

**National Evaluation of the Gang Resistance Education and Training
(G.R.E.A.T.) Program**

School Personnel Survey Report

By

Dana Peterson, Ph.D.
Vanessa R. Panfil, M.A.

University at Albany

Finn-Aage Esbensen, Ph.D.
Terrance J. Taylor, Ph.D.

University of Missouri-St. Louis

June, 2009

This project was supported by Award No. 2006-JV-FX-0011 awarded by the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. This research was made possible, in part, by the support and participation of seven school districts, including the School District of Philadelphia. The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Justice or of the seven participating school districts.

For questions about this report or for more information about the evaluation, please contact:

G.R.E.A.T. Evaluation
Department of Criminology & Criminal Justice
University of Missouri-St. Louis
St. Louis, MO 63121-4499
Phone: (314) 516-4777
Fax: (314) 516-5048

**National Evaluation of the Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.)
Program: School Personnel Survey Report**

Executive Summary

The process and outcome evaluation of the Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) program consists of several components, including surveys of administrators and teachers in the middle schools participating in the evaluation. Surveys were distributed to all administrators and G.R.E.A.T.-grade level (i.e., 6th or 7th) teachers and coordinators in the seven study locations (Albuquerque, NM; Portland, OR; Greeley, CO; Nashville, TN; Philadelphia, PA; Chicago, IL; and a Dallas/Fort Worth, TX location). Of 373 surveys distributed, 230 were returned (62% completion rate). This report details the results of those surveys, in which respondents gave their opinions about a variety of issues, including disorder in their schools, perceptions of their work environment, fear of crime and actual victimization experiences within or around their schools, views of the roles of law enforcement officers and prevention programs in schools, and, for those who indicated they were familiar with the program, opinions about the G.R.E.A.T. program and G.R.E.A.T. officer. The goal of the school personnel survey was to better understand the context in which the G.R.E.A.T. program is offered, as well as factors that might influence variation in opinions about the G.R.E.A.T. program and G.R.E.A.T. officers.

There appears to be a good deal of support for both the G.R.E.A.T. program and officers. The majority of educators believed the program taught skills necessary for youths to avoid delinquency and gangs, addressed problems faced by their students, and improved student-police relations, but only about half agreed that the program played a significant role in reducing youth gang participation in their schools and communities. Similarly, the G.R.E.A.T. officer teaching the program was viewed favorably by the majority of respondents, in terms of both preparation and delivery of program and their interactions in the classroom. Despite this overall positive assessment, results indicated that some officers struggled with classroom management or failed to attend on scheduled days. These favorable views of program and officer are most strongly tied to positive views of law enforcement officers and prevention programs in schools and do not appear to be related to problems in schools such as delinquency and gangs, to fear of crime or crime victimization, to job satisfaction or other perceptions about school as a work environment, or to whether the respondents' school has a School Resource Officer. Importantly, views of the G.R.E.A.T. program and the G.R.E.A.T. officer are related to each other; many school personnel felt that the success of the program hinges upon the officer.

School personnel in whose classrooms G.R.E.A.T. had been taught also provided comments about their role in the program. Most played at least some role in the program, although this was largely classroom management activities, while many used the time for grading or other paperwork. Aspects of the current educational climate, such as meeting standards set forth in the "No Child Left Behind" act, provide challenges to delivery and reinforcement of the G.R.E.A.T. program. Almost half did not incorporate G.R.E.A.T. lesson content into their own curricula, mostly due to lack of time (a large concern was covering material for mandated testing), but also because it was not relevant to their subject. Similarly, most did not use extended teacher activities associated with G.R.E.A.T. lessons, often due to lack of time, but almost as often because they had not been made aware of the activities by the G.R.E.A.T. officer. The report concludes with recommendations based on findings from the School Personnel Survey.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.)	1
Process and Outcome Evaluation of G.R.E.A.T.	1
School Personnel Survey	2
<i>Survey Distribution and Response</i>	3
<i>Sample Characteristics</i>	5
School Problems, Environment, Crime and Victimization	7
<i>School Problems</i>	7
<i>School/Neighborhood Crime and Delinquency</i>	9
<i>Fear of Crime and Experiences of Victimization at School</i>	10
School as a Work Environment	11
<i>Perceptions of Work Environment</i>	12
<i>Job Satisfaction</i>	13
<i>School Rules and Enforcement</i>	14
Opinions of Law Enforcement and Prevention Programming in Schools	16
<i>Law Enforcement Officers in Schools</i>	16
<i>Prevention Programs in Schools</i>	18
<i>Prevention Program Content and Delivery</i>	19
Attitudes about G.R.E.A.T.	21
<i>Opinions about the G.R.E.A.T. Program</i>	22
<i>Open-ended Comments about the G.R.E.A.T. Program</i>	24
<i>Do Opinions of G.R.E.A.T. Differ by Context? Correlational Analyses</i>	25
<i>Opinions about G.R.E.A.T. Officers</i>	26
<i>Open-ended Comments about the G.R.E.A.T. Officer</i>	29
<i>Do Opinions of G.R.E.A.T. Officers Differ by Context? Correlational Analyses</i>	30
<i>Role of Educators in the G.R.E.A.T. Program</i>	31
Summary and Conclusion	34
References and Resources	39

Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.)

The Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) program is a primary gang and delinquency prevention program delivered by law enforcement officers in school settings. The original G.R.E.A.T. program was developed in 1991 by Phoenix-area law enforcement agencies and quickly adopted by agencies throughout the United States. This curriculum contained nine lecture-based lessons to be taught primarily in middle-school grades. Results from an earlier National Evaluation of the G.R.E.A.T. program (1994-2001) found no differences between G.R.E.A.T. and non-G.R.E.A.T. youths in terms of key behavioral outcomes the program intended to affect (i.e., involvement in gangs and delinquent behavior).

Based in part on these findings, the G.R.E.A.T. program underwent a critical review that resulted in substantial program modifications. The revised curriculum consists of 13 lessons aimed at teaching youths the life-skills (e.g., communication and refusal skills, conflict resolution and anger management techniques) thought necessary to prevent involvement in gangs and delinquency. The program's two main goals are 1) to help youths avoid gang membership, violence, and criminal activity, and 2) to help youths develop a positive relationship with law enforcement. The revised G.R.E.A.T. curriculum was piloted in 2001, with full-scale implementation occurring in 2003.

Process and Outcome Evaluation of G.R.E.A.T.

In 2006, following a competitive peer review process, the National Institute of Justice awarded the University of Missouri-St. Louis funding to conduct a six-year evaluation of the revised G.R.E.A.T. program. This process and outcome evaluation consists of a number of different components, including student surveys; classroom observations in both G.R.E.A.T. and non-G.R.E.A.T. classrooms; surveys of school personnel and of law enforcement officers; interviews with G.R.E.A.T. officers and G.R.E.A.T. supervisors; and observations of G.R.E.A.T. Officer Training (G.O.T.) and G.R.E.A.T. Families sessions. ***This report provides information from the School Personnel Survey component of the evaluation.***

Seven cities varying in size, region, and level of gang activity were selected for inclusion in the evaluation: Albuquerque, New Mexico; Chicago, Illinois; Greeley, Colorado; Nashville, Tennessee; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Portland, Oregon; and a Dallas-Fort Worth (DFW),

Texas area location. Three criteria guided the selection of cities: 1) the existence of an established G.R.E.A.T. program, 2) geographic and demographic diversity, and 3) evidence of gang activity.

Once the cities were selected, the research staff worked with the primary local law enforcement agency and the school district in each city to secure their cooperation with the evaluation efforts which began in Fall 2006. Upon district approval of the study, four to six public middle schools were identified within each site for study participation, and principals were contacted. The goal of the school selection was to identify schools that, taken as a whole, would be representative of the districts. In five of the cities, we were successful in doing so. In Chicago¹ and Philadelphia, due in part to the sheer size of these districts, we were not as successful; even in these two instances, however, the final sample does not diverge too much from the district as a whole. The final sample consists of 31 public middle schools in the seven evaluation sites.

School Personnel Survey

One component of the evaluation is an anonymous self-report survey of participating schools' teachers and administrators in order to supplement the classroom observations of G.R.E.A.T. program delivery and the student and law enforcement surveys. Included in the twelve-page survey were sets of questions designed to measure a variety of perceptions, attitudes, and experiences. School personnel were asked, for example, about disorder in their schools, their perceptions of their work environment, fear of crime and actual victimization experiences within or around their schools, view of the role of law enforcement officers in schools, opinions about school-based prevention programs in general, and, for those who

¹One of the five originally-selected Chicago schools, which was comprised nearly 100 percent of African American students, was unable to meet the requirements of the study and was dropped from the sample. Given time constraints (i.e., it was too late in the school year to select a comparable school and implement the G.R.E.A.T. program with fidelity), we were unable to replace the excluded school during 2006-2007. Thus, the resulting sample was largely Hispanic, while the district was largely African-American. To increase representativeness of the Chicago sample, the decision was made to add two primarily African American schools to the evaluation in the 2007-2008 school year, even though this meant that these schools would be one year behind other schools in the evaluation. In addition to this exclusion and replacement of one school in Chicago, two principals (one in the DFW area and one in Albuquerque) who were contacted declined their schools' participation. In one case, the principal had previously been a police gang investigator and, thus, "knew the program worked." In the other case, the principal would not agree to our study design, which called for random assignment of classrooms within schools to either receive the G.R.E.A.T. program (experimental condition) or not receive the program (control condition). In these two instances, schools were replaced with another similar school in the district.

indicated they were familiar with the program, opinions about the G.R.E.A.T. program and G.R.E.A.T. officer. The goal of the school personnel survey was to better understand the context in which the G.R.E.A.T. program is offered as well as factors that might influence variation in opinions about the G.R.E.A.T. program and G.R.E.A.T. officers.

