GANG PREVENTION AND GANG INTERVENTION:

Preliminary Results From the 1995 Project GANGPINT

National Needs Assessment Gang Research Task Force

A Special Report of the:

NATIONAL GANG CRIME RESEARCH CENTER

PRINCIPAL CO-INVESTIGATORS:

George W. Knox, Ph.D.
Bradley J. Martin, J.D.
Alice P. Franklin Elder, Ph.D.
Shirley R. Holmes, Ph.D.
Robert E. Morris, M.D.
Kathleen Aquino, B.A.
James G. Houston, Ph.D.
Barbara H. Zaitzow, Ph.D.
Edward D. Tromanhauser, Ph.D.
Thomas F. McCurrie, M.S.
John A. Laskey, M.S.
Zheng Wang, Ph.D.
Curtis Robinson, M.S.
Dorothy Papachristos
Jean Chang, Ph.D.
Jodet-Marie Harris, Ed.D.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

ABOUT THE AUTHORS:

George W. Knox, Ph.D., is the director of the National Gang Crime Research Center, founded in 1990 and currently based at Chicago State University where he is a tenured associate professor in the Department of Criminal Justice. He has authored several books and numerous articles based on his 20 years of ongoing gang research.

Bradley J. Martin, J.D., is an assistant professor of criminal justice at the University of Findlay in Ohio. He is a Ph.D. candidate in Human Resource Development, specializing in training, at the University of Toledo. He is also an attorney admitted to practice in the state of Michigan and the U.S. District Court in Detroit, Michigan.

Alice P. Franklin Elder, Ph.D., administers the Office of Correctional Research for the Ohio Department of Youth Services in Columbus, Ohio. She is a sociologist/criminologist. She graduated from Ohio State University's Department of Sociology under the tutelage of the renowned criminologist Simon Dinitz.

Shirley R. Holmes, Ph.D., is an assistant professor of Education and Special Education at the University of Wisconsin - Stevens Point. Her research interests including bullying, gangs and deviant behavior among school children, gang behavior in rural areas, as well as prevention and intervention programs.

Robert E. Morris, M.D., Associate Clinical Professor of Pediatrics and Senior Physician of the Los Angeles Juvenile Court Health Services supervises the adolescent rotations at the Los Angeles Central Juvenile Hall for the University of California, Los Angeles. He also directs and or consults with HIV education and research protocols for Los Angeles adolescent detainees.

Kathleen Aquino, B.A., has worked with incarcerated youths in Los Angeles County for six years. Her specialization is health education services (e.g., HIV/STD prevention, violence, substance abuse, teen parenting, etc). She is currently working towards a masters degree in Public Health at California State University, Long Beach.

James G. Houston, Ph.D., is an associate professor of criminal justice at Appalachian State University. He has over 20 years experience in prisons, jails, and community services and is author of Correctional Management: Functions, Skills, and Systems. He has been involved in numerous gang research projects and is currently completing a book entitled Criminal Justice and the Policy Process for Nelson-Hall, Inc.

Barbara H. Zaitzow, Ph.D., is an assistant professor in the Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice at Appalachian State University. Her current work involves assisting local and state officials seeking the increased use of intermediate sanctions as alternatives to imprisonment.

Edward D. Tromanhauser, Ph.D., is the chairman of the Department of Criminal Justice at Chicago State University. His criminological research on gangs dates back to 1981 and continues today. He has numerous publications in the area of gang research.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS: Continued

Thomas F. McCurrie, M.S., is the managing editor and a founding staff member of the <u>Journal of Gang Research</u> and serves as the publications manager for the National Gang Crime Research Center. He also teaches various criminal justice courses at Chicago State University. He served for many years as the chief investigator for the Cook County Public Defender's Office.

John A. Laskey, M.S., is a college instructor and active police officer, serving as a homicide detective for many years. He has also taught criminal justice courses at Morton College. He is active in the Army Reserve. He is active in providing gang training to numerous groups: police, teachers, social workers, academics, etc.

Zheng Wang, Ph.D., is an assistant professor in Administration of Justice at Texas Southern University. He serves as co-chair of the Houston Mayor's Asian Anti-Gang Advisory Board and teaches at the Houston Police Academy. He has conducted research and published on various aspects of gangs, Asian gangs, and organized crime.

Curtis Robinson, M.S., has a decade of experience in the field of juvenile probation in Lake County, Indiana, where he currently works in a new capacity of developing resources to confront the prevention and intervention needs of juveniles in his area.

Dorothy Papachristos is co-founder of Communities Dare To Care. Dorothy's efforts confronting the problem of violence has focused on both community activism and one-on-one relationships with "at risk" youths and their families. Her work in assisting communities has been commended at the national, regional and local level.

Jean Chang, Ph.D., is currently a research associate at the Research Institute of Illinois TASC. She received her Ph.D. from Western Michigan University in 1993. She has conducted a number of studies in the area of drug and crime, and street gangs.

Jodet-Marie Harris, Ed.D., is a lecturer at Illinois State University where she teaches special education courses. She has taught in the Chicago Public School system for six years and prior to this numerous research and service programs in the field of criminal justice.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Sixteen gang researchers working together in a national study organized by the National Gang Crime Research Center conducted a survey of 3,348 youths, 1,994 of which were self-reported gang members. The gang research took place at 24 sites in 8 states (California, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, North Carolina, Ohio, Texas, and Wisconsin), and included alternative schools, juvenile correctional facilities, private programs, and jails.

The gang members included the broad spectrum of gangs found in large urban centers like Chicago and Los Angeles, but also included most of the well-known gangs known to exist in America today.

Among the major findings of this research about the gang members themselves:

Background: Most are males (91.3%) 14 to 18 years of age (88.8%).

Family: Nearly all (91.6%) worry about the safety of their family members. Nearly all (93.5%) of the gang members would like to get a legal job, get married, and have children. Nearly all (91.2%) felt their family worried about them being killed. A third (32.9%) said their father never punished them for misbehavior. The gang members seem to have a more positive attachment to mother than father. A fourth (27.9%) did not get help with homework at home. A fifth (19.1%) agreed that if parents cannot keep kids out gangs the kids should be taken away from the parents. Two-fifths (44.1%) felt that some parents benefit financially from having a child who is a gang member. Two-thirds (69.9%) have had family or friends killed because of gang violence. Most (83.4%) would not want their own children to join a gang. Over half (60.4%) have another family member who is a substance abuser. Over two-thirds (72.4%) did have a good relationship with an adult who tried to keep them out of gang life. Most (79.2%) would discourage their own children from joining a gang. Four-fifths (80.5%) want to eventually get married. Over two-thirds (69.8%) of these gang members have family members who are also in a gang; the same proportion (68.3%) indicated that in their gang there are members whose parents are also active gang members. Most (70.8) said their parents disapproved of their gang involvement; about the same proportion (73.2%) said they would quit gang life if they had the chance to get married, get a good steady job, and live somewhere else.

School: Two-fifths (41.6%) of the gang members had been bullied in school, and even more (66.5%) were bullies themselves. Mostly all (95.1%) had not yet completed high school. Half had been demoted, even more (88.7%) had been suspended from school, and two-thirds had been expelled from school.

Executive Summary: Continued

Religion: A third of the gang members had some religious training (37.1%). Three-fourths (75.9%) liked their experiences with church. Half (54.2%) indicated they rarely if ever attend church though. Still, most (89.3%) said they do believe in God. A third (32.3%) expect to go to hell, two-thirds (67.7%) expect to go to Heaven.

Mass Media: Less than half (44.2%) felt that television news coverage of gangs makes others want to join gangs. But nearly two-thirds (65.5%) did feel that gang members like seeing themselves on television, and in the newspapers (63.9%). Half (51.1%) felt that gang members would like to be a part of a study where an important professor might be willing to hang out with them in the hood. Some 42 percent felt if less attention was given to gangs in the mass media that fewer people would join gangs. A third (35.5%) felt that if the confidentiality of the juvenile justice system were eliminated, this might prevent some juveniles from committing a crime. Asked about the effects of intense news coverage of their gang: only 28.9 percent viewed it as an embarrassment, 72.9 percent felt more members would get involved in the gang, and 79.4 percent felt more new members would join the gang.

Their Beliefs About Prevention: Only half agreed that programs can effectively prevent kids from getting involved in gangs or prevent kids from joining gangs. More disagree than agree with the idea that gang problems can be prevented by school education, or drug prevention/education, or strict law enforcement. They were most likely to believe job training and employment opportunities are the best solution to the gang problem. Between a fourth to a third of the gang members believe some of the most common approaches to gang prevention/intervention are a waste of time for kids at risk of joining a gang: educational programs (33.6%), counseling programs (36.9%), and job training programs (25.6%). About half question whether social workers can have any effect: in reaching out to persons who might want to quit a gang (43%), in helping kids stay out of a gang (49.1%), or in combination with other services whether this could have prevented them from joining a gang (52.8%). Given the choice of program service components, though, most would prefer employment programs. Three-fourths (74.7%) believe that most people in gangs want out sooner or later. Three-fifths (60.1%) do not believe a boot camp could influence someone to drop out of a gang.

Their Own Experiences With Programs and Intervention Services: These gang members have not been neglected in terms of being recipients of a number of social services and prevention or intervention services. Half have been in group therapy (52.6%), or in court-mandated therapy (53.7%), or in some counseling program (59.7%). Two-fifths of this gang population have been in a substance abuse counseling program (42.3%), a job skills program (44.1%), a job training program (40.2%), the YMCA recreation program (43.7%), and completed the D.A.R.E. anti-drug program (45.4%). A third (33.8%) had the benefit of a professional one-on-one tutor. A fourth (28.9%) had parents active in the PTA. Only 19.3 percent had been in the Big Brother/Big Sister program. And only 15.9 percent had ever used a crisis hotline for help. Thus, few of these gang members actually slipped through the cracks of society in terms of a complete lack of any social services being available to them.

Executive Summary: Continued
Gang Involvement Through the Human Development Lifespan: By age 11 most (79.1%) had already first heard something about gangs. Most (83.6%) had first met a gang member before they were 13. Half (53.9%) had first fired a pistol or revolver before the age of 13. Half (48.9%) had seen someone killed or seriously injured by gang violence before the age of 13. Half (50.5%) had first got a permanent tattoo before the age of 14. Half (49.9%) had first been arrested before the age of 13. Half (52.6%) thought they would be married before the age of 24. Half (48.1%) had first joined a gang before they were 13. A fourth (25.1%) of these gang members did not believe they would live to see their 28th birthday.

Personality: Over a third (37.3%) agreed that success is more dependent on luck than on real ability. Most (80.7%) worry about the future facing today's children. Some 62.1 percent felt that people can be divided into two distinct classes: the weak and the strong.

Their Personal Experiences in the Gang: Almost all (84.7%) have five or more close gang friends. Most (71.9%) were still active gang members, and many of the rest were now gang associates. Nearly half (46.7%) have tried to quit the gang. Two-thirds (65.3%) have held rank or leadership in their gang. Two-fifths (44.3%) have been "violated" by their gang. Over half (60.7%) have committed a crime for financial gain with their gang. Half (51.5%) have fired a gun at someone over their gang's drug business, but this variable did not vary much by race. Two-thirds (67.2%) had fired a gun at someone defending their gang turf. Half (50.5%) have been a shooter in a gang drive-by shooting, motivated more often than not by concerns for gang reputation. Half claim to be willing to die for their gang. The most common reason they gave for joining the gang was it offered a "family" for them. Over two-thirds (70.9%) have recruited others into the gang, the most common recruitment source being the neighborhood context.

Their Descriptions of Their Gang Group/Organization: While almost all major American gangs were represented in the large national sample, about a fourth were Crips and Bloods; a third were Folks. Over half (58.9%) indicate their gang has a special language code. Two-thirds (66.1%) indicate their gang has written rules. Most (84.8%) indicate their gang has older leaders who have been in the gang a long time. Most of the gangs (74.8%) exist in multiple geographical areas. Half indicated their gang did arise locally, and half indicated their gang did not arise locally on its own without contact from a gang from outside the same area. Only a fourth (25.2%) indicated their gang copied the symbols and name of an out of town gang. Half have had contact with the same gang in another city. Three-fourths (73.9%) indicate their gang provides money to needy members in or out of custody. Over a third (35.6%) said their gang has a private attorney used for defending its members in criminal matters. Some 43.7 percent said their gang keeps an account that pays for only legal defense. Three-fourths (76.2%) indicated their gang holds regular meetings. Some 70.3 percent of the gang members indicated their gang had been around for ten years or more. Some 60.9 percent indicated their gang was an official branch of a larger national gang, while 40.2 percent described their gang as "homegrown" (emerged on its own in their city). Over half (59.8%) indicated their gang maintains a treasury. Two-fifths (40.9%) indicated their gang collects regular dues from its members; the same proportion (39.2%) indicated that criminal activity is a required part of gang membership.

Executive Summary: Continued
A number of characteristics these gang members use to describe their gang also tend to describe authoritarian cults: a third (34.8%) fear to express their opinions in the gang, most (60.6%) cannot simply leave the gang by resigning at anytime, half (49.8%) indicate their personal life is known to other members, nearly two-thirds (63.3%) indicate the things the gang does are approved by a higher up leader, two-thirds do not simply accept everyone who wants to join, half say their gang does keep a list of the names of its members (50.7%), and in about half the cases (57.3%) the gang member can be fined for making a mistake. Some 47.1 percent indicated that they did have Asian members in their gang. About two-fifths (41.7%) report that persons who make big money are looked up to in their gang. Only 12.6 percent indicated their gang never fights with another gang over money. About a third agreed that making big money is a way of gaining respect among rival gangs.

       Gang Behavior While Incarcerated. Some of the gang members had been in custody for as long as five years. Two-thirds had privileges taken away while in custody. Half have been in fights while in custody. Half have threatened others with violence while in custody. Nearly half (46.5%) have fought with rival gang members while in custody. A fourth (27.8%) have tried to recruit new members to their gang while in custody. A fourth (28.4%) have carried a homemade weapon while in custody. Over a fourth (29.7%) have threatened a correctional officer or employee while incarcerated. Most have had one or more disciplinary reports, a third of the gang members having 5 or more while in custody. Two-fifths (43.9%) have started a fight with someone or attacked someone while in custody. A fourth have tried to smuggle drugs into the correctional facility. A fourth indicated that some gangs use religious or cultural fronts for their meetings while in custody.

       Major Life Events For Gang Members: Using a human development lifespan approach, a series of questions addressed at what age these major life events occurred for the gang members. A clear pattern emerged here having many implications for gang prevention and gang intervention programming. The mean or average ages are used here. At age 8.9 they first heard anything about gangs. Age 9.2 were first bullied in school. Age 10.4 first made the transition to bullying someone else in school. Age 11.3 first fired a pistol or revolver, and saw first killing or injury due to gang violence. Age 12.0 first joined the gang and first arrested for any crime. Age 12.3 first got their own real gun. Age 13.0 first got a permanent tattoo. Age 16.5 their current average age in this study. At the time some of them were interviewed, those in correctional institutions had already served an average of 8.9 months of their sentence. For those who think they will eventually get legally married to someone, it will occur at an average age of 24.1 years of age. They expect to die at an average age of 59.5 years of age.

       Differences Comparing Gang Members and Non-Gang Members: In chapter 4, among the strong differences that emerged from comparing gang members and non-gang members, gang members were more likely to be bullies in school, and therefore suspended and expelled from school, have a permanent tattoo, having friends or family killed in gang violence, much less likely to believe boot camps will flip a gang member, much more likely to want their own children to be gang members, much less likely to believe the mass media exacerbates the gang problem, much more combative and disruptive (physical fights, threatening violence, carrying an improvised weapon in custody, threatening staff, starting fights, and trying to smuggle in drugs) in custody than their non-gang member counterparts.

Executive Summary: Continued

 The greater the level of involvement in gang life: the greater the skepticism such persons have towards gang prevention programs; the less they worry about the future facing today's children; the more they believe that traditional programs (education, counseling, job training) are a waste of time for kids at risk of joining a gang; the more they are likely to have a background of being bullies in school; the more they are likely to have been incarcerated in a juvenile correctional institution; the more likely the persons father did not punish them for misbehavior; the greater the tendency toward dogmatic beliefs, like stereotype; the more these persons also had the benefit of societal responses (court-mandated psychological counseling or therapy, being involved in group therapy or counseling programs, etc); the less the believev"Boot Camps" could help anyone drop out of a gang; the greater their individual school failure (not finishing high school, being suspended or expelled); the less satisfying their church experiences; the more they believe they will go to hell in the afterlife; the more likely they are to have a permanent tattoo; the less likely they are to be female; the less they believe social work can make a difference in prevention and intervention with gangs; the less they believe the media has a negative impact; the more likely they are to have had family/friends killed in gang violence; the more they want their own children to be in gangs; the higher the substance abuse in their family; the less they believe lifting the secrecy of juvenile court would prevent additional juvenile crime; and a long list of threat behaviors in the correctional environment: including - disciplinary problems, fighting behavior, threats of violence, fighting with rival gangs, gang recruiting while in custody, carrying improvised weapons, threatening staff or correctional officers, attempts to smuggle in illegal drugs into the correctional institution, and using religious or cultural fronts for gang operations. All of these hypotheses were supported from a gang involvement or gang risk analysis undertaken in chapter 5.

Chapter 6 looked at the gang as a collective social entity it was possible in this research to identify a number of factors in the nature of the group or organizational structure including its features and capabilities that were significantly related to low or high gang risk behavior at the individual level.

The profile that emerged here was that higher threat levels of individual gang behavior were associated with the following features of more sophisticated gangs: using violence to enforce internal rules; having a special language code; having written rules; having adult leaders who have been in the gang for many years; being a gang that exists in several different geographical areas; being a gang that arose due to exogenous formation (i.e., first arose by contact with the same gang in another city); having a private attorney used for criminal matters; having an account that pays for legal defense; having members from the same family members in a gang; having a treasury; paying regular dues; being required to participate in illegal activities before being considered a full member; having parents as members; parents approving of gang membership; being a gang that knows each member's personal life; being vertically structured gangs (i.e., the things the gang does are approved by a higher up); being a gang that maintains a membership list; being able to fine a member; and having Asian members.

A primary research finding here was that the interaction between gang structure and gang behavior showed a strong clustering effect towards two polar extremes. One tendency was for the less dangerous individual gang member to cluster around less sophisticated and less complex social group formations. The other tendency was for the higher threat gang members to be concentrated in more sophisticated types of gang structures.

Executive Summary: Continued

Having shown how the many ways in which gang behavior is a function of the structure or organizational sophistication of the type of gang the youth was a member of, the research also examined the scope and extent of social service experiences. This matter of social service consumption involved developing a scale that allowed for comparisons of low and high level of such prior experiences that are commonly regarded as gang prevention and gang intervention service components. It was shown that this consumption also varied by gang risk classification, the tendency being for the gang member to have had more not less of such help from larger society.

Some peculiarities did emerge in examining the consumption patterns of social services among gang members. This showed for example that those in the greatest need, that is those significantly less likely to have had high doses of intervention and prevention services, were Mexican American youths. Other factors were shown to differentiate service consumption levels.

The final chapter examined the differences between female gang members and female non-gang members. There were no exceptions: the female gang members shared much of the same "profile" that is found among male gang members. A variety of such factors were described.

Described as well are the conclusions and recommendations of this large scale national consortium project for knowledge development on gang prevention and gang intervention.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents: Continued

Table of Contents: Continued

Table of Contents: Continued

Table of Contents: Continued

Table of Contents: Continued

Table of Contents: Continued

Table of Contents: Continued

CHAPTER 1

The Issues of Gang Prevention and Gang Intervention

INTRODUCTION

While it is hard to exactly quantify, it is safe to say that during the last four decades as much as a billion dollars may have been spent on gang research and gang programs. Annually, and currently, federal agencies like the Department of Health and Human Services spend millions on programs designed to treat or intervene with gang members or youths at-risk of gang membership.

What is very curious about the history of gang programs is that for the last four decades a high level of spending has continued from funding by government agencies and private donors, and these gang prevention and gang intervention programs throughout the United States have not had the benefit of a national needs assessment. Implementing programs without a needs assessment is like traveling in a foreign land without a road map. More importantly, as will be shortly discussed, when we are dealing with social programs that have potential impact areas in crime and violence the issue becomes more acute.

In this chapter, we will explain the rationale for undertaking this large scale national research, called Project GANGPINT and some of the basic issues in gang prevention and gang intervention. We will outline the importance of a quantitative assessment of the prospects for gang prevention and gang intervention. We will explain how this effort could be useful in developing a coherent national policy towards the gang problem that now affects nearly all American communities in one way or another. Finally, we will explain the basic details of how the research was conducted. A more detailed description of the methodology is provided in Chapter 2 which provides details of validity and reliability.

A BASIC ISSUE: The Public Health Model of Prevention

In the public health model of prevention there are only three logical possibilities for "what is to be done to who". There is primary prevention, this means getting to the person before they are exposed to the problem. There is secondary prevention, this means getting to persons who are at risk from the gang problem, but who are not yet a part of the problem. And there is tertiary prevention, this means getting to those persons who have the problem.

So, applied to the gang problem, we can quickly summarize what the public health model of prevention means. Primary prevention is the pure version of prevention, it means getting to kids early in life before they have even heard about gangs or know anything about gangs, and insulating them against any future contamination from gangs or gang members. Secondary prevention in the gang context is basically intervention with those who are already at-risk of gang involvement, these may be kids who have gang friends, who are low on the ladder of the gang-risk continuum, but who show every sign of potentially becoming a future gang member. Finally, tertiary prevention basically means "rehabilitation", an effort to work with gang members and gangs and turn them around somehow.

A BASIC ISSUE: The Assumption That Gang Problems Can Be Prevented

We are willing to assume the affirmative: that in most cases prevention can be effective in heading off a number of different social problems like that presented by the American gang problem today. We are even more willing to assume that pure prevention is going to hold greater prospects for successful progress than tertiary prevention efforts. That is, the greatest dividend for society is in pure prevention. We would expect less success in tertiary

prevention initiatives because we are aware of no "magic bullet" in the long history of offender services. We do recognize that education and employment are important ingredients to any tertiary prevention program.

A BASIC ISSUE: Programs Without Theory Are Risky Business
If the social program under analysis were simply that of a program design to enhance the social etiquette skills of young persons, it is hard to conceive of how the program could harm society in some way. That is, even if the children slept through the program, or did not learn from it, all we really have as a logical potential outcome are kids that could have less than good manners. So if the "good manners" program lacked a theory of human behavior for inculcating such manners, the risk to society is not very large.

The issue changes dramatically when we are talking about criminal justice, delinquency, crime, offender, and particularly "gang" programs. If a gang program without a good theoretical justification for intervention "goes bad", then we are facing more than a problem of bad manners from "program failures". If a gang program goes bad in terms of outcomes, then we could be in the situation of producing an even more dangerous gang problem.

A BASIC ISSUE: Some "Gang Programs" Of The Past Did Produce Greater Gang Problems For Society
The interested reader is urged to examine the chapters pertaining to this issue in An Introduction to Gangs (Knox, 1995), as we can only provide a sketch of this interesting American history here. This is the situation where truly "the road to hell is paved with good intentions", and we might add a true lack of a theoretical model for expecting positive impact on a hardcore gang offender population!

Two books are available providing espousing the accomplishments of Rev. John Fry in the 1960's in Chicago. Obviously, the author viewed his work as successful (Fry, 1969; Fry, 1973). Why don't you be the judge.

Here is what Fry did. He tried to coopt the gangs, offering them a "bone", offering them jobs in running a gang program for their gang members, the context being a church in Hyde Park on Chicago's south side.

Fry's gang program therefore sought what many programs today seek: the blessing of the gang to work with the gang. It means recognizing the gang as a bargaining agent. It means conferring legitimate negotiating authority on a gang organization from larger society: it is a bad idea theoretically. Why? Because the gang leader then gains in prestige, certain concessions may be made to the gang, and any influence the gang has will only make that gang stronger as an entity.

Fry sought to use age-old basically good "service components": educational upgrading, vocational training, and job placement. We would not argue against the merits of any human capital development service component: we argue as all in the social professions argue today that this might be the most powerful way for a nation like the United States of America to actually continue to be a leading world power --- by producing better types of human beings, more educated, more skilled, more developed and self-actualized as human beings.

The flaw, then, was in the delivery process and the structure of authority: Fry enlisted the gang itself in controlling what gets done. The rest of the story unfolds quickly.

Will any criminal gang take government and foundation money that is offered to it? Certainly. And Jeff Fort, the leader of the Blackstone Rangers at that time which would later become the infamous El Rukn gang empire, was no exception. Jeff Fort eagerly got involved in Rev. Fry's new social program for Chicago's south side, something that aimed to significantly improve the quality of life in south Chicago.

So what happened? Well, the area affected is today desolate, and has had three decades of continued escalating gang violence. What happened to Jeff Fort? Jeff got his first federal criminal conviction by stealing thousands of dollars in federal money spent on the program. Jeff also got his first firearms arsenal and his first Mercedes Benz out of the deal. Jeff was able to catapult his small group into an empire over the years. It would finally take a major effort by the federal government to squash Jeff's gang. At the time of his last conviction, which landed Jeff in federal prison for life, Jeff's was on the verge of carrying out terrorism for hire acts in the USA for hostile foreign countries.

So what happened overall, over time? Jeff's gang benefitted enormously from the largesse of Rev. Fry's social program. It meant an infusion of hard cash into the gang. It meant enormous positive publicity for Jeff. Jeff converted that into an even larger gang. Over time, the name of the gang changed. But what did not change was the crime: the crime threat only escalated.

A gang has no respect for a chump. A gang will only exploit a chump. A program that helps a gang become stronger or more effective as a gang is a program that is in the business of <u>the production of further gang crime and more gang violence</u>.

A BASIC ISSUE: We Are Talking About Criminal Gangs

It is popular in some circles to assume that all playgroups and even fraternities can be at some times considered a gang. We do recognize that the term gang is deservedly a label, a label that implies a risk or threat to society. We therefore reserve this label for those groups and organizations --- both formal and informal --- that are responsible for ongoing crime and violence. America does not fear "Spanky and Alfalfa" in the "Little Rascals". America fears criminal gangs. Criminal gangs are groups and organizations, formal and informal, that benefit from the known and approved criminal activity of its members.

That is why this study sought to find the real gang members in American society today: the Crips, the Bloods, the People, the Folks, and a very long list of very well known gangs operating throughout the United States today.

Programs that claim to be working with gangs and only work with low level groups of alienated kids not yet involved in crime or delinquency are really programs working at the primary level of gang intervention. There are literally thousands of such programs today. There are also many programs that work with real gang members. But what has been missing in all of the work of thousands of persons who work in this worthwhile field is a national needs assessment that examines the actual backgrounds of a large number of real gang members in different geographical areas of the USA. The present study sought to fill this void in our knowledge about what to do and about what should or should not be done about the gang problem today.

UNDERSTANDING THE MEDICAL MODEL OF PREVENTION

Many persons want to do something about the gang problem, and more often than not the response involves establishing some type of gang program. There are many, many different gang programs; some are simply better known than others. Most knowledgeable citizens want gang prevention programs. Prevention can mean: (1) primary prevention, (2) secondary prevention, and (3) tertiary prevention. Primary prevention means getting to the person before they have been exposed to gangs, attempting with a good theory of human behavior to prevent the person from ever having any involvement with gangs. Secondary prevention means getting to the person who has already been exposed to gangs, and with a good theory of human behavior and based on what we know from criminology and delinquency prevention,

and attempting to extract them from gang influence and prevent them from further gang involvement. Tertiary prevention means basically an intent to "rehabilitate", and means getting to the person who is a self-reported gang member and attempting with professional guidance based on theory, research, and sound policy to reduce the future crime impact of such persons.

Prevention carries a somewhat different meaning than intervention. Intervention implies working with gang youths. Tertiary prevention therefore comes closest to the full meaning of intervention in that it implies that some type or combination of services need to be provided to "those in the gang". Given a limited number of resources, the preference assumed by the social polity here is that of primary prevention rather than intervention. Intervention implies some ability to "rehabilitate" and the literature on the success of such efforts is truly mixed. A somewhat less ambitious goal in terms of impacting on human behavior is implied in primary prevention where the emphasis is on "insulating" someone from becoming involved in the problem behavior.

As will be explained elsewhere, there are different levels of gang involvement. This is not simply the difference between "hard core" and "fringe" members. There are leaders. There exists in most formal organizational gangs a middle management as well. There exist those who are "honorary" members or "ancianos" (i.e., older less active, almost retired, or honorary members) from whom less is expected. There always exists the regular "foot soldiers". But there also exists those who are simply "associates", or wannabes. Knowing what level of social integration the person has into any gang will vary proportionately to the difficulty of prevention efforts. The higher the gang integration, the higher the difficulty of inducing individual behavior change.[1]

The purpose of this chapter is to take a much closer look at gang programs; their ingredients (what they do), their structure (how they do it), their goals (what they hope to accomplish), their target groups (who they provide services to), and their assumptions if any (when and under what conditions do they logically expect to achieve a positive result based on the social sciences about human behavior).

GANGS RUNNING GANG PROGRAMS: A BAD IDEA

A good deal of our psychological literature and common sense would tell us that professional help is needed when it comes to restoring someone to good mental health. That is to say, an active criminal cannot rehabilitate another criminal nor rehabilitate himself. The idea behind professional trained expertise is that it is unrealistic to lock someone up and basically say "go rehabilitate yourself or someone else". On the other hand, the indigenous approach works well in some contexts, for some persons, at some times, for some specific purposes. Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) and its many related forms (NA, etc) is viewed as an important and positive part of an overall solution throughout most of the literature and in common beliefs.

There are many examples of gang leaders and gangs being the primary administrators of "gang prevention/intervention" programs. These gang programs fit a definite profile. Once the government or foundation funding disappears, they disappear. Once the government or

---

[1]The one exception to this general rule of thumb is when a gang member, including the very top gang leaders, basically "defect" (e.g., "flip") and agree to testify against other fellow gang members.

foundations discover they have misappropriated the funds, they disappear. They will resist to the bitter end any efforts to hold them "accountable" by the means of formal program evaluation research that involves a complete statistical accounting. They see "program evaluators" as the "G-men", the "funding five-oh". They want to be able to spend their money any way they want to. They do not want to have someone tell them they need a good theory of human behavior before attempting to intervene in the life of an individual regarding the protection of human subjects (e.g., what could happen afterwards if it really was not a good theoretically sound idea to do what they did to an individual in their field-service experiment).

How do gangs whose main goal is illegal income from criminal activity end up running gang programs? The fieldwork of Kotlowitz describes this process as it worked for Jeff Fort on Chicago's south side:

"By the late 1960s, the gangs had won some standing among the establishment, particularly with liberals who felt that these young hoodlums, given proper guidance, might turn their energies and enviable organizing and leadership abilities to bettering their neighborhoods" (Kotlowitz, 1992: p. 37).

Similarly, for the Vice Lords on Chicago's westside:

"At Henry Horner, the Vice Lords gained a similar standing when a local hospital bequeathed a former Catholic boys' school it owned, coupled with a grant of over $20,000, to local gang leaders in the hope that they would open a neighborhood center" (Kotlowitz, 1992: p. 37).

Just like Jeff Fort, the Vice Lords used those assets for something other than community improvement.

The Federal government has not been a leader in clarifying "what works" in terms of gang prevention/intervention. It has been a leader in funding a wide number of 1960's style programs that were specifically targeting gang members or potential gang members. The Federal government has, over the last three decades, supported a wide number of gang experiments seeking to intervene in the gang crime problem. Some have clearly and most certainly achieved dramatic results, but in the opposite direction! That is, some programs have inadvertently increased the wealth and power, and thereby the persistence, continuity and expansion, of certain specific gangs. It seems reasonable to conclude that this has also meant, in its limited context, increasing rather than decreasing the gang crime problem.

The well-intended work of a member of the clergy known as Reverend Fry is one such example. Whether he said it or not in his applications for federal funding, Rev. Fry assumed the theory that gang members could be easily "coopted" into leading a law abiding existence. Rev. Fry hired Jeff Fort, the leader of the Black P. Stones and the Main 21, to help "solve the gang problem". Jeff Fort quickly manipulated the situation, ciphering off funds, hiring "ghost workers", demanding "kickbacks" from fellow gang members whom he hired under the authority of the program, and outright misappropriation (e.g., program fraud).

This sudden influx of hard money into the treasury of Jeff Fort's gang, meant it accumulated more weapons and more capital with which to eventually enter large scale narcotic trafficking. Overall, it meant never asking Jeff Fort, nor any other gang member, to ever sign a "pledge" that they had dropped their gang allegiance, that they would "give up on crime". Rev. Fry was concerned about gang violence and convinced the Federal government he could "do something about it". Rev. Fry assumed that offering a context for a "peace treaty" and a helping hand to these troubled youths would have a positive result. The result was not positive, the result was the El Rukns: a formidable, highly organized, tight knit,

highly selective, extremely violent, criminal gang that still operates today in spite of the incarceration of its top leadership.

A genuine "bad idea" is to basically turn over assets to a hostile group like a highly organized criminal gang. Such an example is detailed in the case of the program started in 1976 known as "GET GOING, INC" (Madden, 1993: 7). It was an aftercare program for "Pintos" (released prisoners) located in East Los Angeles. It was run by the Mexican Mafia (EME). It was clearly, then, aimed at "tertiary prevention": the hardest to accomplish[2]. According to the report this program was "actually a front for the Mexican Mafia" (ibid). Thus, "Federal grants were used to purchase heroin in Mexico" and they used their access to the prisons to increase the gang presence throughout California. When someone was about to "spill the beans" in 1977 about this federal fraud, she was killed by an EME member (ibid).

The cases of Jeff Fort and the Get Going Inc program illustrate what not to do. Providing assets that can be readily converted to the use of the gang (a criminal enterprise) is not the best idea if the goal is to reduce the gang crime threat problem. Similarly, a Boot Camp or "Leadership Training" program for some gangs might fit right into the agenda of a gang leader. A physically stronger and better disciplined gang member is the ideal soldier of any gang leader. Thus, program intervention cannot be predicated on the "terms" of the gang, but must rather be based on the "terms" and expectations of the community that must eventually face the gang problem if it gets much worse. The goals of the law-abiding community and the goals of the gang may be antithetical outside of the generalized context of "we all want a better world". In the context of specific issues, community members do not want armed gangs shooting up the neighborhood. No gang truce or "peace treaty" has yet to surface where gang members truly turned in their weapons. Someone who thinks the "gang truces" in Los Angeles, Chicago, Minneapolis[1], and elsewhere have resulted in a sudden permanent decrease in gang violence should get a police scanner and start listening to their local police calls like the organized gang-controlled drug-distribution rings do themselves to avoid serious arrests.

Gangs do aspire to control government funding for gang programs and sometimes appear to be able to reach to the very top of the local politicians for such support. More often than not, however, it backfires. Such was the case in October, 1985 when the mayor of St. Paul, Minnesota met with John Scruggs, the local leader of the Disciples gang who was seeking $58,000 in seed money to start a youth center. The very next day, this same gang leader executed a 16-year-old female member --- Christine Kreitz --- because he feared she could link him to a crime that if discovered would jeopardize the government grant. Scruggs was convicted of first-degree murder and received a life sentence in prison[2].

