

Summary of PRP Studies

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

Empirical Paper Citation(s)	Setting & Sample	Design & Length of Follow-up	Improvement / Prevention of Depression Symptoms?
1. Initial evaluation (Jaycox et al., 1994; Gillham, 1994; Study 1; Gillham et al., 1995; Reivich 1996; Gillham & Reivich, 1999; Zubernis et al., 1999)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeted² • School • N = 143 • 5th & 6th graders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PRP (3 versions) vs. Control • Matched control design • 36-month follow-up 	Yes
2. First parent program pilot (Gillham, 1994; Study 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Universal • School • N = 108 • 5th & 6th graders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PRP vs. PRP + parent component vs. Control • Random assignment by school • 6-month follow-up reported for cohort 1 sample 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PPR vs. Control – Yes • PRP + parent vs. Control – No
3. Effectiveness and specificity study (Reivich, 1996; Shatté, 1997)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Universal • School • N = 152 • 6th-8th graders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PRP vs. alternate intervention vs. control • RCT³ • 12-month follow-up 	Yes
4. Incarcerated adolescents study (Miller, 1999)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeted • Juvenile detention center • N = 56 • 14-18 year olds, predominantly male 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
5. First Australian study (Pattison & Lynd-Stevenson, 2001)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Universal • School • N = 66 • 5th & 6th graders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
6. Australian girls' school study (Quayle et al., 2001)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Universal • School • N = 47 • 7th grade girls 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PRP vs. control • RCT • 6-month follow-up 	Mixed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No at post • Yes at 6-month follow-up

7. Inner city study (Cardemil et al., 2002; Cardemil et al., 2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Universal • School • N = 168 • 5th & 6th graders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PRP vs. control • RCT • 24-month follow-up 	Mixed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, in Latino sample • No, in African American sample
8. PRP in Beijing, China (Yu & Seligman, 2002)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeted • School • N = 220 • 8-15 year olds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PRP vs. Control • RCT • 6-month follow-up 	Yes
9. Rural Australian study (Roberts et al., 2003, 2004)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeted • School • N = 189 • 11-13 year olds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School-based evaluation • PRP vs. Control • Schools randomized to condition. • 30-month follow-up 	No
10. All girls vs. Co-ed PRP study (Chaplin et al., 2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Universal • School • N = 208 • 6th-8th graders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	Yes
11. Primary care study (Gillham, Hamilton et al., 2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeted • Clinic • N = 271 • 11-12 year olds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PRP vs. Usual Care Control • RCT • 24-month follow-up 	Mixed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No for full sample • Moderation by gender • Yes for girls • No for boys
12. Large universal effectiveness study (Cutuli, 2004; Cutuli et al., 2007; Gillham, Reivich, Freres, Chaplin et al., 2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Universal • School • N = 697 • 6th-8th graders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PRP vs. alternate intervention vs. Control • RCT • 36-month follow-up 	Mixed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No for full sample • Moderation by school • Yes in two schools • No in third school
13. PRP + Parent Component (Gillham, Reivich, et al., 2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeted • School • N = 44 • 6th-7th graders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PRP + Parent Component vs. Control • RCT • 12-month follow-up 	Yes