Survey Distribution and Response

The target sample consisted of school administrators (Principal and Vice or Assistant Principals) and all teachers and coordinators in the grade level at which G.R.E.A.T. was taught at the school. In most of the 31 participating schools, this was the 6th grade; in five schools, this was 7th grade.

The survey was originally distributed to 29 schools in the seven cities participating in the National Evaluation toward the end of the spring semester of 2007 (the two Chicago schools added in Fall 2007 completed surveys in Spring 2008). Included in survey packets were a blank survey and a cover memo explaining the evaluation, the purpose of the survey, and the facts that participation was voluntary and anonymous. Stapled to each packet was a small “thank-you” present for completing the questionnaire (a happy-face “stress ball” on an elastic string). Distribution and collection procedures varied by site and/or school: in some schools, the Investigator or an on-site research assistant placed a packet with postage-paid return envelopes in each teacher’s and administrator’s school mailbox; in other schools, packets were mailed to a contact person at the school for distribution and collection, with a pre-paid FedEx Pak envelope provided for return; and in still other schools, the Investigator personally picked up completed surveys.

The response rate for this Spring 2007 distribution was much lower than desired, with just 29.1% of the intended sample returning completed surveys. Rates varied considerably across sites, from a low of 13.5% of respondents in Philadelphia completing and returning surveys to a high of 54.2% in Chicago. At the school level, response rates ranged from zero percent for one school each in Philadelphia and Portland to 100% in one Chicago school (the next highest rates were 67% in another school in Chicago and 64% in one DFW area school).

In order to achieve a response rate that would enable adequate analyses of the data to produce meaningful findings, surveys were re-distributed in Fall 2007 to 22 of the 29 schools. Two schools had high response rates in Spring 2007, returning most, if not all, and were thus not

re-surveyed; a third school had a change in Principal for Fall 2007 and the new principal did not agree to re-surveying of school personnel; finally, due to teacher-union negotiations occurring in Fall 2007, the four schools in Greeley were re-surveyed in Spring 2008. In addition, surveys were distributed in Spring 2008 to targeted personnel in the two new schools added in Chicago. All Spring 2008 surveys are included in the Fall 2007 group. In this second distribution effort, most² packets were mailed directly from the St. Louis research office to a contact person at each school, who was in charge of distributing and collecting the surveys for return in a pre-paid FedEx Pak envelope; in some instances, completed surveys were picked up in person by the Investigator, who was on-site at the time. The response rate for this second distribution was still lower than desired, but better, at 58.4%. Response rates ranged from a low of 40.4% in both Philadelphia and the DFW area location to a high of 90% in Nashville. At the school level, response rates ranged from zero percent at one DFW area school to 100% in Nashville.

Surveys returned in Spring 2007 and Fall 2007 (which included those collected in Spring 2008) were combined to create the final sample for analyses. To identify any duplicates (that is, individuals who had completed both a Spring 2007 and a Fall 2007 or Spring 2008 survey), responses to key demographic questions (e.g., sex, race/ethnicity, position held, years at school) were compared between Spring and Fall surveys. This process identified thirty-nine school personnel who had completed both surveys; for these, only their Spring 2007 survey was included in the final sample. As shown in Table 1 below, the final, combined response rate was 61.7%, with a final sample of 230 non-duplicate surveys.

² In Greeley, surveys were distributed to educators' mailboxes by the Investigator. In one school in Albuquerque, it was discovered that the contact person had failed to distribute all of the surveys; thus, the Investigator met with each educator individually to request that s/he complete the survey. A different contact person agreed to collect them and mail them to the research office.

Table 1. School Personnel Survey Total Combined Response Rates (Spring 2007 and Fall 2007/Spring 2008)

	Surveys Distributed	Total Surveys Returned	Return Rate
Albuquerque	57	38	66.7%
Chicago	48	26	54.2%
DFW area location	73	38	52.1%
Greeley	38	30	79.0%
Nashville	50	33	66.0%
Philadelphia	57	28	49.1%
Portland	50	37	74.0%
TOTALS	373	230	61.7%

Sample Characteristics

Table 2 presents the characteristics of the sample of school personnel. Consistent with our sampling approach of targeting administrators and teachers in the G.R.E.A.T. grade level, the majority of the sample is teachers (83%), and most (64%) teach primarily 6th grade. Females (68%) and Whites (75%) comprise the largest proportions of the sample, although these vary across the seven evaluation sites. The proportion of the sample that is female ranged from 54 percent in Portland to over 90 percent in Chicago (results not shown in table format); and, African American educators were more prevalent in Chicago (31%), Philadelphia (24%), and Nashville (21%), while Hispanics (15%) made up a larger proportion of the Albuquerque sample (not shown in table format). Over 60 percent of the sample has advanced education degrees (greater than bachelors), with a range from 43 percent in the DFW area location to 96 percent in Philadelphia. On average, school personnel in our sample had a total of 15.5 years in the education field (range from 11.2 in DFW area to 19.5 in Philadelphia), with 7.4 years at their current school (ranging from 6.6 in DFW area site to 8.1 in Chicago). Finally, class sizes averaged 24.6 students, with a range from 21.0 in Albuquerque to 27.3 in Portland.

Table 2. School Personnel Sample Characteristics

	N / Mean	% / SD
Sex		
Female	143	68
Male	67	32
Race		
White	158	75
African-American	25	12
Hispanic/Latino	9	4
American Indian/Native American	2	1
Asian/Pacific Islander	3	1
Multi-racial	13	6
Primary job assignment		
Teacher	183	83
Administrator	36	16
Counselor	1	<1
Other	1	<1
Grade-level taught		
Sixth	115	64
Seventh	24	13
Eighth	7	4
Sixth, seventh, and eighth	22	12
Multiple grades	12	7
Subject taught		
Health/Physical Education	12	7
Language Arts	87	49
Math/Computer Science	20	11
Natural Sciences	24	14
Social Sciences	19	11
Arts/Theatre/Music	7	4
Other	7	4
Highest degree attained		
Bachelors	79	36
Masters	132	60
Ph.D.	9	4
Other	1	<1
Average class size	24.56	6.48
Total years in field of education	15.47	10.41
Total years at this school	7.42	6.88

In the sections that follow, we report findings that help us understand the contexts in which the G.R.E.A.T. program is offered. Knowing more about these contexts can help us better identify challenges in delivering the G.R.E.A.T. program and factors that might affect levels of

support for G.R.E.A.T. The original G.R.E.A.T. curriculum was revised to improve such aspects as dosage, delivery, and content. It may be (and our outcome evaluation results will speak to this) that this longer curriculum, based on building skills in an active learning environment, will be more effective than the previous curriculum in reaching G.R.E.A.T. goals. But, it is also true that the educational environment has changed in the past 10 years, especially with the implementation of No Child Left Behind. Consequently, it is useful to look at how perceptions of G.R.E.A.T. vary by educators' perceptions of issues facing their schools, their school environment, etc. Administrators' and teachers' perceptions of such things as their work environment, including school disorder, and school-based prevention programs may be related to their opinions about the G.R.E.A.T. program and their perceptions of its potential effectiveness. These opinions are important because they may, in turn, affect students' perceptions of and responsiveness to the program.

The remainder of this report is divided into four sections. The first section discusses school personnel views of their schools' problems and environment and their fear of crime and actual victimization at school; the second section reviews perceptions of their schools as a work and organizational environment; the third contains educators' views of law enforcement and prevention programs in schools, as well as prevention program content and delivery; and the final section provides their views of the G.R.E.A.T. program and G.R.E.A.T. officers.

School Problems, Environment, Crime and Victimization

School Problems

School personnel were presented with a series of issues faced by some schools across the country and asked to indicate whether these were "not a problem," "somewhat of a problem," or "a big problem" in their own schools. Table 3 presents the proportion of respondents who answered that each issue was "a big problem"; results are also presented by job position (administrators compared to teachers) and by city.

Meeting standards set forth in "No Child Left Behind" legislation was cited by the largest proportion (41%) of respondents as a big problem facing their schools. The extent to which school personnel felt this was a problem varied, however, across sites, from only eight percent of personnel in the DFW area to over 60 percent in Albuquerque and Greeley. One-third of the

overall sample felt that bullying was a problem in their schools, and this varied from 21 percent in Albuquerque to 45 percent in Greeley. Over 20 percent noted big problems in terms of classroom over-crowding, meeting state educational standards, and truancy. Less than one-half of one percent said that guns were a big problem in their schools. Administrators and teachers differed significantly on four items (classroom over-crowding, places where students are afraid to go, students beating up or threatening each other, and students having things stolen); fewer administrators than teachers felt these were big problems at their schools. There were statistically significant differences across sites for all but two items (places in school where some students are afraid to go and students bringing guns to school).