PROGRAMS WITHOUT THEORIES ARE RISKS NOT WORTH TAKING

As used here a theory means a model of etiological logic that is consistent with prior research support and/or common sense application of validated explanations of human behavior; in this instance, human behavior involving deviance, more specifically, crime and

---

[2]It is the hardest to accomplish because in the extensive literature on "criminal rehabilitation", no one has yet been acknowledged as having discovered the "silver bullet", the true "cure". Some times, in some ways (typically job placements), their recidivism or relapse or return to prison seems to be reduced. It is a sufficient probability of potential impact to work on, however it is a voluntary process that leads someone to want to accept a job in the first place.

delinquency, as well as substance abuse and violence. Intervention or prevention implies an effort to "interrupt" a sequence of human behavior, at an appropriate point in time, to motivate behavioral change. This also presumes we are talking about individual behavior; not the treatment of group behavior. It is not assumed here that an entire group (i.e., gang in this case) is subject to such change[3].

The idea that no theory is used to guide program intervention efforts means it is an atheoretical model. In an atheoretical model, basically anything could happen as a result of the intervention because there is no logical sequence or justification for "what might happen". It is a "flip of the coin" situation. It could just as easily go "wrong" as go "right". If it goes wrong we produce criminals rather than preventing crime. The idea of having a theoretically justified model of intervention is that the program can logically expect positive impact at a higher level of probability than a flip of the coin (50/50 chance). A good theory of human behavior increases the odds of having a positive impact, which is why it is needed.

That any program of intervention or prevention dealing with crime or delinquency --- in this instance gang crime --- needs a theory justifying what it proposes to do is now one of the areas of consensus not just among gang researchers, but among almost all criminologists and social scientists[3].

It is important to have rigorous evaluation research conducted on all gang intervention/prevention programs. This should include both process (what happens during the program) and product evaluations (what happens afterwards, the "outcomes"). An atheoretical evaluation is also not a good idea. The "measures" used in the evaluation (reduction in recidivism, increased self-esteem, reduced interaction with gang members, etc) need to be as closely as possible related to the specific theory of intervention being used by the program.

PRIMARY PREVENTION IN THE SCHOOL SETTING

A number of program approaches have been described in the gang literature that are useful in the school setting (Knox, Laske, and Tromanhauser, 1992). The idea is to combine anti-gang education with anti-drug education, because so often in the school setting these two problems go hand in hand. Actually, a third problem --- conflict and violence --- can also be highly correlated with gang and drug problems. Thus, in the Cleveland Public Schools a special Youth Gang Unit was created in its Division of Safety & Security[4]. The concept behind this type of added expertise is that by training teachers on gang recognition issues, on conflict resolution, etc, and working with parents and community groups, that the school has a fighting chance to curb these inter-related problems[4]. Most teachers do not get training about gangs in college, however they need it to effectively carry out their mission.

---

[3]Think about it, coopting a gang leader would not even work: how could a gang leader "order" his underlings to go straight in the same fashion any similar order comes down to violate the law? It is illogical and incomprehensible that any such genuine change could be affected in a level three gang. Certainly, much earlier work shows that non-gangs or 'pre-gangs', the level zero type of Alfalfa and Spanky groups, are certainly subject to redirection --- they are easily provided with positive direction, because overall they do not have a criminal direction as of yet.

[4]This is a program in the Cleveland Public Schools.

PRIMARY PREVENTION IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXT

Recreational activities structured and supervised in such a fashion as to provide a viable alternative to what the gangs offer in terms of fellowship and "excitement" are a common ingredient for the primary prevention of gang problems. Boys and Girls Clubs offer such activities in their drop-in centers as do many others (e.g., the YMCA/YWCA). Special initiatives such as the "Take Our Daughters to Work Club" work with large corporate sponsors such as Ameritech and in addition to providing a daily safe haven for kids also provide some social skills upgrading[5]. The goal is to prevent such "good kids" from ever joining a gang, and to keep them "off the streets" where the gangs are ever present.

A program that specifically incorporated such recreational activities as well as arts and crafts for youths, and which operated continuously for 52 years and is therefore regarded by some as the oldest anti-gang program in Chicago, is that started by the late Daniel "Moose" Brindisi who was the executive director of the Near Northwest Civic Committee[6]. This neighborhood based program also acquired its own summer camp, Camp Pompeii, which is located in Park Forest, Illinois. This program also used the recommendation of Thrasher (1918) that Boy Scout and Cub Scout groups could provide valuable socialization experiences as a way of gang prevention at the primary level. Groups like Boys Nation and Girls Nation also provide such general positive socialization experiences in an adult supervised context of legitimate social control.

There is a potentially endless list of positive, pro-social, skill-building, adult-supervised projects, programs and experiences that can be provided to children in an overall strategy to prevent gang affiliation at the primary level of prevention. At an elementary school near Chicago's Cabrini-Green, a drum and bugle corp was formed; while the staff volunteers could handle 80 children ages 5 through 9, some 300 actually applied to use the 36 drums available[7]. There are basically some very worthwhile programs that need to be funded that are not being funded. If we really want to do something for youths, then clearly there are a lot of ways to steer them away from gang involvement.

SECONDARY PREVENTION: WORKING WITH "AT RISK" YOUTHS

A common theme in secondary prevention is to target geographical areas that represent a "high risk". This has often meant targeting youths from 8 to 16 in public housing complexes. In such settings, the gang/drug/violence/crime problem is an ever present problem. Project FLOW (Future Leaders Of the World) in Philadelphia, for example, with $875,602 in funding for the first 17 months seeks to serve 490 such at-risk youths. As described in its literature, this program includes a number of traditional and unique service components:

"The program activities developed to benefit these youth will include an education component involving tutoring, homework assistance, study groups, etc; comprehensive drug related services such as drug and alcohol education, prevention education, refusal skills building (Drugs/Violence/Alcohol) and counseling. The comprehensive gang prevention services will provide mentoring, individual and family counseling, conflict resolution and anger control workshops. Other activities will include summer programs, sports and recreation and other related cultural activities including trips to museums, parks etc. Parent support groups will also be formed to support and stabilize the family structures.

All Project FLOW youth will receive basic Health Care through the Philadelphia Department of Public Health. Another major component...will be the 'Rites of Passage' module which is designed to increase awareness and develop skills associated with positive

culture and ethnic identities of the youth served"[5].

As should be expected, the FLOW program is evaluated by a University in its area. All programs with direct contact with youths should be subject to such thorough independent evaluation.

Some consulting firms have arisen rapidly to the potential market for such services to local government. It is not unusual for such consultants to be paid $100 an hour for their services in helping establish such programs[8].

THE COMMUNITY-BASED CONSORTIA APPROACH

In recent years, the federal funding for gang programs has emphasized a community-based consortia approach. What it means is bringing together a number of different programs and services under a larger umbrella-style program; all of the actors targeting a specific population for intensive prevention services. An example of such a program that bases its expectations for impact on the prior research and on sound theory is that of the "Mujeres Y Hombres Nobles" (Noble Men and Women) program of the Los Angeles County Office of Education. Funded with a $3 million grant that will last five years the consortium will serve 30,000 residents and 350 school age children in East Los Angeles. Its program components include: "gang risk reduction, drug prevention and treatment, HIV/AIDS prevention, vocational training, cultural pride and esteem, spiritual and moral rencounterment, mentoring by Madrinas and Padrinos, intergenerational gang family systems intervention, conflict resolution and mediation, education and community awareness, and linkages to services".

This program is unique in being capable of dealing with the intergenerational gang family situation. Unfortunately, it is a not infrequent problem apparently, and one of the least researched aspects of the gang/family area. The Mujeres y Hombres Nobles program summary gives an example:

Teen Angel Magazine published exclusively for California gang members, regularly publishes pictures submitted by teen mothers of their children and babies dressed in gang clothing and giving gang hand signs; these teen mothers are unknowingly enculturating a new generation of gang members.

CONFUSED GANG PREVENTION: AN EXAMPLE OF A PROGRAM WITHOUT A THEORY

The Gang Project described here was funded by the Administration on Children, Youth and Families of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). It had as its first broad purpose to "develop an action plan in the city which identified the community's vision for a gang-free city, the obstacles blocking that vision, new directions to take to overcome the obstacles, and implementation plans for each new direction". The strange idea here was that the gang problem could be solved with an administrative solution: some master plan that would take a couple years to develop. As the program "unfolded", it changed its goal away from "gang-free" to that of having gangs be less violent in their city. To quote their final report to DHHS:

"A shift occurred in the original language of the goals from 'gang free' to one that focused on creating a climate in which gangs did not act in violent ways. It was felt that some hypocrisy would be in place if our goal was gang free but we said nothing about 'gangs' such as Rotary or Kiwanis or Lions."

---

[5]Project FLOW, Mayor's Office of Community Services, 101 N. Broad Street, 3rd Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19107.

The project offered "training" of an unspecified nature to community groups and nonprofit staff, which along with "community meetings" were not well attended[6]. At some point, the project engaged in direct service to youths in schools and juvenile corrections; using former addicts and ex-gang members to speak to them on --- presumably --- the evil of gangs and drugs.

So what happened at the end of the project funding period? No such coherent strategic plan was ever actually written. The final report included a lot of vague generalities about the need for community empowerment.   It evaluated itself, and felt it did a good job.

That is the danger of an atheoretical program: it can literally change its goals, which must be viewed with some criticism. The Project was probably not the best use of public monies. It probably sounded good to Washington (holding community forums, interfacing various agencies, etc), but the Project lacked any coherent theory and then changed its goals and began doing direct service work.

A GANG OUTREACH PROGRAM THAT MADE RECENT HISTORY
This is another federally funded program, but which as an "advocacy organization", receives funding from a variety of other sources especially foundations. A highly educated police officer who is also a gang researcher first told me about this program in his city. The word among police was that the program served as a site for gangs to hold their meetings and conduct their gang business. This program bills itself as a "gang outreach program". There is no theory of just how, exactly, it would prevent anything.   The idea itself was peculiar: not a traditional "detached worker outreach program" to individual gang members, for which there are a lot of materials that can be used for training such detached workers; but rather it sought outreach to the "gang" itself. Such on-line program service personnel would clearly have to be organizational and group psychology experts; which of course they were not, they were indigenous staff, paraprofessional at best. What is the single most important criteria of program success in such detached worker programs is the ability to increase a more law abiding and prosocial lifestyle, and to reduce a delinquency and criminality lifestyle. Most prior evaluation research on such detached worker programs has not shown the ability to actually accomplish this goal (Mattick and Caplan, 1962; Klein, 1968; Miller, 1974; Quicker, 1983).

In the program being described here, what it did do is basically turn the program over to the gang. To quote from its final report: "Access to Gang Leadership: staff know the gang leadership in the city; some of the program staff have been recruited from this leadership". The program provides its staff with beepers and car radios, and thus claims it is a "round the clock" operation. The program employs active gang members, and "has hired most of its junior staff from the ranks of gangs in" the city. Without any indication of training for such staff, the report goes on to claim how it provides gang outreach, case management, crisis intervention, family services, school services, some type of "ministry to gang members"[7],

---

[6]This may have been due to a program lacking a "needs assessment".

[7]This should have been a "red flag" to the federal agency providing funding in the first place: the government has no business subsidizing "street versions" of religious prosyletizing. What religious doctrine was being "pushed" to these gangs?

security work at public events, and prison work. Hiring gang leaders and active gang members under the guise of working with the local gang scene somehow gets translated into establishing a Gang Council and sponsoring a gang conference.

Here we see the real danger of an atheoretical program evaluating itself: of course, it claims to literally have walked on water. It provides a number of statistics which on their face would appear to be "doing something": during 1991, 235 meetings with gangs or gang leaders to prevent conflicts (does that include meetings the gang members themselves who work in the program have between each other, we don't know), 156 mediations of gang-related conflicts at schools (does that include the conflicts in its own school program that it runs, we don't know), 195 mediations between gangs in conflicts on the streets.

What we have here are paraprofessional at best who while indigenous to the city, are employed in a social service and a crime prevention and public safety function, who might potentially be part of the problem itself. The media coverage gained by some of the gang leaders has certainly helped them to promote their gang as an organization "about Growth and Development" --- a code word for Gangster Disciple --- so it provides a public relations function for the local gangs. There is nothing in the program report documentation about success in reducing drug use or drug sales, of actual reductions in gang violence, or actual reductions in gang membership involvement. In fact, one would have to postulate from the declarations in this report back to the federal government that gang membership probably increased --- at least for those gangs whose leaders were put on the payroll. It is comparable to the early Jeff Fort and Rev. Fry phenomenon[9].

Needless to say this program did not have, as is apparently required of many programs receiving federal funding, any external quantitative process and product program evaluation. But it continues today. Is it possible that the beepers and car phones given to these gang members were used in anything other than "making peace"? Is it really a good idea to have gang members provide "security work" for concerts as this program does, is that not similar to hiring the Hell's Angels at Woodstock? What is the theory here for such a program that it is going to reduce the gang problem? It is certainly not well articulated.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FUNDING FOR GANG PROGRAMS

The federal Youth Gang Drug Prevention Program was authorized by legislation in 1988 (section 3501 of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988). The federal Youth Gang Drug Prevention Program awards funding to actual gang programs "to prevent and to reduce the participation of youth in the activities of gangs that engage in illicit drug-relate activities and to promote the involvement of youth in lawful activities". The federal agency having the responsibility to administer this funding is the Administration on Children, Youth and Families (ACYF) and is managed by the Family and Youth Services Bureau, both within the Department of Health and Human Services. Since it first began in 1989, this federal initiative has provided over $50 million dollars in funding to over 100 different gang prevention programs.

The FYSB Youth Gang Prevention Program has issued a number of printed newsletters. The Connections newsletter provides updates on various programs funded by FYSB and other features such as its National Conferences. At any particular time there are a sufficient number of such federally funded programs to hold a National Youth Gang Conference. The First National Conference was held June 5-7, 1991 in Alexandria, Virginia; the Third such conference was held in 1993. A number of other conferences have been funded by the FYSB as well.

Many of the programs funded by this federal initiative publish short guidelines in the Connections newsletter. Much very useful and important information is published in the

newsletters[8]. It promotes practitioner/researcher interaction; gives advice on hiring gang outreach workers, provides highlights of gang programs in the news; and contact information.

PROGRAMS TO ESTABLISH "GANG TRUCES"
     A number of efforts have been made historically to establish "gang truces". Typically these are ad hoc arrangements and do not reflect a formal program per se. Some programs seek "mini-truces" on an individual level, for example in the context of a single school, where this kind of gang program service is sometimes called "gang mediation".   The Youth For Christ evangelical group in Chicago has been holding its "United Nations" meetings for a decade: bringing rival gang members together in groups representing over twenty different gangs over time (Mc Lean, 1991) - the goal being to allow the individuals to appreciate the Christian faith[10]. Such counseling and prosocial advice where the unit of service delivery being targeted is the individual does not seek to work with the gang as a collective enterprise, but rather simply seeks to apply conflict resolution skills at the level of the individual. Such work at the level of the individual is certainly worthwhile.   But what "gang truces" involve typically are not services, nor are they formal programs accountable for their actions, and the unit of service delivery target is the entire gang as a collective identity. A common theme of such truce efforts is to bring together warring or rival gangs and unite them under a larger umbrella organization. The position taken in the present book is that such endeavors are rarely successful and are indeed risky. Supporting the present position that negotiating with gang leaders basically means that through such official recognition the gang becomes stronger are a number of other analyses (Haskel and Yablonsky, 1982) and more recently Kodluboy and Evenrud:

     "It is probable that mediation with gang members or gang leaders may sometimes be necessary to forestall immediate violence or prevent loss of life. It is also probable that such mediation increases the risk of validating the gang as a legitimate social entity, thus buying short-term peace at the price of long-term persistence of the gang (Goldstein and Huff, 1993: p. 285)."
Still, it is not hard at all to find those who felt the "truce" between the Crips and the Bloods in Los Angeles was a major positive development[11]; just as it is not hard to find the skeptics either. We have found no such lasting truce between gangs anywhere. What we have found are ways for gangs to gain additional power, prestige, and recognition in the process of conning otherwise responsible adults into believing that criminal organizations can rehabilitate themselves.

A LOOK AT COMPONENTS OF SERVICE IN GANG PROGRAMS
     The full and complete book the history of gang programs has yet to be written. It cannot be accomplished in this report either. Some of the programs that had the best theoretical basis for prevention were those making use of the social control that comes from involving the family of the youth in the process[12]. Such programs like the FOCUS Project in Washington, D.C. provided support group activities, family counseling, home visits, working with other social service agencies and police, and sought to prevent gang involvement and drug-abuse and with some promising results. It enlisted the parent in the effort to impact on the children in a systems approach. The good news is that there are a number of such positive impact

---

[8]The <u>Connections</u> newsletter is published and distributed by the Cosmos Corporation, 1735 Eye Street, NW, Suite 613, Washington, DC 20006.

programs throughout the United States. The bad news is that after the federal funding runs out after one or two years, the program services stop.

The federal approach to gang prevention and gang intervention has been piecemeal and segmented. It may not even involve true competitive bidding, that is: politics still seems a factor in who gets funding. We never hear of how knowledge development is improved by these programs. We already know some such program models and services can truly have a positive impact. And yet, still today, such specific services are not standardized nor does the funding agency provide an overall summary of "what works". And it certainly does not do a very good job at disseminating this needed information to the communities that could benefit from it: just in case they wanted to do something without federal funding.

Examining a number of such current federally funded gang prevention programs the typical program that operates at the primary level of prevention has the service components shown in Figure 1. By and large, the vast majority of these service components are indeed traditional social service approaches and can be found in many correctional aftercare programs with similar program goals (e.g., to reduce recidivism). Thus, they can be assumed to be useful as well in secondary and tertiary prevention programs.

A couple of the services in Figure 1 stand out as being uniquely related to the gang-drug problem. The "court advocacy" is not a new service, it was tried throughout the 1960's and 1970's and before. It simply motivates the client to participate in the program. But on a large scale, it basically means supplementing the resources of the juvenile public defenders office. Logically, it works against "Weed and Seed" and the strict accountability concept. Because through this service component, some juvenile offenders will get off the hook via the advocate from the program. It is a cheap way to generate clients: they may have to participate in the program as part of their probation agreement. But clearly, if the youth is at the level of being involved in the juvenile court system for delinquency, the program is operating for that youth at a secondary or tertiary level of prevention --- not a primary level of prevention.

In none of the programs reviewed as funded by the recent federal initiative was there any breakdown by goals in terms of numbers of youths to be served at these various levels of prevention/intervention. This is truly remarkable in light of the vast accumulation of program knowledge and information in federal agencies. What this may imply is that the federal initiative should be dramatically changed. It should provide a model service intervention/prevention program and in its Requests For Proposals solicit who wants to run this specific type of Model Program (with no deviation, no changing of goals, etc). The evaluation research component would then be meaningful from a comparison and regional point of view. The federal initiative might then take on more structure and consistency. Currently, the initiative could be summarized as Requests for Proposals that solicit "do what you want to do....and if it sounds interesting we'll give you the federal money for it".

There are, however, important conceptual and policy issues in gang programs, especially the current federal initiative that need to be resolved. The foremost is comparable to the credo that physicians use: above all, do no harm. That is, whatever is done, make sure the program does not in fact increase the gang problem or the drug problem or the violence problem. The fact that very rigorous outcome evaluation research is sorely lacking in the current federal initiative unfortunately does not allow us to rule out such a hypothesis. Where that "reverse intended effect" hypothesis needs to be tested first are in those controversial programs that are substantially more than gang outreach, they may be subsidies for the gang (e.g., giving beepers and cellular phones to active gang members and leaders hired by the program).

FIGURE 1

TYPICAL PROGRAM SERVICE COMPONENTS IN GANG PROGRAMS

Program Service Component	What it hopes to accomplish.
Referrals	Send the youth to a traditional service agency for specific type of assistance (e.g., health, addiction, housing, etc).
Individual counseling	Motivate youth to change beliefs and behavior.
Group counseling	Apply positive peer culture to facilitate individual change in beliefs and behavior.
Family counseling	Apply the social control of family members to facilitate individual change in beliefs and behavior.
Peer/adult mentoring	Through one-on-one volunteers or staff, match with youth to motivate or reinforce change in beliefs/behavior.
Educational Upgrading	Increase the academic skills of the youth. TECHNIQUES: tutoring, independent study, homework assistance, computer instruction, etc.
Cultural enrichment	Increase youth awareness of the larger social order to motivate respect for conformity. TECHNIQUES: Figure 1: Continued visits to museums, higher culture events, outings, etc.
Job placement	Motivate youth to seek legitimate opportunities for achievement. TECHNIQUES: subsidized employment, guaranteed summer job, meaningful work experience, etc.
Court Liaison Advocacy	Seek leniency in juvenile court for clients in return for their program involvement.

Parenting skills   Increase the knowledge and skills
                                    to nurture children.

Program Service Component   What it hopes to accomplish.
                                    AIDS/HIV prevention
                                    Increase the knowledge of health
                                    risk behavior and motivate youth
                                    to avoid such risks. Rites of
                                    passage awareness Increase the
                                    awareness of youth about human
                                    development, the increased
                                    responsibilities over The lifespan,
                                    and to celebrate their own manhood
                                    and womanhood development.

Adult supervised recreation   Drop-in centers, day camp, etc.
                                    AKA: Social Recreation. Many such
                                    examples: Health & Physical
                                    education.

Parent Empowerment   Motivate parents affected by gangs
                                    and drugs to take back control of
                                    their homes, children, and
                                    neighborhoods. (E.G., Operation
                                    Parent Sweep).

Why This National Study Was Conducted

The sixteen researchers agreed together and collectively that more hard data was needed on gang prevention and gang intervention, particularly looking at the real experiences of real gang members. The effort planned was to be called Project GANGPINT and became a major national gang research project undertaken without government or private sector funding.

What is Project GANGPINT?

Project GANGPINT is the acronym for "Project Gang Prevention/Intervention", a large national study of 5,000 gang members. This consortium of researchers has been organized by the National Gang Crime Research Center. The primary purpose of this research and service is to provide the hard data for purposes of a national needs assessment.

What is the National Gang Crime Research Center?

The National Gang Crime Research Center was established in 1990 and its track record of organizing, completing, and disseminating useful information from national and local gang research projects has steadily expanded over the last five years. The Center publishes a professional quarterly journal, called the Journal of Gang Research. The Center provides assessment, research, and training services about gangs and security threat/risk groups. A copy of the Annual Report of the Center is available upon request, documenting the positive track record of service to criminal justice agencies and communities throughout the United States.

Methodology for Project GANGPINT

A lengthy process of item pool development and survey research instrumentation and pretesting was involved. All members of the research consortium --- a national group of distinguished researchers --- contributed their hypotheses. The result is an anonymous questionnaire designed for use on populations at risk of gang membership. No names or personal identifying information are sought in the survey process, thus the lack of invasive data gathering means no threat exists to human subjects. Further, no release forms are needed, as this is a totally voluntary and completely anonymous technique for data collection.

National Sampling Strategy

The sampling strategy for Project GANGPINT is to identify sites in all major geographical jurisdictions of the continental United States. Sites previously used by the National Gang Crime Research Center (jails, schools, private programs, juvenile centers, etc) on previous national consortium research projects will also be used for Project GANGPINT.

Value of the Research

Currently, such a national needs assessment does not exist for gang prevention and gang intervention. This means that a vacuum exists and no empirical basis exists for purposes of planning and developing policies and procedures to de-escalate problems associated with gangs and security threat groups. Thus, Project GANGPINT will provide the first such national needs assessment in this regard.

Researchers Involved in Project GANGPINT:

We are a group of responsible criminological researchers with a positive track record of both good scholarship and good services to the agencies we work with. We are not being paid for this research, it is a probono effort. In fact, researchers had to pay many expenses out of their own pockets for this research. No one received any supplemental salary for the research reported here. The reason is easy to understand: we did not seek funding for this project, nor did we receive any. Supplies, photo duplication, amenities used to reward respondents, postage, communication, and travel were expenses assumed by the individual researchers alone.

The Task Force Approach Used in Project GANGPINT

The researchers involved in Project GANGPINT are providing their services, skills, and work in probono fashion: they are not paid, rather they are doing this work as a public service. This approach is therefor a means of carrying out major large scale national research without specific funding for it from government or other sources. This approach also allows for being able to rapidly disseminate findings and results.

Benefits to Host Sites

Host sites are those criminal justice agencies (jails, programs, juvenile detention centers, prisons, long term juvenile correctional institutions, schools, etc) who allow a Project GANGPINT researcher to collect local data. A host site receives a major service free of charge: a customized local research report based on an analysis of that local data collected; this is a confidential report for the eyes of the site administration. Project GANGPINT provides this local, rapid, useful feedback at no expense and as a public service to the host agency.

Process For Collecting Data

The best process we have found that works best in secure settings is to rapidly distribute the surveys as quickly as possible. Thus, if it takes an hour to get all the surveys distributed to the population, at the end of distribution, the local research simply returns to the first point of distribution for collection. Thus, we have been able in this process to survey an entire medium sized jail in about an hour. We have been able to survey the largest juvenile detention facility in the United States in two hours using this technique. Thus, there is very little disruption: indeed, it provides the respondents something positive to do.

Option to Remain A Totally Anonymous Site

A host site can remain completely anonymous: that is, we do not have to identify it in the acknowledgments section of the final report. About a month before the report is to be released, a copy is provided to the host site for review: at which time the host site is asked whether it wants to be acknowledged (names, titles, etc). If we do not hear from the sites after providing the advance copy of the report and asking them if they want to be acknowledged, then we assume they want to remain anonymous, and thus we will not identify the site or staff.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Today much continuing interest exists in the hope for reducing the gang problem in America. Much government and private money is being spent on various programs and efforts towards that end. As we have seen in this chapter, a program for prevention or intervention with gang members requires a higher level of responsibility in terms of accountability: because there is the risk that the program could "go bad", that is, have reverse-intended effects.

The present research involves nearly 2,000 gang members who were surveyed from coast to coast, from Los Angeles, to North Carolina; from areas are far north as Wisconsin, to areas from as far south as Houston, Texas. Some 24 different social environments were studied in eight different states to tap into the gang population of the United States. We feel we have learned something in this research and we are sharing it with you here.

A detailed explanation of the methodology for this research is provided in the next chapter.

Some discussion is in order about the structure of this study. The table of contents describes the different chapters in this book, and the diversity of ideas. Each chapter includes boxed "vignettes" solicited from the various researchers in response to their views on WHAT SHOULD BE DONE in America to deal with the present gang problem. As will be seen, there are many rather complex issues involved in the study of gangs, and particularly in addressing the matter of gang prevention and gang intervention. The reader is advised to read the endnotes, provided at the very end of the book (consult the table of contents). A full bibliography of relevant books, periodicals, articles, and monographs discussed throughout this study is also provided.

Chapter 2

METHODOLOGY

This section of the report describes how the research was conducted, the pretesting of the instrument, validity, and reliability issues.

FORMATION OF THE PROJECT GANGPINT TASK FORCE

The Project GANGPINT research task force was formed in 1994 and involved invitations to a number of gang researchers and experts to pledge their support and labor in a unique knowledge development project. It was agreed in advance that this would have to be an unfunded type of research, because in the current overall state-of-the-art gang research there has been little comparative research done on gang prevention and intervention, and literally nothing that could speak to the national picture. Developing a national needs assessment for gang prevention and gang intervention has not, in other words, been a research priority area for funding sources. It was agreed that to really understand the multifaceted nature of gang life itself, that multiple social contexts would have to be studied (i.e., schools, jails, juvenile facilities, programs, etc). It was agreed that in addition to being a research project, that this would also be a probono service project as well: specifically, that we would provide a detailed "site report" reflecting a complete analysis of all data to each and every site that cooperates with our research efforts. The objective of these "site reports" was to provide useful rapid feedback describing trends and important findings about the site population. The site populations included schools, jails, juvenile correctional facilities, etc.

It was also agreed that to be able to speak effectively to the wide variety of hypotheses that a large task force group might want to test, that a very large national sample would be needed. It was agreed by the Project GANGPINT research task force members that this study would have as its goal the inclusion of at least two thousand (N = 2,000) self-reported gang members in various parts of the United States.

In this type of large scale research there would be hard costs that could not be avoided: travel, lodging, photo duplication, honorariums to the respondents, etc. It was agreed by Task Force researchers that any individual expenses in travel and per diem and time would be donated to this project, that is the researcher would basically pay his or her own way to the extent they were able to do so. No one was to be paid any salary for work. Thus, all time devoted to this project was not reimbursed in any sense. Further, only hard expenses spent on the respondents, involving honorariums (cookies, potato chips, etc) would be expenses that the Task Force would collectively agree to share in a equal fashion.

It is difficult to estimate the amount of labor and effort that went into this project, but is was obviously extensive. Of course, the researchers in their capacities as educators were able to use some small resources involving photo duplication from their respective universities. Outside of this limited assistance, no federal, state, or other government or private foundation support existed for this project. It was, in short, a research team designed to accomplish a goal as an end in itself: not for compensation, but because it needed to be done.

SAMPLING GANG MEMBERS IN MULTIPLE SOCIAL CONTEXTS

One of the goals of the Project GANGPINT research task force was to ensure that gang members were studied in a variety of social contexts. The universe became easy to define when we asked the general question: where could we most likely find some gang members

today? The first answer was: custody, those in jail, etc. The second answer was schools and the community. Thus, at an early stage in the research process various social contexts were identified, contacted, and persuaded to cooperate with our research mission.

The types of social contexts used in the Project GANGPINT task force research therefore consists of the following:

(1) Alternative schools in the midwest,

(2) Juvenile correctional facilities in seven states (California, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Ohio, Texas,

and Wisconsin),

(3) Jails in Illinois and North Carolina,

(4) A state boot camp program in Texas.

(5) Private residential facilities for youths at risk of gang membership in Iowa, Indiana, and Ohio.

ITEM DEVELOPMENT AND PRETESTING THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

All members of the Project GANGPINT research task force at an early stage in the research process developed specific hypotheses they would explore and test. This meant that every researcher developed and submitted specific questions or items to be included in the survey instrument. These questions in the preliminary item pool were then distributed for review, critiqued, revised and then finally tested in a pretest of the finalized survey instrument. With 16 different researchers in this national gang research consortium, obviously there were many different types of hypotheses that would be explored in the research, even though the primary theme examined aspects of gang prevention and gang intervention generally.

The pretesting of the instrument was conducted in a high gang density juvenile correctional institution in the midwest. This is a famous site for the Chicago-school of criminological research. The site staff were very skeptical that the youths could in fact complete the survey, but most were able to complete it in a very short period of time. In fact this facility containing nearly 500 youths in short term detention were completely surveyed in a very short period of time: the researchers were able to get in and out of the facility within a two hour period. Several members of the research task force were present for this pretesting, they made observations, and debriefed some of the respondents (i.e., asking them to report questions they did not understand, words they did not understand, phrases they did not understand, etc) and some of the staff. Through this process the survey instrument was further modified to make necessary changes identified from the pretesting. Actually very few changes had to be made. The pretest sample was known in advance to contain gang members. We expected that there would be some respondents who would not know about some of the detailed issues of gang life: any non-gang member would not be privy to the socialization and training afforded by a gang (i.e., learning its language or subcultural argot, its rules, its code, etc).

After the survey instrument was field tested, we felt comfortable as described in the section on validity below that the instrument was capable of measuring what it sought to measure.

SAMPLING NEARLY 2,000 GANG MEMBERS

The type of research that samples only from one city, or one state, has historically been a source of confounding and confusing research results in the gang research arena. We felt we needed to capture gang members where they can really be found: on the street, and in custody. Our research strategy was one that therefore focused on a variety of social contexts in order to obtain a sample of over 2,000 gang members. Mostly, we sought to have

representative national data and therefore we focused our research strategy on multiple states, in large and small jurisdictions.

Figure 2 below shows the type of social context by the sample size of gang members from these sites in five states.

FIGURE 2

TYPE OF SOCIAL CONTEXT BY SIZE OF GANG SAMPLE

Self-Reported Gang Member?

	Missing	NO	YES	Total
	*******	*******	******	******
Chicago, Illinois				
Juv. Det. Center	30	85	383	498
Gary, Indiana				
Juv. Det. Center	2	25	71	98
Davenport, Iowa				
Private Youth Center	0	3	18	21
Rock Island, Illinois				
Arrowhead Ranch	1	31	36	68
Houston, Texas				
Juv. Det. Center	1	24	32	57
Houston, Texas				
State Boot Camp	5	76	36	117
Irma, Wisconsin				
State Juvenile				
Training School	9	94	224	327
Chicago, Illinois				
Alternative High				
School Program	4	18	39	61
Chicago, Illinois				
Day Jail Program	1	14	46	61
Los Angeles, Calif.				
Juvenile Det. Center	26	57	305	388
Downey, California				
Juvenile Det. Center	16	75	205	296
Lake Co., Indiana				
Hoosier's Boys Town	0	20	29	49
Southern Texas				
Juv. Detention Center	9	38	58	105
Ohio: Riverview				
Juv. Corr'l. Center	7	42	46	95
Forsyth, North Carolina				
Forsyth County Jail	21	123	37	181
Ohio: Lighthouse				
(Private Facility)	2	12	11	25
Normal, Illinois				

McLean Co. Juv. Detention Center	3	7	10	20
Ohio: Maumee Youth Correctional Center	5	43	48	96
Ohio: Sciotto Youth Correctional Center	8	62	82	152
Ohio: Indian River Youth Corr'l. Center	14	41	47	102
Chicago, Illinois Alternative Elementary Disciplinary School	9	11	6	26
Ohio: Tico Youth Correctional Center	13	123	105	241
Ohio: Mohican Youth Correctional Center	8	76	60	144
Ohio: Cuyahoga Hills Youth Corr'l. Center	12	48	60	120
TOTAL	206	1148	1994	3348

In all contexts a saturation sampling technique was sought. This meant everyone in the social context was asked to participate in the research. Sometimes incentives were used, and this meant upwards of 90 percent of the populations in these contexts cooperating. Our sample of gang members therefore includes youths and adults, those in custody, and those not in custody.

INTERNAL CONTROLS ON DATA QUALITY

A number of precautions and safeguards were undertaken during the survey process to ensure the highest possible quality
in the data collected.

1. Covert Observation. During the actual collection of data at some sites there was the opportunity for covert observation. This involved several of the jail or juvenile correctional sites where it was possible to watch the inmates completing the questionnaires on closed circuit television or through observation areas. Thus, in some jail sites it was possible for the researchers to hand out pencils and surveys and then in a control room watch the inmate behavior in their cell areas on the security video monitors. In no case did we see collaboration or any systematic tampering (i.e., one inmate filling out more than one questionnaire). There was no evidence of any collective fraud on the part of inmates in completing the questionnaires. As in other settings, this was presented as a "very personal" survey. Almost all inmates and others surveyed in other sites were remarkably cooperative. In school sites, for example, there was always at least one researcher present at all times inside each classroom while the questionnaires were being filled out.

