 189</td>
<td>School-based evaluation PRP vs. Control Schools randomized to condition 30-month follow-up</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. All girls vs. Co-ed PRP study</strong> (Chaplin et al., 2006)</td>
<td>Universal School N = 208 6th-8th graders</td>
<td>PRP vs. Control (Boys randomized to co-ed PRP vs. Control; Girls randomized to co-ed PRP vs. all-girls PRP vs. Control) RCT Post; 12 month attempted but very low response limited analyses</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. Primary care study</strong> (Gillham, Hamilton et al., 2006)</td>
<td>Targeted Clinic N = 271 11-12 year olds</td>
<td>PRP vs. Usual Care Control RCT 24-month follow-up</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>No for full sample Moderation by gender Yes for girls No for boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. Large universal effectiveness study</strong> (Cutuli, 2004; Cutuli et al., 2007; Gillham, Reivich, Freres, Chaplin et al., 2007)</td>
<td>Universal School N = 697 6th-8th graders</td>
<td>PRP vs. alternate intervention vs. Control RCT 36-month follow-up</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>No for full sample Moderation by school Yes in two schools No in third school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13. PRP + Parent Component</strong> (Gillham, Reivich, et al., 2006)</td>
<td>Targeted School N = 44 6th-7th graders</td>
<td>PRP + Parent Component vs. Control RCT 12-month follow-up</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>