Table 3. Issues Facing Schools, by Job Position and Site

Issues Facing Your School ^a	Total	Adm	Tchr	ABQ	CHI	DFW area	GRL	NSH	PHL	PTD
School over-crowding ^c	17	6	19	16	31	29	13	9	11	11
Classroom over-crowding ^{b,c}	23	11	25	18	50	18	37	9	8	24
Meeting state educational standards ^c	24	23	25	37	12	8	38	15	30	25
Meeting “NCLB” standards ^c	41	46	41	68	31	8	63	30	30	53
Truancy ^c	22	20	23	37	12	19	10	15	30	27
Kids bullying/teasing other children at your school ^c	33	26	34	21	39	32	45	24	41	33
Places in your school where some students are afraid to go ^b	6	3	6	8	8	0	17	3	7	3
Students beating up or threatening other students at your school ^{b,c}	12	0	14	13	12	13	13	6	30	0
Kids of different racial or cultural groups not getting along with each other ^c	7	0	8	13	0	5	17	3	8	0
Students bringing guns to school	0.4	0	0.5	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
Students having things stolen at school ^{b,c}	14	9	15	16	4	21	17	9	15	14

^a Percent of respondents who answered “A big problem”

^b $p < .05$, differences between administrators and teachers, chi-square measure of association

^c $p < .05$, differences across sites, chi-square measure of association

School/Neighborhood Crime and Delinquency

In addition to rating the above issues as problems or not, educators were asked to indicate their level of agreement (strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, strongly agree) to a series of statements about crime and gang activity in and around their schools. See Table 4 for the proportion who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with each statement.

About a quarter of all educators noted a lot of gang activity within their schools and a lot of racial conflict in the surrounding neighborhood. While over 30 percent agreed that there was a high rate of delinquency in their school’s neighborhood (39%) and that this delinquency was gang-related (30%), the majority of educators (61%) felt safe in those neighborhoods.

Table 4. School/Neighborhood Crime and Delinquency, by Job Position and Site

School Environment ^a	Total	Adm	Tchr	ABQ	CHI	DFW area	GRL	NSH	PHL	PTD
A lot of gang activity at my school ^c	28	22	29	38	32	21	80	9	19	5
Most disciplinary problems at my school are gang-related ^{b,c}	16	11	17	24	17	8	53	6	7	0
A lot of racial conflict in neighborhood around school ^c	26	25	26	18	17	14	53	22	48	19
High rate of serious juvenile delinquency in neighborhood around my school ^c	39	39	38	43	52	35	37	27	54	32
Much of the serious crime in neighborhood around my school is gang-related ^c	30	39	27	38	44	11	55	24	26	19
I feel safe in neighborhood around my school ^c	61	67	59	74	44	45	55	52	70	81

^a Percent of respondents who answered “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”

^b $p < .05$, differences between administrators and teachers, chi-square measure of association

^c $p < .05$, differences across sites, chi-square measure of association

Administrators’ and teachers’ responses were similar, with significant differences for only one item (fewer administrators than teachers indicated that their school’s disciplinary problems were gang-related). Across sites, however, there were differences on every measure. The majority of respondents in Greeley agreed that there was a lot of gang activity at their

schools (80%), that most disciplinary problems were gang-related (53%), and that there was a lot of racial conflict in the neighborhood around their schools (53%). By contrast, only five percent of school personnel in Portland indicated their schools had a lot of gang activity, none related their disciplinary problems to gangs, and just 19 percent noted a lot of racial conflict in the neighborhood. Over half of educators in Chicago (52%) and Philadelphia (54%) agreed that the neighborhoods surrounding their schools had high rates of delinquency, but just 44 and 26 percent, respectively, indicated that much of this crime was gang-related. Less than half of respondents in Chicago (44%) and DFW area (45%) schools agreed that they feel safe in the neighborhood around their schools, compared to over 70 percent in Albuquerque (74%), Philadelphia (70%), and Portland (81%).

Fear of Crime and Experiences of Victimization at School

Two sets of questions asked school personnel about their fear of crime victimization and their actual victimization in the school setting. For the first set of questions, respondents were asked, “Please indicate how afraid you are of the following things happening to you” and provided responses on a 5-point scale from “not at all afraid” to “very afraid.” The percentages of respondents who answered “afraid” or “very afraid” are presented in Table 5. The second set of questions asked, “Have the following things ever happened to you, and if yes, how often in the past six months?” The bottom half of Table 5 presents the proportion of the sample that answered “yes” to each question about ever experiencing victimization.

While respondents do not report high levels of fear of crime, a good proportion have been victimized, particularly by theft (44%) and attacks or threats at school (20%). Teachers were significantly more likely than administrators to report both being afraid of (12% compared to 3%) and actually (51% vs. 11%) having things stolen at school, and there were no significant differences on the other items in Table 5. Differences across sites occurred on one item (having been attacked or threatened at school), although there were some relatively high prevalence rates reported.

It is notable that half or more of all educators in Albuquerque (61%), Chicago (55%), and Greeley (50%) reported ever having had things stolen from them at school. Almost half (46%) of Philadelphia educators had been attacked or threatened at school at some time, as had one-fifth to one-quarter in Greeley (20%), Albuquerque (24%), and Chicago (27%). Overall, 51

percent of the sample had ever experienced one or more types of victimization; and, 43 percent of the sample had been victimized at least once in the past six months (not shown in table). The average number of victimizations they experienced in the six months prior to the survey was 1.75 for being attacked or threatened on the way to or from school, 2.61 for having things stolen at school, and 2.43 for being attacked or threatened at school (not shown).

Table 5. Fear of Crime and Victimization Experiences, by Job Position and Site

	Total	Adm	Tchr	ABQ	CHI	DFW area	GRL	NSH	PHL	PTD
“How afraid are you of...”^a										
Being attacked or threatened on way to or from school	2	0	2	5	0	0	0	3	0	3
Having your things stolen from you at school ^b	11	3	12	19	8	8	17	6	15	6
Being attacked or threatened at school	4	0	3	8	0	0	7	0	7	3
“Have you ever...”^d										
Been attacked or threatened on way to or from school	4	3	4	3	9	3	3	0	8	3
Had your things stolen from you at school ^b	44	11	51	61	55	24	50	41	42	37
Been attacked or threatened at school ^c	20	8	22	24	27	13	20	13	46	6

^a Percent of respondents who answered “Afraid” or “Very Afraid”

^b $p < .05$, differences between administrators and teachers, chi-square measure of association

^c $p < .05$, differences across sites, chi-square measure of association

^d Percent of respondents who answered “Yes”

School as a Work Environment

In this section, we review responses to several sets of questions about respondents’ schools as a work environment, including their perceptions of how the school is run, relationships between administration, teachers, and students, and job satisfaction. Questions were also asked about the establishment and enforcement of rules for students.

Perceptions of Work Environment

School personnel indicated their level of agreement (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree) with a number of statements about their work environment. Table 6 displays the percentage who agreed or strongly agreed with each statement. Overall, two-thirds or more of educators agreed that teachers have a say in how their schools are run (66%), that teachers are supportive of administration (66%), that the principal gives positive reinforcement (69%), that the respondent's views are respected by their school administration (70%), and that the school provides materials and equipment needed for teaching (70%); further, only 36 percent agreed that tension exists between teachers and administrators. Only about one-quarter and one-third, however, agreed that students have a say (24%) and that their schools have all the space they need (31%), and 42 percent agreed that it was hard to change established procedures.

Administrators were more positive than were teachers on all items, with a greater proportion agreeing with positively-worded statements, and a lower proportion agreeing with negatively-worded statements. These differences were statistically significant for seven of the 10 items; there were no significant differences in levels of agreement with parents having a say in how the school is run, with it being hard to change established procedures, or with the school having all the space/physical arrangements needed.

Across the seven sites, few overall patterns can be discerned, but Nashville educators were most likely to agree with parents and teachers had a say in how their schools were run and that their views were respected by the administration; Portland educators were least likely to agree that there was tension between teachers and administrators, and most likely to agree that the principal praises staff and that the school has supplies and space needed; by contrast, educators in the DFW area site were least likely to agree that students and parents have a say, that their views are respected by administration, that teachers are supportive of administration, and that the school has all the space needed. Statistically significant differences between sites were found for four items in Table 6.

Table 6. Perceptions of Work Environment, by Job Position and Site

Work Environment ^a	Total	Adm	Tchr	ABQ	CHI	DFW area	GRL	NSH	PHL	PTD
Students have a say in how this school is run ^b	24	40	20	16	19	8	23	33	44	31
Parents have a say in how this school is run ^c	55	66	51	50	73	34	43	79	56	57
Teachers have a say in how this school is run ^b	66	97	59	55	46	61	67	82	79	74
My views are respected by the school administration ^b	70	100	63	71	62	58	70	85	75	71
There is tension between teachers and administrators ^{b,c}	36	15	41	41	27	38	63	30	32	22
Teachers are supportive of principal/administration ^b	66	91	60	60	58	58	60	73	79	75
Principal lets staff know when they have done something well ^{b,c}	69	94	63	50	58	57	80	73	82	86
It is hard to change established procedures at my school	42	31	44	49	39	49	40	24	52	42
School supplies teachers with material & equipment needed ^b	70	100	64	68	58	74	60	76	71	78
School has all the space and physical arrangements needed ^c	31	43	30	34	35	11	23	39	21	56

^a Percent of respondents who answered “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”

^b $p < .05$, differences between administrators and teachers, chi-square measure of association

^c $p < .05$, differences across sites, chi-square measure of association

Job Satisfaction

There appears to be a fairly high level of general job satisfaction among school personnel in our sample (see Table 7). More than three-quarters feel satisfied with their jobs, more than 80 percent enjoy coming to work (83%), feel their school is a good place to work (81%), and get along well with administration (89%), and over 90 percent get along well with teachers (93%) and students (93%). Again, a greater proportion of administrators than teachers agreed with each statement, but the difference was significant only for feeling satisfied with their jobs (94% compared to 74%). There were no significant differences across sites, and in no instance did less than 70 percent of educators in any site agree with each statement.