2. Overt Observation. Overt observation was the rule of thumb in all sites, as one or more of the principal researchers were on hand at all sites to watch and observe the process of data collection. This also afforded the opportunity of introducing another methodological safeguard to evaluate the quality of our data collection. Gender is a specific forced-choice item on the questionnaire, but it was also a variable coded during overt observation immediately after collecting the questionnaires. In all the jails, in the west coast site, and in Chicago sites, we took an additional overt observation precaution during the data collection

process. This entailed physically marking all of the physical source documents with a code for gender. Thus, all male and female respondents could then be assessed in terms of attempts at deception with regard to gender. This code assigned by the researchers as an observation taken during a close social contact (i.e., collecting the survey instruments one at a time) was then able to be compared with the respondents forced-choice response. A random response pattern or a fraudulent response pattern could possible be evident in a case where the overt observation of gender did not match with the self-reported gender in the response to the question inside the survey about gender. Thus, lying about gender was seen in only a couple cases and where it was detected the entire survey instrument was not used. Thus, a few cases were eliminated for obvious attempts at deception.

    3. Zero Tolerance for Data Entry or Transcription Errors. All survey data stored electronically for purposes of computerized statistical analysis were cross-checked against source documents (i.e., the survey instruments). The data was checked and re-checked and contains no validity threat from transcription errors in the data reduction process. Most of the data entry was performed by one of the Ph.D. researchers or a Ph.D. candidate statistical typist. Some of the data was keyed to disk by highly trained advanced students serving as interns to the National Gang Crime Research Center and their work was thoroughly checked.

    4. Few Unusable Survey Instruments Detected. In most of the sites and social contexts used for data collection, a saturation sampling method was used: everyone in the site was asked to complete the questionnaire. Small honorariums were used in some of the sites, and in these sites we would could casually check the surveys to ensure they were fully completed before giving out the honorariums. In very few instances were unusable questionnaires returned. This is far less than one percent and typically involved someone who would check every response to every question, or some similar non-seismical way of showing non-cooperation. This was a voluntary action to participate in the research, and for the most part a very large majority of the persons at all sites participated and provided high cooperation. The most hostile reaction the gang members had to the survey was the question we had about their expected life expectancy: at what age they expected they would die.

    However, we got the distinct impression that most respondents including those in custody were highly motivated to complete the questionnaires, in one sense because this provided an interesting distraction from the boredom of routine regular activities. In only rare instances, then, did we obtain "tainted" survey instruments: those what were obviously fraudulently completed, or not capable of being interpreted, that is for the most part non-cooperative. Thus, no tainted data is included in our analysis because these very few cases where the respondent was less than cooperative their survey instruments were discarded.

    5. An Acceptable Level of Trust Was Established.

    While our approach was essentially the same with everyone regardless of the social context, in the jail and secure contexts extra efforts were made to provide an adequate introduction and explanation to the respondents. At least one or more of the researchers were typically on hand in the correctional environments studied, where they approached each cell-house area or living area and explained in detail the purpose of the survey research.   In the correctional settings, it was not uncommon for joking comments to be heard from the respondents about criminal justice officials, or critical comments towards the criminal justice system generally. Friendly dialogue was common in all social contexts, because the researchers often took time after the survey to answer verbal inquiries, and listen to concerns and issues of the respondents.   While the survey asks for no name, and its printed title is ANONYMOUS NATIONAL STUDENT SURVEY, and while we explained verbally that we did not want their names because this was a very personal type of questionnaire; it was not uncommon in some instances for respondents to still write-in their names and provide other

unsolicited information. Several offered to become paid informants, or desired personal interviews such as this respondent (#932): "I can be more helpful, ask for Pac-Maniac on 2N3. For a small fee I can tell you anything plus more you need to know! The message above is only valid til this Tuesday at 5 PM!".

In the school settings and non-correctional settings, research assistants were always on hand in each room or area, and to ensure the privacy of the responses the respondents were told that their teacher or program supervisor would never actually see or touch the surveys. Thus, we collected all surveys directly from the respondents in and out of the correctional settings.

We feel on the basis of the above procedures respectful of the respondents in their social settings regarding the privacy of their responses, and based on our observations of the process of data collection, that a sufficient level of trust was established with respondents to get relatively honest answers.

We have only one caveat that all criminological researchers should be recognizing themselves: offenders have the tendency to over-report their positive attributes and under-report their stigmatizable attributes, and the kind of gang members we are studying are more often than not offenders. Regardless of social context this tendency operates in all areas of research on real offenders, and gang offenders are no different. We also recognize, and this tendency works to our methodological advantage, that offenders are more likely to honestly report the deviance of their friends and associates than their own deviance. Thus, many of the questions or focal areas of our research ask them about "others", i.e., their gang.

6. High Cognition on the Meaning of the Survey Items Implies Clearly We Are Measuring What We Purport To Measure. A large number of respondents, across social contexts but particularly those in custody, had the tendency to write notes and memoranda style comments in the margins of the survey instrument on a variety of issues. These are highly emotive comments implying clear cognition of the true meaning of the survey items or questions. Several examples of this kind of "running" commentary and shared written communication from respondents is helpful to review here to illustrate our assumption regarding this aspect of the strength of our methodology.

Not one survey respondent returned the survey instrument and claimed not to understand the questions. Not one written comment indicated a lack of understanding of the meaning of the question. These were, after all, very concrete questions.

7. Built-in "Lie Tests". In the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) full form of 566 true or false questions, a "lie scale" exists by being able to compare responses to a question early in the form with a similar question latter in the form. When someone intentionally engages in deceit, they often forget what they lied about before. Thus, it is possible to identify clear inconsistencies in this way.

Similar provisions were adopted for the present research methodology by building in such "lie tests" or tests of inconsistency into the survey instrument questions. Thus, like the MMPI once scored, our present survey instrument once analyzed provides the basis for identifying deceptive response patterns --- those that are clearly inconsistent or suggestive of deceptive responses.

The first test is one where we could capture any respondent who was paranoid enough to lie about present age and age at time of first arrest. One of the questions in the survey instrument asks "At what age were you FIRST arrested for any crime? When I was_____years old". Another item in the survey instrument asks "How old are you today? I am _____ years old." A respondent who would engage in early intentional deceit in a response pattern to the survey instrument could therefore be detected by comparing these two items. Deceitful responses would be evident whenever the value of the age for first arrest

exceeded the value of present age. A simple computer check allowed for directly testing for this type of systematic deception. In other words, a deceptive respondent might give the age of 20 for age at time of first arrest and give the age of 17 for current age later in the item order of the survey instrument. The results of this test were no detected deception of this blatant nature.

Several other hypotheses were tested to evaluate the validity of the data. These consisted of matched-pair items that were very similar in nature, that is these questions basically asked the same thing, but with the item phraseology being slightly altered. Most of these matched pair variables measuring the same thing were intermixed throughout the survey. By using contingency table or crosstabulation analysis, the relationship between these paired variables had better be statistically significant by the Chi-square test because one similar variable should significantly different a second similar variable if the respondents are being honest with us. We found these tests (ITEM51*ITEM52, ITEM72*ITEM58, ITEM3*ITEM47, ITEM49*ITEM125C, ITEM30G*ITEM29, ITEM2*ITEM3) very significant with Chi-square values reaching Chi-square = 542.1 in strength. Had these matched-pair lie tests not been significant, then we would have had to conclude that large scale lie behavior threatened the validity of the data.

In short, much attention in this research during the instrumentation phase was paid to the matter of structuring a variety of opportunities for the respondent to be deceptive or deceitful in a way that could be easily detected by data analysis. We know it is not customary for researchers when investigating such offender populations as included in the present research to do this, but we did feel that it was necessary to speak to this issue in as much as this was a large scale investigation involving an assortment of known offender groups.

OTHER ISSUES OF VALIDITY

As previously alluded to much attention to detail and many precautions were undertaken during the research process that were designed to enhance validity by protecting against threats to validity. These protective measures used will be described here. We conclude that the validity of the research reported here is higher than average for social research of the type conducted here.

We begin by recognizing that generally in social research, and all criminal justice or criminological research, that the term validity is defined as the extent to which the researchers have measured what they purport to measure. Therefore, the ultimate assessment of validity goes directly to the issue of whether or not the survey instrument captures and effectively differentiates the population at-risk to gangs, whether it can effectively identify subgroupings within the gang population (i.,e., specific gangs), and whether the questions about gang life, economic issues, and other related factors or variables really measure what they say they measure. We further note that the ambiguity in language in the survey instrument was reduced during a field or pretest of the survey instrument. We further note that there were few who did not understand the questions in the survey that they were predicted to understand.

Obviously, we did not assume that non-gang members would understand much about the detailed dynamics of the economic infrastructure and financial aspects of gang life. We did, however, predict that gang members would both understand the meaning of such questions and be able to report their experience and beliefs about these specific aspects of gang life. We therefore report that in terms of the construct validity of the survey instrument itself that gang members clearly did understand and had little difficulty in providing responses to the nearly 200 variables in the survey instrument.

The validity issue of the length of the survey is a moot issue we feel. Our survey

instrument is long, but generally can be completed in about 30 minutes by most respondents. The structure of the social settings in which the data was collected were such that no "pressure" existed to rapidly complete the questionnaires. The respondents in all social contexts had more time available to them than was needed for the actual completing of the anonymous questionnaire. In school rooms, a entire hour was set aside, and few needed this much time. In other settings, such as a community program, the respondent could take as much time as needed. Thus, by the nature of the precautions taken during the implementation of the research, we rule out any fatigue or "length of survey deterioration" factor as a threat to the validity of this research.

Concurrent of criterion validity means examining a measurement in relationship to some other variable it should be highly predictive of. The most important aspect of the current research was defining who was or who was not a gang member. The way in which validity controls were implemented in the present research design therefore asked different versions of the same question for several variables. This also meant being able to induce much quality control: for example, making sure that someone who in one question reports they have ever joined a gang, and who in another variable indicates the exact name of the gang in an open-ended "fill in the blank" type of question (i.e., "What gang did or do you belong to?_____), and who then indicates the type of alliance or nation status. Thus, any "Gangster Disciple" would in our sample have to also indicate a membership in the "Folks" nation. We found very little discrepancy between such variables, and therefore believe that our basic measures that differentiate gang members and non-gang members are very accurate. These are also, for the most part, "brand name" gangs: gangs common to the social contexts from which they were sampled (Crips, Bloods, and Sureno sets on the west coast, etc). One of the ways in which we were able to use a "criterion" validity approach was our access to probably the best and most current national directory of gangs in America today --- the National Geographic Guide to Gangs in the United States. This is a large computer file maintained by the National Gang Crime Research Center, it is updated from numerous sources (law enforcement, corrections, etc) every year and has monitored the gang proliferation problem for five years in a row. For a sample listing of this information useful in validating gang names for gang members, see the companion volume to An Introduction to Gangs (3rd and expanded edition, 1995): National Gang Resource Handbook: An Encyclopedic Reference (1995, Bristol, Indiana: Wyndham Hall Press). Thus, official sources providing names of numerous gangs in America were used to cross-check the self-disclosed data from respondents in the present research. As the analysis will reveal, the gang members in the present study are for the most part very well known gangs. Thus, for our most important variable of focus (gang membership), we were able to ascertain the validity of the self-reported gang membership by examining it in relationship to another of other validity control items (name of gang, gang nation alliance, type of rank held in the gang, etc). We did not encounter any cases that were impostors: only a gang member in such a gang would know the type of leadership positions in its unique hierarchy.

The present research can rule out a threat to the internal validity of the design based on history. The reason this is true is that all the data was collected in a short period of time during 1995 (Spring to summer, 1995) covering about a six month period. The hidden benefit of not being a federally funded type of research project is that also there were few if any obstructions to the research process, and that the results could be reported in a relatively short time frame as well. Thus, the findings are very much reflective of the current social reality (i.e., we did not have to wait a couple years to report our findings). For the same reasons, maturation was not a threat to the validity of our research design, because as stated all data collected occurred in a short period of time nationally (a three month period) in all sites,

sometimes simultaneously.

The issue of testing as a threat to validity is common to all surveys on known offenders and all self-report surveys. Completing surveys in some of the contexts was a common expectation, particularly among students and youths in juvenile correctional settings. Even the jail inmates had much experience in completing such questionnaires and "surveys". A number of precautions were taken to ensure the validity of the research design by always having researchers on-site during all data collection, typically several members of the larger team were present to assist with data collection. Mostly this involved explaining to the potential respondents that this was a completely anonymous survey, it did ask very personal questions, and that was the reason we did not want anyone's name, and that the "we" consisted of: university professors.

Wherever possible we tried to off-set the disruptiveness of having unknown persons intruding on their social contexts distributing surveys and pencils by offering some type of consumable amenity as a small reward or honorarium for completing the questionnaire. Thus, in most contexts this was viewed as a pleasant distraction. For these and other reasons discussed in the report we do not feel that testing was a major threat to the validity of the present research.

As discussed above as well, the pretesting or field testing of the survey instrument was designed to eliminate any ambiguity in words, phraseology, expressions, and writing.[9] These are forced-choice questions that are not double-barrelled questions, they are pinpointed to specific issues or measurements of background and behavioral experience, beliefs, and attitudes. We posit that the validity of the present study is therefore acceptable for studies of its kind regarding any threat to validity from instrumentation. Another reason that we can rule out instrumentation as a major threat to the validity of our research is that a number of our variables are direct replications of previous research found to be acceptable and reported in the literature --- as is discussed at appropriate points in this report, where such literature is specifically cited.

One of the strengths of the present research regarding validity is how we overcame the potential threat to validity from differential selection of subjects. In gang research, as is common in criminal justice and criminological research on offenders generally, the common situation is to have only one social context to study the human aspect of interest. In the present research, as explained earlier, the plan in advance was to develop and use multiple social contexts for purpose of data collection. Thus, gang members were not just studied in the school context, they were studied in all social contexts where we could reasonably assume we could find them: in adult correctional settings, in juvenile correctional settings, in community programs, in probation caseloads, and of course in the school context. Further, the geographic representation of the sample was intended to be able to examine variations across a large span of the United States: including data collection sites in California, Indiana, Iowa, Illinois, Texas, North Carolina, Wisconsin and Ohio. Therefore in a comparative assessment our present research is stronger than most in this regard to taking precautionary measures to ensure that the threat to validity in terms of differential selection of subjects included a broad cross-section (i.e., across different social contexts) and geographical spectrum. Our analysis can therefore speak to issues of comparison not capable in much previous gang research (i.e., comparing west coast Crips/Bloods with midwest People/Folks,

---

[9]No respondents were used from the pre-testing. The national sample of gang members was completely developed after the pretesting.

etc).

The issue of <u>mortality</u> for validity is of minimal concern to the present study and is therefore not a major threat. This was, after all, a "snapshot" survey design: we only sought out a cross-section of data; this was a multi-state multi-context cross-sectional survey research design. It was not intended to be a longitudinal design, with follow-up measurements. The only way in which <u>mortality</u> might therefore negatively impair on the research design would be if our sampling was limited to only one type of social context, or if we only used one site for each type of social context. The fact is we used multiple social contexts and for some of these (i.e., jails, juvenile correctional facilities) we used multiple sites within these social contexts as well. Thus, if someone "missed out" from such a site, chances are this is minimal in terms of not being able to capture the social reality of these social contexts. After all, within the specific social context sites, the research plan called for a "saturation" sampling method: everyone in the jail, the school, the program, etc, was asked to complete the questionnaire. Very few persons refused to complete the questionnaire. We tried to structure our data collection in correctional settings where we did not interfere with court calls or visiting, thus we often had to be at the jail late at night on some occasions, and almost always on the weekends, requiring travel and overnight stays in various cities for some of the researchers. Through previous research experience the researchers knew how to structure the data collection process to be as minimally disruptive to the security and other concerns of correctional facilities. We do know that with a long survey instrument such as that used in the present research project that there may be "item mortality", this is not a matter of "attention deficit disorders", it is a matter of simply losing the respondent at some later point in the survey instrument, thus resulting in some cases missing data for those items towards the end of the survey instrument. The present research is, therefore, not unlike other similar survey research designs in having the common problem of some missing data on the many variables measured.

Finally, the issue of <u>regression</u> as a threat to validity is viewed as minimal in the present research and not a major threat. Measurement error was not a major problem, given the fact that among gang members our variables designed to elicit the nature of their economic experiences in and associated with gang life were questions or items or variables that are both replicable and having little if any ambiguity. No cognitive bias exists in this regard to the variables used in the research. We did not simply include extreme cases: such as those highly cooperative youths on a street corner who might suddenly become very interested in a research project when a person of higher social class and social power arrives on the scene to offer aid and assistance --- material and psychic benefits in nature. The fact is our gang analysis covers the complete gang risk continuum as the analysis will reveal.

The gang member respondent was particularly prone to write lengthy and unsolicited comments in the margins of the surveys. This highly affective arousal signaled clearly that the respondents understood <u>all too well</u> the meaning of the questions. Sometimes this running commentary of unsolicited remarks directed feedback to the researchers in various ways, explaining subtle nuances, some of which will be discussed in this report at appropriate points in the presentation of results.

These were questions that gang members clearly understood, enough so that often such members would strike up conversations and seek out attention from the researchers at almost all the sites. The typical gang member respondent was very curious that anyone would ask such specific questions about gang life today. Thus, it was not uncommon for the researchers to stay around the site for additional time spent answering direct questions from the youths, this was particularly true in the juvenile correctional setting.

To recap, in many of the common threats to the internal validity of research such as that

reported here (history, maturation, testing, instrumentation, differential selection of subjects, experimental mortality, statistical regression), the precautions taken in the research design, the scope and extent of the research effort (i.e., covering several states, different social contexts, and a large sample), render these threats to be viewed as minimal.

RELIABILITY

The issue of reliability is the matter of the "quality" of the data. The informed reader will recognize that the term reliability in research means basically "do we get the same results with repeated measures". Over time it is possible, indeed probable, that "gang life" and the gang problem itself can, could and might change. For example, the gang problem has expanded and proliferated in recent years in the United States. In another sense, the meaning of reliability in the type of social research conducted here often means "would different researchers going to the same places using the same questions get the same results". We argue, by the nature of the methodological rigor and level of effort in the present research design, that this would in fact be the case to a high degree. In other words, when we issue what are called "site reports" or rapid information summaries back to the host sites that provided access for data collection, that our data truly does reflect the social reality of their environment. Most who have received these site reports agree with us in regard to the critical issues: specifically, gang density, and the scope and extent of the gang member problem in their populations.

This is not to say that the problem may not escalate or deteriorate in the years ahead. That is not the nature of our research purpose to predict the future. Rather our intent is limited to the nature of our research methodology --- a cross-sectional survey design using large samples --- of simply describing the current situation in these various social contexts. Given the rapid feedback, that is little time delay arose between time of data collection and the reporting of findings, we also argue that our research has high reliability in terms of the volatility of such data: ours was recently collected, and quickly reported. Our generalizations are to the present, not the future --- as we recognize the gang problem is a dynamic and not a static problem.

But the trained researcher will also recognize that the methodological matter of reliability is really the simple and testable issue of whether the same measurement techniques used in different research settings or at different points in time produce the same results. We can give and test an example of this aspect of reliability. Different questions at different points in the item order of the survey produced almost identical results. These are discussed in the chapter describing the descriptive findings on our gang member sample.

However, if this measurement is lacking in the area of reliability this would come out if multiple sites were chosen to study the issues of gang prevention and gang intervention. That is, the hypothesis of logical inference is that in the same city, among the same gangs, there should be no difference in this factor if we asked the same question in different social settings. Indeed, social settings that are indeed mutually exclusive: that is, one could not exist or be found in both simultaneously. For example, one could not exist in a regular public high school population and also exist in a day jail pretrial program.

It is important to note the subtle social nuances of the these two types of social settings. We chose these settings very carefully for purposes of being able to ultimately have some representativeness of the universe to which we sought to generalize. Thus, the alternative high school site is kind of like a school of last resort for some students, and it is a day program during the week. One cannot exist in two places at the same time, as the day jail program operates also during the ordinary work day (9/5) and also during the weekdays. However, if one were a gang member and had come to the attention of social control agencies, one could

end up in either of these two different levels of sanctions against deviance. To be in the alternative school setting one had to be at least 16 years of age; to be in the adult jail general population (and qualify for the day jail program) one would have to be 17 years of age. Students travel to the alternative high school site from all over the City of Chicago. Participants in the day jail program travel to the day jail site also from all over the City of Chicago. Obviously, one is in more trouble with the law in the day jail program than in the alternative high school setting, but the measurements on an aspect of the economic function or expectations in the same gangs in the same area should not be different just because we use different sampling frames for the same gangs. That is, just because we have different social context sites for data collection, the measurement should not be substantially different. If it is substantially different results and/or much variation does exist in the same concept measured on the same gangs among relatively equal age groups in different catchment areas of the same city, then a clear problem of reliability exists.

Our research was structured in a way to enhance both validity and reliability. Thus, in Chicago we had several such mutually exclusive sites that were identical in several important methodological respects: a public high school, a juvenile detention center, and a day jail program. The same gangs existed in both sites, as detailed elsewhere in this report. Both settings contained about an equal gang density (percentage of the persons surveyed there who were self-reported gang members). Both settings also had catchment areas that were citywide: persons in these contexts could come from anywhere in the wider Chicago geographical area. Now the test: but did we get the same results in different settings, the equivalent of one research project compared with another research project? Yes, is the answer.

In the Chicago alternative high school sample with a gang density comparable to that of the day jail program we obtained almost identical results on the characteristics the gang members used to describe their gang organization. In addition to these sites having comparable gang density rates, they also attracted persons from all over the city.

OTHER ISSUES OF VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY: FOR IMPROVING FUTURE RESEARCH

No replication problems materialized in the present research, as these were variables or items (i.e., survey questions) used in the prior literature. However, in some small selected instances of paving new grounds in the area of the economic life of gangs, and other factors included in some of the sites (i.e., sexual abuse, family life, etc) in this comprehensive survey, we felt that some improvements could be made in terms of the structure of such questions. These are reported as they appear in the presentation of results, and in their interpretation at relevant points in this report. We also provide suggestions for improving the validity and reliability of these measurements for purposes of future research. We recognize that there is no such thing as the "perfect" model of social research on anything, but that improvements can always be made.

The present research project was clearly an ambitious undertaking. We do, therefore, discuss ways to improve the validity and reliability of future research efforts such as that reported here. These discussions and references are made in the body of this report where relevant. Thus, we fairly and fully alert other researchers to these concerns.

We have lots of recommendations for improving research on gangs. We discuss these issues in greater detail in our conclusions section.

TYPES OF GANGS REPRESENTED IN THE SAMPLE OF OVER 2,000 GANG MEMBERS

The full list of gangs represented in this sample includes several hundred different gangs

most of whom fall into the Crip, Blood, People, and Folks classification system. This sample therefore includes over 100 members of the Gangster Disciples gang in Chicago, for example. A large variety of different sets of Crips and Bloods are represented in the sample as well. The types of gangs cut across the ethnic and racial spectrum as well (white, Black, Latino, Asian). These are, for the most part, the more serious types of gangs of interest to the criminological researcher. These include gangs such as the Aryan Brotherhood, and a variety of different factions of Vice Lords from the midwestern United States (Insane Vice Lords, Conservative Vice Lords, Unknown Vice Lords, Mafia Insane Vice Lords, Traveller Vice Lords) and literally all types of disciples (Gangster Disciples, Black Disciples, Maniac Latin Disciples, etc).

WHY WE KNOW THE GANG MEMBERS ARE IN THE GANGS THEY PURPORT TO BE MEMBERS OF

For most of our sites used in Project GANGPINT we used a unique methodological tool developed by the National Gang Crime Research Center. It involves a comparison of the symbols and expressions known to be used by the gang a person purports to be a member of. This was one of our additional validity control devices.

CHAPTER 3

A DESCRIPTION OF THE GANG MEMBERS IN THE PRESENT STUDY

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a full description of all the information the authors obtained in this national study for the large sample of N = 1,994 gang members.[13] This means providing a lot of new and interesting statistics on the gang problem in America. No technical knowledge of statistics is required to understand this chapter, because it relies entirely on descriptive statistics most people are already familiar with.

The purpose here is not to compare gang members to non-gang members, as that issue will arise in the next chapter. Thus, the purpose of this chapter is to simple: examine in great detail the a large number of factors about gang members and only gang members.

Can we better understand gang members? The answer is yes, it begins with reading this chapter.

BASIC DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS

The age of the gang members in this sample ranged from a low of 10 to a high of 56. Some 83.5 percent were under the age of 18. Almost all (88.8%) fell in the small age range of 14 to 18 years of age.

In terms of race and ethnicity: 48.7 percent were African-American or Black; 5.5 percent were Asian or Chinese; 3.4 percent were American Indian or Native American; 19.3 percent were Mexican; 3.5 percent were Puerto Rican; 14.8 percent were white or caucasian; and 4.9 percent were "other".

Most of these gang members (91.3%) are males. Only 8.7 percent of the gang members are females (8.7%).

FAMILY FACTORS

Seventeen different variables were used to address a wide variety of issues about the family life generally, and the role of the family regarding gang prevention and gang intervention specifically. These factors are all included in hypotheses about gang members in terms of family conditions, family socialization, and those things a family offers that might play a role in preventing future children from joining gangs.

High Level of Fear Among Gang Members: They Worry About The Safety of Their Family Members

The survey asked "do you worry about the safety of your family members". Some 91.6 percent (N = 1824) replied "yes", they do in fact worry about the safety of their family members. Only a small percentage of the gang members in this large national sample did not worry about the safety of their family members (N = 167, 8.4%).

This fear might be labelled by psychologists as aberrant or perhaps even reaching the level of paranoia and persecution. However, one thing gang membership offers in its benefit package that families find out the hard way is the unexpected violence that comes to family members from opposition or rival gang members --- particularly when the rival gangs discover where the individual lives. Gang violence today can mean simply attacking the physical structure where an opposition gang member lives. In many cases, nationwide, this can mean

a firebomb being thrown at the house where the gang member lives, shooting a gun into the house where the gang member lives, and what inadvertently and typically happens is a non-gang involved family member dies or is seriously injured. So, we believe that the kind of gang members we are studying have some right to be concerned about the safety of their family members.

Almost All Claim to Want To Eventually Lead A Conventional Lifestyle

The survey asked "in the future, would you like to get a legal job, get married, and have children". That was, a researcher in Project GANGPINT hypothesized, the basic ingredients of a conventional future adult lifestyle. What we found did amaze us: almost all claim to want this conventional lifestyle in the future. Some 93.5 percent (N = 1854) indicated "yes", that in the future they would like to get a legal job, get married, and have children. Only 6.5 percent (N = 128) did not have this future plan to lead a conventional lifestyle.

The Wartime Hysteria Phenomenon: Almost All Think Their Parents/Family/Friends Worry About Whether These Gang Members Will Be Killed

The survey asked "do you think your parents/family/friends worry about you being killed". The findings here did not surprise us. Almost all (N = 1793, 91.2%) did feel their significant others worried about them being killed. These are after all gang members in the kinds of gangs that do kill. Only 8.8 percent of the gang members in our sample (N = 174) did not express this kind of wartime hysteria phenomenon.

A Third of the Gang Members Say Their Father Never Punished Them For Misbehavior

The survey asked the gang members to indicate in a true or false type of response mode their answer to the following statement: "My father never punished me for misbehavior". Two-thirds of the gang members in this sample (67.1%, N = 1274) gave the response of "false". A third (32.9%, N = 625) replied true, that their father never punished them for misbehavior.

Over A Fourth Agree That Fear Is The Only Effective Means That Can Be Used To Control Children

The survey asked the gang members to indicate whether they agree or disagree with the following statement: "Fear is the only effective means that you can use to control children". Obviously, agreeing to this would tend to suggest an important aspect of authoritarianism in the character and personality of the same person. While this sounds like a strange question to be asking anyone, it is actually a replication of some previous important research.

In fact, 30.5 percent (N = 582) of the gang members agreed with this statement that fear is the only effective way to control children. However, most of the gang members (69.5%, N = 1328), disagreed with the statement.

The Love Mother -- Hate Father Pattern

Common to the criminal offender population generally, mother is held in reverence, and father is more likely to be despised. Such a trend of differential evaluations of mother and father appears among gang members in this research as well. Two separate questions are used to address this issue.

The first question asked the respondents to agree or disagree with the following statement: "there is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great deal of love, gratitude, and respect for his/her mother".[14] A majority of the gang members (72.2%, N = 1378) agreed with this moral evaluation. Of course, just over a fourth (27.8%, N = 531) disagreed.

The second question used the same language but used "father" instead of mother. In this variable measuring respect for father figures, some 57.6 (N = 1,112) percent agreed. Thus, 42.4 percent (N = 820) disagreed.

Clearly, mother holds a greater role to play in the lives of these gang members than does the father figure in terms of respect.

A Previously Taboo Topic: Parents As Facilitators of Gang Crime

The family might be a sacred institution, but today the family as a social institution does have some serious problems that perhaps need to be recognized. One of these is the issue that being a biological parent is no guarantee of being a nurturing parent that can raise a law-abiding child. Further, it is one thing to be a bad parent out of ignorance of parenting skills, and it is another thing entirely to be a covert accomplice to the crimes of their children.

The survey asked the simple and straight-forward yes/no question "did your parents ever approve of your stealing". Most (81.7%, N = 1571) indicated "no", that is their parents did not approve of their stealing. However, nearly a fifth of the gang members (18.3%, N = 353) answered "yes", that is, their parents did approve of their stealing.

So for at least 18.3 percent of these gang members, when we are talking about what kind of family background they have, it is a criminogenic family background: one where the parent approves, or may often benefit, from the crimes of the children. In this scenario, the parent is the economic beneficiary of the crime committed by children. These are situations where the parent appears to also face criminal sanctions and a topic worthy of additional future research into "parents as facilitators" of gang crime.

A Fourth of All Gang Members Never Got Help At Home With Their Homework

The survey asked the respondents to answer yes or no to the following question: "when you were going to school, did any adult living in your household help you with your homework". Most (72.1%, N = 1408) answered "yes", that is they did get such help from an adult in their household. However, a fourth (27.9%, N = 546) indicated they did not get help from any adult in their household with their homework when they were going to school.

We suspect this family and household factor may have some bearing on school failure rates among the gang member population as well.

A Fifth of Gang Members Actually Agree to the Ultimate Last Resort: Taking Kids Away From Inept Parents

When the sixteen researchers began this study, they agreed to a scientific spirit of discovery: let the chips fall where they may, let no important issue be avoided. It is not a matter of producing controversy, it is a matter of addressing existing controversy in society. A long-standing controversy in the current version of the parens patriae doctrine surrounds the issue of taking kids away from their biological parents: it is generally believed it is a bad idea, it is best to keep wherever possible the family intact as a social unit. But what if the social unit is anti-social? So we addressed this issue in our study.

The survey asked for a yes/no answer to the question: "do you feel that if parents cannot keep their children out of gangs, the children should be taken away from the parents". Most of these gang members answered "no" (80.9%, N = 1568). About a fifth (19.1%, N = 371) answered "yes".

Over Two-Fifths of Gang Members Agree: Some Parents Benefit Financially From Having A Child Who Is A Gang Member.

The survey asked "do you feel that some parents benefit financially from having a child

who is a gang member". Some 44.1 percent (N = 841) agreed that some parents reap economic benefits from having gang-involved kids, we would suspect this is particularly true in the area of drugs and stolen goods. Still, some 55.9 percent (N = 1064) indicated "no", that they do not believe that some parents benefit from the ill gotten gains of their gang member offspring.

Two-Thirds of Gang Members Have Had Friends or Family Members Killed Because of Gang Violence

This is another one of the "downside" aspects of gang life that children are not told about when they receive their initial understanding of the "benefits package" offered by joining a gang. Gang recruiters focus on the glamourous side of gang life, its excitement not its loss of life, its thrill not its sorrow, and its "fast times" and good life not its statistically significant increased probability of violence to both self and loved ones.

Some of the contemporary literature on gangs has claimed that gang life is basically a boring existence, without offering any nationwide empirical evidence of the same claim. While we agree obviously that because of their attachment to territorial claims (i.e., turf) in the community context, many gang members do not tour the city or elsewhere on a frequent basis; nor do we expect them to be enjoying many competitive sports or high culture (i.e., opera, theatre, ballet, symphonies, ballroom dancing, etc), we do expect them to be those who control the streets in the night. So contrary to some gang experts, we do suspect that there is an important essentially <u>social</u> attraction to gang life: its perceived excitement, the thrill of conflict, the adrenaline rush of violence, etc --- these are not boring at all. Guns, drugs, sex, violence, subcultural music forms --- these can have an enormous appeal to kids, kids who join gangs.

Our survey therefore asked the question "have any of your friends or family been killed because of gang trouble". Our results show that over two-thirds of the gang members (69.9%, N = 1,353) report that they have in fact had friends or family members who have died because of such gang conflicts. Some 30.1 percent (N = 584) therefore reported not having any friends or family killed because of gang trouble. We remind the reader that the drive for revenge is not a boring psychological state of mind, and the data here suggests that two-thirds might be capable of that type of orientation. In previous research findings about the "combative personality syndrome" among gang members, the gang member views his world as an urban guerilla war, where the rival gang is the force of opposition in a civil war against a corrupt overall society that needs to be destroyed, and lost friends and family are simply "heros of the revolution", just as the gang member himself is a modern day "freedom fighter".

The Real Test of The Benefits of Gang Membership: Whether Gang Members Would Want Their Own Children to Be In A Gang.

This may be a surrogate measure of the extent to which gang members may be admitting to making a bad decision by joining a gang themselves. In otherwords, the gang may not be all it is cracked up to be. That is, beneath the glitz and glitter of how gang members portray their status in life may be some really serious disadvantages that are not apparent until after falling into the trap of the "group think" and "risky shift" phenomenon of gang membership.

The survey asked for a yes/no response to the question: "do you want your children to be in a gang". Here the response pattern is unequivocal: apparently gang life is not, after all, such a good life. Some 83.4 percent (N = 1,607) of the gang members indicated they would not want their children to be in a gang. Only 16.6 percent (N = 319) said they would want their own children to be in a gang.

This is also something naive children never have the good sense to ask the gang recruiter: whether they would want their own child in the same gang. The evidence suggests that gang members are to some extent admitting they have been "chumped" in regard to their own decisions about joining a gang. Gang life is, after all, not something that most gang members would want their own children to be involved in is the evidence that emerges here.

High Rate of Substance Abuse in Gang Families
The survey asked an important question about the role of substance abuse within the family of orientation. The survey question asked for a yes/no response to the question: "do you think anyone in your family uses drugs or drinks too much". The results show that over half of the gang members (60.4%, N = 1174) report that yes in fact they have someone in their family who would fit this type of definition of having a substance abuse problem. Thus, some 39.6 percent (N = 771) indicated they did not have someone in their family who uses drugs or drinks too much.

What Gang Members Would Like To Give To Their Own Children
In their best of dreams, what gang members would ideally like to be able to some day give to their own children may tell us something about what they are not getting themselves presently. The survey therefore asked a kind of projective question in this regard, it asked "assume some day you will be a parent, what is the one most important thing you would like to give your child (Check ONE only)". They were given five choices and could choose only one: status, education, money, power, and love.
Remember that "status", "money", and "power" figure prominently in what gang members are supposed to be getting in their respective gang Nations and organizations. But is it something they would like to someday be able to give to their children? Apparently not.
Most of the gang members (64.9%, N = 1,119) wanted to give "love" to their own children. The second most popular item was "education" (21.9%, N = 378). Status was the lowest item on the list (2.6%, N = 45). Power did not do much better (4.1%, N = 71), nor did money (6.4%, N = 111).

