

**National Evaluation of the
Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T) Program:
2007 Report to Schools and Communities**

by

Finn-Aage Esbensen, Ph.D.

Terrance J. Taylor, Ph.D.

Bradley T. Brick, M.A.

Dana Peterson, Ph.D.

This research was made possible, in part, by the support and participation of seven school districts, including the School District of Philadelphia. 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. We would also like to thank the numerous school administrators, teachers, students, and law enforcement officers for their involvement and assistance in this study. The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication 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

We would like to thank the numerous project staff for their work on this study:

Adrienne Freng, Ph.D.
Mountain City Site Coordinator

Research Assistants

Brad Brick	Meredith McKinney
Desiree Coleman	Chris Melde
Kelly Cutler	Nick Miofski
Steven Downing	Adrian Molina
Erin Flannery	Skyler Pimple
Teri Gullede	Katie Polzer
Laura Hastings	Zachary Robbins
Sara Hoover	Aaron Segó
Joelle Jones	Brad Stevens
Russell Jewell	Candice Tate
Graham Jones	Karin Tusinski
Krystle Leugoud	Sarah Young
Nicole Logan	

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

The Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) program is a gang and delinquency prevention program delivered by law enforcement officers within a school setting. Developed as a local program in 1991 by Phoenix area law enforcement agencies, the program quickly spread throughout the United States. The original G.R.E.A.T. program operated as a nine-lesson lecture-based curriculum taught primarily in middle-school settings. Results from an earlier National Evaluation of the G.R.E.A.T. program found no differences between G.R.E.A.T. and non-G.R.E.A.T. youths in terms of behavioral characteristics (i.e., gang membership and involvement in 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 (see box at right) consists of 13 lessons aimed at teaching youths the life-skills (e.g., communication and refusal skills, as well as conflict resolution and anger management techniques) necessary to prevent involvement in gang behavior and delinquency. The revised G.R.E.A.T.

The G.R.E.A.T. Lessons

1. **Welcome to G.R.E.A.T.** – An introductory lesson designed to provide students with basic knowledge about the connection between gangs, violence, drug abuse, and crime
2. **What’s the Real Deal?** – Designed to help students learn ways to analyze information sources and develop realistic beliefs about gangs and violence
3. **It’s About Us** – A lesson to help students learn about their communities (e.g., family, school, residential area) and their responsibilities
4. **Where Do We Go From Here?** – Designed to help students learn ways of developing realistic and achievable goals
5. **Decisions, Decisions, Decisions** – A lesson to help students develop decision-making skills
6. **Do You Hear What I Am Saying?** – Designed to help students develop effective verbal and non-verbal communication skills
7. **Walk in Someone Else’s Shoes** – A lesson to help students develop active listening and empathy skills, with a particular emphasis on understanding victims of crime and violence
8. **Say It Like You Mean It** – Designed to help students develop effective refusal skills
9. **Getting Along Without Going Along** – A lesson to reinforce and practice the refusal skills learned in Lesson 8
10. **Keeping Your Cool** – A lesson to help students understand signs of anger and ways to manage the emotion
11. **Keeping It Together** – Designed to help students use the anger skills learned in Lesson 10 and apply them to interpersonal situations where conflicts and violence are possible
12. **Working It Out** – A lesson to help students develop effective conflict resolution techniques
13. **Looking Back** – Designed to conclude the G.R.E.A.T. program with an emphasis on the importance of conflict resolution skills as a way to avoid gangs and violence. Students also present their projects aimed at improving their schools.

curriculum was piloted in January 2001 with full-scale implementation occurring the following year.

The program's two main goals are:

1. To help youths avoid gang membership, violence, and criminal activity.
2. To help youths develop a positive relationship with law enforcement.

The National 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 the National Evaluation of the G.R.E.A.T. program. The evaluation consists of a number of different components, including student surveys, classroom observations, surveys of teachers and 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. Family sessions.