Table 7. Job Satisfaction, by Job Position and Site

Job Satisfaction ^a	Total	Adm	Tchr	ABQ	CHI	DFW area	GRL	NSH	PHL	PTD
I enjoy coming to work	83	94	80	71	89	79	80	85	85	95
I feel satisfied with my job ^b	78	94	74	74	77	74	70	81	78	92
My school is a good place to work	81	92	77	70	77	76	80	91	78	92
I get along well with teachers at my school	93	92	93	92	92	95	90	91	100	92
I get along well with principal/administration at my school	89	97	87	84	92	79	93	91	96	92
I get along well with students at my school	93	100	92	95	89	87	90	100	93	100

^a Percent of respondents who answered “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”

^b $p < .05$, differences between administrators and teachers, chi-square measure of association

School Rules and Enforcement

A final set of items about the school as a work environment is contained in Table 8. Here, school personnel indicated their level of agreement with a series of statements about school rules, enforcement, and student behavior. Over 90 percent of educators agreed that school rules are clearly stated (90%), fair (96%), and that students are aware of the rules (95%). A much smaller proportion (47%), however, agreed that these rules are consistently enforced. About three-quarters indicated that students in their schools are rewarded for good behavior and less than half, although a good proportion (45%), agreed that student behavior disruptions often made it difficult to cover lesson plans.

Table 8. School Rules and Enforcement, by Job Position and Site

School Rules and Student Behavior ^a	Total	Adm	Tchr	ABQ	CHI	DFW area	GRL	NSH	PHL	PTD
Students are aware of school rules	95	100	95	92	92	100	100	97	96	89
School rules are clearly stated	90	97	89	87	89	100	93	94	93	76
School rules are fair	96	100	96	92	100	100	97	94	100	92
School rules are consistently enforced at my school ^b	47	83	40	47	35	45	37	61	50	54
School rules are too strict	5	11	3	11	0	5	7	3	7	3
Students are rewarded for good behavior ^b	78	94	74	79	54	70	93	82	85	78
It is often difficult to cover lesson plan content because of student behavior disruptions ^{b,c}	45	22	50	57	58	45	57	27	52	24

^a Percent of respondents who answered “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”

^b $p < .05$, differences between administrators and teachers, chi-square measure of association

^c $p < .05$, differences across sites, chi-square measure of association

Administrators and teachers differed significantly on three measures, with a much greater percentage of the former agreeing that there is consistent enforcement of rules (83% compared to 40%) and that students are rewarded for good behavior (94% vs. 74%), and a greater percentage of the latter agreeing that it is often difficult to cover lessons due to student misbehavior (50% compared to 22% of administrators). Respondents in different sites differed significantly on just the last item in Table 8, with nearly 60% of those in Albuquerque, Chicago, and Greeley agreeing it is difficult to cover lessons because of behavioral disruptions, compared to just about one-quarter of those in Nashville and Portland. These three sites in which a majority of educators indicated difficulty in getting through lesson plan content are also the sites in which the lowest proportions of educators agreed that rules are consistently enforced.

Opinions of Law Enforcement and Prevention Programming in Schools

Since the G.R.E.A.T. program is delivered by law enforcement officers, school personnel views of law enforcement officers in schools, in general, were assessed. Similarly, educators were queried about their attitudes about the role of schools in prevention of delinquency and about prevention program content and delivery. Attitudes about school-based prevention in general may be related to views of the G.R.E.A.T. program in particular (assessed in a later section).

Law Enforcement Officers in Schools

School personnel were generally positive about the role of law enforcement officers in schools (see Table 9), with the majority feeling safer when police officers were in their schools (65%), agreeing that having officers in schools improves students' perceptions of law enforcement (74%), supporting law enforcement in schools (91%), and believing that police play an important role in prevention (80%). There was less agreement that having police officers in schools has reduced problems of delinquency and violence (41%) or that police officers make good teachers³ (55%). Further, less than 40% of school personnel agreed that police often respond to their schools for delinquency or gang-related violence. Finally, the proportion of respondents who indicated that their schools had a School Resource Officer (SRO) assigned from the city or county law enforcement agency is shown in the last row of Table 9, with 74 percent overall responding "yes." This ranged, however, from 29 and 41 percent in Philadelphia and Chicago, respectively, to 100 percent in both the DFW area and Nashville schools. Additional analyses (not shown) indicated that attitudes about law enforcement in schools were related to whether the respondent's school had an assigned SRO: those who reported their schools had a SRO had a statistically significantly higher mean on a scale of attitudes about police (created by summing responses to all items except the last in Table 9) than did those whose schools did not have a SRO. That is, those whose schools had an SRO had more positive views of law enforcement officers in schools.

³ A large proportion (36%), however, selected "neither agree nor disagree," perhaps indicating that many did not feel they could adequately answer this question; many may not have had the opportunity, for example, to observe an officer in a teaching role.

Table 9. Opinions about Law Enforcement Officers in Schools, by Job Position and Site

Opinions about LE ^a	Total	Adm	Tchr	ABQ	CHI	DFW area	GRL	NSH	PHL	PTD
I feel safer when police officers are in my school ^c	65	56	66	76	56	82	73	76	77	19
Police often respond to my school to handle delinquency problems ^{b, c}	39	42	38	39	46	58	48	18	44	24
Police often respond to my school to handle gang-related violence ^c	37	39	38	39	44	51	55	15	35	24
Students' perceptions of police are improved by having officers in schools ^c	74	89	71	95	46	78	80	70	56	84
Having police officers in my school has reduced delinquency and violence problems ^{b, c}	41	64	38	57	16	68	43	39	50	11
I support having police officers in schools ^c	91	91	91	97	85	95	100	97	96	70
Police officers make good teachers ^c	55	56	55	60	36	73	55	46	74	41
Uniformed police officers do NOT belong in the classroom ^c	8	8	8	8	19	5	3	3	15	5
Police play important role in preventing students from becoming involved in drugs, gangs, and delinquency ^c	80	86	79	95	62	92	70	76	89	68
Does your school have School Resource Officer? (% yes) ^c	74	81	73	68	41	100	96	100	29	58

^a Percent of respondents who answered “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”

^b $p < .05$, differences between administrators and teachers, chi-square measure of association

^c $p < .05$, differences across sites, chi-square measure of association

There was variation between administrators and teachers on two individual items in Table 9. Administrators were more likely than teachers to agree that police often respond to their schools for delinquency problems (42% of administrators, compared to 38% of teachers) and that having police in their schools has reduced delinquency and violence (64% compared to 38%). Looking across the cities, significant differences were found on every measure. Portland

educators were least likely to agree they feel safer with police in schools (19%, although 51% responded “neither agree nor disagree”), to agree that having officers in schools has reduced delinquency and violence (11%), to support having police officers in schools (70%), to believe that police make good teachers (41%), and to agree that police play an important prevention role (68%). By contrast, educators in the DFW area site were most likely to agree that they feel safe with police in schools (82%), that officers have reduced delinquency/violence problems (68%), that police make good teachers (73%), and that police play an important prevention role (92%).

Prevention Programs in Schools

School personnel were also generally positive about school-based prevention programs (see Table 10). Most agreed that such programs can deter youth from drugs, delinquency, and gang involvement (80%) and that it is part of a school’s responsibility to prevent students from becoming involved in these behaviors (81%). Few agreed that schools should focus on “the basics” rather than prevention (8%), that such programs are disruptive to teaching of the required curriculum (10%), or that there are too many prevention programs in their schools (3%). Sixty-four percent even indicated that they would like to see more prevention programs in their schools. Just 56 percent, however, went so far as to agree that teachers should incorporate prevention program lessons into their own curricula.

Differences between administrators and teachers reached statistical significance on one measure: a greater proportion of administrators (12%) than teachers (7%) agreed that schools should focus on the basics. Administrators were also more likely (74%) than teachers (51%) to believe that teachers should incorporate prevention program lessons, but this difference was not statistically significant. One site difference was statistically significant; the proportion of educators who agreed that they would like to see more prevention programs in their schools ranged from a low of 42 percent in Portland to a high of 89 percent in Philadelphia.

Table 10. Opinions of School-based Prevention Programs, by Job Position and Site

Prevention Programs in School? ^a	Total	Adm	Tchr	ABQ	CHI	DFW area	GRL	NSH	PHL	PTD
Prevention programs in schools can be effective in deterring students from drugs, delinquency, and gangs	80	88	78	84	62	92	80	75	89	75
Schools should focus on basics like reading, writing, and arithmetic instead of prevention programs ^b	8	12	7	8	8	5	10	6	7	11
Part of school’s responsibility is to prevent children from becoming involved with drugs, delinquency, and gangs	81	91	78	71	72	92	93	75	86	78
I would like to see more prevention programs taught in my school ^c	64	79	60	66	73	71	67	44	89	42
Teachers should incorporate prevention program lessons into their own curricula	56	74	51	42	54	58	43	56	71	67
Prevention programs are disruptive to teaching of required curriculum	10	3	12	11	8	0	10	13	7	22
There are too many prevention programs at my school	3	0	4	3	0	3	0	6	7	3

^a Percent of respondents who answered “Agree” or “Strongly Agree

^b $p < .05$, differences between administrators and teachers, chi-square measure of association

^c $p < .05$, differences across sites, chi-square measure of association

Prevention Program Content and Delivery

Respondents were given a list of skills or content that school-based prevention programs commonly provide to students and asked to rate each in terms of how important (“not important,” “somewhat important,” “very important”) they believe it is in helping youths avoid drugs, delinquency, and gangs. We sought educators’ opinions about prevention program content, as all of the components noted in Table 11 are included in current G.R.E.A.T. program curricula.