Many Adults Have Tried to Prevent These Gang Members From Ever Becoming Gang Members
The survey asked "have you ever had a good relationship with an adult who tried to prevent you from being involved with gangs". We asked this because it is an obvious needs assessment baseline variable: many assume no one tried to help these kids, and therefore as the kids fell through the cracks, the kids became gang members because of neglect from their society. But is that really true? We had to find out.
The fact is over two-thirds (72.4%, N = 1,377) of these gang members reported in the survey that they had in fact enjoyed the benefit of having a good relationship with an adult who tried to prevent them from being involved with gangs. It just didn't work!
Only about a fourth (27.6%, N = 525) of these gang members indicated they did not have this opportunity in life of having a good relationship with an adult who tried to prevent them from being involved with gangs.

If Gang Life Is So Rewarding, Why Would Four Out of Five Gang Members Discourage Their Own Children From Joining A Gang?
The survey asked "If you have or plan to have children, would you encourage them or discourage them from joining a gang". Only a fifth (20.8%, N = 388) of the gang members indicated they would actually encourage their own children to join a gang. This is not

significantly different than the 16.6 percent of gang members we previously described who said they would not mind if their child was in a gang. So there is high consistency in the response rates here for this sample.

The most important finding is that four-fifths of these gang members (79.2%, N = 1,480) would discourage their own children from joining a gang. This really tells us something about the nature of the modern authoritarian gang structure today: its appeal is not something most members would want to seriously encourage others they really love to get involved in. We feel this has the most dramatic value for sending the message to the presently non-gang involved youths in America: when you join the gang, you are joining something that most members would not want their own children involved in. This finding will become even stronger when we present the nature of the kinds of gangs we are talking about in this study.

Four-Fifths of Gang Members Do Want To Eventually Get Legally Married

A picture is starting to emerge about the what is "inside" the modern American gang member today. It is the collective "wish" that many gang members have for a conventional life. For many of them, however, we seriously wonder how viable that hope or wish might be in light of the depth they have entered the gang world.   The survey asked "do you think you will ever get legally married to someone". What we found was very conventional, and we tested this against whether the same relationship held up by comparing male and female gang members. What we found was that there is no difference at all by gender, that is if we compare male or female gang members on this issue: they are both adamant --- regardless of how gang members claim to have a "good life" in the gang, this is not a life they would want their own children living.

Overall, 80.5 percent (N = 1535) of the gang members in this sample indicated that they did in fact think that they will someday get legally married to someone. Only 19.5 percent (N = 371) did not think they would ever get legally married to someone.

The Family As A Source of Corruption: Over Two-Thirds of Gang Members Report They Have Other Family Members Who Are Also Gang Members

This is a hard piece of news to get about a social institution as sacred as the family. But it appears to be true. The family can be a corrupting force to the same extent that it can be a powerful positive force is what our data suggests. It also has dramatic implications for what we mean when we say someone has a family structure. Having a gang-infested family structure is no asset to a child in America today is another finding of our research.

The survey asked the relatively simple question "do you have family members who are in a gang". Over two-thirds (69.8%, N = 1,327) of the gang members did in fact report that they do have family members who are in a gang. Less than a third (30.2%, N = 574) reported that they did not have other family members who are in a gang.

Juvenile judges, school teachers, and others have assumed what we assumed until now: that having any kind of family that cared about a child was automatically assumed to be an asset that would contribute to the increased probability of a positive prognosis for the future of that child. We no longer assume that. We assume, rather, that like anything today: there is natural variation in everything --- and unfortunately, that also means the family. Some families can be criminogenic and an environment that could help propel youths into gangs: why? Because they would emulate what older siblings might be doing --- gang banging.

The Modern Childhood Nightmare: Parents Who Are Themselves Active Gang Members

It is not uncommon for gang members to describe their gang association as a "family thing", a kind of pseudo-family structure of support for like-minded persons who just happen to be involved in crime and violence as a way of life. As will be explained later in this report, one of the things we investigated was not just aspects about the individual gang member, we also gave much effort to finding out about the gang itself as an organizational structure. One of these questions where we asked the gang member to tell us about his/her gang dealt with the issue of parents who are themselves active gang members.

The survey asked "in your gang, are there members whose parents are also active gang members". Apparently this is not at all a rare phenomenon, in fact two-thirds of these gang members (68.3%, N = 1140) reported that in their gang there are members whose parents are also active gang members. Only 31.7 percent (N = 529) of the gang members told us that in their gang there are not members whose parents are also active gang members. We feel this particular modern nightmare deserves much more investigation in the analysis that will follow later in this report.

Most Gang Members Say Their Own Parents Disapproved of Their Gang Activity

The survey asked "in general, did your parents approve or disapprove of your own gang involvement". Only 8.2 percent (N = 137) said their parents actually approved of their gang activity. Most of the gang members (70.8%, N = 1188) said their parents disapproved of their gang activity. And 21.1 percent (N = 354) said their parents did not care one way or the other.

A Fascinating Finding: Over Two-Thirds of the Gang Members Say They Would Quit Gang Life If They Had the Chance To Get Married, Get A Steady Job, And Relocate

Maybe they are lying, maybe they are just having second thoughts about the value of gang life, or maybe they are really telling us the truth that they are human beings with normal dreams for a better life. The survey asked "would you quit gang life if you had the chance to get married, get a good steady job, and live somewhere else".

The fact is that 73.2 percent (N = 1145) of these gang members told us they would quit gang life if they could "style over" in this regard. Only a fourth (26.8%, N = 420) indicated they would not quit gang life for this image of the good life. Still, the possibilities are mind boggling if three-fourths of the gang members in American communities today could be derailed from their gang activities --- if that could be achieved, then most would agree that the gang problem could be substantially curtailed throughout the USA.

SCHOOL FACTORS

About fifteen different variables were used to examine school factors, as educational institutions, like the family as a social institution, are often look at in our society as the panacea for the prevention of a large assortment of problems. We entered this research project with a willingness to "let the chips fall where they may". Some of our hopes for the family, as seen in the previous section, quickly changed in light of the seriousness of how the gang problem has penetrated our social institutions today.

The Anatomy of Gangbanging: From Victim to Victimizer

Bullying behavior is hypothesized to figure prominently in the anatomy of gangbanging behavior. Four different questions were directed at better understanding this behavior among this large national sample of gang members. First, the survey measured whether these gang members had ever been "bullied" by anyone else while in school, and if so, the age this victimization first occurred. Secondly, the survey measured whether the gang member had

ever "bullied" anyone else, and if so when this behavior first happened.

It appears that two-fifths (41.6%, N = 814) of these gang members have been a victim of bullying behavior in school. This typically happened at about age 9, the mean or average for this sample of gang members being 9.2 years old. Thus, over half (58.4%, N = 1145) of the gang members report that they were not childhood victims of bullying behavior.

It is also clear that two-thirds (66.5%, N = 1,296) of these gang members were themselves "bullies" in school. Thus, only about a third (33.5%, N = 654) were not bullies in school. For those that were bullies in school, this behavior typically began at the age of 10.4 years of age which is the mean or average age for this sample of gang members.

Educational Attainment

The vast majority of these gang members have never completed high school or received the GED (87.4%, N = 1,681). In many of the juvenile correctional facilities these youths could work on their GED diplomas, some apparently got them. However, 95.1 percent (N = 1,588) had actually completed no higher than the 11th grade of education. The mean, or average, level of educational attainment actually completed was 9.2 years of educational training.

About Half Have Been Demoted in School

The survey asked "have you ever been demoted in school". Half (47.5%, N = 916) indicated that they have in fact been demoted in school. The other half (52.5%, N = 1011) had not been demoted in school.

Most Did Get Have The Benefit of Adult Help With Homework

While many of these gang members have had problems in school, it is simply not true that the homes they came from are to blame, at least in terms of this one variable about whether the youths had any adult in their household who helped them with their school homework. Some 72.1 percent (N = 1408) indicated they did in fact have the benefit of adult help with homework. Only about a fourth (27.9%, N = 546) did not have the benefit of this factor of adult help in their home with homework from school.

The Attention-Surplus Disorder

Certainly most Americans know have some idea what the "attention deficit" disorder, it is a kind of catchall category, not implying a lack of intellect, but it is applied to many children whom the teacher believes have a hard time focusing on what they want them to focus on. We are aware of another kind of disorder that arises when too much attention from someone in authority is given to someone who is a gang member --- we have called this the attention-surplus disorder.

The survey posed the following scenario to the gang members "when a school teacher or principal negotiates with a gang member, does this encourage more gang activity". The fact is, early experts in the field of gang intervention and prevention had emulated the mistakes that prison wardens made: negotiating with gang leaders, trying to coopt the gang by giving special attention to the gang leaders, i.e., "consulting" with the gang leaders on how to run the prison. So if one reads the gang literature closely one will find a report from the National School Safety Center on gangs recommending that a principal who wants to establish a gang prevention program should consult with "student gang leaders and solicit their support" (Stephens, 1988: p. 28).

Actually, there is an entire school of thought that believes in making concessions to gangs, as if they have earned the right to our attention by simply rising to be the threat that they are.

There is a rival school of thought, however, that believes that giving attention or recognition where it is not deserved could exacerbate the gang problem.

The results of our inquiry here do shed some light on this issue. Some 44.6 percent (N = 855) of these gang members told us that school personnel who negotiate with gang members actually encourage more gang activity. Admittedly, the gang members are divided on this issue. As just over half (55.4%, N = 1062) did not believe that teachers and principals who negotiate with gang members leads to more gang activity. However, over two-fifths of these gang members do seem to be telling us that for them at least, this surplus attention given to gang members would in fact encourage more gang activity. So, like most everything, this is not an absolute issue; it is an issue that means sometimes this type of policy of trying to negotiate with gang members could in fact backfire and actually spread fuel on the gang problem itself.

Most Gang Members Have Been Suspended From School Before

The survey asked another important question about the school experiences of gang members: "have you ever been suspended from school". It appears this must be the contemporary "red badge of courage" for gang youths or alternatively it is a quality on the resume of life experiences that makes one an ideal candidate for gravitating towards gang life. About nine out of ten gang members in our study (88.7%, N = 1727) have in fact been suspended from school. It is a rarity (11.3%, N = 220) to find a gang member who has not been suspended from school. We will want to take a closer look at this factor later in our analysis, to examine gender differences if any.

Two-Thirds of All Gang Members Have Been Expelled From School

This is the issue of school failure, not necessarily because of only low academic performance, but disciplinary problems that the youth creates in the school environment. Most students are not expelled for bad grades, bad hygiene, or bad attitudes --- they get expelled for bad behavior, which today translates into one thing: violent behavior.

The survey therefore asked "have you ever been expelled from school". Some 65.4 percent (N = 1275) of these gang members have in fact had this experience of being expelled from school. Only about a third of the gang members (34.6%, N = 675) have not been previously expelled from school.

THE ROLE OF RELIGION

Religion is one of the major social institutions of any society and therefore we also examined what role this factor played in the lives of the nearly two-thousand gang members we surveyed in 1995. We asked these gang members some simple questions that all could answer. The idea was to assess the extent to which the church could be a part of any solution to the gang problem in America today. Our results are encouraging in this respect.

We are aware of a number of initiatives that involve the role of religion in the movement of gang prevention and gang intervention. Some church-based programs have historically qualified for federal funding for gang programs. Sometimes, however, this comes under attack from those who want to see a separation of church and state.[15]

A Third of the Gang Members Have Had Some Religious Training

The survey asked "have you ever completed any religious training by a church, synagogue, or mosque". Over a third of the gang members (37.1%, N = 678) indicated that they have had the benefit of such religious training. Still, some 62.9 percent (N = 1149) reported that they had not had the benefit of such religious training.

Three-Fourths Had Positive Experiences With Churches

The survey asked "how would you rate your experiences with churches: ___Liked it ___Disliked it". Some 75.9 percent (N = 1426) of the gang members indicated that they liked their experiences with church. Only about a fourth (24.1%, N = 452) indicated that they disliked their church experiences.

Half Rarely If Ever Attend Church

The survey asked "which best describes you: ___I rarely if ever attend church ___I often attend church". Some 54.2 percent of the gang members (N = 1017) indicated that they rarely if ever attend church. Still a sizeable proportion of the gang members (45.8%, N = 859) report that they often attend church. Some of these variables about religion, we hypothesize, could figure important in explaining other aspects about the gang problem today and we shall address these in the analysis that follows later in this report.

Nine Out of Ten Gang Members Believe in God

While this aspect of gang life has not been previously investigated with the rigor of the present research effort, we feel comfortable at this point ruling out one possibility about gangs: that gang members are godless atheist heathens. The survey asked "which best describes you: ___I believe in God ___I do not believe in God". Some 89.3 percent (N = 1714) told us they do in fact believe in God. Only 10.7 percent (N = 205) indicated they do not believe in God.

Where They Expect To Go: 1/3 to Hell, 2/3 to Heaven

A final question about religion posed the following scenario to the gang members: "assume there is a God, so if you died right now, where would you go? ___To Hell ___To Heaven". About a third of the gang members (32.3%, N = 564) felt they would go to hell. Most (67.7%, N = 1184) felt they would be going to Heaven.

THE ROLE OF THE MASS MEDIA

We are especially grateful to a number of gang researchers who have encouraged us to explore the role of the mass media in relationship to gangs.[16] While much more remains to be done in regard to exploring the role of the mass media, we did make an effort to include a number of variables that addressed this important concern. So we believe some of the findings that follow may begin to shed new light on this issue.

Does Television News Coverage Encourage Others To Join The Gang?

The survey asked "do you feel that when gangs are seen on T.V. news reports that this makes people want to join gangs". Some 44.2 percent (N = 852) indicated they do feel that television news coverage will encourage others to join gangs. Still, there is not complete agreement on this, as it may obviously involve the type of coverage provided, so we are not surprised to find that 55.8 percent (N = 1074) of the gang members did not feel that television news coverage encourages others to join the gang.

Two-Thirds of All Gang Members Agree: They Like The Attention They Can Get in the News

The survey asked "do you feel that gang members like seeing themselves on the news". Obviously, this is more of an individual effect on the gang itself, perhaps as a morale booster, a kind of attention getting device. The results show that two-thirds of all gang members (65.5%, N = 1259) do in fact indicate that gang members like seeing themselves on the news. About a third (36.1%, N = 687) did not think that gang members like seeing themselves on the news. Again, perhaps it depends on the nature of the news coverage.

Nearly Two-Thirds of Gang Members Agree: They Like Seeing Themselves in the Newspapers

The survey asked "do you feel that gang members like seeing themselves in the newspapers". Here some 63.9 percent (N = 1217) of the gang members indicated they do feel that gang members like this attention they can get in the newspapers. Still, over a third (36.1%, N = 687) did not feel that gang members would like gaining this type of attention.

Half of the Gang Members Agree: They would like being a part of a "study" where an important professor might be willing to hang out with them in the hood.

Qualitative research with gang members, ethnography, barrio-ology, participant observation, the collaborationist school of gang research --- many styles of gang research involve "hanging with the homies". Most of these researchers have not told us that this was a benefit to the gang itself in terms of the attention the gang receives.

Our survey asked "do you feel that gang members would like being a part of a study where an important professor might be willing to hang out with them in the hood". The gang members are equally divided on this issue, and it deserves much closer scrutiny, perhaps beginning the analysis with whether those who like it are the younger gang members who are in fact less knowledgeable about the overall workings of the gang. Some 51.1 percent (N = 979) of the gang members rejected the idea that gang members would like being a part of such a study, getting the attention of an important professor. Still, some 48.9 percent (N = 938) said that gang members would like this kind of attention.

In a profile of the Gangster Disciples gang published recently in the <u>Journal of Gang Research</u> (1995, Fall, Volume 3, Number 1, pp. 54-74) we find another type of attention that obviously some gangs would like to get from professors: getting professors to testify on behalf of major gang leaders in a ploy to get the gang leaders paroled from prison.

Two-Fifths of Gang Members Agree: If Less Attention Was Given to Gangs in the Mass Media That Fewer People Would Join Gangs

There are many ways to interpret an issue like this. Does it mean that these particular gang members are really saying that they themselves would not have joined a gang had there not been so much media attention given to gangs in America? No, we cannot say there is that kind of direct evidence. But in mass media research, just as in advertising research, one must be able to make inferences from the general to the specific. We suspect that we may be raising a controversy here in this regard, however, we remind the reader that our study of the mass media's role in gang life is only a portion of the overall investigation made in Project GANGPINT. However, we have been able to study this issue at a greater level of methodological rigor and with a much larger national sample of actual gang members than any previous research known to us. So in this respect we are treading on new ground generally.

Our survey asked "Do you feel that if less attention was given to gangs on television, in newspapers, and in movies that fewer people would join gangs". The results show that 42 percent (N = 813) of the gang members in this study agree: less attention in the mass media would result in fewer people joining gangs. Still, over half of the gang members (N = 58%, N = 1125) did not agree that less media attention would stem the flow of youths into the open-system of gang groups and gang organizations in America today.

The Issue of Lifting the Privacy Protections Traditionally Afforded Juvenile Offenders: A Third of the Gang Members Agree It Could Discourage Juveniles From Committing

A Crime

Juveniles enjoy special rights in the criminal justice system, one of which is an overall secrecy process, where information about juveniles is prevented from being public information. This is a long-standing policy that stems from the <u>parens patriae doctrine</u> of juvenile justice: the idea that the paternalist state knows best what is in the best interests of the child. We therefore included a rather pointed question in this respect regarding the prevention or deterrence of juvenile crime.

The survey asked "if the confidentiality of juvenile court was eliminated, and the juvenile court would be open to the public and the newspapers, do you think this would discourage more juveniles from committing a crime". Just over a third (35.5%, N = 679) of the gang members indicated they did believe this would discourage more juveniles from committing a crime. Still, some 64.5 percent (N = 1235) did not agree that this would have the intended deterrent effect.

Intense News Coverage of A Gang Appears to Have An Intense Benefit to the Gang

Finally, our survey used the following vignette: "where there is intense news coverage of your gang, what effect does this have on your gang". Three separate scenarios in terms of outcomes were then assessed.

The first scenario asked them if it resulted in "makes them proud" or "makes them embarrassed". The results here show that 71.1 percent felt such intense news coverage makes the gang members proud. Only 28.9 percent felt it was an embarrassment.

The second scenario asked them if the intense media coverage makes "more members get involved" in the gang, or makes "fewer members get involved" in the gang. Some 72.9 percent of the gang members studied here indicated it makes more members get involved in the gang. Only 27.1 percent felt it reduced members getting involved in the gang.

The third scenario was directed specifically at gang recruitment and asked whether "more new members join" or "fewer new members join" the gang. Here the results seem very clear: 79.4 percent said "more new members join". Only 20.6 percent indicated that "fewer new members join". We would interpret this as evidence of the attention-surplus disorder: some types of attention while intended as having a detrimental effect on the gang, appear to the gang members themselves to have a positive effect or add strength to the vitality of the gang itself!

BELIEFS ABOUT GANG PREVENTION: VIEWS FROM THE GANG MEMBERS WHO MIGHT KNOW

About sixteen different questions were developed to examine different aspects of gang prevention and gang prevention --- about as many researchers who contributed their different hypotheses for this large national study of gangs and what can be done about the gang problem in America. While about three-fourths of all cities in the United States today have some level of a gang presence or gang problem, and that therefore there are literally thousands of programs, persons, and agencies trying to do something about the gang problem, it is curious that not much attention has previously been given to the viewpoints of gang members themselves in terms of what should be done. We are aware of smaller local or provincial studies, that sometimes have qualitative data or impressions about what a small handful of gang members might feel about these issues, however our study includes something no other study has previously attempted: breadth and depth on the issue. For breadth, we have about two thousand gang members we got data from, from many areas of the USA, and representing literally all the major American gangs today. For depth, we have not asked one simple question, we have asked a number of different questions as will be seen.

Only Half Agree: Programs Can Effectively Prevent Kids From Getting Involved in Gangs

It is worthwhile to be realistic in the field of crime prevention, just as it is good to know those things that can be changed and those things that cannot be changed --- and presumably the wisdom to recognize the difference between the two. The survey asked "do you think that programs could be effective in preventing kids from getting involved in gangs". The gang members are evenly divided on this issue. Half (47.2%, N = 921) did not believe programs can be effective in preventing kids from getting involved in gangs. Half (52.8%, N= 1031) did believe that programs can be effective in this regard.

Only Half Agree That Gang Prevention Programs Can Prevent Kids From Joining A Gang

The survey also asked "do you think gang prevention programs can be effective in preventing persons from joining a gang". Again, the issue is a coin toss from the perspective of this large national sample of gang members. Half (49.9%, N = 974) believe gang prevention programs cannot really prevent kids at all from joining a gang. Half (50.1%, N = 976) did believe that gang prevention programs could be effective in preventing kids from joining a gang.

A CURRENT REAL STORY ON GANG PREVENTION SERVICES:

Tommie is 14 years old, a Filipino living on Chicago's northwest side. This is not an atypical call that comes to the National Gang Crime Research Center. This call was from a minister who had just discovered what is happening to Tommy.

"There is a Vietnamese gang that is trying to recruit Tommy, and there is a Filipino gang that is trying to recruit him too, both gang operate in the same neighborhood, and because Tommy has not joined either yet, both gangs are assaulting him to and from school. What programs in Chicago could help Tommy?", the minister asked.

I told the minister, sadly, most programs in his area work only with the active gang members, it is a gang outreach program, so he would have to already be in the gang to benefit from their services. The minister was chagrined.

I told the minister that what he needed was called "emergency gang recruitment suppression intervention", a service not offered by most "gang programs" in Chicago. I did mention the one program that does this work, but which is not funded and therefore acts in a volunteer capacity. I mentioned that ideally the intervention should include the police, because the aggressive gang recruitment effort by the two gangs to enlist Tommy is a crime specifically known as "conscripting" or "drafting", and is on the books in Illinois for "compelling gang or organizational membership".

The minister's faith was shaken, "give me the names and numbers of the largest gang programs in Chicago then". Which I did. I explained, that the best was a university type of experiment, but it existed only in a Hispanic neighborhood, and it did not deal with preventing gang recruitment, it was aimed at working with known hard core gang members. I explained the two programs existed in Tommy's neighborhood, one was a gang outreach program and one was a service program for gang members. The gang outreach program sent street workers or gang outreach workers to certain neighborhoods to talk with local gang members, they try to "keep the peace in the hood". The other program tried to get gang members GED's and jobs.

The exasperated minister said "This does not make sense, just what the hell are they

helping the gang for, they need to be helping kids stay out of the gang".

How Gang Members Feel About Five Contemporary Prevention Issues

Five different questions, each using the identical type of response modes, were used to also study the viewpoints of gang members on the issues of gang prevention and gang intervention. These results have been summarized in Table 1.

As seen in Table 1, only 29.4 percent of our large sample of gang members actually agreed or strongly agreed with the idea that gang problems can be prevented by school education. Most of the gang members did not accept this viewpoint at all. Nearly half (45.3%) clearly disagreed or strongly disagreed with the assumption that gang problems can be prevented by means of school education.

As seen in Table 1, less than a third of these gang members (30.9%) believed that gang problems could be prevented by means of effective drug prevention and drug education. This does not bode well knowing that the number one most frequently list "anti-gang" strategy currently being used by law enforcement agencies throughout the United States is the "DARE" program (see Project Georgia95; Project Wisconsin95; Knox, 1995).

There is another piece of bad news in Table 1, this is for those in the gang research and gang intervention arena who assume that the gang problem can be eliminated just by eliminating some magical single source problem like poverty. It just ain't so, according to our data. And this is the largest single study of actual gang members on this issue that has yet surfaced in the literature. It also has some implications for theorists who believe that the fundamental cause of gang crime problems can be traced to the door of poverty. We have the beliefs of nearly two thousand gang members for this issue (N = 1925) of the role of poverty, and these gang members are giving us another perspective entirely. As seen in Table 1, when asked if they believe that the real cause of gang problems is poverty, only 38 percent agree or strongly agree --- just as many disagree or strongly disagree! We do not have strong support one way or the other here.

Table 1 does lend some support for the idea that job training and employment opportunities are the best solution to the gang problem. At least here we find about half of the gang members (49.1%, N = 952) agreeing or strongly agreeing to this intervention philosophy. Still, the other half are either uncertain or disagree to some extent.

Finally, Table 1 provides the results from asking these gang members whether they believe that strict law enforcement is the best solution to the gang problem. Clearly, 52.5 percent of the gang members disagreed or strongly disagreed with the idea that strict law enforcement is the best solution to the gang problem, which is not necessarily a surprise to us. What is interesting is that a fourth (27.1%) agreed that a pure suppression policy could be the best policy.

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE BELIEFS ABOUT VARIOUS GANG PREVENTION STRATEGIES FROM A LARGE NATIONAL SAMPLE OF GANG MEMBERS

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I feel that gang problems can be prevented by school education.	14.3	15.1	25.3	20.8	24.5
I feel that gang problems can be prevented by means of effective drug prevention and drug education.	12.4	18.5	25.7	23.7	19.7
I feel that the real cause of gang problems is poverty.	16.3	21.7	24.8	21.2	15.9
I feel that job training and employment opportunities are the best solution to the gang problem.	22.4	26.6	24.0	17.5	9.4
I feel that strict law enforcement is the best solution to the gang problem.	10.7	16.5	20.4	24.2	28.3

Between A Fourth to a Third of Gang Members Think Common Approaches Are A Waste of Time for Kids At Risk of Joining a Gang

Table 1 presents the results of three additional variables about the value of intervention and prevention services designed for kids at risk of gang membership. The respondents in Table 1 have the unique ability to speak to this issue, having been at one time themselves simply "at risk" of gang membership, and having made the transition into gang life itself.

As seen in Table 1, a third of these gang members (33.6%) agree that educational programs are a waste of time for kids at risk of gang membership. Still, two-thirds disagree (66.4%).

A third of these gang members (36.9%) also believe that counseling programs are a waste of time for kids at risk of gang membership. Still, nearly two-thirds (63.1%) disagree.

Finally, a fourth of these gang members (25.6%) believe that job training programs are also a waste of time for kids at risk of gang membership. Still, three-fourths (74.4%) disagree.

The overall net effect here is consistent, however, the majority of the gang members do not view these initiatives as a waste of time for kids at risk of joining a gang. And that we view as good news.

TABLE 2

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTIONS FOR HOW GANG MEMBERS FEEL ABOUT THE PREVENTION VALUE OF EDUCATIONAL, COUNSELING, AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

	AGREE		DISAGREE	
	N	%	N	%
For kids at risk of joining a gang, getting involved in educational programs is a waste of time.	653	33.6	1289	66.4
For kids at risk of joining a gang, getting involved in counseling programs is a waste of time.	717	36.9	1228	63.1
For kids at risk of joining a gang, getting involved in job training programs is a waste of time.	500	25.6	1450	74.4

Ratings About the Efficacy of Recreational Like the YMCA

The survey asked "to what extent are recreational programs like the YMCA good for preventing kids from joining a gang".[17] We were fortunate to have used a complete scale of responses this kind of rating. The respondent was asked to circle one number that came closest to their rating for the efficacy of recreational programs like the YMCA as programs for preventing kids from joining a gang. The results of this question are provided in Table 3.

TABLE 3

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION FOR
SCALE SCORE RESPONSE RATINGS:
THE VIEWPOINTS OF N = 1,402 GANG MEMBERS ON
WHETHER RECREATIONAL PROGRAMS LIKE THE YMCA
ARE EFFECTIVE IN KEEPING KIDS OUT OF GANGS

Not good at all
for preventing
kids from
joining gangs

Rating	N	%
0	166	11.8
1	88	6.3
2	69	4.9
3	137	9.8
4	135	9.6
5	302	21.5
6	124	8.8
7	91	6.5
8	84	6.0
9	40	2.9
10	166	11.8

Very good at
preventing kids
from joining gangs

As seen in Table 3, a normal distribution exists here, with both extreme views of ineffectiveness and high effectiveness, with most ratings clustering near the middle of the scale. The mean or average scale score for Table 3 was 4.6 on a zero to ten point score, the higher the score the higher the estimated effectiveness of recreational programs in terms of preventing kids from joining a gang.

Half of the Gang Members Question The Effectiveness of Social Workers
Three different questions were directed at the effectiveness of social workers in various roles of gang prevention and gang intervention. The results of these questions for gang members are provided in Table 4.

TABLE 4

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Beliefs About
The Effectiveness of Social Workers in Gang Prevention
Among A Large National Sample of Gang Members

	NO		YES	
	N	%	N	%
Do you think social workers can be effective in reaching out to persons who might want to quit the gang?	829	43.0	1099	57.0
Do you think social workers can be effective in helping kids stay out of gangs?	930	49.1	966	50.9
Do you think that recreation programs, after school programs, or social workers might have been able to prevent you from joining a gang?	1016	52.8	908	47.2

As seen in Table 4, we really have a rather divided set of beliefs on the effectiveness of social workers in all areas of potential prevention and intervention impact. Overall, about half of the gang members believe social workers can be effective, and about half do not believe social workers can be effective in these capacities of: (1) reaching out to persons who might want to quit the gang, (2) helping kids stay out of gangs, and (3) whether they themselves would could have been prevented from joining a gang.

What the findings in Table 4 demonstrate is that when we ask nearly two thousand gang members themselves, only about half believe that a social worker can have any meaningful impact on their lives. Half do not believe a social worker can be effective in these three common roles of combatting the modern gang problem.

We recognize, however, that these findings may have their best interpretation as covert measures of the "approachability" of the gang members themselves to such initiatives: that is, the extent to which they recognize the potential positive value of social workers they may also be saying their are themselves amenable to such efforts. Further analysis is warranted on these variables, and we promise in later sections of this report to address this matter. One hypothesis might be that these three measures are really surrogate measures of the willingness of the gang members to enter into anti-gang counseling. How these variables correlate, for example, with attempts to quit the gang should provide some valuable insights into these gang members. But this analysis must wait for a later chapter.

Program Preferences From Gang Members on Gang Prevention

The researchers in this study were well aware of the kinds of programs currently being used in the war against gangs nationwide. The researchers therefore developed a special question that sought to obtain the preference function of a large sample of gang members on what single program service component would be most effective in getting young people to

stay out of gangs.

The question and its instructions read as follows: "what is the ONE best kind of program you think is most effective in getting young people to stay out of gangs? (Check ONE answer ONLY)". The five choices included: employment, counseling programs, live-in residential programs with counseling and education, vocational/education programs, and a social worker who works with youngsters in the neighborhoods.

The single largest preference (39.4%, N = 667) was for "employment" services.

There was a tie for second-place: about a fifth (20.4%, N = 346) thought the most effective service was that of a live-in residential program with counseling and education; also about a fifth (20.3%, N = 344) thought that a social worker who works with youngsters in the neighborhood was the most effective service.

Clear losers in this race were: "counseling programs" (9.9%, N = 167) and "vocational/education programs" (9.9%, N = 344).

From the viewpoint of nearly two-thousand young persons who should know then, employment is the component of choice for preventing kids from joining a gang.

Three-Fourths of the Gang Members Believe That Most People in Gangs Want Out Sooner Or Later

Some 74.7 percent (N = 1414) of the gang members in this study indicated that they agree that "most people in gangs want out sooner or later". Only a fourth (25.3%, N = 478) did not agree that most gang members want to eventually leave the gang. So, from this perspective it would appear that even once an individual is on the "gang ladder": that is, climbing up the successive stages of being a threat and risk to self, to the community, to public safety, etc --- for a substantial number of these gang members, the gang appears to lack a lifelong commitment! That is good news for purposes of tertiary prevention services. It would appear to justify some sophisticated, but potentially costly, efforts at inducing gang defection. We can, as will be seen, only recommend that such programs be accountable in terms of a strategic gang abatement plan that uses a professional gang assessment technology to identify potential candidates for such a program. Historically in American social services, any client who steps forward and volunteers for the help is automatically ruled eligible for the services. We believe some serious screening must be undertaken, based on classification and assessment, in order to make the benefits outweigh the costs of such endeavors. That means using criteria for maximizing the potential impact of the program, it means identifying by objective assessment procedures, those who can be potentially "flipped" out of gang life. It means, conversely, rejecting those candidates whose assessment does not justify intervention based on the low probability of a favorable outcome adjustment from the intervention.

Three-Fifths Do Not Believe a Boot Camp Could Influence People to Get Out of A Gang

The survey asked "do you think a boot camp could influence some people to get out of a gang". The results show that 60.1 percent (N = 1149) do not believe a boot camp could influence someone to "drop their flag". Still over a third (39.9%, N = 764) of these gang members did believe a boot camp might be able to break the hold that a gang has on some people.

THE VALUE OF A REAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT: LOOKING AT THE SERVICE UTILIZATION BACKGROUNDS IN THE GANG MEMBER POPULATION

For the individual gang member, as for anyone in the offender population, a proper needs assessment begins with the social service history of the person. That means ascertaining what programs and treatments has the individual previously been through? What has not yet been

tried?

The greatest moral abomination of our times is that the gang problem has in recent years come to affect the lives of so very many American citizens and the hard research into what can or cannot work --- and a national needs assessment is the first step in that direction --- has been so abysmally absent. Rather than focusing on what works in the natural recurring order of social service intervention arrangements, those actors already positioned to potentially be mobilized in the war against gangs, much of the federal research initiative related to evaluation has been either that directed down deadends or focusing on pet programs of unproven worth. Many of the present authors are not confident that the best interests of the American public are served when government agencies that award such "gang research contracts" are subject to political preferences: that is, until a true competitive procurement system is in place. It is not in place at present. Federal agencies like NIJ and DHHS and others do not have true competitive bidding, and often use a research proposal review system that relies on Washington, D.C.-based consulting firms that can manipulate the federal procurement system to their own benefit.

A Big Long List of Previous Intervention Experiences

Table 5 presents the long list of factors the present researchers measured on these gang members in terms of whether or not they had ever previously benefited from these intervention experiences.

TABLE 5

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Whether
The Gang Members Have Previously Benefited From
Twelve Different Types of Services and Programs

	NO		YES	
	N	%	N	%
Used crisis hotline	1635	84.1	308	15.9
Court-mandated therapy	849	46.3	985	53.7
Ever in group therapy	930	47.4	1034	52.6
Ever has 1-on-1 professional tutor	1286	66.2	658	33.8
Ever in a drug/substance abuse counseling program	1117	57.7	818	42.3
Ever in a job skills program	1093	55.9	861	44.1
Ever in a job training program	1158	59.8	778	40.2
Were parents active in the PTA	1339	71.1	544	28.9
Ever involved in any counseling program	782	40.3	1159	59.7
Ever involved in the big brother/big sister program	1569	80.7	375	19.3

Ever involved in the YMCA recreation program	1091	56.3	846	43.7
Ever complete the D.A.R.E. anti-drug abuse program	1059	54.6	880	45.4

Local or National "Crisis" Hotline Telephone Services

These have always been popular since the advent of telephone answering machines and switchboards. Our survey therefore asked "have you ever called a local or national hotline telephone number seeking help with a personal problem". The vast majority of these gang members (84.1%, N = 1635) never used a crisis hotline service. Only 15.9 percent of these gang members were the type to call a crisis hotline telephone service for help with a personal problem. We have not mentioned this until now, but we do have a large non-gang member sample, so it will be of some interest on this and other variables to see if any significant differences emerge from comparisons between gang and non-gang youths. That will, however, have to wait for a subsequent section of this report.