The current report provides city-level information obtained from more than 3,600 students enrolled in 186 different classrooms in 29 schools in seven cities across the continental United States during the 2006-2007 school year. This report is the first of a series of annual reports intended to provide school personnel, law enforcement, and other interested community members with information about issues related to youth attitudes and behaviors in their communities. Data described herein are drawn from the pre-test survey of students (i.e., assessments prior to G.R.E.A.T. implementation), which asked students a variety of questions about students' attitudes and behaviors associated with gangs, violence, experience with and perceptions of police. The questions were drawn from a variety of empirical studies assessing key risk and protective factors associated with youth problem behaviors.

Site Selection

During the summer of 2006, efforts were made to identify cities for inclusion in the National Evaluation of G.R.E.A.T. Site selection was based upon three main criteria: 1) existence of an established G.R.E.A.T. program, 2) geographic and demographic diversity, and 3) evidence of gang activity. This site selection process was carried out in a series of steps.

First, the research staff contacted the G.R.E.A.T. Regional Administrators¹ and Bureau of Justice Assistance² personnel to identify locales with institutionalized programs. Consideration was given to factors such as the length of time the program had been in operation, number of G.R.E.A.T.-trained officers, number of schools in which the program was offered, and the components of the G.R.E.A.T. program implemented. Second, once this list of agencies was constructed, the research staff contacted representatives in these cities to obtain more information about the delivery of the G.R.E.A.T. program. Third, given the focus of the program, information about gang activity in these potential cities was obtained from the National Youth Gang Center. Ultimately, a list of seven cities varying in size, region, and level of gang activity were identified.

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. Upon district approval, either four or five schools were identified 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. Once initial agreement to participate was obtained from the school administrator, more detailed discussions/meetings were held between school personnel, G.R.E.A.T. officers, and the research team. Whenever possible, face-to-face meetings were held, but in some instances final arrangements were made via telephone. School and police personnel were informed of the purpose of the evaluation, issues related to the random assignment of classrooms to the treatment condition (i.e., receive G.R.E.A.T./not receive G.R.E.A.T.), procedures to obtain active parental consent for students in these classrooms, scheduling the G.R.E.A.T. program delivery, and other logistical issues associated with the study design.

¹ G.R.E.A.T. is a national program overseen by the G.R.E.A.T. National Policy Board (NPB). For administrative purposes, responsibilities for program oversight are held by (or “given to”) agencies operating in different geographic regions: Northeast, Midwest, Southeast, Southwest, and West. Additionally, two federal partners—the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (BATF) and the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC)—are involved in program training and oversight.

² The Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) oversees the allocation of federal funds and grant compliance associated with the G.R.E.A.T. program.

Student Sample

To maintain the scientific rigor of the evaluation design, in each participating school, classrooms were randomly assigned to treatment (i.e., G.R.E.A.T.) or control condition. All students in the selected classrooms were eligible to participate in the evaluation. The 186 participating classrooms had a total of 4,653 students enrolled at the beginning of the data collection process.

Federal law considers youth under the age of 18 a “special population” requiring additional safeguards in research. The consent of the youth’s parent/guardian is required for the youth’s participation in any research study. Parental consent generally takes one of two forms: 1) passive consent (i.e., parents must specify that their child be excluded from participation) or, 2) active consent (i.e., parents must specify that their child be included in participation).

Active parental consent procedures were implemented as part of this evaluation. The research staff worked closely with the principals and classroom teachers during the consent process. Teachers distributed and collected “consent form packets.” Each packet included a cover letter explaining the purpose of the evaluation and an informed consent form (explaining the risks and benefits of the students’ participation) for parents/guardians to read, sign, and return to the teacher. When allowed by the districts, the research staff provided monetary compensation to the teachers directly for their assistance. In some instances, district regulations prohibited such compensation; in these cases, compensation was provided as a donation to the school or district made in honor of the teachers. Students were also provided a small personal radio in exchange for returning a completed consent form. These radios were provided to students regardless of whether the parent/guardian granted or withheld consent for the youth to participate in the study. Overall, 89.6 percent of youths (N=4,169) returned a completed consent form, with 78.9 percent of parents/guardians (N=3,671) allowing their child’s participation.