There was a high level of support for each of the program aspects. Decision-making, problem-solving, communication skills, and conflict resolution were rated as “very important” in preventing drugs, delinquency, and gangs by over 90 percent of school personnel, and over 80 percent gave this rating for goal setting, anger management, refusal skills, recognition of peer pressure, and social responsibility. Program aspects receiving the lowest proportion of respondents rating it “very important” (though still over ¾ of respondents) were “anti-gang and violence norms” (77%) and “empathy and perspective taking” (78%). A significantly greater proportion of administrators than teachers rated goal setting (97% vs. 79%, respectively) and problem solving (100% vs. 89%) as “very important.” There were no statistically significant differences across sites.

Table 11. Prevention Program Content, by Job Position and Site

How important is each in helping youths avoid drugs, delinquency, and gangs? ^a	Total	Adm	Tchr	ABQ	CHI	DFW area	GRL	NSH	PHL	PTD
Goal setting ^b	83	97	79	78	85	84	90	88	89	73
Decision making	92	100	91	92	92	92	93	91	93	92
Anger management	88	94	87	89	92	81	87	88	93	87
Problem solving ^b	92	100	89	89	96	89	90	97	89	87
Refusal skills	82	86	80	75	77	72	90	88	82	92
Recognition of peer pressure	87	92	86	81	92	78	90	97	82	92
Anti-gang and violence norms	77	78	77	81	89	70	83	85	68	67
Communication skills	90	94	89	89	92	92	87	97	86	87
Conflict resolution	93	100	92	92	100	87	97	94	96	92
Social responsibility	86	89	84	89	77	87	87	94	79	84
Empathy and perspective taking	78	86	77	78	77	73	73	79	82	84

^a Percent of respondents who answered “Very important”

^b $p < .05$, differences between administrators and teachers, chi-square measure of association

School personnel were also asked to rate, on a three-point scale from “not effective” to “very effective,” the effectiveness of different methods of delivering prevention program content. As shown in Table 12, role playing (71%), small group activities (70%), and class discussion (60%) were the most likely to be rated “very effective.” Least likely were lecture (7%) and written homework (6%). Administrators (92%) were significantly more likely than teachers (66%) to rate small group activities as a very effective delivery method, and although there was variation across sites, none of the differences was statistically significant.

Table 12. Prevention Program Delivery Methods, by Job Position and Site

How effective is each in conveying prevention program material? ^a	Total	Adm	Tchr	ABQ	CHI	DFW area	GRL	NSH	PHL	PTD
Lecture	7	6	7	12	12	11	7	3	0	3
Class discussion	60	72	58	59	69	49	57	79	54	60
Role playing	71	75	71	71	65	70	67	79	75	70
Question & answer sessions	54	69	51	56	69	46	63	61	36	49
Small group activities ^b	70	92	66	68	69	62	80	76	64	73
Written homework	6	11	6	3	15	3	7	3	14	3

^a Percent of respondents who answered “Very effective”

^b $p < .05$, differences between administrators and teachers, chi-square measure of association

Attitudes about G.R.E.A.T.

In the final sections of the questionnaire, a series of closed-ended and open-ended questions about the G.R.E.A.T. program and G.R.E.A.T. officer were asked. The first set of closed-ended questions was intended to gather information about respondents’ level of support for G.R.E.A.T.; views about the content, age-appropriateness, and length of the program; and opinions about the effects of the program. The second set of questions inquired about G.R.E.A.T. officer preparedness and delivery of the program, as well as officer-student interactions. The open-ended questions were intended to assess the role that teachers play (if any) in the G.R.E.A.T. program and to gather any additional comments respondents wished to provide.

Opinions about the G.R.E.A.T. Program

Toward the end of the questionnaire, respondents were asked, “Are you familiar with the G.R.E.A.T. program?” Those who answered “no” were instructed to skip the two sections of questions regarding the G.R.E.A.T. program and the G.R.E.A.T. officer. Most of the participants (186 or 82% of the sample) answered that they were familiar with the program; this includes 92 percent of administrators and 79 percent of teachers. Familiarity with G.R.E.A.T. across the seven sites ranged from 74 percent (Albuquerque and DFW area) to 93 percent (Greeley and Philadelphia).

School personnel as a whole responded positively about the G.R.E.A.T. program (see Table 13). Nearly 90 percent, for example, are in favor of having the program in their schools. In regard to specific statements about program materials and length, 90 percent feel that the curriculum is appropriate for students’ age and comprehension levels, but fewer agreed that G.R.E.A.T. program materials are appealing to students (77%), that the length of the G.R.E.A.T. curriculum (45-60 minutes a week for 13 weeks) provides enough time to cover the important, relevant topics (63%), or that officers teaching the G.R.E.A.T. program have enough time during the class period to sufficiently cover the educational materials for each lesson (62%).

School personnel were also asked their opinions about the effects of the G.R.E.A.T. program, and there was a good deal of agreement that G.R.E.A.T. reaches many of its goals. Over 80 percent agreed that G.R.E.A.T. teaches students the skills they need to avoid gangs and violence (82%), that G.R.E.A.T. improves students’ perceptions of the police (85%), and that G.R.E.A.T. addresses problems facing students in their schools (86%). Interestingly, however, only about half agreed it played a significant role in reducing youth gang participation in their schools (54%) and communities (47%).

Administrators and teachers differed significantly on four items, with a greater percentage of administrators agreeing that G.R.E.A.T. addressed problems of students in their schools, that G.R.E.A.T. reduces youth gang participation in their communities, that the program was of sufficient length, and that there was sufficient class time for G.R.E.A.T. There was only one significant difference across sites: just 39 and 41 percent of school personnel in Nashville and Portland, respectively, agreed that G.R.E.A.T. reduces gang participation in their

schools, while 65 and 79 percent of those in Philadelphia and the DFW area schools, respectively, agreed.

Table 13. Opinions about the G.R.E.A.T. Program, by Job Position and Site

Opinions of G.R.E.A.T. ^a	Total	Adm	Tchr	ABQ	CHI	DFW area	GRL	NSH	PHL	PTD
I am in favor of having G.R.E.A.T. in my school	89	94	87	96	91	96	92	85	89	76
G.R.E.A.T. curriculum is appropriate for students' age and comprehension levels	92	100	89	89	96	89	92	92	88	96
G.R.E.A.T. educational materials seem to be appealing to students	77	91	72	69	78	82	83	58	81	85
G.R.E.A.T. teaches students the skills needed to avoid gangs and violence	82	88	80	70	87	86	83	77	92	82
G.R.E.A.T. program improves students' perceptions of police	85	91	83	93	82	89	88	69	77	93
G.R.E.A.T. addresses problems facing students at my school ^b	86	100	83	89	87	96	92	73	88	79
G.R.E.A.T. plays a significant role in reducing youth gang participation in my <u>school</u> ^c	54	70	48	44	48	79	58	39	65	41
G.R.E.A.T. plays a significant role in reducing youth gang participation in my <u>community</u> ^b	47	73	40	42	39	71	54	46	48	26
Length of G.R.E.A.T. curriculum is enough time to cover important, relevant topics ^b	63	88	57	56	65	56	75	60	52	78
G.R.E.A.T. officers have enough time during class period to sufficiently cover materials for each lesson ^b	62	91	56	44	70	56	71	62	63	70

^a Percent of respondents who answered "Agree" or "Strongly Agree"

^b $p < .05$, differences between administrators and teachers, chi-square measure of association

^c $p < .05$, differences across sites, chi-square measure of association

Open-ended Comments about the G.R.E.A.T. Program

Each respondent who reported that G.R.E.A.T. had been taught in her/his classroom (n=96) was asked to answer a series of five open-ended questions about their involvement with the G.R.E.A.T. program; 78 respondents provided comments on at least one of the five questions. The last of these questions (the remainder are discussed in another section) asked, “Do you have any additional comments you would like to make about the G.R.E.A.T. program?” Fifty educators (52% of the 96 who had had G.R.E.A.T. in their classrooms or 64% of the 78 who answered the open-ended questions) offered comments. Most of the responses (n=35 or 70% of those who answered this question) were in regard to the program itself, although 24 also offered specific comments about the G.R.E.A.T. officer, which will be discussed in a later section.

Of the 35 program-related comments, the overwhelming majority (n=29 or 83%) were positive in nature, four were negative, and an additional two can be considered neutral. Educators feel that the G.R.E.A.T. program is, among other things, “wonderful,” “amazing,” “engaging,” and, of course, “great.” They also indicated that they see changes in their students, asserting that “students seem more mature, confident, and happy after attending the program,” “...more empathy for others has developed,” and that the program “actually brought a lot of students out of their [illegible] shell.” A few recognized that the program assisted them in their own teaching, for example, “GREAT is a very effective and valuable support to my curriculum” and “GREAT content effectively meets state standards for health education which are not necessarily addressed in other curricula...” In addition, a number of school personnel wrote that they believe the program to be effective, though one respondent suggested that G.R.E.A.T. would be more effective in grades 3-4. By contrast, a number of respondents indicated a desire for the program to continue or return to their schools, one suggested expanding the program throughout the school year, and one even suggested extending it into high school.

The negative comments were in regard to length of the program, suggesting that students’ interest waned (“Why 13 weeks? It is way too long. The kids were done week 6.”), the fact that prevention programming cuts into an already-crowded curriculum (“There is never enough time to do the basics and prevention programs. We need all the help we can get!”), and apparent inconsistency in program delivery (“Too inconsistent”). Finally, one educator wrote that, “We need prevention programs but I do not think G.R.E.A.T. is working at this time.”

