Responding in Peaceful and Positive Ways (RiPP)

Responding in Peaceful and Positive Ways (RiPP) is a school-based violence prevention program for middle school students. RiPP is designed to be implemented along with a peer mediation program. Students practice using a social-cognitive problem-solving model to identify and choose nonviolent strategies for dealing with conflict. RiPP emphasizes behavioral repetition and mental rehearsal of the social-cognitive problem-solving model, experiential learning techniques, and didactic learning modalities. RiPP sessions are taught in the classroom by a school-based prevention specialist and are typically incorporated into existing social studies, health, or science classes. The intervention is offered in three grade-specific modules:

- **RiPP-6 (6th grade)**: 16 sessions over the school year, focusing broadly on violence prevention
- **RiPP-7 (7th grade)**: 16 sessions at the beginning of the school year, focusing on using conflict resolution skills in friendships
- **RiPP-8 (8th grade)**: 16 sessions at the end of the school year, focusing on making a successful transition to high school

### Descriptive Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Interest</th>
<th>Mental health promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Outcomes** | **Review Date: January 2007**
  1: School disciplinary code violations
  2: Violent/aggressive behavior---self-reports
  3: Victimization
  4: Peer provocation
  5: Life satisfaction |
| **Outcome Categories** | Education
  Quality of life
  Trauma/injuries
  Physical aggression and violence-related behavior |
| **Ages** | 6-12 (Childhood)
  13-17 (Adolescent) |
| **Genders** | Male
  Female |
| **Races/Ethnicities** | Black or African American
  Hispanic or Latino
  White
  Race/ethnicity unspecified |
| **Settings** | School |
| **Geographic Locations** | Urban
  Rural and/or frontier |
| **Implementation History** | As of January 2007, RiPP has been implemented in more than 50 middle schools in the United States. |
| **NIH Funding/CER Studies** | Partially/fully funded by National Institutes of Health: No
  Evaluated in comparative effectiveness research studies: No |
| **Adaptations** | RiPP was originally developed to meet the needs of public school students in Richmond, Virginia. Most students in this school system are African Americans, and many come from low-income, single-parent households in neighborhoods with high rates of crime and drug use. RiPP also has been implemented in racially diverse, rural school systems in Florida. The empirical and theoretical foundations of RiPP suggest that... |
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Documents Reviewed
The documents below were reviewed for Quality of Research. The research point of contact can provide information regarding the studies reviewed and the availability of additional materials, including those from more recent studies that may have been conducted.
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Outcomes

Outcome 1: School disciplinary code violations

Description of Measures
This outcome was measured using counts of all reported violations of school disciplinary codes that were related to violence. Types of violations included fighting, assault, weapons possession, and in-school and out-of-school suspensions.

Key Findings
At 12-month follow-up, in-school suspension rates among 6th-grade boys who received RIPP were one-third the rate experienced among their peers (p < .05); no similar difference was reported among 6th-grade girls. Postintervention scores indicated that the 6th-grade classes receiving RIPP had more than twice the rate of violence-related disciplinary code violations and five times the rate of in-school suspensions compared with other classes. In another evaluation, 8th graders who had received RIPP the previous year had fewer violence-related disciplinary code violations compared with 8th graders in the same school who had never received RIPP (p < .05). Students who appeared to benefit most from the intervention tended to be those with the highest initial levels of aggression.

Studies Measuring Outcome
Study 1, Study 3

Study Designs
Quasi-experimental

Quality of Research Rating
2.3 (0.0-4.0 scale)

Outcome 2: Violent/aggressive behavior—self-reports

Description of Measures
The frequency of violent behaviors was measured by the seven-item Violent Behavior Frequency Scales (VBFSS) for youth and the Family Violence Frequency Scales (FVFS) for parents. The VBFSS was used to measure the frequency of violent behaviors among youth, while the FVFS was used to measure the frequency of violent behaviors among parents.

Key Findings
The intervention had a significant impact on reducing violent behavior among both youth and parents. Youth who received the intervention had lower rates of violent behavior compared to those who did not receive the intervention. Parents who received the intervention also had lower rates of violence compared to those who did not receive the intervention.

Studies Measuring Outcome
Study 1, Study 3

Study Designs
Quasi-experimental

Quality of Research Rating
2.3 (0.0-4.0 scale)
### Description of Measures
The frequency of violent behaviors was measured by the seven-item Violent Behavior Frequency Scale (also known as the Physical Aggression Frequency Scale), one of the Problem Behavior Frequency Scales. This scale includes items from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Youth Risk Behavior Survey (e.g., "been in a fight in which someone was hit," "threatened someone with a weapon"). Students were asked how frequently they engaged in the behavior in the past 30 days, using a 6-point anchored scale. Some items with a low base rate were recoded as dichotomous (yes/no) outcomes.