Table 1 presents the demographic information of the National Evaluation of G.R.E.A.T. sample for the entire group of youths, as well as separately by site. The sample is evenly split between males and females, most (56%) youth reside with both biological parents, and the majority (88%) was born in the United States. The sample is racially/ethnically diverse, with Hispanic youths representing the modal category (38%). Approximately 2/3 of the youth (62%) were aged 11 or younger, representing the fact that 24 of the 29 schools delivered the G.R.E.A.T. program in 6th grade; three schools in Midwest City and one school each in Northeast and

Southwest cities taught G.R.E.A.T. in 7th grade. Thus, the students in Southwest City, Northeast City, and Midwest City were somewhat older than students in the other sites. Except in Midwest City (in which Hispanics are over-represented and African Americans under-represented), the sample is similar to the demographic composition of the respective school districts.

Table 1. Sample Characteristics

	Full Sample N=3,671	SW City N=591	West City N=486	South City N=613	Mtn. City N=582	SE City N=590	NE City N=457	MW City N=352
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Sex								
--Male	50	50	42	54	52	55	43	51
--Female	50	50	58	46	48	46	57	49
Race/Ethnicity								
--White	28	16	51	20	34	45	12	13
--African American	15	4	7	21	2	23	44	3
--Hispanic/Latino	38	49	13	46	50	17	20	76
--American Indian	4	10	4	2	5	1	4	1
--Asian	4	2	9	6	1	6	4	1
--Multi-Racial	8	14	13	5	4	4	12	2
--Other	4	5	3	1	5	5	5	2
Age								
--11 or younger	62	35	79	74	77	80	61	12
--12	29	43	20	25	22	19	35	41
--13 or older	9	23	1	2	2	<1	4	48
Mean	11.46	11.87	11.21	11.27	11.23	11.19	11.42	12.39
Living Arrangement								
--Both Biological Parents	56	52	58	60	58	60	38	71
--Single Parent	17	20	15	15	14	18	24	11
--1 Biological/1 Step-Parent	14	15	13	14	15	12	18	10
--1 Biological/1 Other Adult	7	7	8	7	7	7	11	4
--Other Relatives	4	6	5	3	4	2	8	3
--Other Living Arrangement	2	1	1	1	3	2	2	2
Resident Status								
--Born outside U.S.	13	10	9	13	11	15	11	21
--Born in U.S.	88	90	91	87	89	85	89	79

School Disorder

We asked students six questions about their perceptions of the school environment. These are presented in the text box labeled “School Disorder.” Students were asked how much of a problem (i.e., not a problem, somewhat of a problem, or a big problem) each of the things was in their school. For the purposes of this report, we combined the “somewhat of a problem” and “a big problem” categories.

Students’ responses to these items are included in Table 2. Overall, approximately 77 percent of the youths indicated that having things stolen at school was somewhat of a problem or a big problem, followed by 75 percent of students indicating that kids bullying other students was a problem, and 70 percent of students stating that

School Disorder
<i>Please indicate how much of a problem each of the following is in your school...</i>
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Kids bullying other students at your school.2. Places in school where some students are afraid to go.3. Students beating up or threatening other students.4. Kids of different racial or cultural groups not getting along with each other.5. Students bringing guns to school.6. Having things stolen at school.
<i>Not a problem, Somewhat of a Problem, A Big Problem</i>

students beating up or threatening other students was a problem at their school. Approximately 56 percent of students indicated that cultural conflicts were a problem. Students were less likely (36%) to indicate problems with students bringing weapons to school or places in school where students were afraid to go (45%). Males and females perceived similar levels of school disorder, although females were slightly more likely to view school disorder as a problem for each of the measures examined.

A few site differences were found. Generally speaking, a larger percentage of students in Southwest City, Northeast City, and Midwest City viewed their schools as disorderly, with lower percentages reported in the other four cities. For example, more than 80 percent of students in Northeast City and Midwest City agreed that kids bullying and/or beating up other students were problems in their schools. Compare this with figures in West City (72% and 62%), South City (72% and 73%), Southeast City (71% and 55%), and Mountain City (63% and 55%).