Do Opinions of G.R.E.A.T. Differ by Context? Correlational Analyses

A series of bivariate correlations was conducted to determine what relationships, if any, exist between the various factors examined above (Tables 3-12) and attitudes about the G.R.E.A.T. program (Table 13). It was thought, for example, that school personnel who perceive their schools to be facing issues of crime, disorder, or gangs might have more positive views and be more supportive of the G.R.E.A.T. program, which is designed to address many of these issues, than would educators in less disordered school environments. Similarly, school personnel who have more negative, compared to more positive, views of police officers or prevention programs in schools may have less favorable views about G.R.E.A.T., a prevention program taught by law enforcement officers in schools.

For these analyses, scales were constructed by summing respondents' answers to series of individual items and obtaining the average of these responses, to get a sense of how the respondents feel about the issue or concept overall.⁴ For the questions in Table 13, two scales were created; the first represents general attitudes about the G.R.E.A.T. program and is comprised of the first eight questions, and the second is a scale representing attitudes about the length of the program, comprised of the last two questions in Table 13. These correlational analyses were restricted to those who had answered "yes" to the question, "Are you familiar with the G.R.E.A.T. program?"

Administrators and teachers differed on both the attitudes about G.R.E.A.T. and length of G.R.E.A.T. scales, with administrators having higher means indicating more positive views of the program and greater agreement that program length was sufficient. It is important to note, though, that means were high for both groups. Attitudes about G.R.E.A.T., but not about the length of the program, varied across sites, with DFW area, Greeley, and Philadelphia respondents having the highest scale means. A number of factors were found to be significantly correlated with respondents' attitudes about G.R.E.A.T., but only one was related to perceptions

⁴ For all scales, the following methods were used: first, factor analyses of items contained within sets of questions (a set of questions is displayed in each table of this report) was conducted to determine whether the items measure a single underlying concept. For three sets of questions (fear of crime, school environment, and job satisfaction), the items represented one underlying concept. For the remainder, two or more factors were found, indicating that the items represented two or more subscales or concepts. Second, reliability analyses were conducted to determine how well the items in a scale measured the underlying concept. The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients for all scales were .64 or higher, indicating acceptable levels for both the total scale (all items of the table) and for the identified subscales. Unless otherwise noted, the correlational analyses in this section and in the next section (about the G.R.E.A.T. officer) were conducted with the total scales, as findings (magnitude and direction of relationship) did not differ by using the subscales.

about the length of the program. Opinions about whether the length of the G.R.E.A.T. curriculum is appropriate and whether there is enough time during the class period to cover the lessons were associated only with positive views of prevention programs in schools. The following factors were related to more positive attitudes about G.R.E.A.T.: greater fear of victimization in and around school (top half of Table 5) and greater presence of school rules that are known and enforced (Table 8) were weakly correlated ($r=.16$ to $.22$); and more positive attitudes about law enforcement officers (Table 9) and prevention programs in schools (Table 10) were both moderately correlated ($r=.44$ to $.55$). These analyses indicate that opinions about the G.R.E.A.T. program are most strongly tied to educators' views of the roles of police officers and prevention programming in schools: the more they support their presence, the greater their support for G.R.E.A.T. (and vice versa).

A number of factors were also found not to be associated with respondents' opinions of G.R.E.A.T. Reports of the presence of school problems (Table 3), perceptions of crime and disorder in their school environment (Table 4), perceptions of their work environment (Table 6), and level of job satisfaction (Table 7) were not related to educators' attitudes about G.R.E.A.T. In addition, there were no significant differences in attitudes about G.R.E.A.T. between respondents who reported ever having been victimized (bottom of Table 5) and those who had not or between respondents who reported SROs in their schools and those who did not. These findings mean that school personnel who describe many issues as "big problems" in their schools, who perceive their schools as having issues with violence and gangs, who perceive their work environment negatively, who are dissatisfied with their jobs, or who have been victims of crime in or around their schools are not more or less likely than others to have positive (or negative) views about the G.R.E.A.T. program.

Opinions about the G.R.E.A.T. Officer

Respondents were also asked whether the G.R.E.A.T. program had ever been taught in their classrooms. Because the subsequent set of questions inquired specifically about the G.R.E.A.T. officers, respondents who had never had the program taught in their classrooms (and, thus, would not have had the experience to adequately answer the questions) were asked to skip to the final section of the survey. Most of the respondents answered that the program had not

been taught in their classrooms, but a large proportion responded “yes” (n=96 representing 42% of the sample and 52% of those who were familiar with the program); across sites, the range was from 32 percent in the DFW area site to 76 percent in Philadelphia. This included 38 percent (n = 12) of administrators and 55 percent (n = 78) of teachers. These respondents were asked to think about the most recent time the program had been offered in their classroom and provide their level of agreement with the statements contained in Table 14. Responses of only those who reported both being familiar with the G.R.E.A.T. program and having had the program taught in their class are included in these analyses.

There were no statistically significant differences between administrators and teachers or across sites on any items, but a few cross-site differences of note are discussed below. In terms of officer preparedness and delivery of G.R.E.A.T., a greater percentage of educators agreed that the G.R.E.A.T. officer appeared adequately trained in delivering lesson content (85%) than in teaching and classroom management (74%); this was still the large majority of the sample, but there was variation across sites, as just 56 percent of Portland educators agreed, compared to 100 percent in the DFW area site. About a third of Portland respondents *disagreed* that the officer was adequately trained in teaching and behavior management (results not shown in table). Most respondents indicated that the officer was punctual (80%) and attended class on scheduled days (86%). While the percentage who agreed with these statements was over 70 percent across the sites, it is worth noting that a fairly large proportion of Portland educators responded “disagree” or “strongly disagree” (results not shown in table): 24 percent disagreed that officers were punctual (as did 15% in Albuquerque), and 22 percent disagreed that officers attended when scheduled (as did 27% in Nashville and 23% in Albuquerque). Just 14 percent overall agreed that the officer often strayed from the lesson plan, though this varied across sites from zero (in the DFW area) to 36 percent (in Nashville, also the site in which the lowest proportion agreed that the officer was adequately trained to deliver lesson content).

A second set of statements in Table 14 dealt with officers’ interactions in the classroom. A little over half (56%) of respondents indicated that the G.R.E.A.T. officer incorporated them into the teaching of the program (see related discussion in the next section). While only 14 percent overall agreed that the officer had difficulty controlling the class, this number was 22 percent in Portland (the site in which the lowest proportion agreed that the officer was adequately trained in classroom management). Of the items in Table 14, school personnel

agreed most with statements regarding officers' interactions with students. Eighty-five percent or more of the respondents agreed that students were responsive to the G.R.E.A.T. officer, seemed to enjoy their interactions with the officer, and were respectful of the officer.

Table 14. Opinions of G.R.E.A.T. Officer, by Job Position and Site

Opinions of G.R.E.A.T. Officer ^a	Total	Adm	Tchr	ABQ	CHI	DFW area	GRL	NSH	PHL	PTD
Officer Preparedness & Delivery										
G.R.E.A.T. officer appeared adequately trained to deliver lesson content	85	100	81	92	85	100	100	64	89	72
G.R.E.A.T. officer was adequately trained in teaching and classroom management	74	83	70	77	85	100	64	64	83	56
G.R.E.A.T. officer punctual or notified me if s/he would be late	80	100	77	77	92	75	82	73	83	77
G.R.E.A.T. officer attended class on scheduled days or made other arrangements	86	100	84	77	92	88	91	73	100	78
G.R.E.A.T. officer often strayed from lesson plan	14	0	15	8	8	0	9	36	12	17
Officer Interactions										
G.R.E.A.T. officer incorporated me into teaching of program	56	83	49	50	54	63	64	36	78	44
Students were responsive to G.R.E.A.T. officer	86	100	82	100	92	100	82	64	83	83
Students seemed to enjoy their interactions with G.R.E.A.T. officer	85	100	81	92	92	100	82	82	78	78
G.R.E.A.T. officer had difficulty controlling the class	14	0	16	8	8	0	18	9	22	22
Students were respectful of G.R.E.A.T. officer	85	100	82	100	100	88	91	82	78	67

^a Percent of respondents who answered "Agree" or "Strongly Agree"

Open-ended Comments about the G.R.E.A.T. Officer

When asked in the open-ended comments section of the survey if they had “any additional comments about the G.R.E.A.T. program,” many school personnel responded with comments about the G.R.E.A.T. officer. Of the 49 who responded to the question, 24 (49%) gave comments about the officer. Of those 24, fifteen respondents (63% of those who commented about the officer) made positive statements about the officer, such as s/he was “wonderful,” “helpful,” “awesome” and “a fantastic teacher.” Some school personnel also thought that students were responsive to the officers (e.g., “We need to keep our SROs and the GREAT program. It was very positively received by the students.”), and others commented that the G.R.E.A.T. program helped with school- and student-police relations (“GREAT officers are friendly and have established a good relationship with the school,” “...relationships between students and police are so much better,” and “The kids have a chance to get to know the SRO and they ask him questions. They are also not afraid to go to him, if they need anything.”).

Several did not have such a positive experience with their officers. Six of the 24 (25%) who made comments about the officer had negative feedback, such as s/he rushed activities, had difficulty with classroom management, or did not use recommended modes of teaching (e.g., “The officer often lectured or put the kids in group work; Did not do as many of the activities to practice skills.”). Others indicated that the officer did not show up when scheduled (e.g., “Our SRO often doesn’t teach on scheduled days and it really disappoints the students when he doesn’t show up” and “Also the officer frequently cancelled class without advance notice.”). One educator even commented that s/he “was personally offended that my kids were addressed by the street ‘jive’,” because “inner-city kids are intelligent and capable.” This respondent went on to write, “I want my kids to give respect and model responsibility for actions. I was not happy when I felt the guest officer, when he tried to control them, modeled disrespect in tone and words to them.”