High Prevalence of Mental Health Services

The survey asked "have you ever been in court-mandated psychological counseling or therapy".[18] What this usually means is the juvenile judge makes an agreement with the juvenile delinquent to enter some kind of "treatment" and the sentence will be suspended on the finding of delinquency. It is a kind of probation sanction, one of a host of diversions from a sentence of incarceration in the juvenile correctional system.

About half (53.7%, N = 985) of these gang members report that they have in fact been in such court-mandated psychological counseling or therapy. Apparently it didn't do any good. Because most of these are gang members in trouble with the law.

About half of the gang members (46.3%, N = 849) have been untouched by such mental health services.

Half of the Gang Members Have Previously Been in Group Therapy

Some 52.7 percent (N = 985) of these gang members report that they have been involved in group therapy before. The other half (47.4%, N = 930) have not been previously involved in group therapy. The scope and extent of this previous experience with group therapy is consistent with the level of court-mandated psychological counseling found in an earlier variable.

A Third of the Gang Members Have Previously Had a One-on-One Professional Tutor

A third of the gang members in this national research project (33.8%, N = 658) indicated that they have in fact previously had the benefit of a one-on-one professional tutor. Most of these gang members (66.2%, N = 1,286) have not had this previous service experience.

It is possible to test some implications of this variable, as others, by examining this intervention experience in relationship to other known educational outcomes: the lag in educational attainment by one's age-grade level, being suspended from school, being expelled from school, etc.

Two-Fifths Have Been in a Substance Abuse Counseling Program.

Two-fifths (42.3%, N = 818) of the gang members in our study report that they have previously been in a drug/substance abuse counseling program. Several of the researchers who have previously studied the drug abuse history of this same population (Knox and Tromanhauser, 1991; Knox, Laske, and Tromanhauser, 1992; Morris, et al, 1995) would

probably argue that this same population has a higher rate of eligibility for such programs than this rate of utilization. Over half (57.7%, N = 1,117) of the gang members indicated they had not been in such a substance abuse counseling program in the past.

Two-Fifths Have Been in a Job Skills Program
Two-fifths of these gang members (44.1%, N = 861) report that they have previously been in a job skills program. Similarly, some 55.9 percent (N = 1093) indicated they have not in the past been involved in a job skills program.

Two-Fifths Have Been in a Job Training Program
Two-fifths of these gang members (40.2%, N = 778) also report that they have previously been involved in a job training program. Thus, 59.9 percent (N = 1,158) of the gang members indicated they have not had the benefit of previously being involved in a job training program.

A Fourth Had Parents Active in the PTA
Only about a fourth of these gang members (28.9%, N = 544) indicated that their parents are or were active in the PTA. Thus, for most of the gang members (71.1%, N = 1,339) apparently their parents were active in something other than the Parent's Teacher's Association in their respective national neighborhoods.

About Three-Fifths Have Been Involved in A Counseling Program Before
As seen in Table 5, some 59.7 percent (N = 1,159) of these gang members have previously been involved in some kind of counseling program. Some 40.3 percent of the gang members (N= 782) indicated they had never been involved in a counseling program.

Four-Fifths Have Never Been Involved in the Big Brother/Big Sister Program
Most of these gang members (80.7%, N = 1,569) report that they have never been involved in a big brother/big sister program. Only a fifth (19.3%, N = 375) indicated they had the benefit of this type of social service.

Two-Fifths Have Been Involved in a YMCA Recreation Program Before
Some 43.7 percent (N = 846) of the gang members reported that they had the benefit of YMCA recreational programs. Just over half of the gang members (56.3%, N= 1,091) indicated that they had not previously had the benefit of YMCA recreational programs.

Two-Fifths Have Been Completed the D.A.R.E. Anti-Drug Abuse Program
Of some interest, 45.4 percent (N = 880) of these gang members reported that they had completed the D.A.R.E. anti-drug abuse program. Similarly, 54.6 percent (N = 1,059) indicated they had not completed the famous DARE program.

GANG INVOLVEMENT THROUGH THE HUMAN DEVELOPMENT LIFESPAN
Through a series of questions that were interspersed throughout the survey instrument, this research has been able to put together the first human development lifespan approach to the understanding of the modern American gang member. Figure 3 below presents a summary of these major milestones in the life event history of our large national sample of gang members from 8 states.

FIGURE 3
Mean Ages For Major Life Events Among A

Large National Sample of Gang Members

Mean Age	Major Event in Gang Involvement
8.9	First heard anything about "gangs".
9.2	First "bullied" in school context.
9.2	First met someone in a gang.
10.4	First "bullied" someone else in school.
11.3	First fired a pistol or revolver.
11.3	First saw killing or injury from gang violence.
12.0	First joined the gang.
12.0	First arrested for any criminal offense.
12.3	First got their own real gun.
13.0	First got a permanent tattoo.
16.5	Current actual age of the gang member.
24.1	Age they expect to first get married.
26.1	Age they expect to quit the gang.
59.5	Age they expect to die.

Age First Heard Anything About Gangs

The survey asked "how old were you when you first heard anything about gangs? When I was _____ years old". The results ranged from a low of 1 to a high of 21 years, with a mean or average age of 8.9 years. But some trends were apparent here. Half (51.8%) had first heard anything about gangs before the age of nine years old. Some 88.1 percent had first heard something about gangs before they were 13 years old. By age eleven, 79.1 percent had already first heard something about gangs.

Age First Met A Gang Member

The survey asked "how old were you when you first met someone who was in a gang? When I was ___ years old". The results ranged from a low of 1 to a high of 32 years, with a mean or average age of 9.2 years. But some trends were apparent here too. Some 83.6 percent had first met a gang member before they were 13 years old. So most first met a gang member when they were probably still in elementary school.

Age First Fired a Pistol or Revolver

The survey asked "how old were you when you first fired a pistol or revolver" _____ years old or ___ Never did it". Only about 14.2 percent indicated they had never fired a pistol or revolver. Which leaves age data available for N = 1573. For this group who had fired a pistol or revolver (N = 1573), the results ranged from a low of 1 to a high of 21 years of age, with a mean or average of 11.3 years. Half (53.9%) had first fired a pistol or revolver before the age of 13.

Age First Saw Someone Killed or Seriously Injured by Gang Violence

The survey asked "how old were you when you first saw someone killed or seriously injured by gang violence. ___ years old or ___ never". Some 16.5 percent claimed never to have seen anyone killed or seriously injured by gang violence. Thus, data was available for a total of N = 1569 on this variable for age of first seeing gang trauma. The results ranged from a low of 1 to a high of 26 years old, with a mean or average of 11.3 years old. Some 64 percent had first seen gang trauma before the age of 14. Half (48.9%) had first seen gang

trauma before they were 13 years of age.

Age They Were First Bullied By Anyone
The survey asked "at what age were you first bullied by someone in school". The results ranged from a low of 3 to a high of 19, with a mean or average of 9.2 years old. Half (51.9%) had first been bullied before the age of 10. Some 88.3 percent had first been bullied before the age of 13. Bullying behavior like a lot of other behavior would appear to need most prevention and intervention in the elementary school years.

Age They First Bullied Someone Else
The survey asked "at what age did you first bully someone else in school". The results ranged from a low of 3 to a high of 18, with a mean or average of 10.4 years old. Some 72.5 percent had first bullied someone else before the age of 13, that is from 3 to 12 years old! We suspect this bullying behavior to be a variable that may tend to help explain variations in other violent behavior by these gang members, but this will have to wait until a later chapter in this report.

Current Age of the Gang Members
The survey asked "how old are you today in years. I am ___ years old". The results ranged from a low of 10 to a high of 56 years old, with the mean or average of 16.5 years old. Some 93.3 percent were teenagers, that is 13 to 19 years of age. Only 1.3 percent were 12 or under. Only 4.1 percent were 20 or older.

Age First Got a Permanent Tattoo
The survey asked "at what age did you first get a permanent tattoo. When I was ____ years old". The results ranged from a low of 1 to a high of 27 years of age, with a mean or average age of 13.0 years old. Half (50.5%) had first got a permanent tattoo before the age of 14. The ages of 12 through 16 appear to be the tattoo years, as this age range accounted for 76.3 percent of all cases.

Age First Arrested for Any Crime
The survey asked "at what age were you first arrested? When I was ___ years old". The results ranged from a low of 5 to a high of 38, with the mean or average being 12.0 years old. Some 80.1 percent had been arrested before the age of 15. Half (49.9%) had first been arrested before the age of 13. By the way, the mean or average number of times previously arrested for this sample of gang members was 13.6 prior arrests.

Age They Expect to Get Legally Married to Someone
The survey asked "at what age will you ever get legally married to someone. When I am ____ years old". The results ranged from a low of 16 to a high of 60 years old, with a mean or average of 24.1 years. Some 83.3 percent thought they would be married before the age of 30. Half (52.6%) thought they would be married before the age of 24.

Age First Got A Real Gun
The survey asked "at what age did you get your first real gun? When I was ___ years old or ___Does not apply". Some 17.8 percent indicated this does not apply, that is they never had a real gun of their own. Thus, age data was available on N = 1423 gang members. Here the age of first getting a real gun of their own ranged from a low of 6 to a high of 42, with a mean or average of 12.3 years old.

Age First Joined A Gang

The survey asked "at what age did you join a gang? When I was ____ years old". The results ranged from a low of 5 to a high of 32, with a mean or average of 12.0 years. Half (48.1%) had joined before they were 13 years old. The primary gang joining years appear to be age 11 through 15, which accounts for 73.1 percent of the cases! If we could only insulate our youths for this four year period, perhaps through some type of national service program designed for children at risk of gang membership, we could effectively cut-off the vast reservoir of most new gang recruits to the modern gang. The gang, as an open-system, depends on such new recruits to stay in business. Without new recruits the gang, like any other social group or social organization, would cease to function effectively. One of the primary goals of gang suppression and gang prevention is to make sure the gang does not function effectively: particularly at attracting new gang recruits!

Age These Gang Members Think They Will Die

The survey asked "at what age do you think you will die. When I am ____ years old." No doubt about it, this question provoked the most panic and hostile reactions among the gang members. It struck a painful spot in their psyche. The results ranged from a low of 16 to a high of 100, with a mean or average age of 59.5 years old. A third of the these gang members did not believe they would live to be 40 years old. A fourth of these gang members (25.1%) did not believe they would live to see their 28th birthday!

Age The Gang Members Believe They Will Quit The Gang

The survey asked "at what age do you think you will quit the gang. When I am ____ years old". The results ranged from a low of 10 to a high of 100, with a mean or average of 26.1 years old. Some 70.2 percent thought they might actually quit the gang before their 22nd birthday.

PERSONALITY FACTORS

Several variables were used in the survey that provide insights on the personality of the gang members. These personality factors were hypothesizes introduced into the research project on the basis that differences in personality traits may produce differences in the degree to which gang members have taken advantage of certain social services. It is also possible that these personality factors could play a role as variables that interact with experience in the gang.

Belief In Luck As A Subcultural Value

The survey asked the respondents to agree or disagree with the following statement: "success is more dependent on luck than on real ability".[19] Most of the gang members in this sample disagreed (62.7%, N = 1208). However, a sizeable proportion of the gang members did agree with this belief (37.3%, N = 720) making it potentially worthy as a variable for further analysis.

Most Gang Members Worry About The Future Facing Today's Children

The survey asked the respondents to indicate if they felt the following statement was true or false: "I worry about the future facing today's children".[20] We appear to have hit some underlying dimension of strong beliefs among these gang members, because most (80.7%, N = 1,575) of the gang members felt this statement was true. Only a fifth of the gang members (19.3%, N = 377) indicated that they do not worry about the future facing today's children.

Authoritarian Stereotypy Among Gang Members

The survey asked the gang members whether they agreed or disagreed with the following statement: "people can be divided into two distinct classes: the weak and the strong".[21] Some 62.1 percent (N = 1176) of the gang members agreed with this authoritarian stereotypic generalization about human beings. Some 37.9 percent (N = 718) of the gang members disagreed with this idea that all people can be divided into two classes: the weak, and the strong.

THE NATURE OF THEIR PERSONAL EXPERIENCES IN THE GANG

In this chapter, we are only describing the background and characteristics of the gang member sample in our research. So there are a great many factors that must be summarized here about their own unique experiences in gang life. A subsequent section will examine a wide range of variables that sought to understand the nature of the gang as an organization itself based on the information supplied from these same respondents. Recall that all of the N = 1,994 respondents being discussed in this chapter are self-reported gang members: they admit simply to having ever joined a gang. We will later see that some of these are now inactive.

Almost All Have Gang Friends

A question we have replicated in the present research from our previous projects is a variable predictive of gang membership itself. It is the question "how many of your close friends and associates are gang members?" The forced choice response modes provided for options as follows: zero, one, two, three, four, and five or more. Only 3.7 percent indicated that they had no such gang friends, this is logically possible because such a gang member could have now denounced his/her gang and disassociated with it. Some 11.6 percent of the gang members indicated they had between one to four such gang friends. The vast majority of the gang members (84.7%, N = 1,573) indicated that they had "five or more" gang friends.

Age They First Joined the Gang

Table 6 provides the complete age distribution for the time at which these persons first joined a gang. As seen in Table 6, some joined as early as age 5, perhaps as "peewees", or perhaps they grew up in a gang. A clear trend exists here: almost all of these gang members, some 99 percent first joined the gang on or before the age of 17. The years of greatest risk for gang joining behavior appear to be ages 11 to 15. Some 93.4 percent of the respondents indicated they had already joined the gang by the age of 15. So from a prevention point of view, seeing that most gang members join before the age of 16, these years of puberty to about 16 are those most vulnerable to the threat of gang recruitment.

Clearly, as well from Table 6, gang prevention needs to start in Kindergarten and continue through the elementary school years to effectively prevent modern children from joining a gang. Almost a third of these gang members (32.4%) had first joined the gang before their 12th birthday.

TABLE 6

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION FOR THE
AGE AT WHICH THESE GANG MEMBERS FIRST JOINED A GANG

Age Period	N	%
5	26	1.6
6	18	1.1
7	30	1.8
8	52	3.2
9	65	4.0
10	142	8.7
11	200	12.2
12	258	15.7
13	358	21.8
14	244	14.8
15	143	8.7
16	69	4.2
17	25	1.5
18	7	.4
19	4	.2
20	2	.1
32	1	.1

What Gang Names Are Represented in This Sample
   We believe, quite literally, all major criminal gangs: it is a ten page long list. It includes all major gangs in the communities and correctional environments, from the Aryan Brotherhood to White Fence, many sets of Crips and Bloods, most all of the People and Folks gangs. It includes a couple hundred Gangster Disciples, lots of Latin Kings and Black P. Stone Nation gang members. Several hundred 200 different gangs are represented in this sample.

What Gang "Nations" Are Represented in This Sample
   Several gang "nations" exist, these are patterns of affiliation, that represent an umbrella identity. Table 7 provides the distribution by known gang nation affiliation for our sample. As can be seen in Table 7, about a third of the gang members in this sample are "Folks". There are few Nortenos, but the rule of thumb is that Surenos do substantially outnumber Nortenos; just as Crips outnumber Bloods. The "other" category includes extremist gangs and white gangs like the Aryan Brotherhood, as well as motorcycle gang groups.

TABLE 7

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of The Gang Nation
Affiliations Within The Sample of Gang Members

	N	%
Crips	267	15.7
Folks	563	33.2
Bloods	143	8.4
Peoples	304	17.9
Surenos	221	13.0
Nortenos	16	.9
Other	183	10.8
	------	-------
Totals	1,697	100.0

Tenure in The Gang: Number of Years of Gang Involvement
A separate question asked the gang members "how many years have you been in a gang during your entire life". The results show that their time in the gang ranged from within the last month or to a high of 32 years ago. As a trend, some 40.2 percent of these gang members had been in a gang for five years or more. The mean or average tenure in the gang was 4.5 years.

Current Active Gang Membership
While all of the gang members in the sample studied in this chapter have joined a gang at some time in their life, it is another matter as to whether they are currently still active in their respective gang organizations. So the survey asked the follow-up question "are you currently a member of any gang group or gang organization". The results show that 71.9 percent (N = 1389) are reporting that they are still active gang members. About a fourth (28.1%, N = 542) indicated that they are not currently active gang members.

Not Currently Active, But Separately Report They Are Still Gang Associates
From the preceding finding, we found some N = 542 gang members who indicated they were not current members. We can now take advantage of a separate question designed to isolate those who have not completely "dropped their flag", that is resigned from the gang totally, but who are simply now gang associates. So the survey asked the additional question "do you consider yourself a current associate of any gang group or gang organization". So within the N = 542 respondents who had joined a gang but who had indicated they were not current members, what we find now is that N = 153 of these are reporting that they are in fact gang associates. That leaves only N = 389 in our gang sample who are neither active members or active associates of the gang.

Surprise: Nearly Half Have Tried to Quit the Gang
The survey asked "have you ever attempted to quit the gang". Some 46.7 percent (N = 864) of these gang members indicated that they have in fact attempted to quit the gang. The other half (53.3%, N = 987) have never attempted to quit the gang.

Two-Thirds Have Held "Rank" or Leadership in Their Gang

The survey asked "have you ever held rank or any leadership position in any gang". Two-thirds (65.3%, N = 1,242) of the gang members report that they have in fact held "rank" or a leadership position in their gang.   Only a third of the gang members (34.7%, N = 661) indicated that they have never held rank or any leadership position in the gang.

We will find later in this report how this variable helps to differentiate between the various "gradations" of gang involvement even among gang members. It is a very important variable in the gang risk continuum.

Two-Fifths Have Been "Violated" By Their Gang

The survey asked "have you ever been violated (received a beating) by your own gang for a violation". Some 44.3 percent (N = 799) of the gang members indicated that they had in fact experienced this violent internal disciplinary procedure commonly used by American gangs today. Just over half of the gang members (55.7%, N = 1003) reported that they had not been violated by their own gang.

Over Half of the Gang Members Indicate Their Gang Has a Special Language Code

This is a huge area that has not been researched, and even less is known where it should probably have emerged (i.e., among qualitative gang researchers). There are thousands of such special codes used by gangs, all common words and expressions and letters having special double meaning to the gang members. For example, a hat bearing the expression "South Central Love" is really a Crip representation, where "Love" has special meaning: it means Let Our Vision Educate.

The survey asked "does your gang have a special language code". Some 58.9 percent (N = 1082) of the gang members indicated their gang does have such a language code. Some 41.1 percent (N = 756) indicated their gang does not have a language code.

A gang with a language code is more complex as a social formation than a gang without it. So, this variable, like many we used in Project GANGPINT will help us to examine the variation in the sophistication of gangs as groups and organizations.

Two-Thirds of the Gang Members Indicate That Their Gang Has Written Rules

The survey asked "does your gang have written rules". Some 66.1 percent (N = 1212) indicated their gang does in fact have written rules. Only a third (33.9%, N = 621) of the gang members indicated their gang does not have written rules.

This too is a variable that helps us to measure the organizational complexity of the gang. Obviously, a gang without rules is probably more fluid, perhaps even more horizontal in structure, and could be more loose knit. Conversely, a gang with written rules may be a more tightly knit group. There is no argument on the issue of organizational sophistication: a gang with written rules is more complex as a social form than one without the benefit of a written code of conduct for its members. We will later see how this kind of variable figures in the "gang risk continuum".

Most Gangs Are Adult Controlled Groups and Organizations

The term "youth gang" is itself somewhat of a misnomer when it comes to the major gangs in America today. True that most gang members are themselves young, typically teenagers. However, we have seen from other sources that the real leaders at the top of these major gangs are in fact older adults, many in their forties and even older. So where we have a gang where most of the members are youths, but the real top leaders are middle-aged adults, is it really a "youth" gang when adults drive the enterprise?

Little data has existed nationally on this issue until the present. Our survey therefore

asked the question "does your gang have adult leaders who have been in the gang for many years". The results show that 84.8 percent (N = 1556) of the gang members in our sample indicated that their gang does in fact have such older adult leaders. Only 15.2 percent (N = 278) of the gang members did not come from a gang that had older adult leaders with long tenure.

Most Gangs Exist in Multiple Geographical Areas
The survey asked "does your gang exist in several geographical areas or does it exist in just one area". Three-fourths of the gang members (74.8%, N = 1297) indicated that their gang exists in several geographical areas. A fourth (25.2%, N 437) indicated their gang exists in only one geographical area.

Thus, here again is an issue of organizational complexity: the ability to exist in two or more geographical areas makes for a more sophisticated gang than one that exists only on one specific street corner.

The Indigenous Formation Controversy
Some researchers have argued that gangs arise locally in many cities in the United States today in an indigenous formation process, that is it happens naturally without any national conspiracy, without any help from "gang ambassadors", and without any outside gang influence. This is controversy will not be resolved completely here, however we are the first to shed this amount of empirical light on the issue. What we suspected was that there was natural variation in this problem of gang proliferation: some do arise locally in an organic process, while others arise in a mechanical process: someone was trying to establish another chapter of the gang and succeeded with the benefit of contact with the parent gang.

Our survey asked "did your gang arise on its own locally without contact from gangs by the same name from another area". What we found was a half and half split. Half (50.9%, N = 890) of the gang members said "no". Half (49.1%, N = 857) said "yes". Thus, half (50.9%) indicated their gang did not arise on its own locally without contact from gangs by the same name in another area. And half (49.1%) indicated their gang did arise locally without contact from gangs by the same name from another area.

What this seems to suggest is very clear: regarding the enormous amount of gang proliferation in the United States today, where three-fourths of all American cities now have some type of gang problem, and where many report the same gang names appearing in many states as well --- in about half of these cases, it may in fact be indigenous formation, but in about half of the cases it may very well be some type of direct contamination (i.e., the familial gang transplant phenomenon, etc).

Only A Fourth of the Gangs Copied the Symbols and Name of An Out-of-Town Gang
The survey asked "did your gang copy the symbols and name of an out-of-town gang". A fourth (25.2%, N = 464) of the gang members indicated that their gang did in fact copy the symbols and name of an out-of-town gang. But three-fourths (74.8%, N = 1377) indicated their gang did not simply copy the symbols and name of an out-of-town gang.

Half Had Contact With the Same Gang in Another City
The survey asked "did your gang first arise by contact with the same gang in another city". Half of the gang members (48.8%, N = 899) report that their gang did in fact first arise by contact with the same gang in another city. Thus, for half (48.8%) there was external gang contact that gave rise to the local chapter of the gang. But for the other half (51.2%, N = 942) their gang did not first arise by contact with the same gang in another city. Thus, there seems

to be high reliability on this issue as this is very similar to an earlier question about the same phenomenon.

Thus, we have basically two differently worded questions that address the same underlying issue: gang proliferation. Some try to reduce the issue to simply "gang migration", which is only one of the ways the gang problem spreads in America today. There are many ways that the gang problem spreads in America today.

About Three-Fourths of the Gang Members Report Their Gang Does Provide Money to Needy Members in or out of Jail/Prison

The survey asked "does your gang provide money to needy members in or out of jail/prison". Some 73.9 percent (N = 1334) of the gang members indicated their gang does provide this kind of benevolent economic function to its needy members. About a fourth (26.1%, N = 472) of the gang members indicated their gang does not have the capability of acting like a trade union group. Obviously, this is also a variable that measures organizational complexity, as one with such a welfare function is going to be more complex than one without such an ability.

Over Half Have Committed A Crime For Financial Gain With Their Gang

The survey asked "have you ever committed a crime for financial gain with your gang". Some 60.7 percent (N = 1111) of the gang members reported that they have in fact committed a crime for financial gain with their gang. Some 39.3 percent (N = 718) indicated they had not committed a crime for financial gain with their gang.

Over a Third Report Their Gang Has a Private Attorney Used for Defending Its Members in Criminal Matters

The survey asked "does your gang have a private attorney that you use for defending your members in criminal matters". There are many twists on how this actually works in the modern gang world. In some gangs like the Latin Kings, a smarter youth growing up with gang members might be offered a gang scholarship: the gang will pay all tuition and related costs for going to law school, but the person must represent the gang when needed as well. Such was an offer made but not accepted to a lawyer who is now serving as an elected member of the Chicago City Council. More typically, the gang has a small law firm that the gang provides a lot of business to, criminal and civil (i.e., election law, corporate law, business and contract law, etc).

What we found was that 35.6 percent (N = 625) of the gang members indicate that their gang does in fact have a private attorney that is used to defend the gang's members in criminal matters.

Still, some 64.4 percent (N = 1129) indicated their gang does not have a private attorney that is used for this purpose.

More Likely Is the Situation Where The Gang Keeps An Account That Pays for Only Legal Defense

The survey asked "does your gang keep an account that pays for only legal defense". What we found here, a more generalized question, was that 43.7 percent (N = 778) of the gang members report that their gang does in fact keep an account that pays for only legal defense. This is typically an amount of money set aside in their gang treasury.

So 56.3 percent (N = 1003) of the gang members indicated that their gang does not have this type of organizational capability.

Three-Fourths Indicate Their Gang Holds Regular Meetings
    The survey asked "does your gang hold regular meetings". Some 76.2 percent (N = 1394) indicated their gang does in fact hold regular meetings. This is typically once a week. There are also other very predictable patterns: People gangs like the Latin Kings who "ride under the five pointed star" often give much numismatic significance to the number "5", and therefore predictably meet on Fridays, the fifth day of the week. Folks gangs like the Gangster Disciples often meet on Saturday or the sixth day of the week, corresponding to their "six pointed star", i.e., their totem of gang representation.
    Thus, only about a fourth (23.8%, N= 436) of the gang members indicated that their gang does not hold regular meetings.

How Long Their Gang Has Existed in Years
    The survey asked a number of questions directed at understanding not the individual gang member, but rather directed at understanding their gang organization itself. One of these was this variable on gang duration. The survey asked "how long has your gang existed in your town? Since 19____ or for about ____ years". All answers were converted to number of years the gang has existed as an entity in that town.
    The results indicate a large range of values between a low of 1 year to a high of 52 years. The mean or average length of time the gangs have existed is 18.1 years.
    Some other trends are very noteworthy here. Only 14.1 percent (N = 149) of the gang members indicated that their gang had existed for five years or less. In fact, some 70.3 percent of the gang members indicated their gang had been around for ten years or more!

Another Test of the Indigenous Formation Issue
    The survey asked the gang members "which best describes your gang: ___Homegrown (emerged on its own in our city) ___An official branch of a larger national gang". The results are consistent with earlier findings on the issue.
    Some 60.9 percent (N = 981) indicated that their gang was an official branch of a larger national gang.
    Some 40.2 percent (N = 707) indicated that their gang was homegrown, that is it emerged on its on in their city.

Over Half of the Gang Members Indicate Their Gang Maintains a Treasury
    The survey asked "does the gang you are in have a treasury". Some 59.8 percent (N = 1052) indicated their gang does maintain such a treasury. Some 40.2 percent (N = 707) reported that their gang does not maintain a treasury. Obviously, this is also an important measure of the organizational sophistication of a gang.

Two-Fifths of the Gang Members Report Their Gang Requires Its Members to Pay Regular Dues
    The survey asked "does your gang require members to pay regular dues". Some 40.9 percent (N = 728) of the gang members indicated that their gang does in fact require its members to pay regular dues. These are often small amounts paid on a weekly basis. For example, $5 is common in Peoples gangs, $6 is common in Folks gangs.
    Thus, over half (59.1%, N = 1054) of the gang members indicated that in their gang they are not required to pay dues. This too is an important measure of organizational sophistication.

Deadly Gang Violence Over Drug Income

The survey asked "have you ever fired a gun at someone because they were threatening the drug business of your gang". Half (51.5%, N = 891) of the gang members indicated that they have in fact engaged in this deadly gang violence over drug income. Thus, about half (48.5%, N = 838) indicated they have not engaged in this activity.

Some recent federally funded research on gang homicides has claimed that this type of gang violence is "instrumental" motivational activity and that it is more likely to be found in one ethnic or racial gang group: Blacks or African-Americans. We did not believe it when we first heard it, so we tested the issue directly in this research.

Is there any significant difference by what ethnic or racial group a gang member or gang represents and the extent to which their gang members actually engage in deadly gang violence likely to cause great bodily harm or death over drug income? We have the ability to directly test this, the results of which are provided in Table 8.

TABLE 8

The Distribution of Race of the Gang Member
by Whether The Gang Member Has Ever Fired a Gun
At Someone Over the Gangs Drug Business

Racial Group	Ever Fired a Gun at Someone Because They Were Threatening The Drug Business of Your Gang?		
	NO	YES	% Yes
African-American	361	396	52.3%
Asian or Chinese	48	36	42.8%
American Indian	25	30	54.5%
Mexican	160	165	50.7%
Puerto Rican	27	23	46.0%
White/Caucasian	120	120	50.0%
Other	31	45	59.2%

As seen in Table 8, no ethnic or racial group appears to have a monopoly on this type of activity that some have used the psychological construct label of "instrumental motivation" gang activity. As we suspected by good theory, no ethnic or racial group should be expected to have a monopoly on any type of human psychological motivation.

Deadly Gang Violence Over Turf Defense

The survey asked "have you ever fired a gun at someone because you were defending your turf?". While only about half of the gang members in the previous question indicated they had engaged in the use of deadly force over drug profits, here we found that about two-thirds of the gang members (67.2%, N = 1245) have in fact used deadly gang violence over such "turf" issues. Thus, about a third of the gang members (32.8%, N = 608) have not engaged in the use of deadly force likely to cause great bodily harm or death because they were defending their gang turf.

This is the flip-side of the previous issue, and goes back to a recent federally funded piece of gang research that concluded that gang homicides could be explained by instrumental and expressive motivation. Instrumental motivation was "money making" and in the federally

funded research it was an activity said to be more common to Black or African-American gangs. Expressive motivation for deadly gang violence involved "turf defense", and was claimed in the recent federally funded research to be more common to Hispanic and Latino gangs.

Again, we are in the position to provide the first real test of this issue, using primary data, not secondary data. And we are using the preferred unit of analysis: the gang members themselves, not "courthouse criminology" as it has been called, using secondary data from government records, the validity and reliability of which has always been subject to criminological criticism.

So are Hispanics and Latinos more involved in this kind of expressive gang violence? Table 9 provides the test.

TABLE 9

The Distribution of the Race of the Gang Member
By Whether the Gang Member Has Ever Fired a Gun
At Someone Over Turf Defense Issues

| | Ever Fired a Gun at Someone Because | | |
| | They Were Defending Their Gang Turf | | |
Racial Group	NO	YES	% Yes
African-American	283	544	65.7%
Asian or Chinese	31	63	67.0%
American Indian	22	37	62.7%
Mexican	93	236	71.7%
Puerto Rican	12	38	76.0%
White/Caucasian	104	155	59.8%
Other	21	61	74.3%

As seen in Table 9, there are some major differences between the ethnic groups in terms of this behavior. However, there are some important variations here: the largest difference is not between Blacks and Mexican Americans, but rather between whites and Puerto Ricans. Whites have the lowest activity level here (59.8%) and Puerto Ricans have the highest activity level here (76.0%). Isolating Hispanic/Latinos as a group consisting of Mexican and Puerto Rican yields a rate of about 72.2 percent. But, overall, Black gang members do seem to have a lower rate of deadly force than Hispanic/Latinos in this regard. However, we are not prepared to immediately embrace the conclusion that any ethnic group holds a monopoly on a type of organizational motivation, and rather we would urge further research along these lines to break out the many subgroups in both types of ethnic/racial groups.

Half of the Gang Members Have Been A Shooter in A Drive-by Shooting

The survey asked "have you ever been a shooter in a drive-by shooting". Half of the gang members (50.5%, N = 939) indicated that they have been a shooter in a drive-by shooting. Half (49.5%, N = 920) had not engaged in this behavior.

Motivation for Shooting In A Drive-By Shooting

As indicated above, about half of the gang members had fired a gun in a drive-by shooting, so among this subgroup we asked the additional question "what motivated you the most: ___my or my gang's money ___My or my gang's reputation". A third of this subgroup (33.5%, N = 268) indicated they did it because they were most motivated by money. Two-

thirds (66.5%, N = 532) indicated they did it because they were motivated by gang reputation concerns.

Half of the Gang Members Are Willing to Die For Their Gang
The survey asked "are you willing to die for your gang friends". Half are, half are not is the finding here. Some 50.8 percent (N = 889) are willing to die for their gang friends. The other half (49.2%, N = 862) are not willing to die for their gang friends.

Two-Fifths of the Gang Members State Crime Is Required Activity For Gang Membership
The survey asked "in your gang, does a person have to participate in illegal activity before the person can be accepted as a member of the gang?". Some 39.2 percent (N = 688) indicated that such criminal activity was in fact required before someone could be accepted into the membership of the gang. But 60.8 percent (N = 1068) indicated that participation in the crime portion of the gang was not required for membership.

A Retrospective Analysis of Reasons For Joining Gangs
The survey used the question "think back, when you were first thinking of joining a gang, which of the following do you recall as being the single greatest benefit the gang offered you". Some 29.9 percent (N = 467) chose "very loyal friends". Some 21 percent (N = 328) chose "income opportunities". About half and the single largest category (49%, N = 765) chose "a type of family".

Over Two-Thirds of Gang Members Have Recruited Others Into Gang Life
The survey asked "have you ever recruited anyone into the gang". Some 70.9 percent (N = 1266) indicated that they have in fact recruited other persons into the gang. Some 29.1 percent (N = 520) indicated that they had not brought new members into the gang.

Where The Gang Recruiting Takes Place
The survey asked "which is the ONE main source where a gang member is most likely to recruit a new gang member". Some 18.6 percent (N = 283) indicated while meeting a new friend while being locked up, that is in a correctional environment (i.e., juvenile detention center, juvenile long term correctional center, adult jail, adult correctional institution, etc). Some 22.3 percent (N = 339) indicated the best place for recruiting was meeting a new friend while in the school environment. Some 41.1 percent (N = 625) indicated the best recruiting place is while meeting new friends in the neighborhood. And 17.9 percent (N = 272) indicated the best source for new gang recruits was while meeting new friends at parties.

Characteristics of the Gang As A Cult-Like Organization
A series of questions were used in the same style that basically began with the preface "In my gang..." (i.e., "In my gang, members fear to express their real opinions").[22] The response modes for these statements were true/false. Table 10 provides the results of eight different such characteristics of the gang as a social group.
Some of the salient findings that emerge from Table 10 are as follows.
About a third (34.8%) of the gang members describe their gang as an environment of fear: members fear to express their real opinions. Still, about two-thirds indicate this is an open exchange type of environment --- a more democratic type of structure.
Typically, these are not gang groups that one can simply walk away from by saying "I quit". As seen in Table 10, only in about two-fifths of the cases does the gang member

describe the gang as something easy to quit. Over half (60.6%) say that members cannot simply leave by resigning at any time --- thus, for these the gang is more like an authoritarian cult than a democratic institution.

In half the cases (49.8%), each member's personal life is known to other members. Thus, there is a powerful type of social control that operates in the type of gang where the individual gang member has no identity apart from that of the gang as a group. So, in half the cases, the gang has this additional cult-like quality where members know all about the personal life of the individual as well.