Table 2: School Disorder

Item Frequencies by City

Items	Full Sample	Male	Female	SW City	West City	South City	Mtn. City	SE City	NE City	MW City
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
School Disorder*										
<i>Kids Bullying Other Students</i>	75	74	77	79	72	72	63	71	87	88
<i>Places Students are Afraid to Go</i>	45	43	47	46	41	54	42	33	58	44
<i>Students Beating up Others</i>	70	67	73	83	62	73	55	55	86	84
<i>Kids of Different Races Not Getting Along</i>	56	54	58	57	53	60	53	50	63	57
<i>Students bringing Guns to School</i>	36	35	38	38	25	46	34	28	48	41
<i>Having Things Stolen at School</i>	77	75	79	87	72	79	81	71	82	81

* Percentage of students who responded that these were somewhat of or a big problem.

Commitment to School

We also asked students to indicate how much they agreed or disagreed with seven statements about their level of commitment to school. These items are presented in the text box labeled “School Commitment.” For questions 1 – 6, students were asked to select their answer on a five point scale (strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, strongly agree), while the response categories for question 7 were “definitely go with friends,” “probably go with friends,” “uncertain,” “probably study,” and “definitely study.” For this report, we combined the agree/strongly agree and the probably/definitely study categories.

School Commitment
<i>How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?</i>
1. Homework is a waste of time.
2. I try hard in school.
3. Education is so important, that it’s worth it to put up with things about school that I don’t like.
4. In general, I like school.
5. Grades are very important to me.
6. I usually finish my homework.
7. If you had to choose between studying to get a good grade on a test or going out with your friends, which would you do?

Students’ responses to these statements are presented in Table 3. Generally, students indicated that they were committed to school. Eighty-eight percent of students indicated that they tried hard in school, approximately 86 percent of students agreed that grades were very

important to them, 77 percent indicated that they generally finished their homework, and 75 percent agreed that education was important enough to put up with the bad things. Approximately 59 percent of students indicated that they would probably or definitely study (as opposed to going out with their friends), and 58 percent of students indicated that they liked school. Conversely, only 21 percent of students agreed with the statement that “homework is a waste of time.”

We again see relatively similar levels of commitment to school for males and females. On each of the questions, however, females were found to be slightly more committed to schools than males. We again see pronounced site differences in students’ commitment to school. Students in Midwest City were generally less committed to school on each item compared with students in each of the other cities.

Table 3: School Commitment

Item Frequencies by City

	Full Sample	Male	Female	SW City	West City	South City	Mtn. City	SE City	NE City	MW City
Items	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<u>School Commitment*</u>										
<i>Homework is a Waste of Time</i>	21	25	17	27	13	19	15	23	25	28
<i>I Try Hard in School</i>	88	85	90	81	93	88	91	88	92	79
<i>Education is So Important</i>	75	74	77	72	80	74	77	73	82	68
<i>In General I Like School</i>	58	55	62	52	71	59	67	58	54	42
<i>Grades are Very Important</i>	86	84	87	80	88	88	89	85	93	76
<i>I Usually Finish My Homework</i>	77	75	79	68	81	78	80	80	82	70
<i>If you Had to Choose ...**</i>	59	56	61	50	68	60	63	52	70	46

* % Agree or Strongly Agree

** % Probably or Definitely Study

Delinquency, Drug Use, and Gang Membership

Students were also asked to indicate the number of times in the past six months that they had engaged in a number of delinquent activities, been involved with gangs, used drugs, and been victimized. The questions used to examine these issues are presented in the text boxes labeled “Delinquency & Gang Membership,” “Drug Use,” and “Victimization.”

Table 4 presents the percentage of students who reported engaging in these behaviors one or more times during the past six months. Table 5 presents the percentage of students who answered affirmatively to the gang membership questions.

Clearly, these items tap a broad range of offenses, ranging from status offenses to serious, violent offenses. Given the relatively young age of the sample, it is perhaps not surprising that a substantial minority of students reported engaging in these activities. The most common offenses were lying about age and hitting someone (22%) and damaging property (18%). Less common were things such as skipping school, avoiding paying for things, and stealing something worth less than \$50 (approximately 11% for each offense). Very few students reported committing offenses such as vandalism, serious theft, burglary, robbery, and drug dealing (5% or less for each offense).