### Key Findings
Multiple studies reported benefits in self-reported experience of violent and aggressive behavior for students who received RIPP compared with peers who did not receive the intervention, including:

- Lower rates of being injured in a fight in the past 30 days in which the injuries required medical attention ($p < .01$)
- Higher rates of participation in peer mediation ($p < .05$)
- Among girls only, lower rates of threatening to hurt a teacher ($p < .05$)
- Among 7th-grade RIPP participants, less frequent violent behavior at 6-month follow-up ($p < .05$)
- Lower frequency of physical aggression ($p < .05$), despite the observation that both RIPP participants and their peers demonstrated an increase in problem behaviors over time.
- At 9-month follow-up, reduced rates of bringing a weapon to school, threatening someone with a weapon, and sustaining fight-related injuries in the past 30 days.

### Studies Measuring Outcome
- Study 1, Study 2, Study 3, Study 4

### Study Designs
Quasi-experimental

### Quality of Research Rating
2.5 (0.0-4.0 scale)

---

### Outcome 3: Victimization

#### Description of Measures
Victimization was assessed using four items from the Children's Report of Exposure to Violence. Adolescents were asked how frequently they had been (1) beaten up, (2) chased or threatened, (3) robbed or mugged, and (4) shot or stabbed. Responses were on a 4-point frequency scale.

#### Key Findings
At the start of 7th grade, boys who had participated in RIPP in 6th grade reported less victimization compared with peers who did not receive the intervention. The effect size was very small but measurable ($\text{Cohen's } d = 0.14$). No similar findings were reported among 7th-grade girls.

### Studies Measuring Outcome
- Study 4

### Study Designs
Quasi-experimental

### Quality of Research Rating
2.5 (0.0-4.0 scale)

---

### Outcome 4: Peer provocation

#### Description of Measures
The Peer Provocation Scale from the Interpersonal Problem Situation Inventory for Urban Adolescents was used to assess the frequency of victimization and harassment. Students were asked to rate how frequently specific situations happened to them during the past year (e.g., "another student was always picking on you"), using an anchored scale.

#### Key Findings
Two evaluations found reduced frequency of peer provocation reported by RIPP participants compared with reports by peers who did not receive the intervention. Effect sizes for this outcome were small to very small ($\text{Cohen's } d = 0.11-0.26$).

### Studies Measuring Outcome
- Study 2, Study 4

### Study Designs
Quasi-experimental

### Quality of Research Rating
2.4 (0.0-4.0 scale)

---

### Outcome 5: Life satisfaction

#### Description of Measures
[Details of measures related to life satisfaction]

#### Key Findings
[Key findings related to life satisfaction]
Description of Measures
The Life Satisfaction Scale was used to assess subjective life satisfaction. Students responded to each item using a 7-point scale.

Key Findings
Participants in the intervention tended to increase their life satisfaction scores while their peers' scores decreased. The difference was reflected in small effect sizes (Cohen's d = 0.20-0.27).

Studies Measuring Outcome
Study 4

Study Designs
Quasi-experimental

Quality of Research Rating
2.5 (0.0-4.0 scale)

Study Populations
The following populations were identified in the studies reviewed for Quality of Research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study 1</td>
<td>6-12 (Childhood) 13-17 (Adolescent)</td>
<td>50.2% Male 49.8% Female</td>
<td>96% Black or African American 4% Race/ethnicity unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 2</td>
<td>6-12 (Childhood) 13-17 (Adolescent)</td>
<td>55% Male 45% Female</td>
<td>61% White 24% Hispanic or Latino 8% Race/ethnicity unspecified 7% Black or African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 3</td>
<td>6-12 (Childhood) 13-17 (Adolescent)</td>
<td>52.9% Female 47.1% Male</td>
<td>97% Black or African American 3% Race/ethnicity unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 4</td>
<td>6-12 (Childhood) 13-17 (Adolescent)</td>
<td>Data not reported/available</td>
<td>65% White 22% Hispanic or Latino 11% Black or African American 2% Race/ethnicity unspecified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality of Research Ratings by Criteria (0.0-4.0 scale)
External reviewers independently evaluate the Quality of Research for an intervention's reported results using six criteria:

1. Reliability of measures
2. Validity of measures
3. Intervention fidelity
4. Missing data and attrition
5. Potential confounding variables
6. Appropriateness of analysis

For more information about these criteria and the meaning of the ratings, see Quality of Research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Reliability of Measures</th>
<th>Validity of Measures</th>
<th>Fidelity</th>
<th>Missing Data/Attrition</th>
<th>Confounding Variables</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
<th>Overall Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: School disciplinary code violations</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Violent/aggressive behavior--self-reports</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Victimization</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Peer provocation</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Life satisfaction</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study Strengths
The developer/research team has done a very good job evaluating the various grade modules (RIPP-6, RIPP-7, and RIPP-8). Adequate psychometric properties were provided for most of the measures. Intervention fidelity was addressed by the use of checklists, attendance records, facilitator training with the use of a manual, classroom observations, and enhanced supervision. Good statistical analysis methods were used, although no power analyses were provided.

**Study Weaknesses**

No evidence of reliability was provided for school record data. However, school records are widely used, and it is standard not to report reliability. Limited information was provided about the manual. Fidelity measures were put in place, but there were some problems with intervention implementation (e.g., not examining the impact of classroom disruptions, some schools not completing the program), and it is unclear how implementation changes may have impacted the findings. Attrition was statistically examined but high in a number of studies; studies also had missing data. While the intervention has produced statistically significant findings, it is unclear how many of these findings may be tied to the pretest differences in violent behavior reported between the treatment and control group students. Issues related to the within-school design, intent-to-treat approach, and attention and missing data may present other confounding variables.

**Readiness for Dissemination**

**Review Date: January 2007**

**Materials Reviewed**

The materials below were reviewed for Readiness for Dissemination. The implementation point of contact can provide information regarding implementation of the intervention and the availability of additional, updated, or new materials.


Prevention Opportunities & Tanglewood Research. (2006). RIPP Teacher Training: Day 1, Disk 1 [DVD].

Prevention Opportunities & Tanglewood Research. (2006). RIPP Teacher Training: Day 1, Disk 2 [DVD].

Prevention Opportunities & Tanglewood Research. (2006). RIPP Teacher Training: Day 1, Disk 3 [DVD].


Prevention Opportunities & Tanglewood Research. (2006). RIPP Teacher Training: Day 2, Disk 3 [DVD].

RIPP student handouts in English (6th, 7th, and 8th grades) and Spanish (6th grade)

RIPP student journal (8th grade)

**Readiness for Dissemination Ratings by Criteria (0.0-4.0 scale)**

External reviewers independently evaluate the intervention's Readiness for Dissemination using three criteria:

1. Availability of implementation materials
2. Availability of training and support resources
3. Availability of quality assurance procedures

For more information about these criteria and the meaning of the ratings, see Readiness for Dissemination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Materials</th>
<th>Training and Support Resources</th>
<th>Quality Assurance Procedures</th>
<th>Overall Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dissemination Strengths**

...
The instructor and student implementation materials provide detailed and well-organized lesson plans and activities for each grade level. The training materials for instructors are comprehensive and offer a thorough preparation for program delivery. A site liaison is available to help support program implementation. Fidelity standards described in the training manual emphasize use of student surveys and adherence to lesson plans to support quality assurance.

**Dissemination Weaknesses**

Graphics and formatting are inconsistent in some implementation materials, which may make it difficult for readers to follow materials in some cases. Expected outcomes are described, but no instrument is provided to assess these outcomes.

**Costs**

The cost information below was provided by the developer. Although this cost information may have been updated by the developer since the time of review, it may not reflect the current costs or availability of items (including newly developed or discontinued items). The implementation point of contact can provide current information and discuss implementation requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Required by Developer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student workbooks</td>
<td>$5 each</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor manual</td>
<td>$350 per grade level</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-day, on-site training (includes instructor manual)</td>
<td>$850 per person plus travel expenses</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone and email support</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Replications**

Selected citations are presented below. An asterisk indicates that the document was reviewed for Quality of Research.


**Contact Information**

To learn more about implementation, contact:
Wendy B. Northup, M.A.
(804) 301-4909
wendynorthup@hughes.net

To learn more about research, contact:
Albert D. Farrell, Ph.D.
(804) 828-8796
afarrell@vcu.edu

Consider these [Questions to Ask](http://nrepp.samhsa.gov/ViewIntervention.aspx?id=59) (PDF, 54KB) as you explore the possible use of this intervention.
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