In most cases (63.3%), these are also authoritarian structures, as the things the gang does are approved of by a higher up leader.

Only a third of the gang groups appear to be willing to take any member. Most of the gang groups (66.1%) are very selective. So in only a third of the gang groups is the environment a completely open system available to anyone for membership.

The gangs more often than not (60.7%) also hold meetings are regularly scheduled times. In half the cases, the gang does keep and maintain a membership list: this is common for example in ascertaining who has and who has not paid their dues.

In over half the cases, the gang can fine a member for making a mistake.

In short, there are a number of ways in which the gang appears to function in a manner similar to the organizational styles of a religious cult group.

<h1 style="color:red; text-align:center">TABLE 10</h1>

<p style="text-align:center">Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Various Factors
Describing The Nature of the Gang as a Social Group
or Social Organizational Entity</p>

	FALSE		TRUE	
	N	%	N	%
Members fear to express their real opinions.	1138	65.2	608	34.8
Members may leave the gang by resigning at any time.	1063	60.6	691	39.4
Each member's personal life is known to other members.	871	50.2	865	49.8
The things the gang does are approved by a higher up leader.	641	36.7	1106	63.3
No applicants for membership in the gang are turned down.	1142	66.1	585	33.9
The rang has meetings at regularly scheduled times.	679	39.3	1047	60.7
The gang keeps a list of names of the members.	852	49.3	875	50.7

A member of the gang can
  be fined for a mistake.   732   42.7   984   57.3

Nearly Half of the Gang Members Report They Do Have Asian Members
    The survey asked "are there any Asian members in your gang (Asian means any Chinese, Cambodian, Vietnamese, Laotian, all Asian countries of origin)". Some 47.1 percent (N = 801) indicated that they do have Asian members. Similarly, half (52.9%, N = 901) indicated that they do not have Asian members in their gang.

Individual and Gang Income: The Percentage that is Legal Money
    Two separate questions were used here to examine the nature of individual income sources among gang members. The first question asked "how much money that you earn is legal. About ___ percent of it". The results ranged from a low of zero percent to a high of 100 percent. Actually, 21.4 percent indicated zero percent of their income was legal. And 12.7 percent indicated that 100 percent of their income was legal. Overall, the mean or average amount of individual income among these gang members that was from legal sources was 32.5 percent.
    The second question was about the gang's income: "how much money that your group (gang) earns is legal? About ___ percent of it". Again the range was between zero percent to 100 percent. A fourth (27.7%) indicated that zero percent of their gang income was legal. Some 9.5 percent indicated all (100%) of their gang income was legal. The mean or average amount of gang income that came from legal sources was 29.0 for the gang members in this sample.

Do High Rollers Gain Status in the Gang?
    The survey asked the gang members to respond to the following statement: "persons who make big money are looked up to in my gang". The results: 19% (N = 322) strongly agree; 22.8% (N = 386) agree; 27.5% (N = 467) no opinion; 18.2% (N = 308) disagree; and 12.6% (N = 213) strongly disagree. Thus, about 41.7 percent of the gang members agree or strongly agree that high rollers also get high respect in their gang. Obviously, this is not always the case.

How Often Gangs Fight With Each Other Over Money
    The survey asked "how often does your gang fight with another gang over money". The results: 16.5% (N = 278) all the time; 13.7% (N = 231) very often; 27.5% (N = 467) often; 18.2% (N = 308) sometimes; and 12.6% (N = 213) never.
Does the Accumulation of Wealth Result in Gained Respect From Rival Gangs?
    The survey asked the gang members to provide their responses to the following statement: "making big money is a way of gaining respect among rival gangs". The results: 15.7% (N = 276) strongly agree; 20.1% (N = 352) agree; 28.7% (N = 503) no opinion; 29.9% (N = 367) disagree; and 14.5% (N = 255) strongly disagree.

GANG MEMBER BEHAVIOR WHILE INCARCERATED
    Two forms of the survey instrument were actually used in the research. The short form of the survey was used for populations at large, that is not in any form of secure confinement (schools, programs, etc). The long form was used for those in any form of confinement, i.e., they were incarcerated at the time (i.e., juvenile detention centers, juvenile training schools, jails).

The longer form contained some additional questions about their behavior while being incarcerated. Thus, special physical precautions were taken to make sure that these questions about gang member behavior behind bars were only measured in those correctional contexts.

Duration of Their Present Incarceration Experience

The survey asked "how long have you been locked up this time only. ___years and ___months". The variable was converted to number of months. The results ranged from a low of zero months to a high of 60 months. The mean or average period of incarceration at the time of data collection was 8.9 months for this sample of gang members.

Removal of Privileges

The survey asked "have you had any privileges removed or taken away while in this facility". Two-thirds of the gang members (67.9%, N = 937) indicated that they have had privileges removed or taken away while in custody. Only a third (32.1%, N = 443) had not had privileges taken away or removed from them during this current correctional experience. Usually, when they have privileges taken away it means they have been a disciplinary problem or a security threat.

Half Have Been in Fights While in Custody

The survey asked "have you been in a physical fight with anyone in this facility". Some 55.9 percent (N = 796) of the gang members indicated they have been in fights while in custody. Thus, only 44.1 percent (N = 628) of the gang members have not been in a physical fight during their present incarceration experience.

Half Have Threatened Others With Violence While in Custody

The survey asked "have you threatened anyone with violence in this facility". Some 53.5 percent (N = 759) of the gang members reported that they have in fact threatened someone with violence while in custody. Thus, 45.6 percent (N = 661) had not threatened someone with violence while in their present correctional facility.

Nearly Half Have Fought With Rival Gang Members While in Custody

The survey asked "have you fought with any rival gang members in this facility". Some 46.5 percent (N = 635) reported that they have in fact fought with rival gang members while in custody. About half (53.5%, N = 730) have not fought with rival gang members while in custody.

A fourth Have Tried To Recruit New Members to their Gang While in Custody

The survey asked "have you tried to recruit anyone to your gang in this facility". Some 27.8 percent (N = 374) of the gang members reported that they have in fact tried to recruit new members to their gang while in custody. Thus, most (72.2%, N = 969) have not tried to recruit new members to their gang while in custody.

A Fourth Have Carried an Improvised Weapon While in Custody

The survey asked "have you carried a homemade weapon (knife, etc) in this facility". Some 28.4 percent (N = 397) of the gang members indicated that they have in fact carried an improvised weapon while in custody. Most (71.6%, N = 1000) indicated they have not carried an improvised weapon while in custody. Still, we will see in the next chapter how some very serious differences emerge in comparing gang members and non-gang members with regard to their threatening behavior behind bars.

Over A Fourth Have Threatened Correctional Staff While in Custody

The survey asked "have you threatened any facility staff member or officer in this facility". Some 29.7 percent (N = 420) indicated they have in fact threatened correctional staff or correctional officers while in custody. Some 70.3 percent (N = 996) have not threatened correctional staff while in custody.

Most Have Had Disciplinary Reports While in Custody

The survey asked "how many disciplinary reports have you had while in this facility? __0 __1 __2 __3 __4 __5 or more". About a fourth (28.3%, N = 366) indicated no disciplinary infractions while in custody. Some 11.7 percent (N = 152) had one disciplinary report. Some 9 percent (N = 117) had two. Some 9.3 percent (N = 120) had three. Some 8.3 percent (N = 107) had four. And a full third of these gang members (33.4%, N = 433) had five or more disciplinary reports while in custody.

Two-Fifths Have Been Violent Aggressors While in Custody

The survey asked "did you start a fight with anyone or attack anyone while in this facility". Some 43.9 percent (N = 618) indicated that they have been aggressors by starting a fight or attacking someone while in custody. Some 56.1 percent (N = 790) did not start a fight or attack anyone while in custody.

A Fourth Have Tried to Smuggle Drugs Into the Institution

The survey asked "have you tried to smuggle in any illegal drugs while in this facility". Some 26.6 percent (N = 376) indicated that they have in fact tried to smuggle in illegal drugs while in custody. Some 73.4 percent (N = 1040) have not tried to smuggle in illegal drugs into the correctional institutions they were confined in.

A Fourth of the Gang Members Report that Gangs Use Religious or Cultural Fronts for their Operations While in Custody

The survey asked "do any gangs use religious or cultural fronts for their operations in this facility". Some 26.1 percent of the gang members (N = 310) stated that gangs do in fact use religious or cultural fronts for their operations while in custody. Some 73.9 percent indicated that gangs do not use such existing facility services for their gang operations.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS IN THIS CHAPTER

The gang members included the broad spectrum of gangs found in large urban centers like Chicago and Los Angeles, but also included most of the well-known gangs known to exist in America today. We shall now summarize these findings in topical sections for a better profile of the modern American gang member.

Background: Most are males (91.3%) 14 to 18 years of age (88.8%).

Family: Nearly all (91.6%) worry about the safety of their family members. Nearly all (93.5%) of the gang members would like to get a legal job, get married, and have children. Nearly all (91.2%) felt their family worried about them being killed. A third (32.9%) said their father never punished them for misbehavior. The gang members seem to have a more positive attachment to mother than father. A fourth (27.9%) did not get help with homework

at home. A fifth (19.1%) agreed that if parents cannot keep kids out gangs the kids should be taken away from the parents. Two-fifths (44.1%) felt that some parents benefit financially from having a child who is a gang member. Two-thirds (69.9%) have had family or friends killed because of gang violence. Most (83.4%) would not want their own children to join a gang. Over half (60.4%) have another family member who is a substance abuser. Over two-thirds (72.4%) did have a good relationship with an adult who tried to keep them out of gang life. Most (79.2%) would discourage their own children from joining a gang. Four-fifths (80.5%) want to eventually get married. Over two-thirds (69.8%) of these gang members have family members who are also in a gang; the same proportion (68.3%) indicated that in their gang their are members whose parents are also active gang members. Most (70.8) said their parents disapproved of their gang involvement; about the same proportion (73.2%) said they would quit gang life if they had the chance to get married, get a good steady job, and live somewhere else.

School: Two-fifths (41.6%) of the gang members had been bullied in school, and even more (66.5%) were bullies themselves. Mostly all (95.1%) had not yet completed high school. Half had been demoted, even more (88.7%) had been suspended from school, and two-thirds had been expelled from school.

Religion: A third of the gang members had some religious training (37.1%). Three-fourths (75.9%) liked their experiences with church. Half (54.2%) indicated they rarely if ever attend church though. Still, most (89.3%) said they do believe in God. A third (32.3%) expect to go to hell, two-thirds (67.7%) expect to go to Heaven.

Mass Media: Less than half (44.2%) felt that television news coverage of gangs makes others want to join gangs. But nearly two-thirds (65.5%) did feel that gang members like seeing themselves on television, and in the newspapers (63.9%). Half (51.1%) felt that gang members would like to be a part of a study where an important professor might be willing to hang out with them in the hood. Some 42 percent felt if less attention was given to gangs in the mass media that fewer people would join gangs. A third (35.5%) felt that if the confidentiality of the juvenile justice system were eliminated, this might prevent some juveniles from committing a crime. Asked about the effects of intense news coverage of their gang: only 28.9 percent viewed it as an embarrassment, 72.9 percent felt more members would get involved in the gang, and 79.4 percent felt more new members would join the gang.

Their Beliefs About Prevention: Only half agreed that programs can effectively prevent kids from getting involved in gangs or prevent kids from joining gangs. More disagree than agree with the idea that gang problems can be prevented by school education, or drug prevention/education, or strict law enforcement. They were most likely to believe job training and employment opportunities are the best solution to the gang problem. Between a fourth to a third of the gang members believe some of the most common approaches to gang prevention/intervention are a waste of time for kids at risk of joining a gang: educational programs (33.6%), counseling programs (36.9%), and job training programs (25.6%). About half question whether social workers can have any effect: in reaching out to persons who might want to quit a gang (43%), in helping kids stay out of a gang (49.1%), or in combination with other services whether this could have prevented them from joining a gang (52.8%). Given the choice of program service components, though, most would prefer employment programs. Three-fourths (74.7%) believe that most people in gangs want out sooner or later. Three-fifths (60.1%) do not believe a boot camp could influence someone to drop out of a

gang.

Their Own Experiences With Programs and Intervention Services: These gang members have not been neglected in terms of being recipients of a number of social services and prevention or intervention services. Half have been in group therapy (52.6%), or in court-mandated therapy (53.7%), or in some counseling program (59.7%). Two-fifths of this gang population have been in a substance abuse counseling program (42.3%), a job skills program (44.1%), a job training program (40.2%), the YMCA recreation program (43.7%), and completed the D.A.R.E. anti-drug program (45.4%). A third (33.8%) had the benefit of a professional one-on-one tutor. A fourth (28.9%) had parents active in the PTA. Only 19.3 percent had been in the Big Brother/Big Sister program. And only 15.9 percent had ever used a crisis hotline for help. Thus, few of these gang members actually slipped through the cracks of society in terms of a complete lack of any social services being available to them.

Gang Involvement Through the Human Development Lifespan: By age 11 most (79.1%) had already first heard something about gangs. Most (83.6%) had first met a gang member before they were 13. Half (53.9%) had first fired a pistol or revolver before the age of 13. Half (48.9%) had seen someone killed or seriously injured by gang violence before the age of 13. Half (50.5%) had first got a permanent tattoo before the age of 14. Half (49.9%) had first been arrested before the age of 13. Half (52.6%) thought they would be married before the age of 24. Half (48.1%) had first joined a gang before they were 13. A fourth (25.1%) of these gang members did not believe they would live to see their 28th birthday.

Personality: Over a third (37.3%) agreed that success is more dependent on luck than on real ability. Most (80.7%) worry about the future facing today's children. Some 62.1 percent felt that people can be divided into two distinct classes: the weak and the strong.

Their Personal Experiences in the Gang: Almost all (84.7%) have five or more close gang friends. Most (71.9%) were still active gang members, and many of the rest were now gang associates. Nearly half (46.7%) have tried to quit the gang. Two-thirds (65.3%) have held rank or leadership in their gang. Two-fifths (44.3%) have been "violated" by their gang. Over half (60.7%) have committed a crime for financial gain with their gang. Half (51.5%) have fired a gun at someone over their gang's drug business, but this variable did not vary much by race. Two-thirds (67.2%) had fired a gun at someone defending their gang turf. Half (50.5%) have been a shooter in a gang drive-by shooting, motivated more often than not by concerns for gang reputation. Half claim to be willing to die for their gang. The most common reason they gave for joining the gang was it offered a "family" for them. Over two-thirds (70.9%) have recruited others into the gang, the most common recruitment source being the neighborhood context.

Their Descriptions of Their Gang Group/Organization: While almost all major American gangs were represented in the large national sample, about a fourth were Crips and Bloods; a third were Folks. Over half (58.9%) indicate their gang has a special language code. Two-thirds (66.1%) indicate their gang has written rules. Most (84.8%) indicate their gang has older leaders who have been in the gang a long time. Most of the gangs (74.8%) exist in multiple geographical areas. Half indicated their gang did arise locally, and half indicated their gang did not arise locally on its own without contact from a gang from outside the same area. Only a fourth (25.2%) indicated their gang copied the

symbols and name of an out of town gang. Half have had contact with the same gang in another city. Three-fourths (73.9%) indicate their gang provides money to needy members in or out of custody. Over a third (35.6%) said their gang has a private attorney used for defending its members in criminal matters. Some 43.7 percent said their gang keeps an account that pays for only legal defense. Three-fourths (76.2%) indicated their gang holds regular meetings. Some 70.3 percent of the gang members indicated their gang had been around for ten years or more. Some 60.9 percent indicated their gang was an official branch of a larger national gang, while 40.2 percent described their gang as "homegrown" (emerged on its own in their city). Over half (59.8%) indicated their gang maintains a treasury. Two-fifths (40.9%) indicated their gang collects regular dues from its members; the same proportion (39.2%) indicated that criminal activity is a required part of gang membership. A number of characteristics these gang members use to describe their gang also tend to describe authoritarian cults: a third (34.8%) fear to express their opinions in the gang, most (60.6%) cannot simply leave the gang by resigning at anytime, half (49.8%) indicate their personal life is known to other members, nearly two-thirds (63.3%) indicate the things the gang does are approved by a higher up leader, two-thirds do not simply accept everyone who wants to join, half say their gang does keep a list of the names of its members (50.7%), and in about half the cases (57.3%) the gang member can be fined for making a mistake. Some 47.1 percent indicated that they did have Asian members in their gang. About two-fifths (41.7%) report that persons who make big money are looked up to in their gang. Only 12.6 percent indicated their gang never fights with another gang over money. About a third agreed that making big money is a way of gaining respect among rival gangs.

Gang Behavior While Incarcerated. Some of the gang members had been in custody for as long as five years. Two-thirds had privileges taken away while in custody. Half have been in fights while in custody. Half have threatened others with violence while in custody. Nearly half (46.5%) have fought with rival gang members while in custody. A fourth (27.8%) have tried to recruit new members to their gang while in custody. A fourth (28.4%) have carried a homemade weapon while in custody. Over a fourth (29.7%) have threatened a correctional officer or employee while incarcerated. Most have had one or more disciplinary reports, a third of the gang members having 5 or more while in custody. Two-fifths (43.9%) have started a fight with someone or attacked
someone while in custody. A fourth have tried to smuggle drugs into the correctional facility. A fourth indicated that some gangs use religious or cultural fronts for their meetings while in custody.

Major Life Events For Gang Members: Using a human development lifespan approach, a series of questions addressed at what age these major life events occurred for the gang members. A clear pattern emerged here having many implications for gang prevention and gang intervention programming. The mean or average ages are used here. At age 8.9 they first heard anything about gangs. Age 9.2 were first bullied in school, and first met someone in a gang. Age 10.4 first made the transition to bullying someone else in school. Age 11.3 first fired a pistol or revolver, and saw first killing or injury due to gang violence. Age 12.0 first joined the gang and first arrested for any crime. Age 12.3 first got their own real gun. Age 13.0 first got a permanent tattoo. Age 16.5 their current average age in this study. At the time some of them were interviewed, those in correctional institutions had already served an average of 8.9 months of their sentence. For those who think they will eventually get legally married to someone, it will occur at an average age of 24.1 years of age.

They expect to die at an average age of 59.5 years of age.

CHAPTER 4

THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GANG MEMBERS AND NON-GANG MEMBERS

INTRODUCTION
    This chapter examines those differences between gang members and non-gang members by using our simplest method of defining gang membership: our basic self-report question (ITEM76A). It asks the respondent "Have you ever joined a gang? ___Yes ___No". The format in this chapter will be to first describe the strong differences, then the moderate to weak findings, and then those factors for which no difference exists in comparing gang members and non-gang members.
    The results that were significant are all presented in Table 11 which appears at the end of this chapter.

Strong Difference: Having A Permanent Tattoo
    We had three questions about tattoos, one was the basic health risk behavior question (i.e., "do you have a permanent tattoo"), which was followed up by the age the respondent first got a permanent tattoo. A third question was a validity item, that asked if any of the tattoos were gang tattoos. Here we found a strong difference in the basic health risk question: whether or not the person has a tattoo varies significantly when comparing gang members and non-gang members.
    The trend is very consistent: gang members show the higher health or behavior risk. Only 30.4 percent of the non-gang members had permanent tattoos, compared to 59.8 percent of the gang members who had such permanent tattoos. Thus, gang members are twice as likely to report having a permanent tattoo.

Strong Difference: Friends or Family Being Killed in Gang Violence
        The survey asked "have any of your friends or family been killed because of gang trouble?". A very strong difference emerged here comparing gang members and non-gang members. In fact, the findings here tell us something that needs to be shared with non-gang involved children in gang prevention at the primary level: when you join a gang, you hurt not just yourself, you may bring harm to your friends and family as well.
    What we found is that a third (33.7%) of those who were non-gang members had friends or family killed in gang violence. But over two-thirds (69.8%) of the gang members had friends or
family killed in gang violence. That is a very significant increase in the probability of violence! So it seems very clear to the health care community: what we need to reduce the violence problem is first reduce the gang problem which serves as the social mechanism for violence.

Strong Difference: Suspended and Expelled From School
    These are actually two separate questions and two separate variables, obviously they are related to each other. Both are measures of school failure, and in both variables the trend is the same: gang members experience higher levels of school failure when compared to non-

gang members.

The variable on being suspended comes from the question "Have you ever been suspended from school?". Here 76.9 percent of the non-gang members report this, but 88.7 percent of the gang members report this school failure. So there is a significant higher risk of school failure among the gang member population. This is understandable if a youth joins a gang to find a social replacement value for a sense of family: because the gang will come to preoccupy the time and energy of the youth, and learning performance in the school environment will become secondary to the immediate gratifications provided by the gang itself.

The variable on being expelled comes from the question "have you ever been expelled from school?". Here under half (45.8%) of the non-gang members report having ever been expelled from school. However, two-thirds (65.3%) of the gang members report being expelled from school. This is a strong significant difference in terms of school failure experiences.

Strong Difference: Beliefs About the Value of "Boot Camps" As A Gang-Deprogramming Tool

The variable measured here is the strength of the belief that "boot camps" could influence some people to get out of a gang. The survey asked "do you think a boot camp could influence some people to get out of a gang". Gang deprogramming is not a known effective technique in any area of applied psychology, applied social work, or any intervention school of thought at the present. Many believe that some experiences can achieve such a gang deprogramming effect. And certainly there are some who certainly believe the intervention must be a harsh punitive type of experience, such as that held out as meaning "shock incarceration" today: the so-called "boot camps". What most unread persons fail to realize is "boot camps" are not new. The American juvenile correctional system began that way, as a military model, facilities like the St. Charles Training School for Boys were based on military discipline and a strict regimen of highly ordered cadence, marching, and silence. It didn't work then in terms of preventing recidivism, like bullying behavior these facilities once studied by Shaw and McKay (see Knox, 1995) were shown to be effective at systematically producing adult offenders.

Some 52.7 percent of the non-gang members believed that "boot camps" might influence some persons to get out of a gang. We found only 39.9 percent of the gang members thought boot camps could be effectively used as a gang deprogramming strategy.

Gang Members More likely To Have Been In Juvenile Correctional Institutions

As seen in Table 11, some 63.4 percent of the non-gang members report having been incarcerated in juvenile correctional
institutions, compared to 81.4 percent of the gang members. Gang members seem more likely to face the likelihood of incarceration in juvenile corrections is the picture that emerges here.

Strong Difference: More Gang Members Believe They Are Really Going to Hell

A later section in this chapter will describe, basically list, those factors that are not significantly different from a comparison of gang members and non-gang members. But we can tell you right now one of these was whether these youths believed in God. That is, no significant difference existed in comparing gang members and non-gang members with regard to whether they actually believed in God. Recall that this is mostly an offender population we are studying. Therefore, gang member or non-gang member alike were about equally likely to believe in God. Where they differed was their personal evaluation of where they would go in the afterlife.

The survey asked "assume there is a God. So if you died right now, where would you go?

___To Hell ___To Heaven".

   Some 20.9 percent of the non-gang members thought they would go to hell. A significantly larger proportion (32.2%) of the gang members believe they are going to hell.

Strong Difference: Gang Members Are More Likely to Want Their Own Children To Be in A Gang

   The survey asked "do you want your children to be in a gang?" Some 8.3 percent of the non-gang members said they would actually want their own children to be in a gang. But 16.5 percent of the gang members indicated they would want their children to be in a gang. We interpret this significant difference in terms of the basic validity issue of whether the "gang subsample" is really what it purports to be, and the "non-gang subsample" is basically for the most part what it purports to be. In this regard, obviously, gang members would be more likely to want their own children to be in the gang, as this would be a way of saving face in the context where the non-gang members can be expected to place greater stigma on gang involvement.

   In fact, we have a validity item that addressed the very same issue, the question was simply worded somewhat differently and located far away in the item order of the physical layout of the survey instrument. This second question produced an equivalent pattern of differences in the same direction of behavior. The second question was as follows: "if you have or plan to have children, would you encourage them or discourage them from joining a gang?" Some 11.8 percent of the non-gang members indicated they would encourage such behavior, but this nearly doubles for gang members (20.7%).

Strong Difference: Gang Members Are Less Likely To Believe That the Mass Media Has A Negative Effect When It Comes To Gangs

   Like boot camps gang members did not look at the mass media as a bogeyman to the same extent that non-gang members believed it has such a negative effect. Perhaps this is because gang members are more skeptical that anything has any effect on them. Then again, perhaps they do have better insights into the problem.

   The factor measured here is basically the hypothesis of reaction formation in the mass media. The survey asked "do you feel that if less attention was given to gangs on television, in newspapers, and in movies that fewer people would join gangs?".

   Here is what we found. There is a very significant difference in comparing gang members and non-gang members in terms of whether they believe it is true that the mass media tends to reinforce gang membership behavior, and that if less attention were given then fewer people would join gangs. Gang members are significantly less like to believe this is true (41.9%). Non-gang members are significantly more likely to believe this is true (52.6%).

Strong Difference: Having Privileges Removed or Taken Away While In Custody

   The survey was able to compare gang members and non-gang members in terms of a number of factors of behavior while in custody. This is, therefore, the first large scale interstate example of gang research that examines such disciplinary behavior problems that gang members have been said to now represent for correctional management.

   The survey asked "have you had any privileges removed or taken away while in this facility?". The difference here is very significant, as about half of the non-gang members (51.8%) have had privileges removed or taken away, compared to two-thirds (67.8%) of the gang members. What this usually means when someone has had their privileges removed or taken away is that they have been manifested behavior problems or security threats while

inside the correctional institution. In fact, these disruptive behaviors found to be more associated with gang members are, as can be seen in Table 11, some of the strongest findings that emerged from our analysis of all variables.

Strong Difference: Having Been in A Physical Fight With Someone While in Custody
    The survey asked "have you been in a physical fight with anyone in this facility". Some 28.2 percent of the non-gang members had been in a fight with someone while in custody. This doubles in magnitude for gang members (55.8%). Obviously, another part of being a gang member appears to be magnified in the custodial context of group behavior.

Strong Difference: Having Threatened Someone With Violence While In Custody
    The survey asked "have you threatened anyone with violence in this facility". Here again the pattern of higher threats associated with gang membership continues to manifest itself. While a fourth (25.2%) of the non-gang members had engaged in this behavior, the threat doubles in the gang member population to 53.4 percent.

Strong Difference: Carrying An Improvised Weapon While In Custody
    The survey asked "have you carried a homemade weapon (knife, etc) in this facility". Only 11.1 percent of the non-gang members indicated that they have carried an improvised weapon while in custody. This threat more than doubles in intensity when the inmate is a gang member (28.4%).

Strong Difference: Threatening Correctional Staff or Officers While in Custody
    The survey asked "have you threatened any facility staff member or officer in this facility". Only 12.3 percent of the non-gang members have engaged in this rather serious behavior of threatening correctional staff or correctional officers while in custody. However, the nature of this risk to the safety of correctional staff and correctional officers more than doubles when they face gang members (29.6%).

Strong Difference: Starting a Fight or Attacking Someone While in Custody
    The survey asked "did you start a fight with anyone or attack someone while in this facility". For the non-gang member only 18.7 percent have engaged in this type of assaultive behavior while in custody. This assaultive behavior threat more than doubles for the confined person who is a gang member (43.8%).

Strong Difference: Trying to Smuggle in Illegal Drugs into the Correctional Institution
    The survey asked "have you tried to smuggle in any illegal drugs while in this facility". Only 8.6 percent of the non-gang members have attempted to smuggle illegal drugs into the correctional institution. However, for gang members this behavior triples, as 26.5 percent of the gang members have tried to smuggle in illegal drugs into the facilities they were studied in.

Moderate Difference: Gang Members More Likely To Believe Educational Programs Are a Waste of Time for Kids At Risk of Joining a Gang
    All of the previous differences, discussed up till now, have been very strong significant relationships. Now we turn to the moderately strong relationships that produce significant differences in comparing gang members and non-gang members. A moderate difference is less pronounced, but very discernable in a rule of thumb that might be used in a classification

system to deal with the gang problem. The ideal custodial classification system would examine all such factors, placing greater weight on the strong factors, and less weight on the moderate factors, and even less weight on the weaker factors. But all these factors add up in a classification system, as they alert staff what to look for.

The survey asked the respondents to agree or disagree with the following statement: "for kids at risk of joining a gang, getting involved in educational programs is a waste of time". Some 23.5 percent of the non-gang members agreed with this statement. About a ten point difference separates the non-gang members from the gang members though. As 33.6 percent of the gang members felt such educational programs for kids at risk of joining a gang are a waste of time. The gang member is, it seems, a bit more cynical and fatalistic.

Moderate Difference: Gang Members More Likely To Believe Counseling Programs Are a Waste of Time for Kids At Risk of Joining a Gang

The survey asked the respondents to agree or disagree with the following statement: "for kids at risk of joining a gang, getting involved in counseling programs is a waste of time". Some 26.5 percent of the non-gang members agreed that it would probably be a waste of time for kids at risk of joining a gang to get involved in a counseling program. However, this repudiation of the value of gang intervention counseling services rises to 36.8 percent for the gang members themselves.

Moderate Difference: Gang Members More Prone Towards Stereotypy

The respondents were asked to agree or disagree with the following statement: People can be divided into two distinct classes: the weak and the strong. Some 51.1 percent of the non-gang members accepted this authoritarian orientation towards people. However, for gang members some 62 percent agreed with the idea.

Moderate Difference: Gang Members Report More Substance Abuse in their Families

The survey asked "do you think anyone in your family uses drugs or drinks too much". Some 50.9 percent of the non-gang members reported such substance abuse in their family. However, for gang members this substance abuse problem in the family rises to 60.3 percent.

Moderate Difference: Gang Members More Likely To Report That in Correctional Environments Gangs Do Use Religious or Cultural Fronts for Gang Operations

The survey asked the confined populations being studied the following question: "Do any gangs use religious or cultural fronts for their operations in this facility". A non-gang member may simply not be privy to the operations of gangs. Some 15.7 percent of the non-gang members did report that gangs do use religious or cultural fronts for their operations while in custody. However some 26 percent of the gang members reported that gangs do use such religious and cultural fronts for gang operations behind bars.

Weaker Significant Differences Between Gang Members and Non-Gang Members

A number of other factors can be seen in Table 11 that while significant produce rather weak overall percentage differences in comparisons between gang members and non-gang members. The significance is due to the large size of the sample being analyzed. We still consider these important factors though. In most of these comparisons there is less than 10 percentage points difference in the factor being analyzed.

We will summarize these remaining weaker differences now.

Asked "do you worry about the safety of your family members", 89.2 percent of the non-gang members said yes, compared to 91.6 percent of the gang members. So gang members

do appear to worry slightly more about the safety of their family members.

Asked "do you think your parents/family/friends worry about you being killed", some 84 percent of the non-gang members said yes, compared to 91.1 percent of the gang members. Thus, the gang members seem to project more paranoia about being killed.

Asked to agree or disagree with the statement "success is more dependent on luck than on real ability", some 29.2 percent of the non-gang members agreed, compared to 37.3 percent of the gang members. Thus, the gang members are more prone to believe in luck and fatalism, i.e., they are slightly more alienated.

Asked for a true/false response to the question "I worry about the future facing today's children", some 85.9 percent of the non-gang members said true, compared to 80.6 percent of the gang members. Apparently gang members worry somewhat less about the future facing today's children, given the many more salient factors they probably have a right to worry about.

Asked to agree or disagree with the statement "for kids at risk of joining a gang, getting involved in job training programs is a waste of time", some 19.6 percent of the non-gang members agreed, compared to 25.6 percent of the gang members. As in the other trends with gang members and the value of such secondary prevention gang program initiatives, gang members are always less likely to agree about the effectiveness of such undertakings.

Asked the true/false question "my father never punished me for misbehavior", some 28 percent of the non-gang members indicated this was true, compared to 32.9 percent of the gang members. Thus, for the gang members there was a slightly larger trend towards the father not punishing them for misbehavior.

Asked to agree or disagree with the statement "fear is the only effective means that you can use to control children", some 25.3 percent of the non-gang members agreed, compared to 30.4 percent of the gang members. Thus, there is a slightly higher tendency for gang members towards an authoritarian belief system.

Asked if they have ever been in court-mandated psychological counseling, some 45.2 percent of the non-gang members have had the benefit of this type of secondary prevention assistance, compared to 53.7 percent of the gang members. Thus, the gang members have received more, not less, in regard to secondary prevention or intervention services.

Asked if their parents were or are active in the PTA, some 32.6 percent of the non-gang members said yes, compared to 28.8 percent of the gang members. Thus, non-gang members had slightly more responsible parents.

Asked if they had received their high school degree, or perhaps more likely in correctional environments whether they had been able to complete their G.E.D. degrees, some 21 percent of the non-gang members said yes, compared to 12.5 percent of the gang members. Gang members are more prone towards school failure seems to be the rule of thumb here.

Asked to indicate if they liked or disliked their experiences with churches, some 80.8 percent of the non-gang members said they liked their church experiences, compared to 75.9 percent of the gang members. Thus, gang members are less likely to report a positive experience with churches.

Asked whether they attend church rarely or often, some 53.6 percent of the non-gang members said often, compared to 45.7 percent of the gang members. Thus, non-gang members were slightly more likely to attend church.

Asked whether their parents ever approved of their stealing, some 13.7 percent of the non-gang members said yes, compared to 18.3 percent of the gang members. The rule of thumb seems to be there are more criminogenic problems in the gang member's family than can be found in the family of the non-gang member.

Asked whether they think social workers can be effective in reaching out to persons who

might want to quit the gang, some 65.6 percent of the non-gang members felt that social workers could be effective in this capacity, compared to 57 percent of the gang members. Thus, the more skeptical and distrustful gang member is less likely to believe a social worker can be effective in reaching out to persons who might want to quit the gang. We expect to later examine this factor for gang members in reference also to whether they have in fact ever attempted to leave the gang, the hypothesis being that those who have considered defecting would have a better evaluation of the efficacy of social workers in such a capacity.

Asked if they feel that some parents benefit financially from having a child who is a gang member, some 37.8 percent of the non-gang members felt this was true, compared to 44.1 percent of the gang members. Gang members are more likely than non-gang members, then, to report that some parents benefit financially from having a child who is a gang member. This is the issue of parental collaboration and parental complicity in gang crime today.

Asked if they felt that gang members like seeing themselves on the news, some 70.4 percent of the non-gang members felt the gang enjoyed this attention, compared to 65.4 percent of the gang members. Thus, the gang members were less prone than the non-gang members to feel that gangs like getting attention in the news media.

Asked if they felt that gang members like seeing themselves in the newspapers, some 70.7 percent said yes, compared to 63.9 percent of the gang members. Again, the trend in the difference comparing non-gang members and gang members, is that gang members attribute less impact to the mass media.

Asked if they felt that gang members would like to have an ethnographer hang out with them in their hood, some 43 percent of the non-gang members said yes, compared to 48.9 percent of the gang members. Perhaps the non-gang members attributed greater critical ability to gang members. Perhaps the gang members thought they could benefit from or exploit the professor.

Asked if they feel that if parents cannot keep their children out of gangs then the children should be taken away from the parents, some 23.9 percent of the non-gang members agreed, compared to 19.1 percent of the gang members. Obviously, the gang members stood to lose on this equation, and thus were less likely to agree with the idea.