Delinquency & Gang Membership

Delinquency

During the past 6 months, how many times have you...

1. Skipped classes without an excuse?
2. Lied about your age to get into some place or to buy something?
3. Avoided paying for things such as movies, bus, or subway rides?
4. Purposely damaged or destroyed property that did not belong to you?
5. Carried a hidden weapon for protection?
6. Illegally spray painted a wall or a building?
7. Stolen or tried to steal something worth less than \$50?
8. Stolen or tried to steal something worth more than \$50?
9. Gone into or tried to go into a building to steal something?
10. Hit someone with the idea of hurting him/her?
11. Attacked someone with a weapon?
12. Used a weapon or force to get money or things from people?
13. Been involved in gang fights?
14. Sold marijuana or other illegal drugs?

Gang Membership

1. Have you ever been a gang member?
2. Are you now in a gang?
3. Do you consider your group of friends to be a gang?

Although offending was uncommon for youths of either sex, males were more likely to engage in each type of offense, with the sex differences more pronounced for the most serious offenses. It is important to note, however, that approximately 12 percent of these youths had carried a hidden weapon for protection (16% of boys and 7% of girls) and eight percent had been involved in gang fights (11% of boys and 5% of girls). Additionally, males were more likely than females to report ever having been in a gang (11% of boys and 6% of girls), currently being in a gang (5% of boys and 4% of girls), and considering their current group of friends to be a gang (10% of boys and 7% of girls).

Table 4: Delinquency

Item Frequencies by City										
	Full Sample	Male	Female	SW City	West City	South City	Mtn. City	SE City	NE City	MW City
Items	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Delinquency*</u>										
<i>Skipped School</i>	11	12	11	23	9	6	6	8	11	14
<i>Lied About Age</i>	22	25	19	23	17	19	19	20	29	30
<i>Avoided Paying for Things Damaged/Destroyed Property</i>	11	12	10	13	10	10	5	9	17	21
<i>Carried Hidden Weapon</i>	12	16	7	16	9	11	10	8	15	13
<i>Illegally Spray Painted</i>	5	7	3	9	2	4	4	4	8	8
<i>Stolen Something Less Than \$50</i>	11	13	8	17	5	9	7	9	12	18
<i>Stolen Something Over \$50</i>	3	5	2	6	2	2	3	2	4	5
<i>Gone into Building to Steal Something</i>	3	4	3	7	1	3	2	3	4	3
<i>Hit Someone to Hurt Them</i>	22	26	17	24	20	22	11	23	28	28
<i>Attacked Someone w/ Weapon</i>	4	6	2	5	2	4	2	5	5	9
<i>Used Weapon/Force to Get Things</i>	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	3	3
<i>Been in Gang Fights</i>	8	11	5	12	2	9	5	4	14	10
<i>Sold Drugs</i>	1	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	2

*% reporting one or more times in past year

Table 4: Gang Membership

Item Frequencies by City

Items	Full Sample %	Male %	Female %	SW City %	West City %	South City %	Mtn. City %	SE City %	NE City %	MW City %
<u>Gang Membership*</u>										
<i>Ever been in a Gang</i>	8	11	6	10	3	9	6	5	17	8
<i>Currently in a Gang</i>	5	5	4	6	2	5	1	4	11	3
<i>Is Your Group of Friends a Gang</i>	8	10	7	9	4	7	5	5	19	10

*% reporting yes

Students were also asked about their use of drugs. Specifically, students were asked to indicate the number of times (e.g., “0,” “1-2 times,” “about once a month,” “about once a week,” “every day”) they had used tobacco, alcohol, marijuana or other illegal drugs, and inhalants during the past six months.

Drug Use
<i>Please indicate which category best describes how often you've used each drug in the past 6 months?</i>
1. Tobacco products?
2. Alcohol?
3. Marijuana or other illegal drugs?
4. Paint, glue or other things you inhale to get high?