An additional three respondents made comments that can be considered more neutral in nature, and their general message was that the success of G.R.E.A.T. hinges upon the officer. These sentiments are as follows: “A good officer is great. An unorganized or unprepared or loss in control of class is not as good;” “The officer is key to whether the program is effective or not;” and “I think it’s a wonderful and effective program if the appropriate officer is presenting the material. Generally, an officer that has the ability to connect with the kids.”

Do Opinions of G.R.E.A.T. Officer Differ by Context? Correlational Analyses

Another series of bivariate correlations was conducted to determine whether school personnel's perceptions of a variety of factors were related to their views about the G.R.E.A.T. officers teaching the program. For these analyses, two scales about the G.R.E.A.T. officer were constructed from the items contained in Table 14. The first, which can be conceived of as representing issues related to G.R.E.A.T. officer training and delivery of the program, was created by summing responses to the first five items in the table; the second, which represents officers' interactions with students and teachers in the classroom, is comprised of the second five items of Table 14. The responses of only those who answered that they were both familiar with the G.R.E.A.T. program and had had the program taught in their classrooms were included in these analyses.

There were no differences between administrators and teachers or between cities on either of the scales relating to the G.R.E.A.T. officer. Only two "contextual factors" were correlated with views about the G.R.E.A.T. officer. Having more positive views of prevention programs in schools was weakly correlated ($r=.27$) with more positive views of G.R.E.A.T. officer interactions in the classroom, but was not related to views of how well the G.R.E.A.T. officer was trained or delivered the program. In addition, the more favorable the respondents' attitudes toward law enforcement in schools, the more positive their attitudes about both G.R.E.A.T. officer training/delivery ($r=.43$) and G.R.E.A.T. officer interactions ($r=.39$), though having an SRO assigned to the school was not related. These correlations also mean that respondents who have more positive views about the G.R.E.A.T. officer have more positive views of prevention programs and law enforcement officers in schools. Finally, the relationship between respondents' views of the G.R.E.A.T. officer and their opinions about the program are also supported in correlational analyses, which demonstrate a significant and moderate correlation ($r=.61$) between both officer preparedness and officer interactions and attitudes about G.R.E.A.T.

Role of Educators in the G.R.E.A.T. Program

Finally, a series of open-ended questions asked about the role of educators in the G.R.E.A.T. program and the extent to which educators incorporated G.R.E.A.T. into their own teaching.⁵ The first of these questions was “When G.R.E.A.T. was delivered in your classroom, what role, if any, did you play in the program?” A number of educators (n= 12 or 16% of the 77 who responded to the question) indicated that they did not play a role in the program. One educator who did not play a role expressed a desire to be involved, writing, “I feel it should be more of a team-teaching model.” By contrast, most educators noted at least some role. These roles ranged from being an “observer” or “just listening” (10%) and engaging in classroom management activities (35%) to assisting the officer (34%) and actively participating in discussion or activities (25%). The most common role mentioned was classroom management and discipline activities (e.g., “I helped with discipline issues,” “class control,” and “helping kids stay on task”) as the extent of their involvement. Another frequent mention was “assisting the officer,” which included “distributing materials...explaining and encouraging GREAT projects,” “helping students with questions. Some clarification of workbook,” and “I assisted the officer with grouping, passing out materials, and organizing groups,” or, more vaguely, such responses as “assisting officer when asked.” Active participation was indicated by some, for example, “facilitated/supported discussions,” “the officer incorporated me into role-playing skits,” and “I assisted in discussion, discussion groups, and taught follow-up lessons in class, put info on our class website and provided activities, reflection, and assessment activities for students each week.”

Seventy-two school personnel provided responses to the second question, “How did you generally use the time when G.R.E.A.T. was being delivered in your classroom?” and many provided more than one response. A good number of educators (n=22 or 31% of those who answered the question) used the time as an opportunity for grading or planning (though some noted that they also listened and/or helped with classroom management), and, despite program expectations that should have been and perhaps had been conveyed, two indicated they had left the classroom to run errands in the school. Others listened or observed (about 42%), engaged in

⁵ In G.R.E.A.T. Officer Training, trainees are instructed that they should meet with teachers prior to the start of the program, to discuss the program and expectations of the teacher. Such expectations include the teacher being present in the classroom when the curriculum is being taught, assisting with classroom management, etc. In addition, trainees are encouraged/instructed to give the teachers a set of extended-teaching activities that correspond to each lesson, to use outside of G.R.E.A.T. instruction time.

classroom management and discipline (about 31%), assisted the officer as necessary and/or participated in some manner (about 20% each). Two wrote that they used the time as an opportunity to plan how to incorporate G.R.E.A.T.: “worked on lessons to incorporate the GREAT lessons into my own” and “to prepare for the enrichment activities that were provided by the officer...”

The third open-ended question was “Did you incorporate G.R.E.A.T. lessons/content into your own lesson plans? (If no, why not? If yes, how?)” Many (n=34 or 45% of the 75 who answered the question) educators did not incorporate G.R.E.A.T. lesson content into their own teaching. The primary reason was lack of time (n=16 or 49% of those who did not incorporate G.R.E.A.T. content). Many teachers responded that with standards, mandated testing, and preparation for these assessments, there was no time for outside activities: “massive amount of state science standards I have to teach,” “too much to cover already!” Another group (n=10 or 30% of those who did not incorporate) of school personnel indicated that G.R.E.A.T. lesson content was not relevant to the subject they taught. Math and science were specifically mentioned, although one math teacher found a way to make a connection: “We had a unit in Math that dealt with data formation and collection. We used some of the statistics presented to us through the GREAT program.” Other responses included the following: “Yes—If appropriate to subject. This was hard because GREAT was taught in the science class. Would social studies be more appropriate?” “Yes—very infrequently on ad hoc basis as a result of student questions. Correlation between GREAT material and Earth Science is tough to achieve on a regular basis.” “No—they had very little to do with math or science.” “No—made some references to it, but mostly GREAT is a stand-alone program. GREAT content doesn’t particularly meet the needs of state science standards, but does effectively address health standards.”

Forty-one (55% of those responding to the question) indicated that they did cover or reinforce G.R.E.A.T. content. Teachers of such subjects as social studies, language arts, and health appeared to view G.R.E.A.T. content as supporting their own lesson plan content and/or their efforts to meet standards; accordingly, they were likely to incorporate G.R.E.A.T. content into their regular curricula:

- “I teach social studies and it fit in naturally when talking about cultures and communicating.”
- “Reading/writing support—the use of literacy to enhance the curriculum.”

- “I would explain the economic side of gang activities.”
- “I used topics like staying away from drugs and gangs as journal topics, my students wrote journal like list 10 ways to avoid violence or what can we do as a classroom to help promote peace at the school (From that journal, my students wanted to make posters, we put the posters in the hall).”

Others mentioned that the topics or skills covered in G.R.E.A.T. naturally come up in their teaching: “Many of the topics—responding to peer pressure, problem-solving, social responsibility, etc.—arise during the school year.” Finally, several instructors used G.R.E.A.T. content to address students’ behavior, for example, “Character development. I could incorporate lessons from GREAT when students got in trouble for different things” and “I incorporated GREAT lessons when my students had difficulties with others in the class. For example, fighting, hitting, peer pressure from other students not only in their class but outside of class.”

Finally, respondents were asked in a fourth open-ended question, “Did you utilize any of the extended-teacher activities included in the G.R.E.A.T. workbook? If no, why not? If yes, which ones?” The majority of educators (n=61 or 84% of the 73 who answered this question) responded that they did not use them, and reasons were neatly grouped into two main categories. These key reasons were lack of knowledge of the existence of the activities and lack of time. Twenty-one (34% of those who said no) respondents noted that they were not aware of the activities, that the officer had not informed them. At least one person who responded this way seemed dismayed that s/he had not known, appearing as though s/he might have used them otherwise: “I didn’t know there were any!! :- (“ Twenty-six (43% of those who said no) responded that they did not use them because of lack of time to incorporate such activities. A few additional reasons for not using the activities were that they were not relevant to the subject (n=2), the “opportunity did not present itself” (n=1) and that the activities were “boring” (n=1).

Of the 12 respondents (16% of those who answered the question) who did use the activities, none specified which of the activities they incorporated (they either simply wrote “Yes” that they used them or also wrote that they did not recall which activities were used), although three indicated they used them all.

Summary and Conclusion

This report provided findings from the National Evaluation of the Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) program's School Personnel Survey, conducted in Spring and Fall 2007 (with surveys re-distributed to Greeley schools and distributed for the first time to the two additional Chicago schools in Spring 2008). Administrators and teachers in the G.R.E.A.T. grade levels (6th or 7th) in 31 participating schools in seven cities were asked to provide their responses to an anonymous questionnaire; 230 (62%) completed the surveys. As discussed throughout the report, school personnel were asked their perceptions of problems facing their schools, crime and gangs in their schools and surrounding neighborhoods, fear of crime and victimization experiences, their school as a work environment, law enforcement officers and prevention programs in schools, and prevention program content and delivery. It was thought that these opinions may be related to their views of the G.R.E.A.T. program and the officers teaching the program; this is the focus of this summary, after a few comments about some specific findings about law enforcement and prevention programs in schools.