Finally, asked if they have any fear about what a juvenile court can do to them, some 59.9 percent of the non-gang members did have some fear of what the juvenile court could do to them, compared to 55.4 percent of the gang members. Thus, the gang members were less fearful of what sanctions the juvenile court could legally use against them.

NON-SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES

A comparison of gang members and non-gang members revealed a number of real commonalities as well. These are factors for which no significant difference exists in comparing gang members and non-gang members. All of the following factors were therefore non-significant differences in comparing gang members and non-gang members.

Whether in the future they would like to get a legal job, get married, and have children.

Whether they had ever been bullied by anyone in school.

Whether they lacked respect for their mother or father.

Whether they have used a wide variety of social services and treatment programs in the past including: having ever called a crisis hotline for help; whether they have ever been involved in group therapy; whether they have ever had a one-on-one professional tutor; whether they

have ever been in a drug-substance abuse counseling program; whether they have ever been in a job skills program; whether they have ever been in a job training program; whether they have been involved in any counseling program; whether they have been involved in a Big Brother/Big Sister program; whether they have been involved in a YMCA recreational program; whether they have completed the D.A.R.E. anti-drug abuse program.

Whether they had completed any religious training.

Whether they would be willing to take off their permanent tattoo if a hospital was willing to offer free services for the removal of the tattoo.

Whether they do or do not believe in God.

Whether they got help with homework from an adult in their household.

Whether they feel that when gangs are seen in T.V. news reports that this makes people want to join gangs.

Whether they do or do not believe that when a school teacher or principal negotiates with a gang member this encourages more gang activity.

Whether lifting the secrecy veil over juvenile court, and allowing the mass media in, would discourage more juveniles from committing a crime.

Whether they believe or not that most people in gangs want out sooner or later.

Whether they believe they will or will not eventually get legally married to someone.[23]

In the above comparisons of gang members and non-gang members, then, neither was significantly different in these respects. In fact, a condition of commonality existed where on these factors gang members were no different than non-gang members.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS IN THIS CHAPTER

Some very useful information has emerged from this chapter in the effort to summarize how gang members differ from non-gang members. The nature of the comparison made in this chapter was based on self-report: whether the respondent admitted to having ever joined a gang or not. This approach is sufficient with the large sample here to distinguish between a variety of factors that significantly differentiate the gang member from the non-gang member. These findings have very practical implications for those who work in the field of corrections, because this self-report definition of gang membership is often very similar in some regards to what might get used in a correctional environment based on presentence investigation and official criminal record files: if it quacks like a duck and claims to be a duck, assume it is a duck.

Strong Differences Between Gang Members and Non-Gang Members

A pattern of very strong differences emerged in comparing gang members and non-gang members in this study. Here then is the profile of these aggregate findings:

Gang members were more likely to be bullies in school, and therefore suspended and

expelled from school, have a permanent tattoo, having friends or family killed in gang violence, much less likely to believe boot camps will flip a gang member, much more likely to want their own children to be gang members, much less likely to believe the mass media exacerbates the gang problem, much more combative and disruptive (physical fights, threatening violence, carrying an improvised weapon in custody, threatening staff, starting fights, and trying to smuggle in drugs) in custody than their non-gang member counterparts.

Moderate Differences Between Gang Members and Non-Gang Members
    A pattern of moderately strong differences also emerged in comparing gang members and non-gang members, typically meaning a difference of at least 10 percentage points or more. Here then is what we find from a profile of these aggregate findings:
        Gang members are more skeptical about the effectiveness of gang prevention and intervention programs, and consistently feel they cannot achieve as much good as non-gang members believe they can. Gang members have more substance abuse in their families. Gang members are more likely to report that gangs use religious and cultural fronts for their meetings in correctional settings.
Weaker Significant Differences Between Gang Members and Non-Gang Members
    A pattern of weaker differences also emerged in comparing gang members and non-gang members, the overall profile of these findings being as follows:
    Gang members worry about their family members and their selves, more prone to believe in luck, less likely to be punished by their father, gang parents being less active in PTA but apparently benefiting financially from a gang involved child and approving of their stealing, somewhat more authoritarian in their views, more likely to be in court-mandated psychological counseling, less positive experiences with church and attend it less frequently, attribute less negative impact to the mass media regarding gangs, more skeptical of social work programs aimed at gangs, and less fearful of juvenile court.

TABLE 11
Factors Significantly Differentiated by Self-Reported
Gang Membership

Ever Join a Gang		NO	YES
Do you worry about the safety of your family members?	NO	123	167
	YES	1022	1824
	% Yes	89.2	91.6
Chi-square = 4.80, p = .02			

| Do you think that programs could be effective in preventing kids from getting involved in gangs? | NO | 362 | 921 |

```
                      YES    761    1031
                    % Yes    67.7   52.8
              Chi-square = 65.5, p < .001
```

TABLE 11: Continued

```
Do you think gang
prevention programs
can be effective in
preventing persons
from joining a gang?   NO    401     974
                      YES    728     976
                    % Yes    64.4    50.0
              Chi-square = 60.2, p < .001
```

```
Do you think your
parents/family/friends
worry about you
being killed?          NO    181     174
                      YES    953    1793
                    % Yes    84.0    91.1
              Chi-square = 35.9, p < .001
```

```
Success is more dependent
on luck than on
real ability.       AGREE    326     720
                 DISAGREE    789    1208
                  % Agree    29.2    37.3
              Chi-square = 20.5, p < .001
```

```
   Ever Join a Gang    NO      YES
I worry about the future
facing today's children.
                  FALSE    160     377
                   TRUE    975    1575
                 % True    85.9    80.6
              Chi-square = 13.5, p < .001
```

```
For kids at risk of
joining a gang, getting
involved in educational
programs is a waste
of time.          AGREE     263     653
               DISAGREE     853    1289
                % Agree     23.5    33.6
              Chi-square = 34.1, p < .001
```

For kids at risk of
joining a gang, getting
involved in counseling
programs is a waste
of time.   AGREE   297   717
            DISAGREE   821   1228
            % Agree   26.5   36.8
                Chi-square = 34.0, p < .001

For kids at risk of
joining a gang, getting
involved in job
training programs is
a waste of time.   AGREE   222   500
            DISAGREE   905   1450
            % Agree   19.6   25.6
                Chi-square = 14.0, p <.001

Did you ever bully
someone in school?   NO   620   654
                YES   511   1296
            % Yes   45.1   66.4
            Chi-square = 133.6, p <.001

Ever been in a juvenile
correctional inst.?   NO   409   362
                YES   709   1590
            % Yes   63.4   81.4
            Chi-square = 122.9, p < .001

 Ever Join a Gang   NO   YES
My father never
punished me for
misbehavior. FALSE   781   1274
            TRUE   305   625
            % True   28.0   32.9
                Chi-square = 7.50, p = .006

Fear is the only
effective means that
you can use to
control children.
            AGREE   277   582

```
DISAGREE   816       1328
   % Agree      25.3      30.4
      Chi-square = 8..95, p = .003
```

People can be divided
into two distinct
classes: the weak
and the strong.

```
         AGREE      557      1176
         DISAGREE   531       718
         % Agree     51.1     62.0
            Chi-square = 33.7, p < .001
```

Have you ever been in
court-mandated
psychological counseling
or therapy?

```
         NO      577       849
         YES     476       985
         % Yes    45.2      53.7
            Chi-square = 19.3, p < .001
```

Were or are your parents
active in the PTA?

```
         NO      737      1339
         YES    358       544
         % Yes   32.6      28.8
            Chi-square = 4.74, p = .02
```

Do you think a "book camp"
could influence some
people to get out of
a gang?

```
         NO      519      1149
         YES    580       764
         % Yes   52.7      39.9
            Chi-square = 46.5, p < .001
```

Have you received a
high school degree or
G.E.D. degree?

```
         NO      887      1681
         YES     237       242
         % Yes    21.0      12.5
            Chi-square = 38.6, p <.001
```

How would you rate your

experiences with churches?

LIKED IT	867	1426
DISLIKED IT	206	452
% Liked It	80.8	75.9

Chi-square = 9.34, p = .002

TABLE 11: Continued

Which best describes you:

I RARELY ATTEND CHURCH	504	1017
I OFTEN ATTEND CHURCH	583	859
% I often attend church	53.6	45.7

Chi-square = 16.9, p < .001

Do you have a permanent
tattoo?

NO	778	788
YES	341	1173
% Yes	30.4	59.8

Chi-square = 245.4, p < .001

Assume there is a God.
So if you died right now,
where would you go?

TO HELL	214	564
TO HEAVEN	806	1184
% To Hell	20.9	32.2

Chi-square = 40.5, p < .001

Did your parents ever
approve of your stealing?

NO	940	1571
YES	150	353
% Yes	13.7	18.3

Chi-square = 10.5, p = .001

Have you ever been
demoted in school?

NO	668	1011
YES	441	916
% Yes	39.7	47.5

Chi-square = 17.1, p < .001

Do you think social
workers can be effective
in reaching out to
persons who might want
to quit the gang?

NO	383	829
YES	731	1099

% Yes   65.6   57.0
    Chi-square = 21.8, p < .001

TABLE 11: Continued

Do you feel that some
parents benefit
financially from
having a child who
is a gang member?

	NO	689	1064
	YES	419	841
	% Yes	37.8	44.1

    Chi-square = 11.5, p = .001

Do you feel that gang
members like seeing
themselves on the news?

	NO	328	664
	YES	782	1259
	% Yes	70.4	65.4

    Chi-square = 7.93, p = .005

Do you feel that gang
members like seeing
themselves in the
newspapers?

	NO	321	687
	YES	775	1217
	% Yes	70.7	63.9

    Chi-square = 14.3, p < .001

Do you feel that gang
members like being
part of a study where
an important professor
might be willing to
hang out with them
in the hood?

	NO	624	979
	YES	471	938
	% Yes	43.0	48.9

    Chi-square = 9.80, p = .002

Ever Join a Gang   NO   YES

Do you feel that if less
attention was given to
gangs on television, in
newspapers, and in movies
that fewer people would
join gangs?

	NO	YES
NO	529	1125
YES	589	813
% Yes	52.6	41.9

Chi-square = 32.8, p < .001

Do you feel that if parents
cannot keep their children
out of gangs, then the
children should be taken
away from the parents?

	NO	YES
NO	856	1568
YES	269	371
% Yes	23.9	19.1

Chi-square = 9.83, p = .002

Have any of your friends
or family been killed
because of gang trouble?

	NO	YES
NO	749	584
YES	381	1353
% Yes	33.7	69.8

Chi-square = 379.1, p < .001

Do you want your children
to be in a gang?

	NO	YES
NO	1038	1607
YES	94	319
% Yes	8.3	16.5

Chi-square = 41.6, p < .001

Do you think anyone in
your family uses drugs
or drinks too much?

	NO	YES
NO	555	771

```
YES        577      1174
% Yes      50.9      60.3
   Chi-square = 25.7, p < .001
```

Ever Join a Gang	NO	YES

Do you have any fear
about what a juvenile
court can do to you?

```
            NO     447      859
            YES    668     1068
            % Yes  59.9     55.4
     Chi-square = 5.80, p = .01
```

Have you ever been
suspended from school?

```
            NO     262      220
            YES    877     1727
            % Yes  76.9     88.7
     Chi-square = 74.6, p < .001
```

Have you ever been
expelled from school?

```
            NO     617      675
            YES    522     1275
            % Yes  45.8     65.3
     Chi-square = 113.0, p <.001
```

If you have or plan to
have children, would
you encourage them or
discourage them from
joining a gang?

```
     ENCOURAGE    131      388
     DISCOURAGE   972     1480
     % Encourage  11.8     20.7
          Chi-square = 38.0, p < .001
```

REMAINING COMPARISONS ARE
AMONG THE INCARCERATED
GROUPS ONLY:

Have you had any privileges
removed or taken away
while in this facility?

```
        NO      281      443
        YES     303      937
        % Yes   51.8     67.8
      Chi-square = 45.2, p < .001
```

TABLE 11: Continued

Ever Join a Gang		NO	YES

Have you been in a physical
fight with anyone in

```
this facility?    NO     447      628
                  YES    176      796
                  % Yes  28.2     55.8
            Chi-square = 132.8, p < .001
```

Have you threatened anyone
with violence in this

```
facility?         NO     463      661
                  YES    156      759
                  % Yes  25.2     53.4
            Chi-square = 139.0, p < .001
```

Have you carried a
homemade weapon (knife,
etc) in this facility?

```
                  NO     532     1000
                  YES     67      397
                  % Yes  11.1     28.4
              Chi-square = 69.7, p < .001
```

Have you threatened any
facility staff member or
officer in this facility?

```
                  NO     540      996
                  YES     76      420
                  % Yes  12.3     29.6
              Chi-square = 69.8, p < .001
```

Did you start a fight with
anyone or attack someone
while in this facility?

```
                  NO     504      790
                  YES    116      618
                  % Yes  18.7     43.8
              Chi-square = 118.2, p < .001
```

Have you tried to smuggle
in any illegal drugs while
in this facility?

	NO	562	1040
	YES	53	376
	% Yes	8.6	26.5

Chi-square = 82.7, p < .001

TABLE 11: Continued

Do any gangs use religious
or cultural fronts for their
operations in this facility?

	NO	337	879
	YES	63	310
	% Yes	15.7	26.0

Chi-square = 17.7, p < .001

Chapter 5

A Risk Analysis of Gang Member Behavior Patterns

INTRODUCTION
   In this chapter we will introduce the reader to the benefits of having operational variability in the study of gang behavior. This research project included sixteen researchers each testing their own unique hypotheses in a mutually agreed gang research strategy. A benefit of such interdisciplinary approaches to the measurement of gang involvement in Project GANGPINT was the diversity of actual measurements used in the national research. Rather than having a lot of bitter differences across disciplines, the present project included a more democratic process of nomination to the item pool, guaranteeing certain measures of gang involvement in the finalized survey instrument. As a result, the present study examined many aspects of actual gang involvement.

   The present study therefore has many different measurements of gang involvement other than a single self-report variable. The fact is, the reality is artificially portrayed in the nominal sense of having a gang problem or not having a gang problem, when the definition of gang problem can consist of more than one single measurement. Because there are different levels of gang risk, the reader will therefore understand that in the best of all research worlds, the data would reflect this natural variability in what is normally viewed as a nominal issue: gang member or non-gang member, gang-related or not gang-related, gang involvement or no gang involvement, etc.

   Serious gang research should strive for an analysis that rises above the nominal level of sophistication. In otherwords, it may not be best to simply classify any population as simply "gang problem" or "not a gang problem", but rather there are benefits to examining the possibility that there are --- quite logically --- varying levels of the gang problem.   This is particularly true when generalizing research findings to the individual gang member. The individual gang members will show much variation in the scope and extent of their gang involvement. This chapter takes advantage of this natural existing variability in gang experiences, specifically individual gang behavior, to demonstrate the utility of a risk/threat analysis model applied to gang problems.

   Here the researchers make the case for the advantages of a flexible, and variable approach to gang analysis. One that includes a spectrum of possibilities for "gang involvement". One that is not based on secondary data, but based on extensive primary data that is then collapsed where needed for purposes of classification. In otherwords, the categories are not artifacts defined outside of the authority of the researcher (i.e., police records, secondary data not planned initially to be used for gang research, etc). These researchers intentionally included a host of independent variables in their individual research initiatives included in the overall

national gang research consortium project. Collectively, these measurements are used here for examining the issue of variability in the individual "gang problem" or "gang threat" or "gang risk".

The chapter will discuss the analytical issues, the potential practical value of this analytical approach, develop a risk model, and test the risk model on a representative risk population.

GANG THEORY, RESEARCH, AND PRACTICE

Today the gang problem is so pervasive that virtually anyone with credentials and an attitude about the gang problem qualifies as a perspective that some mistake for a theory. A useful theory is one that helps to build an accumulative body of useful knowledge. The knowledgeable gang researcher will therefore recognize that it is possible for gang research to mislead other scholars when the research is fatally flawed by what is called overly conservative operationalizational measures that basically help "deny" the gang problem. When a gang research sets the measurement criteria to be overly restrictive of what "gang-related" actually amounts to in empirical research, it is possible to develop operationalizations that can "unfound" most gang crime in America. This happens for example, when a killing in a gang's drug business, or inter-gang rivalry over drug disputes, results in a homicide; and the police lacking a complainant to verify it is gang-related just because the victim was a gang member may classify the homicide as a "drug-related homicide". Variability and versatility in research measurements therefore adds much rigor to gang research. As, the lack of variability and overly restrictive definitions can clearly be a source of over-identification and therefore a logical fallacy fatally flawing the best of sampling and statistical methods.

To avoid these logical pitfalls, the present research planned well in advance to develop a number of operational measurements of gang-risk behavior. The research strategy during item development and instrumentation was to develop an extremely sensitive set of measurements that captured the varied and uniquely different aspects of actual gang behavior. Gang behavior cannot be properly inferred with validity from simply examining police files or official reports of such behavior: for police files were not designed to assist researchers in data collection. Rather, the best data is data directly from gang members, thus anyone relying on official records without seeking to obtain corroborative data from the gang members and non-gang members involved makes a major mistake in basic criminological research.

It is also an issue of the unit of analysis studied in gang research. Studying police agencies in the USA means using the agency itself, a government agency, as the unit of analysis. One can get viewpoints from agency staff about gang member behavior, and sometimes get a good estimate of the prevalence of the gang member behavior problem. However, a better way to study gang member behavior is basically to ask the gang members themselves. Using primary data from the actual gang member provides the best unit of analysis for research that has the goal of being able to speak to the issue of gang member behavior.

We alert other scholars to the possibility of federal gang research misinformation when the research seeks to generalize to gang member behavior by relying on official information and then further restricting the variable of interest to a point where what the researcher measures about the most important ingredient of gang research "defining the gang impact" is such a rigid and insensitive operational definition of the variable defining "gang", we end up with the conclusion that there is no gang problem in any given context or issue. We must be most alert to this problem where it is most logically likely to occur in theory, research and practice: when the research uses aggregate secondary data to explain underground behavior that occurs

at the individual human level.

In practice, there is enormous potential practical value in a useable gang risk classification system. In correctional environments, this could help reduce violence, prevent confrontations, and possibly save lives of inmates and staff. In schools and contexts such as mental health facilities that come to be faced with the reality of the gang conflict problem spilling over from streets into school rooms and hospital wards, a classification system that works to effectively assign resources to a problem to the empirical and justifiable level of perceived threat can more efficiently prevent existing problems from escalating. In theory, all we need is baseline expectancy analysis not remarkably more sophisticated than that of the early prediction research of the Chicago school that has come to be common in the insurance industry today. It is recognized that one cannot predict 100 percent of everything that is human, but that a great deal of what is human risk behavior can be understood and planned for accordingly.

The Basic Screening Questions Used in the Gang Risk Scale

Figure 4 provides and explains the use of the basic screening questions used for the computation of the raw gang risk scale score. The raw gang risk scale score is a value between an absolute low of zero to an absolute high of 15. The higher the scale score, obviously, the higher the risk of the gang involvement measurement.

Figure 4 provides the means by which fifteen different questions that were used in the Project GANGPINT survey instrument are scored to develop an additive scale index measuring the variability in gang involvement. At this stage of the risk analysis development component of the research, it is sufficient to demonstrate its utility without factor analysis and without other multivariate weighting techniques. The issue is simply whether the less statistically complex version of the model achieves the goal of applied use.

As seen in Figure 4, all gang members would probably have an additive scale score of at least a value of 1 or greater. But the value could be as high as 15. This differentiation in terms of variability deserves some further explication.

Someone who was a total non-gang member in the juvenile to adult population would score a zero on the gang risk scale. However, depending on the individual, some gang members are greater risks than others. It is this assumption of the natural variability of the gang involvement continuum that provides the theoretical basis for the gang risk scale. We assume there are differences even in the offender population, this is not a new discovery in corrections, criminal justice, or criminology --- it just has not caught on in gang research.

The implication of the use of the gang risk scale, the operationalization of which is described in Figure 4, is then quite pragmatic: just as some offenders are more dangerous than others, some gang members are more "hard core" than others. We would prefer not to use the term "hard core", because logically that implies there is a "soft core" gang member as well. But the basic mathematical direction or salience is correct: the higher the gang risk scale score, the greater the level and intensity of an individual's gang involvement. The issue is whether a classification system, or rating system, whatever we want to call it, would be useful in preventing problems. That is the entire subject of this chapter.

The Raw Scores of the Gang Risk Index

Table 12 provides the distribution of the gang risk index scores for the entire sample of gang members and non-gang members alike. As seen in Table 12, over a fourth of the total sample had scores of 0 through 1 (30.4%), which is regarded as a level zero gang risk: the least risk group in our sample. The level one group is classified as anyone with scores in the range of 2 through 5 which accounts for about a fifth of the sample (18.8%). The level two group consists of those with scores in the range of 6 through 9 and has roughly a fourth of the

sample. Finally, the highest threat category is the level three group which consists of scores between 10 and 15, and represents about a fourth of the sample.   The raw scores in Table 12 therefore represent an additive index score of various measures of gang involvement. There is, it appears, remarkable variation in the extent of individual level gang involvement in this manner of analyzing the problem. However, this is only a first step towards ascertaining the value of a gang risk classification system.

It remains to be seen if the levels 0 through 4 in this system are sufficiently different along other known dimensions of risk behavior to make any such system useful in practice.

In otherwords, we will need to use these raw scores to compute a new variable that comes to define a <u>varying level of gang involvement</u>. The value of such an approach to analyzing the other type of data we have in this research project, is that this helps us to go beyond a myopic and artificial analytical definition of "gang involvement". The hypothesis is very clear at least: we should see an ascending level of threat in other measurements along the same risks levels (0, 1, 2, and 3). This is truly a different way of looking at the same data and retesting almost all gang theory concepts and gang research hypotheses of interest.

We shall turn to that analysis now.

FIGURE 4

The Ten Separate Measurements Used to Construct
The Gang Risk Assessment Continuum:
An Additive Index of Gang Risk Behavior

The Basic Screening Questions and Rules for Scoring:

1. Have one or more close friends and associates who are gang members, add one point (ITEM75>=1).

2. If they have family members who are in a gang, add one point (ITEM94=1).

3. Considers self a current "associate" of any gang group or gang organization, add one point (ITEM78=1).

4. Has a gang tattoo, add one point (ITEM36C=1).

5. Ever joined a gang, add one point (ITEM76A=1).

6. Is still active in the gang, add one point (ITEM77=1).

7. Been in a gang for 5 years or more, add one point (ITEM76E>=5).

8. Ever held rank or leadership position in the gang, add one point (ITEM80=1).

9. Ever helped recruit new members into the gang, add one point (ITEM105=1).

10. Ever fired a gun at someone because they were threatening the drug business of their gang, add one point (ITEM99=1).

11. Has never attempted to quit the gang after joining, add one point (ITEM76A=1 &

ITEM79=0).

12. Ever been a shooter in a drive-by shooting, add one point (ITEM101A=1).

13. Ever fired a gun at someone in defense of their gang turf, add one point (ITEM100=1).

14.   Expect to be a gang member for the next five years, add one point (ITEM32+5)<=(ITEM118).

15. Willing to die for their gang friends, add one point (ITEM102=1).

TABLE 12

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of
Gang Risk Scale Scores
(The Additive Index of Gang Risk Behavior, see Figure 4)

Gang Risk Scale Score Values	N	%	Risk Level
0	463	13.8	Level zero
1	541	16.2___	Level zero^
2	215	6.4	Level one
3	135	4.0	
4	151	4.5	
5	143	4.3___	Level one^
6	204	6.1	Level two
7	214	6.4	
8	215	6.4	
9	245	7.3____	Level two^
10	215	6.4	Level three
11	219	6.5	
12	193	5.8	
13	126	3.8	
14	57	1.7	
15	12	.4____	Level three^
	********	******	
Totals	3348	100.0	

FINDINGS FROM THE GANG RISK CLASSIFICATION ANALYSIS

Table 13 presents the reference table for a number of variables shown to be consistently significantly differentiated by the gang risk classification system. In the gang risk classification system, there are four levels (0, 1, 2, and 3), the higher the level the higher the gang involvement risk. The classification system is based on different questions about gang involvement (see Figure 4) which are used to develop an additive scale score (see Table 12). The distribution of the raw scale score values also provided the basis for separating the scores

into the Level 0 through Level 3 categories.

Table 13, because it is an extensive reference table containing a number of different findings, is provided for easy reference at the end of this chapter.

Table 13 shows that this type of classification really does smooth out the data on a wide variety of important factors. In other words, we get a logically consistent distribution of a number of relevant variables using the classification system. There is a definite progression up and down the levels of gang involvement risk is what Table 13 shows.

It is helpful, before discussing some of these findings from the risk or threat analysis, to also briefly explain what might be a more commonly used language for these four classification categories. For the most part, a "Level 0" is a non-gang member, a neutron maybe, possibly even a real ex-gang member. A Level 1 category includes persons at-risk, but with a low level of involvement in the gang: these can be gang associates, wannabes, etc. A Level 2 category is similar to a regular or core gang member, but is basically someone with a moderate level of gang involvement, perhaps someone new to gang life. A Level 3 category is what some call a hard core gang member, but is more often than not a gang leader or someone with a great deal of gang involvement.

Another way to view the gang risk classification system is it is a kind of "step ladder", the higher one goes on the ladder, the higher one is involved in gang risks.

From the healthcare model of prevention, primary prevention would be directed at a Level 0 group; secondary intervention could be used on a Level 1 group; and one faces tertiary intervention in dealing with a Level 2 or Level 3 group.

The Greater The Gang Involvement, The Greater The Skepticism in Gang Prevention Programs

As seen in Table 13, there is a steady progression effect in this skepticism about gang prevention the higher one goes on the gang risk ladder. Believe in the effectiveness of programs that try to prevent kids from getting involved in gangs is highest in the Level Zero group, where two thirds (68.5%) believe such programs can be effective. This reduces to half (48.3%) among the Level Three group.

Nearly the same effect is shown for a closely related question "do you think gang prevention programs can be effective in preventing persons from joining a gang". Here we have the highest belief about effectiveness with those in Level One (64.1%) which reduces to less than half (43.3%) for the Level Three group.

The More Involved in the Gang, The Less Worry About the Future Facing Today's Children

The pattern here is very clear: the more gang-involved person really does worry less about the future facing today's children. Such a person at a level three on the gang ladder or gang risk continuum probably does have more immediate things to worry about, evidence of which also surfaces in Table 13. We will also see shortly that the more gang involved person is also more likely to want kids in the gang. Table 13 does show the variable for the question "I worry about the future facing today's children" yields a pattern of support that deteriorates the higher one goes in the gang risk continuum.

The Higher The Gang Involvement Classification, The Higher The Belief That Educational, Counseling, and Training Programs Are A Waste of Time for Kids At Risk of Joining A Gang

Table 13 shows the same basic trend for three different questions along these lines. Again, the pattern is very consistent: the higher up in the gang involvement ladder one goes, the

higher the skepticism about these three common gang prevention efforts (education, counseling, and job training). For example, at the low end of the gang risk continuum (Level 0) only 19 percent believe that job training programs are a waste of time for kids at risk of joining a gang. This rises to 28.6 percent for the Level Three group! A pattern found in Chapter 4 is therefore again confirmed here with a more fine-tuned measurement of gang involvement.

Bullying: The Essential Resume Item for Gang Involvement

The gang both attracts and produces persons with records of antagonism toward their society. Table 13 shows a fascinating pattern for the bullying variable with regard to the gang risk classification system. The classification system that we developed here, which emphasizes variability in the concept of gang involvement, seems to have also been able to significantly isolate the low to high levels of bullying behavior. In fact, the trend here is so strong that bullying almost seems to be an essential resume item for higher level gang involvement. At least, the trend is very clear: at the low end of the spectrum (Level Zero) only 42.9 percent were bullies, while at the high end of the gang involvement spectrum nearly two thirds were bullies in school (73.5%).

No Surprise: The Higher The Gang Involvement, The Higher The Incidence of Juvenile Incarceration Experiences

As seen in Table 13, the gang risk continuum does account for a consistent pattern with regard to the correctional sanction for juveniles. We would recommend examining in future research the timing of these sanctions in the human development lifespan of the same gang members. But it is clear in Table 13 that those at the higher end of the gang involvement spectrum are also those who are more likely to report that they have been locked up in a juvenile correctional center or institution.

Family: The Role of the Father Revisited

Recall that the survey asked the respondents whether they felt the following statement was true or false: "My father never punished me for misbehavior". As seen in Table 13, the real difference that emerges is at the higher end of the gang involvement continuum. It is for this Level 3 gang-risk group that over a third (36.9%) indicate that in fact their father never did punish them for misbehavior.

Dogmatism and the Gang Personality

Table 13 shows another interesting trend in regard to the variable measuring stereotypy. This is the question asking the respondents to agree or disagree with the statement: "people can be divided into two distinct classes: the weak and the strong". It is also an aspect of dogmatism in the gang personality is what Table 13 suggests. Clearly, as seen in Table 13, the higher one goes on the gang ladder the greater the dogmatism.

Gang Members Have Had More, Not Less Help

As discussed in chapters 3 and 4, we were quickly able to rule out one type of contemporary thinking on the gang problem: the idea that gang members are in gangs because they have not had any help from their society in terms of intervention programs and services. Table 13 shows a clear pattern with regard to three separate variables in this regard: ever being in court-mandated psychological counseling or therapy, ever being involved in group

therapy, and ever being involved in a counseling program. The trend is very clear in Table 13, the higher the involvement in the gang the more the individual also reports he or she has had the benefit of these three intervention services or programs. We will later address the issue of whether the costs outweigh the benefits of continued such services at the higher end of the gang involvement spectrum.

One thing is very clear: the gang members are getting more, not less such services. This could be the very nature of the filtering process in gang life. Those at the higher end of the gang involvement spectrum may therefore represent those whom society has tried in different ways to help, it just did not work. We are aware of how some gang interventionists believe that the most gang prevention impact is to be derived from working with and providing special services to the truly "hard core", the logic being this group has the greatest negative impact. While we cannot argue with the apparently good assumption that the higher end of the gang spectrum individual is also, obviously, the person more likely to wreak havoc on society (at least as when compared to those at the lower levels of the gang risk continuum), it does not logically follow that prevention and intervention services are necessarily going to work on those who have already had the benefit of such services. The larger issue is the matter of limited resources: two few services to go around, and far more problem-oriented persons deserving of such scarce resources. For reasons developed in this study and elsewhere, the G.R.I.P. (Gang Risk Intervention Paradigm) model discussed later in this report, basically takes the position of placing greater value at the lower end of the gang spectrum in terms of pure or primary level prevention and secondary prevention (or intervention), rather than providing services to the higher end of the threat continuum (i.e., rehabilitation or tertiary prevention).

Beliefs About Whether A Boot Camp Could Influence Some People to Get Out of A Gang Are Inversely Related to Gang Risk Levels

In otherwords, the higher one goes on the gang risk scale, the higher the level of gang risk the less the person believes that a boot camp could influence someone to get out of a gang. At the lowest level of gang involvement about half (53.4%) think a boot camp could influence some persons to get out of a gang. But this reduces to 35.3 percent at the higher end of the gang involvement spectrum.

The Higher The Gang Involvement, The Greater the School Failure

There are several variables about school in Table 13 that provide very consistent findings about gang involvement. The real difference in completed a high school degree or the G.E.D. degree is whether the person has any level of involvement in gangs; those with no involvement (Level Zero) have the greatest likelihood it seems of achieving these educational credentials.

Another finding about school failure in Table 13 concerns being demoted in school. The higher the gang involvement, the higher the likelihood of being demoted in school is the finding that emerges in Table 13.

Being suspended from school is another measure of school failure, and Table 13 shows this varies consistently in a fashion where it rises to 92.5 percent for the highest level of gang involvement.

Being expelled from school is another measure of maladjustment in school and varies from a low of 43.5 percent for the Level Zero group to a high of 74.8 percent for the Level Three group.

The Higher the Gang Involvement, The Less Satisfying Experiences With Churches

Table 13 shows a clear trend with regard to how these persons rate their experiences with churches. While more liked these experiences than disliked them, there are some very important differences on the gang risk continuum. Those at the lowest level of gang involvement report the higher levels of liking their experiences with churches (82.5%). This reduces to 71.9 percent for those at the higher end of the gang risk level.

The Higher The Gang Involvement, The More The Individual Expects to Go to Hell

The religious belief that they would go to hell rather than to heaven is shown in Table 13 to nearly double as one moves up the gang risk level categories. At the lowest level of gang involvement (Level Zero) only 19.3 percent expect to go to hell. This nearly doubles to 38.1 percent for those at the highest level of gang involvement (Level Three).

The Higher The Gang Involvement, The More Likely The Person Is To Have A Permanent Tattoo

Table 13 is very clear about this particular behavior of having permanent tattoos. Among those at the lowest level of gang involvement (Level Zero), only 29.9 percent have such tattoos. This rises consistently the higher one goes on the gang risk continuum and reaches 73.7 percent for the highest level of gang involvement (Level Three).

The Higher the Gang Risk Level, The Lower The Female Representation

Table 13 shows an interesting new finding on gender in relationship to the gang problem. The percentage of females decreases consistently the further up the gang risk ladder one goes. This trend is quite consistent: reducing by half the female involvement the higher the level of gang involvement. Due to this and some other gender effects, many of the present researchers are joining with others to shortly being Project GANGGEND; the first major study of gender, sexual behavior, and identity in relationship to gang involvement.

The Higher The Gang Risk Level, The Lower The Belief That Social Work Can Play An Effective Role in Gang Prevention/Intervention

Three different variables along these lines produced almost identical patterns as seen in Table 13. The first of these questions asked whether social workers could be effective in reaching out to person who may want to quit the gang, here the rated effectiveness begins at 66.8 percent for the Level Zero group and reduces to 51.9 percent for the Level Three group. The second question deals with whether social workers can be effective in helping kids stay out of gangs, and again the trend goes from 63.1 percent for the Level Zero group to a low of 43.3 percent for the Level Three group. The third question asked "do you think that recreation programs, after school programs, or social workers might have been able to prevent you from joining a gang", and the results again range from 63.7 percent for the Level Zero group to a low of 39.1 percent for the Level Three group.

The Higher The Gang Risk, The Lower The Attribution of Negative Effects to the Mass Media

Those at the lower end of the gang risk continuum are the most likely to believe that if less attention was given in the mass media to gang members that perhaps fewer people would join gangs. This belief in a negative effect from the mass media decreases substantially the higher one goes in the gang risk continuum. As seen in Table 13, the highest level of this belief about the mass media is found in the Level Zero group (53.7%) but decreases over the spectrum to a low of 35.8 percent for the Level Three group.

Something Gang Recruiters Don't Mention: The Higher The Gang Risk, The Greater The Likelihood of Having Friends or Family Killed Because of Gang Trouble

Table 13 shows a very real aspect of gang life in America today that probably never gets mentioned by a gang recruiter. At the lowest level of gang involvement (Level Zero) only 27.3 percent report having friends or family members killed in gang violence. This figure goes up to half (50.8%) for Level One; goes up to two-thirds (66.1%) for Level Two; and up to 81.4 percent for the Level Three group.