Table 5 presents the percentage of students who reported using each type of

drug one or more times during the past six months. As with delinquency, use of each type of drug was uncommon for these youths. Alcohol was the most commonly used drug (11%) with much lower prevalence of tobacco (4%), inhalant (4%), and marijuana or other drug (3%) use. The percentage of boys and girls who reported using these drugs was virtually identical, although site differences were quite pronounced. Again, students in Southwest City, Northeast City, and Midwest City³ were the most involved in delinquency, drug use, and gangs, while students in West City, South City, Mountain City, and Southeast City were less involved.

³ It should be remembered that students in these cities were slightly older than students in the other cities because the G.R.E.A.T. program was taught in the 7th grade in three of the four Midwest City schools and in one school each in Southwest City and Northeast City.

Table 5: Drug Use

Item Frequencies by City

Items	Full Sample %	Male %	Female %	SW City %	West City %	South City %	Mtn. City %	SE City %	NE City %	MW City %
<u>Drug Use*</u>										
<i>Used Tobacco</i>	4	4	3	8	2	2	3	2	3	6
<i>Drank Alcohol</i>	11	12	10	17	7	9	9	4	7	25
<i>Used Marijuana/Other Drugs</i>	3	3	2	9	1	1	2	1	1	5
<i>Used Paint/Glue/Inhalants</i>	4	4	5	7	2	4	2	5	1	9

*% reporting one or more times in past year

Finally, students were asked about the extent to which they had experienced different types of victimization, both in school and out of school, during the prior six months. These questions again address a range of victimization experiences, including theft, bullying, assault, aggravated assault, and robbery. The individual questions used to assess victimization are presented in the text box labeled “Victimization.”

Table 6 presents the percentage of students who reported having experienced each type of victimization during the past six months. Theft was the most common victimization reported by these students. Forty-eight percent of students indicated that they had been the victim of theft while in school and 39 percent indicated that they had been theft victims outside of school. In general, students were

<p>Victimization</p> <p><i>How many times in the last 6 months have you...</i></p> <p><u>School-Related Victimization</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Been attacked or threatened on your way to or from school? 2. Had your things stolen from you at school? 3. Been attacked or threatened at school? 4. Had mean rumors or lies spread about you at school? 5. Had sexual jokes, comments, or gestures made to you at school? 6. Been made fun of at school because of your looks or the way you talk? 7. Been bullied at school? <p><u>Out-of-School Victimization</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Been hit by someone trying to hurt you? 2. Had someone use a weapon or force to get money or things from you? 3. Been attacked by someone with a weapon or by someone trying to seriously hurt or kill you? 4. Had some of your things stolen from you?

more likely to report being victims at school, as opposed to being victimized outside of school. Part of this may be due to the fact that some of the school-related victimizations may be considered less serious than the out-of-school victimizations. (That is, the out-of-school victimizations measured are generally violent offenses, while the school-related victimizations include a broad range of items including rumors or lies, being made fun of, etc.) It is still important to note the relatively large percentage of students who experienced school-related victimizations: 44 percent of students reported having mean rumors or lies spread about them, 35 percent had been made fun of for their looks or the way they talked, 25 percent had had sexual jokes or comments made about them at school, and 21 percent said they had been bullied at school during the past six months. Violent victimizations were less common at school, but still noteworthy. Of particular import, 21 percent of students said that they had been attacked or threatened at school, and 20 percent indicated that this had happened to them on their way to or from school. Violence outside of school was less common, with robbery and aggravated assault victimizations particularly rare.

Males were more likely than females to experience serious violent victimization, both in and out of school. For example, 24 percent of boys had been attacked or threatened on their way to or from school or while at school, compared with 17 and 18 percent of girls, respectively. Similarly, six percent of boys had been the victims of aggravated assault and five percent the victims of robbery (both offenses occurring outside of school), compared with two percent of girls experiencing these types of serious violent victimization. The percentage of males and females who reported victimizations such as theft and bullying-type behaviors were similar. The only type of victimization experienced by girls more than boys was having had mean rumors or lies spread about them at school: 48 percent of girls, compared with 40 percent of boys, indicated that this had happened to them in the past six months.