Educators were generally positive about having law enforcement officers in schools. Most respondents' schools had a School Resource Officer (SRO), and these respondents had the most positive attitudes about police in schools. In addition, school personnel were supportive of prevention programs in schools and the role of schools in prevention, although only about half agreed that teachers should incorporate prevention program lessons into their own curricula. These findings generally bode well for the G.R.E.A.T. program. In regard to program content and delivery, over 70 percent rated the components in Table 11 as "very important" in helping youths avoid drugs, delinquency, and gangs, with decision-making, problem-solving, and conflict resolution skills receiving this rating by over 90 percent. The G.R.E.A.T. curriculum includes all of the 11 components, with an emphasis on a skills-building approach that culminates in activities designed to allow students to practice conflict resolution. The G.R.E.A.T. program also utilizes mostly "active teaching" methods such as small group activities and role-playing, which were rated as "very effective" means of prevention program delivery by 70 percent or more of respondents, as well as class discussion, rated very effective by 60 percent. The G.R.E.A.T. program is not designed to be delivered using such didactic methods as lecture and written homework, rated as "very effective" by only six and seven percent of school personnel.

School personnel who were familiar with G.R.E.A.T. had positive views of the program, with about 90 percent in favor of having the program in their schools. Most believed the program materials to be appropriate and appealing, though fewer agreed that the length of the curriculum or the class time allotted were enough to cover the topics and materials. The majority of educators believed the program taught skills necessary to avoid delinquency and gangs, addressed problems faced by their students, and improved student-police relations (the latter a key goal of G.R.E.A.T.), but only about half agreed that the program played a significant role in reducing youth gang participation in their schools and communities. Respondents' views about G.R.E.A.T. were related to several attitudes elicited in the earlier sections of the survey; specifically, greater fear of crime in and around school, greater perception of existence and enforcement of school rules, and more positive views of law enforcement and prevention programs in school were all related to more favorable views of G.R.E.A.T., and vice versa.

The G.R.E.A.T. officer teaching the program was also viewed favorably by the majority of respondents, in terms of both preparation and delivery of program and their interactions in the classroom. Despite this overall positive assessment, responses to both the closed-ended and open-ended questions indicated that some officers struggled with classroom management or failed to attend on scheduled days. Open-ended comments revealed that many educators believed the success of the program to be tied to the officer, and additional analyses showed that respondents' views of the program were related to their views about the officer teaching the program. Views of the G.R.E.A.T. officer were also positively related to attitudes about law enforcement officers and prevention programs in schools.

School personnel in whose classrooms G.R.E.A.T. had been taught also provided comments about their role in the program, and several findings are worth reiterating. Most educators played at least some role in the program; although this was largely classroom management activities, some assisted the officer and others actively participated. Many used the time for grading or other paperwork. Almost half (45%) did not incorporate G.R.E.A.T. lesson content into their own curricula, mostly due to lack of time (a large concern was the amount of material to cover for mandated testing), but also because it was not relevant to their subject. The other 55 percent, especially those in relevant courses such as social studies, language arts, and health, did cover or reinforce G.R.E.A.T. content. Most (84%) did not use extended teacher

activities associated with G.R.E.A.T. lessons, often due to lack of time, but almost as often because they had not been made aware of the activities by the G.R.E.A.T. officer.

We close this report with a number of recommendations that can be drawn from these findings from school personnel. Although educators were very positive overall about the G.R.E.A.T. program and officers, the findings suggest a number of steps that can be taken to potentially improve school personnel attitudes even more and make the experience of the G.R.E.A.T. program in schools even better.

- 1) The length of the curriculum and of each lesson may need to be revisited. Just over 60 percent of respondents agreed that the length of the curriculum is enough to cover important topics and that officers have enough time during the class period to cover each lesson (almost 40% indicated that the program was not long enough and that officers did not have adequate time for each lesson). It may be difficult to increase the length of the curriculum: at 13 weeks, officers already have a challenge to complete the program in a semester (if that is their goal), taking into account assemblies, field trips, mandated testing, snow days, and other disruptions to the schedule. And, while class periods cannot necessarily be lengthened, our observations of G.R.E.A.T. Officer Trainings (GOTs) indicate a possible resolution: in trainings, lessons are modeled in a 50-60 minute time frame, while the average class time available is about 35 minutes (see Taylor, Esbensen, and Peterson 2009). In our report on GOT observations, we recommend that lessons be modeled and that officers practice modeling lessons in a shorter time frame that more realistically represents what officers will face when implementing the program in schools.
- 2) Officers should be encouraged in the GOTs to ensure they distribute the extended teacher activities to their classroom teachers, discuss their importance in reinforcing the program lessons, and remind teachers of the activities throughout the course of program delivery. Our observations of GOTs found variation in the extent to which these activities were covered, with some trainings covering their content in detail and strongly encouraging officers to work with teachers to implement them and other trainings covering them briefly or giving them little attention at all (see Taylor, Esbensen, and Peterson 2009 for a complete report of our GOT observations).

- 3) In GOTs, strongly encourage officers to work with schools to offer the G.R.E.A.T. program in subjects that have similar or related content. This will, as intended, assist teachers in achieving mandated standards (a great concern as far as time and a limitation to reinforcing G.R.E.A.T. in their own curricula), while also providing integration of and continuity in G.R.E.A.T. content and skills, to better drive home the lessons and allow students multiple opportunities for exposure and practice. Such courses include language arts, health, and social studies. Respondents who taught subjects such as math, science, and physical education rarely, if ever, incorporated G.R.E.A.T. content/lessons into their own curricula or used extended teacher activities, as they viewed them as not relevant to their subjects.
- 4) Although the proportion was small, a not-insignificant percentage of respondents indicated that G.R.E.A.T. officers had difficulty controlling the class (14% overall agreed, with a range of 0-22% across sites). Our classroom observations of program delivery also found that some officers struggled with classroom management (see Leugoud, Esbensen, Brick, and Taylor 2009 for a complete report of observations). These findings may suggest that more attention to classroom management techniques in GOT would benefit officers in the field; GOT trainers might consider encouraging trainees to practice such techniques during their lesson modeling or in a separate activity (so that they may focus on content and delivery during modeling).
- 5) GOTs should ensure that they stress the importance of punctuality, dependability, and communication; in a few sites (Albuquerque, Nashville, and Portland), over 20 percent of respondents disagreed that the officer was punctual or notified the teacher if s/he would be late and that the officer attended when scheduled or made other arrangements. This was also noted in a number of our classroom observations of program delivery. Officers should make every effort to be on time each scheduled day or to contact the teacher to notify her/him and re-schedule. It is also the case that teachers should be communicative with officers; our observers noted several times when officers arrived to teach the program and learned only then of an assembly or field trip that prohibited teaching that day.

In sum, there appears to be a good deal of support for both the G.R.E.A.T. program and officers. These views are most strongly tied to views of the role of law enforcement officers and prevention programs in schools and do not appear to be related to problems in schools such as delinquency and gangs, to fear of crime or crime victimization, to job satisfaction or other perceptions about school as a work environment, or to whether the respondents' school has a School Resource Officer. Aspects of the current educational climate, such as meeting standards set forth in the "No Child Left Behind" act, provide challenges to delivery and reinforcement of the G.R.E.A.T. program that can be addressed, in part, by locating the program in specific subjects. Finally, views of G.R.E.A.T. and the G.R.E.A.T. officer are related to each other, an important tie that provides avenues for improving even more the overall positive attitudes of school personnel.

References and Resources

Leugoud, Krystle M., Finn-Aage Esbensen, Bradley T. Brick, and Terrance J. Taylor. 2009. *National Evaluation of the Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) Program: Observing the Implementer: Description of Findings, Recommendations, and Conclusions from G.R.E.A.T. Program Implementation Observations*. St Louis, Missouri: University of Missouri-St. Louis.

Taylor, Terrance J., Finn-Aage Esbensen, and Dana Peterson. 2009. *National Evaluation of the Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) Program: G.R.E.A.T. Officer Training (GOT) Report*. St. Louis, Missouri: University of Missouri-St. Louis.

For more information about the Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) Program, see the official G.R.E.A.T. website located at <http://www.great-online.org/> .

For more information about youth gangs and effective responses, see the official website of the National Youth Gang Center located at <http://www.iir.com/nygc/> .

For more information on the earlier National Evaluation of G.R.E.A.T., consult the following (NOTE: Peterson & Esbensen 2004 contains results of the previous School Personnel Survey):

Esbensen, Finn-Aage. 2004. *Evaluating G.R.E.A.T.: A School-based Gang Prevention Program – Research in Policy*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. Available online at: <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/198604.pdf> .

Esbensen, Finn-Aage, Adrienne Freng, Terrance J. Taylor, Dana Peterson, and D. Wayne Osgood. 2002. The National Evaluation of the Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) Program. Pp.139-167 in Winifred L. Reed and Scott H. Decker (Eds.), *Responding to Gangs: Evaluation and Research*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice. Available online at: <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/190351.pdf> .

Esbensen, Finn-Aage, D. Wayne Osgood, Terrance J. Taylor, Dana Peterson, and Adrienne Freng. 2001. How Great is G.R.E.A.T.?: Results from a Quasi-experimental Design. *Criminology & Public Policy* 1 (1): 87-118.

Peterson, Dana and Finn-Aage Esbensen. 2004. The Outlook is G.R.E.A.T.: What Educators Say about School-Based Prevention and the Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) Program.” *Evaluation Review* 28(3): 218-45.

Winfrey, L. Thomas, Jr., Dana Peterson Lynskey, and James R. Maupin. 1999. Developing Local Police and Federal Law Enforcement Partnerships: G.R.E.A.T. as a Case Study of Policy Implementation. *Criminal Justice Review* 24 (2): 145-168.