Unlike the clear site differences we saw earlier, victimization experiences seem to be similar across settings. A slightly greater percentage of students living in Southwest City, Northeast City, and Midwest City report having experienced most types of victimization compared with the students in other sites, but the percentage differences across cities are rather minimal. Thus, it generally appears that students from each site experience similar likelihoods of being victimized.

Table 6: Victimization

Item Frequencies by City

	Full Sample	Male	Female	SW City	West City	South City	Mtn. City	SE City	NE City	MW City
Items	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Victimization*</u>										
<u>School-Related</u>										
<i>Been Attacked on Way to School</i>	20	24	17	26	12	23	17	14	30	23
<i>Had Things Stolen at School</i>	48	48	48	49	42	52	44	47	50	56
<i>Been Attacked/Threatened at School</i>	21	24	18	24	17	21	16	19	25	27
<i>Had Mean Rumors/Lies Spread</i>	44	40	48	44	40	46	42	43	45	51
<i>Had Sexual Jokes/Comments Made</i>	25	26	25	27	24	24	20	23	34	27
<i>Been Made Fun Of</i>	35	34	36	31	36	36	31	35	40	41
<i>Been Bullied at School</i>	21	22	21	22	20	20	21	24	19	24
<u>Out of School</u>										
<i>Been Hit By Someone Trying to Hurt</i>	18	24	13	20	17	22	14	16	20	19
<i>Had Someone Use Force to Get Things</i>	3	5	2	3	2	4	2	4	5	4
<i>Been Attacked By Someone Trying to Hurt/Kill</i>	4	6	2	6	2	5	4	3	5	5
<i>Had Things Stolen From You</i>	39	41	37	38	34	47	37	35	42	39

*% reporting one or more times in past year

Summary

The current report is the first report to schools and communities prepared as part of the National Evaluation of the Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) program. The G.R.E.A.T. program was developed in 1991, underwent a rigorous evaluation from 1995 – 2001, and was substantially revised and implemented in 2002. The core of the current G.R.E.A.T. program consists of 13 lessons, delivered by law enforcement officers in middle-school settings,

intended to meet two main goals: 1) help youths avoid gang membership, violence, and criminal activity; and 2) help youths develop a positive relationship with law enforcement.

The University of Missouri-St. Louis is evaluating the current G.R.E.A.T. program in seven cities. Students have been pre-tested (surveyed prior to implementation of the G.R.E.A.T. program) and post-tested (surveyed shortly after the G.R.E.A.T. program was completed). We will continue to follow the same students, surveying them in their current school one time each year until 2010, to assess the impact that the G.R.E.A.T. program has on students' attitudes and behaviors. Program outcomes have not yet been assessed, but these will be shared in the future.

The current report provides descriptive information about some areas of interest for schools, police, and communities participating in the National Evaluation of G.R.E.A.T. Specifically, we have focused on issues related to youths' perceptions of and commitment to school; their involvement in delinquency, drug use, and gangs; and their victimization experiences during the prior six months. Our results show that students are generally committed to school and few of these students are involved in delinquency and drug use. Those students who are involved in delinquency are generally involved in relatively minor types of offending. Victimization experienced by these students is generally more common at school, but the types of victimization typically involve non-violent experiences. A substantial percentage of students, however, perceive their schools to be disorderly. Perceptions that theft is a problem at school are particularly salient for these youths. This is consistent with the relatively large percentage of students who reported having things stolen at school during the prior six months.

Our results also illustrate both similarities and differences between males and females and between youths residing in different cities. While males and females reported similar perceptions of school disorder, commitment to school, and drug use, more males were involved in delinquency, gangs, and serious victimization. Additionally, youths in Southwest City, Northeast City, and Midwest City were more likely than other youths to view their schools as disorderly, report lower commitment to school, engage in more delinquency and drug use, and belong to gangs. Conversely, victimization prevalence was relatively similar across each of the study settings.

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:

Finn-Aage Esbensen. 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.

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.