A Kind of Child Abuse Not Formally Recognized as Child Abuse: The Higher The Gang Risk Level, The More The Person Would Want Their Own Children To Be in a Gang

Obviously, as will be recalled from chapter 3 and chapter 4, most people studied in this research would not want their children in a gang, including gang members. But there are, apparently, some other differences here: the more seriously involved gang member is more likely to want his/her children involved in gang life too is the finding from Table 13. As seen in Table 13, among those in the lowest level of the gang risk classification system (Level Zero), only 5.4 percent said they would want their own children in a gang. But this rises to 21.2 percent for those in the Level Three group category.

The Higher The Gang Risk, The Higher The Substance Abuse in the Family

The survey question "do you think anyone in your family uses drugs or drinks too much" is the measure of substance abuse in the family. As seen in Table 13, this factor increases steadily over the gang risk continuum. At the lowest level of gang involvement (Level Zero) about half (46.4%) report this substance abuse in the family, but this rises to two-thirds (65.1%) among those in the Level Three higher risk category.

The Higher The Gang Risk, The Lower The Perceived Deterrent Function of Allowing Juvenile Offenders To Be Identified in the Mass Media

The survey asked the policy-related question: "if the confidentiality of juvenile court was eliminated, and thus juvenile court would be open to the public and newspapers, do you think this would discourage more juveniles from committing a crime". In otherwords, this was asking if the mass media could have a deterrent function regarding juvenile crime. Those most likely to believe this to be true are those at the lower end of the gang risk continuum (39.3%), but it decreases steadily to 32.6 percent for the higher gang risk group (Level Three).

Gangs in Correctional Institutions: The Clear And Present Danger of Increased Threats Along The Gang Risk Continuum

Recall that the gang risk classification system uses different factors to derive a raw score and then a category of gang risk. This is basic risk or threat analysis. The issue is whether it could improve the basic security and afford greater safety to the management and operation of a correctional institution. Table 13 seems to settle this issue with rather conclusive evidence.

Eleven different factors are shown in Table 13 to be consistently and significantly differentiated by the gang risk classification system. Clearly, the higher the gang involvement, the higher the security and behavior threat a person represents while in a correctional institution is the finding from Table 13. Recall, a separate version of the instrument was used for those contexts in our study that were correctional environments. Thus, this data about correctional environments would reflect data that came only from correctional environments.

Most of our data for this assessment of the role of gangs behind bars comes from juvenile

correctional facilities, both short term and long term.

The Higher The Gang Risk, The Greater The Disciplinary Problems in Correctional Facilities

Table 13 shows a number of factors along these lines, two of which are direct measures of how much the gang population comes under the disciplinary system inside correctional institutions. Asked if they have had any privileges removed or taken away while in custody, this factor is very consistent and significant as seen in Table 13. At the low end of the gang risk continuum, 46 percent have had privileges removed, compared to 70.7 percent at the higher end of the gang risk continuum. For the reader unfamiliar with the corrections system, one typically loses privileges or has them taken away because of being a disciplinary problem behind bars.

Similarly, the actual frequency distribution for the number of disciplinary reports is provided in Table 13. The trend in disciplinary reports shows a much higher rate the higher one goes in the gang risk continuum.

The Higher The Gang Risk, The Higher The Fighting Behavior Behind Bars

The survey item used here is a replication and adaptation from previous health risk behavior research on gangs, and asks the simple question "have you been in a physical fight with anyone in this facility". As seen in Table 13, this variable rises consistently as one progresses up the gang risk continuum. While only 18.1 percent in the low gang risk category (Level Zero) have been in a physical fight, this fighting behavior rises steadily up the gang risk continuum to a high of 69.1 percent for the Level Three group. If fighting behavior can be predicted, as easily as it is differentiated here, then fighting behavior among inmates in correctional facilities could be prevented by using a gang risk classification system.

The Higher The Gang Risk, The Greater The Threats of Violence Behind Bars

The survey asked "have you threatened anyone with violence in this facility". As seen in Table 13, this behavior of threatening violence varies consistently across the gang risk continuum. At the lower level of gang risk (Level Zero), only 16.2 percent have threatened violence. This rises continuously across the gang risk continuum to a high of 65.6 percent for the Level Three gang risk category.

The Higher The Gang Risk, The Greater The Fighting With Rival Gang Members Behind Bars

Table 13 demonstrates another consistent trend regarding the safety of other inmates behind bars regard gangs. The survey asked "have you fought with any rival gang members in this facility". As seen in Table 13, this type of conflict also escalates along the dimensions of gang involvement risk classification. It varies from a low of 7.8 percent for the Level Zero group to a high of 60.3 percent for the Level Three group.

The Higher The Gang Risk, The Greater The Gang Recruiting That Goes on Behind Bars

Table 13 suggests a valuable gang prevention methodology: making sure that the more extremist gang members do not have access to "neutrons" or those not yet involved in gangs. The survey asked "have you tried to recruit anyone into your gang in this facility". The results show a consistent rise in this behavior of gang recruiting the higher the gang risk category. Among those in the higher risk category (Level Three), a third (33.5%) have tried to recruit new gang members behind bars.

The Higher The Gang Risk, The Higher The Problem of Inmates Carrying Homemade Weapons

The survey asked "have you carried a homemade weapon (knife, etc), in this facility". As seen in Table 13 this serious problem of carrying improvised weapons is a threat and health risk behavior that varies consistently across the gang risk continuum. Only 2.3 percent of those in the Level Zero group report carrying a homemade weapon while in the correctional institution itself. This increases to 33.3 percent for the Level Three group.

The Higher The Gang Risk, The Greater The Threats Against Correctional Staff and Officers

The survey asked "have you threatened any facility staff member or officer in this facility". As seen in Table 13, the gang risk continuum is very effective in differentiating these threats to correctional staff and officers. This threatening behavior is closely associated with the level of gang involvement. It varies from a low of 3 percent in the Level Zero group to a high of 37.2 percent in the Level Three group.

The Higher The Gang Risk, The Greater the Violent Behavior Inside Correctional Populations

The survey asked "did you start a fight with anyone or attack someone while in this facility". As seen in Table 13, this violent behavior varied consistently along the gang risk continuum. It ranged from a low of 7.4 percent in the Level Zero group, a fairly manageable level of violent behavior; to a high of 54.1 percent in the Level Three group --- an almost unmanageable level of violent behavior behind bars.

The Higher The Gang Risk, The Greater The Attempts To Smuggle Illegal Drugs Into The Correctional Institution

The survey asked "have you tried to smuggle in any illegal drugs while in this facility". As seen in Table 13, this type of threat to the security of a correctional institution also varies directly along the gang risk continuum. Only 1.9 percent of those in the Level Zero group have attempted to smuggle illegal drugs into the correctional institution. This rises to a third of the inmates (34.6%) among the Level Three or higher gang risk group.

The Higher The Gang Risk, The More Likely The Inmate Gang Members Are To Use Religious or Cultural Fronts For Their Operations in the Correctional Facility

The survey asked "do any gangs use religious or cultural fronts for their operations in this facility". Table 13 shows that this factor varies consistently across the gang risk continuum. As discussed previously in this report, it may also be true that the more serious gang member may simply be more likely to know the truth about this. The use of existing religious or cultural front groups for gang operations is shown to vary from a low of 10.7 percent for the Level Zero group to a high of 29.4 percent for the Level Three group.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

We began this chapter discussing the weakness of gang research that has a limited variability in defining what is or what is not "gang involved" or shows a sign of "gang involvement". The value of variability in operational definitions of gang involvement is at

the heart of any risk or threat analysis system or classification system applied to the understanding, control, or prevention of gang behavior. File systems in agencies are often not comparable from one facility to the next in terms of what gets defined as a gang member or "gang involvement" or "gang-related" incident. Thus, the preferred way to ascertain "gang involvement" is with primary, not secondary data.

The present study had the blessing of much primary data along these lines. Further, it was specifically and intentionally planned to be able to be able to differentiate between varying levels of gang involvement at the individual level or unit of analysis. As seen in Figure 4, some 15 different questions were used to computer-generate "gang involvement" risk scores (see Table 12) that were then collapsed into four categories of gang risk dimensions. This provided the basic gang risk or threat analysis or classification system. The terminology is not important, the researchers themselves on this project have different disciplinary orientations that use different words for what amounts to the same thing. In law enforcement, it is called threat analysis. In corrections, it is called classification. In health care it is called risk analysis. As our research team did include law enforcement, corrections, and healthcare experts who are also established and recognized gang research experts, we do not care what it is called, it is basically all of these in theory, and perhaps only some of these in practice: that is, it depends how it is used.

Here the gang involvement risk analysis was used to take a closer look at some major issues and problems that will have to be confronted in any coherent strategy to implement a logical and theoretically consistent gang prevention and gang intervention policy at a national level. That has obviously been, all researchers on the present project agree, sorely lacking historically in the government and private sector responses to the gang problem in America.

The profile that emerges here from the gang risk analysis is very consistent across the levels of gang involvement. We can summarize these findings in terms of hypotheses that we challenge other gang analysts to test for themselves.

The greater the level of involvement in gang life: the greater the skepticism such persons have towards gang prevention programs; the less they worry about the future facing today's children; the more they believe that traditional programs (education, counseling, job training) are a waste of time for kids at risk of joining a gang; the more they are likely to have a background of being bullies in school; the more they are likely to have been incarcerated in a juvenile correctional institution; the more likely the persons father did not punish them for misbehavior; the greater the tendency toward dogmatic beliefs, like stereotypy; the more these persons also had the benefit of societal responses (court-mandated psychological counseling or therapy, being involved in group therapy or counseling programs, etc); the less the believe "Boot Camps" could help anyone drop out of a gang; the greater their individual school failure (not finishing high school, being suspended or expelled); the less satisfying their church experiences; the more they believe they will go to hell in the afterlife; the more likely they are to have a permanent tattoo; the less likely they are to be female; the less they believe social work can make a difference in prevention and intervention with gangs; the less they believe the media has a negative impact; the more likely they are to have had family/friends killed in gang violence; the more they want their own children to be in gangs; the higher the substance abuse in their family; the less they believe lifting the secrecy of juvenile court would prevent additional juvenile crime; and a long list of threat behaviors in the correctional environment: including - disciplinary problems, fighting behavior, threats of violence, fighting with rival gangs, gang recruiting while in custody, carrying improvised weapons, threatening staff or correctional officers, attempts to smuggle in illegal drugs into the correctional institution, and using religious or cultural fronts for gang operations.

This chapter has not examined the relationship between the gang risk classification levels and the characteristics of organizational sophistication or organizational structure reported by the same gang members as well as a host of other variables that focus almost exclusively on describing the gang itself as a social group entity or social organization. What we do know is that this is another story altogether that remains to be told that may help understand other pitfalls in past and contemporary gang research: the kind of gang members studied may also limit the kind of "gangs" being studied, leading researchers to premature conclusions about organizational sophistication in the gang world today.

Table 13
Factors Significantly Differentiated By
The Gang Risk Classification System

Higher the Level, Higher the Risk-->	Level 0	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Do you think that programs can be effective in preventing kids from getting involved in gangs?				
Percent YES	68.5	60.2	55.1	48.3
Chi-square = 79.1, p < .001				
Do you think gang prevention programs can be effective in preventing persons from joining a gang?				
Percent YES	64.1	57.9	53.4	43.3
Chi-square = 80.5, p < .001				
I worry about the future facing today's children.				
Percent TRUE	88.1	83.1	82.1	76.3
Chi-square = 34.7, p < .001				
For kids at risk of joining a gang, getting involved in educational programs is a waste of time.				
Percent AGREE	24.1	27.8	32.8	35.6
Chi-square = 32.2, p < .001				
For kids at risk of joining a gang, getting involved in counseling programs is a waste of time.				
Percent AGREE	25.8	31.1	36.2	40.8
Chi-square = 49.1, p < .001				

For kids at risk of joining
a gang, getting involved in

job training programs is a
waste of time.

| | Percent AGREE | 19.0 | 22.7 | 25.5 | 28.6 |

Chi-square = 24.3, p < .001

Did you ever "bully" someone
in school.

| | Percent YES | 42.9 | 54.1 | 63.6 | 73.5 |

Chi-square = 184.9, p < .001

TABLE 11: Continued

Have you ever been locked up
in a juvenile correctional
center or institution?

| | Percent YES | 60.5 | 70.2 | 80.1 | 87.3 |

Chi-square = 185.4, p <. 001

My father never punished me
for misbehavior.

| | Percent TRUE | 28.7 | 29.4 | 30.8 | 36.9 |

Chi-square = 15.4, p = .001

People can be divided into
two distinct classes: the
weak and the strong.

| | Percent AGREE | 49.6 | 56.4 | 58.8 | 68.0 |

Chi-square = 59.1, p < .001

Have you ever been in court-
mandated psychological
counseling or therapy?

| | Percent YES | 41.2 | 49.5 | 52.5 | 59.4 |

Chi-square = 56.3, p < .001

Have you ever been involved
in "group therapy"?

| | Percent YES | 48.3 | 51.6 | 52.1 | 55.5 |

Chi-square = 9.04, p = .02

Have you ever been involved
in any counseling program?

| | Percent YES | 53.1 | 56.0 | 57.9 | 65.1 |

Chi-square = 26.5, p < .001

Do you think a "boot camp"
could influence some people
to get out of a gang?

| | Percent YES | 53.4 | 48.7 | 41.9 | 35.3 |

Chi-square = 62.6, p < .001

Have you ever received a
high school degree or G.E.D.
degree? Percent YES 22.1 13.9 13.3 12.9
Chi-square = 37.9, p < .001

TABLE 11: Continued

How would you rate your
experiences with churches?
Percent LIKED IT 82.5 78.0 77.8 71.9
Chi-square = 26.6, p < .001

Do you have a permanent
tattoo?
Percent YES 29.9 39.8 52.6 73.7
Chi-square = 357.3, p < .001

Assume there is a God. So
if you died right now, where
would you go?
Percent TO HELL 19.3 26.4 29.2 38.1
Chi-square = 68.5, p < .001

Have you ever been demoted
in school?
Percent YES 38.3 44.9 46.0 49.5
Chi-square = 23.0, p < .001

Gender.
Percent FEMALE 16.7 13.3 10.2 7.0
Chi-square = 40.6, p < .001

Do you think that social
workers can be effective in
reaching out to persons who
might want to quit the gang?
Percent YES 66.8 64.1 57.9 51.9
Chi-square = 45.2, p < .001

Do you think social workers
can be effective in helping
kids stay out of gangs?
Percent YES 63.1 61.0 54.9 43.3
Chi-square = 75.8, p < .001

Do you think that recreation

programs, after school
programs, or social workers
might have been able to
prevent you from joining
a gang?

	Percent YES	63.7	57.5	51.1	39.1

Chi-square = 105.4, p < .001

TABLE 11: Continued

Do you feel that if less
attention was given to gangs
on television, in newspapers,
and in movies that fewer
people would join gangs?

	Percent YES	53.7	50.4	43.6	35.8

Chi-square = 61.8, p < .001

Have any of your friends or
family been killed because
of gang trouble?

	Percent YES	27.3	50.8	66.1	81.4

Chi-square = 554.3, p < .001

Do you want your children
to be in a gang?

	Percent YES	5.4	11.5	17.6	21.2

Chi-square = 102.4, p < .001

Do you think anyone in
your family uses drugs
or drinks too much?

	Percent YES	46.4	55.9	60.2	65.1

Chi-square = 66.3, p < .001

If the confidentiality of
juvenile court was
eliminated, and thus
juvenile court would be
open to the public and the
newspapers, do you think
this would discourage more
juveniles from committing
a crime?

	Percent YES	39.3	38.7	35.8	32.6

Chi-square = 9.62, p = .02

Have you ever been
suspended from school?

Percent YES   78.8   82.2   82.3   92.5
                 Chi-square = 63.9, p < .001

Have you ever been
expelled from school?
                 Percent YES   43.5   53.0   60.5   74.8
                 Chi-square = 177.7, p < .001

TABLE 11: Continued

Have you had any "privileges"
removed or taken away while
in this facility?
                 Percent YES   46.0   57.2   69.8   70.7
                 Chi-square = 79.6, p < .001

Have you been in a physical
fight with anyone in
this facility?
                 Percent YES   18.1   40.8   49.7   69.1
                 Chi-square = 263.6, p < .001

Have you threatened anyone
with violence in this facility?
                 Percent YES   16.2   36.6   47.9   65.6
                 Chi-square = 253.4, p < .001

Have you fought with any
rival gang members in
this facility?   Percent YES   7.8   25.4   41.3   60.3
                 Chi-square = 250.2, p < .001

Have you tried to recruit
anyone into your gang
in this facility?   Percent YES   1.8   14.7   29.8   33.5
                 Chi-square = 108.6, p < .001

Have you carried a homemade
weapon (knife, etc) in
this facility?   Percent YES   2.3   15.3   31.6   33.3
                 Chi-square = 166.5, p < .001

Have you threatened any
facility staff member or
officer in this facility?
                 Percent YES   3.0   18.0   30.3   37.2
                 Chi-square = 173.6, p < .001
How many "disciplinary" reports

have you had while in
this facility?
(Note: Actual Frequency Used)

NONE	196	151	164	136
ONE	67	46	65	65
TWO	31	31	57	45
THREE	21	35	55	56
FOUR	20	22	66	41
FIVE OR MORE	35	95	163	232

Chi-square = 176.8, p < .001

TABLE 11: Continued

Did you start a fight with
anyone or attack someone
while in this facility?

Percent YES	7.4	25.7	44.1	54.1

Chi-square = 266.9, p < .001

Have you tried to smuggle in
any illegal drugs while
in this facility?

Percent YES	1.9	10.4	27.0	34.6

Chi-square = 197.2, p < .001

Do any gangs use religious
or cultural fronts for their
operations in this facility?

Percent YES	10.7	17.7	27.2	29.4

Chi-square = 41.7, p < .001

CHAPTER 6

**The Relationship Between Individual Gang Risk Behavior
and the Gang as a Group or Organizational Structure**

INTRODUCTION

One of the first things a novice to the field of gang studies learns is that there is much disagreement and often diametrically opposed conclusions about what gangs do and how sophisticated gangs are as organizational entities, i.e., social groups and social organizations. One of the first things an empirical gang researcher learns in the field is that this "disagreement" in the professional gang literature is less a mystery due to theoretical orientations than it is a matter of research methodology itself: less sophisticated gangs, and less threatening gang members are easier to study. We postulate that much of this confusion today among some authors in the gang literature, about whether gangs are mostly loose-knit groups or organized groups, derives from the way the same researchers actually conduct their research. That is, gang research that covers the lower end of the gang risk continuum will pick up a lower level of gang sophistication, and conversely the higher end of the gang risk continuum will be able to identify a more complex style of gang organizational structure. There is no controversy in this way of looking at the past research, what we have are differences only in the kinds of gangs and gang members studied: the lack of variability in research access to this underground phenomenon therefore limits generalizability, even though such individual authors with small research efforts have not been reluctant to make large generalizations about the world of gangs in modern America today.

In otherwords, an important piece of the gang knowledge puzzle can be solved by the present research. In spite of what some authors are willing to conclude about the complexity of gang organizational structures that exist in the United States today, the present data environment was specifically designed to obtain primary data along the dimensions of the types of gang groups or gang organizations that exist in the United States today. This data encompasses 24 different social contexts for our sampling strategy in 8 different states. This sampling strategy includes the east, the midwest, the south, and the west; major urban areas like Los Angeles County and Chicago, as well as smaller rural areas and "heartland" areas. Thus, unlike most gang research ours does provide comparative data across many jurisdictions. Most gang research has lacked such a comparative analytical capability. Also, unlike most gang research, our data is not limited to the at-large schoolroom population, it includes some of the hardest data to get access to: those behind bars, inside juvenile, youth,

and adult correctional institutions. In fact, the present study includes the single largest sample of confined persons ever reported in the gang research literature. Most such previous research has relied on groups easily accessed from one state only. And most such previous research on the confined gang member population has had to rely on official records as secondary data, while our research through much effort relies on primary data.

In light of these observations, we argue that our research is best able to speak to the issues of organizational complexity.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GANG INVOLVEMENT AND GANG STRUCTURES

   The purpose of this chapter is to examine the relationship between gang involvement and gang structures. For this purpose, we will use the gang risk classification system discussed in chapter 5, but only using as our sample for analysis those in categories 1, 2 and 3. In otherwords, including the Level Zero group would not be justified in examining gang structures: something non-gang members are not expected to know anything about. Those in the most advantageous position to know about gang structures are those with actual levels of gang involvement. Thus, it makes only good sense to eliminate the Level Zero gang involvement risk category for purposes of the analysis undertaken here.

    Unlike the analysis in chapter 5, the present chapter looks at the gang as a collective, as a social entity, as a group or as an organizational structure. While chapter 5 examined gang involvement in relationship to other threat and risk behaviors of gang members, or related beliefs, these were at the individual level. In otherwords what was being measured in the chapter 5 was mostly information about the individual, not the individual's group or organization. The present chapter uses the categories 1, 2 and 3 in the gang involvement risk scale to examine these measures of gang involvement in relationship to information describing the gang itself as a social organizational structure. The reader will recall from chapter 3 that a number of different questions in the survey for this research project sought information not about the individual, but about the kind of group, the type of organization (i.e., gang) the person actually belonged to.

   For convenience, the findings discussed here are presented in Table 14. Table 14 is a long reference table and is located at the very end of this chapter.

The Basic Profile of the Gang Involvement Risk Levels

    The first three findings in Table 14 describe findings about the basic profile of the gang involvement risk levels, and help to simply define what we mean by these categories. A Level One group therefore is typically: half have joined the gang, and most others are gang associates. A Level Two group reflects mostly those who have joined a gang, two-thirds of which are still active members in the gang. A Level Three group is composed of more serious levels of gang involved: 99 percent have joined a gang, 94 percent are still active, 80 percent have held rank or leadership in their gang. What shakes out in comparing these levels of gang involvement is a classification system reflecting low, medium, and high levels of gang involvement. Now we can turn to those findings where this level of gang involvement is also significant in relationship to measurements about the nature of the gang itself as a social organizational entity.

The Gang as A Coercive Compliance Structure

      Obviously, a gang that uses violence on its members to enforce internal rules and

regulations of the gang is a gang that is more sophisticated organizationally and functionally than one that does not "violate" its members for infractions. Table 14 shows that if we examine whether or not the same gang member has been "violated" by his/her own gang, that this in fact is very strongly associated with levels of gang involvement: the higher the gang involvement, the more likely the gang member is to report having been "violated" by his/her gang. For example, among the Level One group category (low level of gang involvement) only a fourth (25.1%) have been "violated" (i.e., received a type of physical punishment or beating from their own gang). This rises to 42.9 percent for the Level Two category and to half of the gang members (51.8%) in the Level Three category. As an aside, it may be valuable to explore at a later point in this report the hypothesis about compliance generally: are the gang members who have been punished or disciplined by their own gang also more likely to have been through a long list of disciplinary measures from high school to their incarceration experiences?

Gangs That Have A Special Language Code
    Obviously, a gang that has a special language code is one that is more organizationally developed than one that does not have a special language code. There are many examples of these special language codes among American gangs today. In these special language codes, subcultural argot is mixed with regular words and expressions that have double meanings, producing a linguistic subsystem that is capable of being used to communicate exact meanings covertly to other members of the same gang. For example, someone hollers out from a group "knowledge, wisdom, and understanding", or wears a shirt or hat saying "Universal Knowledge", this may all seem like nothing more than simple words from the English language: but it is not, the phrase "knowledge, wisdom, and understanding" comes from the first three meanings of the first three "points" in the star of David symbol used by Gangster Disciple gang members, it is an expression that they can use to basically represent their gang in a coded expression. Similarly, "Universal Knowledge" is a code word for the same thing among Gangster Disciples.
    In correctional settings, inmates of one gang communicate their presence to members of the same gang using such special language codes. For example, in a lock-up, or jail setting, when a new member arrives that no one else can see because they are all locked down in their cells, it is not uncommon for the person if he or she is a gang member to do a "shout out". The person will might holler something like "twenty-two twelve", the alphanumeric code for V.L., or Vice Lord. The person is saying he or she is a member of the Vice Lords. Someone else locked up nearby in shouting distance might holler back "nine twenty two twelve", meaning that person is an Insane Vice Lord. And if the original new person to the lock-up hollers back "one nine twenty two twelve" he is saying "almighty insane vice lords", and basically says by coded message he or she is a member of the same gang.
    Table 14 shows that among those in the Level One category of gang involvement a third (34%) report having a special language code. This rises to half (55.9%) for the Level Two category of gang involvement. And then rises to two-thirds (68.5%) for the Level Three category. Clearly, there is a differentiation occurring here: lower levels of gang involvement are associated with less sophistication regarding special language codes, and higher levels of gang involvement are associated with descriptions of their gang as being more organizationally complex in this respect.

Gangs That Have Written Rules
    Table 14 also shows that whether the gang has written rules is also a factor that seems to vary with the level of gang involvement. Having written rules is an aspect of greater

organizational sophistication. That is, a gang with written rules is more organized than one without written rules for its members. One of the common elements in these internal written rules for gang members is typically about secrecy: don't tell anyone about what really goes on in our organization, i.e., don't divulge "nation business". Ethnographers and participant observers of gangs, not surprisingly often come away with no knowledge of the written rules or the prayers or the written constitution of gangs like the Latin Kings and Vice Lords --- two that clearly have this type of organizational infrastructure feature. A classic example is David Dawley's book about the Vice Lords, someone who so identifies with the gang that he is shown in a picture in the book exhibiting the gang stand (arms crossed to the left), and who actually makes the claim of being the only white member of the Vice Lords; but no where in his account do we ever find out about the written rules of the Vice Lords.

A clear progression is shown in Table 14 regarding this aspect of gang structure. The percentage of gang members reporting their gang has written rules varies from a low of 42.4 percent for the Level One group to a high of 69.3 percent for the Level Three group.

Gangs With Adult Leaders Who Have Been in the Gang For Many Years

There are many youths or young people in the branches of the U.S. armed forces, but no one would refer to the Army, Marines, Air Force, Navy, or Coast Guard as "youth organizations". Churches, Mosques, and Synagogues while they have youth and juvenile members of their respective flocks are similarly not referred to as a collective identity as a "youth organization". The issue here is that a gang that is basically administered by older adults is not a "youth gang" or a "juvenile gang" just because it has youths or juveniles as members, rather it is more accurate to say it is an adult driven organization that contains youths. One of the questions about gang structure gets directly at this issue.

Obviously, the natural variation in gangs is such that there truly are collections of youths without adult leaders, but we would suspect these smaller less formally organized gangs are a significantly lower threat to public safety than the more organized adult led gang organizations. The pure youth gang may also be more likely to be a product of indigenous formation, at least we can test this hypothesis in our present research at a later point in the report.

As seen in Table 14, the real difference that emerges in regard to whether the gang has adult leaders who have been in the gang for many years, is in comparing the lowest level of gang involvement (Level One) with the other two categories. About half (55.6%) of the Level One gang members report their gang has adult leaders who have a long period of tenure in the gang. But this jumps to 83 percent for the Level Two group and to 91.3 percent for the Level Three group. Again, we are seeing a clear differentiation of gang structure by levels of gang involvement.

Gangs That Exist in Several Different Geographical Areas

A truly local gang is a gang that exists in only one specific geographical area. A gang that has units of operation that are in several different geographical locations, perhaps even non-contiguous geographically, is a more complex organizational structure. Here again, as seen in Table 14, this aspect of gang structure is shown to vary with the level of gang involvement. Some 60.9 percent of the Level One gang members report their gang exists in several different geographical areas, compared to 80.4 percent for the Level Three group.

Exogenous Formation

An issue about gang etiology, how the gang first originates, as one of many concerns about gang proliferation (see Knox, Tromanhauser, McCurrie, and Laske, 1996), is whether the

gang arose because of indigenous formation (i.e., it arose on its own locally without contact from gangs by the same name from another area) or whether it was due to exogenous formation (i.e., the gang first arose by contact with the same gang in another city). We suspect both phenomena are occurring, it is not an issue of one or the other, as we assume natural variation in this factor as well. But Table 14 does show an interesting finding about exogenous formation: this factor is also related to the level of gang involvement. Some 37.1 percent in the Level One group report their gang arose in the fashion of exogenous formation, compared to 51.5 percent for the Level Three group. It is reasonable to therefore argue that gangs arising from exogenous influence will have greater organizational sophistication, because they will have joined a larger alliance structure with friendly contacts in other cities.

Gangs That Have A Private Attorney Used For Criminal Matters

Table 14 shows a clear trend in regard to whether the gang has the organizational sophistication to have a private attorney used for defending its members in criminal matters. This finding is consistent with several others in Table 14, particularly about dues and whether the gang maintains a treasury, because this is how a gang pays an attorney: and typically in cash. Only 20.3 percent of the Level One gang members report their gang has this capability, but this figure doubles (45.9%) for the Level Three group.

Gang That Keep An Account That Pays Only for Legal Defense

Most any social organization or voluntary association would admire this aspect of organizational sophistication: a provision for legal defense. As seen in Table 14, about a fourth (24.5%) of the Level One gang members report their gang has this capability, compared to half (51.2%) of the Level Three gang members. Clearly, again, this aspect of gang organizational sophistication does vary with the severity level of the individual gang members.

Gangs That Hold Regular Meetings

This is a basic issue for any social organization or volunteer group: a group that does not hold regular meetings is truly a loose knit group in some respects. Just as it is true that a group that holds regular meetings is one that has a higher level of organizational functioning than one that does not. Table 14 shows that about half (49.5%) of the Level One gang members report their gang holds regular meetings, compared to 86.1 percent for the Level Three group.

Familial Ties in Gang Life

This is an issue of greater solidarity by blending the social networks any individual has and it means, theoretically, a stronger organizational cohesiveness when family ties are mixed together with gang ties. Table 14 shows that while 45.6 percent of the Level One gang members report they have family members who are in a gang, this rises to 64.8 percent for the Level Two group, and to a high of 86.2 percent for the Level Three group.

Gangs That Maintain A Treasury

This is an obvious feature measuring organizational sophistication: a gang that maintains a common treasury for collective expenditures is one more sophisticated than a gang that does not maintain a treasury. Typical expenditures from a gang treasury are: gang clothing/emblems/paraphernalia, guns, ammunition, parties, and small token payments to incarcerated members as well as, obviously, lawyers. For detailed information on gang treasuries see Project GANGECON (1995).

Table 14 shows a clear pattern in regard to gangs that maintain treasuries in relationship

to the gang involvement classification system. A third (33.3%) of the Level One gang members report their gang has a treasury, compared to two thirds (68.4%) of the Level Three group. Clearly, the same overall pattern appears here as well: the higher threat level gang members are associated with more organizationally sophisticated gang organizations; and vice versa.

Gangs That Require Members to Pay Regular Dues

This is another basic element of gang organization where we expect natural variation to exist. It is also, however, a matter of organizational sophistication. A gang that cannot gain regular, typically weekly, dues in small amounts ($5 or $6), is not a particularly sophisticated gang. Paying dues to gangs is also usually enforced by means of "violations": someone who does not pay dues can be "violated" (i.e., physically beaten).

Table 14 shows that a fourth (25.7%) of the Level One gang members report they pay dues to their gang, compared to 44.5 percent of the Level Three gang members. So the difference that emerges here is really between the Level One group compared with levels two and three generally.

Gangs That Require Participation in Illegal Activity

A gang that requires persons to participate in illegal activities before being considered a real member of the gang is a gang that also has a greater level of control over members. In other words, it is a gang requiring greater sacrifice and risk from its members; and in this sense is a stronger gang than a gang that has no expectations from its members. It is an matter of organizational functioning in gang behavior, and there obviously exist gangs like this, just as there are variants of gang organizational styles where a member may be afforded the choice to be involved in the crime end of gang business or not. We expect, after all, with the thousands of gangs that exist in the United States today that such variation should logically exist.

Table 14 shows, clearly, that the higher end of the individual gang member threat level is associated with a more complex gang form. A fourth (25.8%) of the Level One gang members report their gang requires some illegal activity before a person can become accepted as a member of the gang. However, this rises to 45.9 percent in the Level Three group.

Parental Complicity in Gang Organizations

A sad fact of life in dealing with the American gang problem today is that some parents are actively involved with the gang, and that could include their children being involved in the same gang. We are aware of a number of cases of parents raising their children to be gang members. Just as we are aware of cases where in the same family the siblings belong to rival gangs.

Table 14 is very clear about the factor of parental complicity in gang life today. When asked "in your gang, are there members whose parents are also active gang members", we see this is no small problem. Some 45.4 percent of the Level One group report this factor of parental complicity, and it rises to 79.2 percent for the Level Three group. Obviously, a gang with both parent and offspring in the same gang means the gang has the benefit of being a kind of "family affair" and adds legitimacy to the gang as a social organizational enterprise. It is a factor to consider in investigating gang structures and in Table 14 it is also shown to vary by the level of individual gang risk as well.

Parents Who Approve of the Gang Membership of Their Children

As seen in Table 14, fortunately this appears to be a relatively rare phenomenon, but it does occur and as seen here it is related to the individual level of gang risk. This would appear to

suggest that parental complicity is not particularly a common occurrence. As only 4.3 percent of those in the Level One group indicated their parents approved of their gang involvement. This does rise to 11.4 percent for the Level Three group. So there is some variation here in the expected direction.

Autonomy and Social Control in Gang Organizations

A gang that operates more like a cult and basically the other gang members know the personal business of the members is a more sophisticated gang organizationally than a gang where the individual member can maintain a secret and private life away from the gang. A gang that operates more like a cult and thus each member's personal life is known to other members is an organizational structure with greater social control over that member. Conversely, a gang that does not know much about each member's personal life is a gang that offers more autonomy and anonymity to its members, but may lack the solidarity that comes from close intimate ties.

Table 14 is clear about this factor: some 37 percent of the Level One gang members report that in their gang, each member's personal life is known to other members. But this rises to 56.3 percent for the Level Three group. The issue of organizational sophistication involved here is the matter of having a "self" or personal identity that exists independently of the gang identity. A gang that knows the personal business of each member is equivalent in some sense to a total control institution.

Vertically Structured Gang Organizations

As seen in Table 14, the way we have measured this aspect of gang organization is similar to the way of investigating any social organization. The survey asked whether the respondent felt it was true or false that "in my gang, the things the gang does are approved by a higher up leader". This basically measures the aspect of vertically structured gang organizations. We recognize, here as well, that there is bound to be variation in this factor; the alternative to vertically structured gangs being horizontally structured gangs.

Table 14 shows that 40.4 percent of the Level One gang members report their gang is vertically structured, compared to 55.5 percent of the Level Three gang members.

Gangs That Maintain Membership Lists

Chances are that if gangs collect dues, gangs also maintain a membership list. Some gangs, obviously, do maintain a list of names of its members. As seen in Project GANGECON (1995), this is also common where the gang holds regular meetings: the gang wants to know who shows up late, and the gang will punish (i.e., violate) members who continually miss required meetings. The issue is simple though: we expect this factor of gang organizational sophistication to also vary in the gang world. Some gangs do and some gangs don't maintain membership lists. But those that do are more organizationally sophisticated.

Table 14 shows that 40.4 percent of the gang members in the Level One group report their gang maintains a membership list. But this rises to 55.5 percent for the Level Three threat group.

Gangs That Can Fine Members for Mistakes

This is an easily recognized factor of organizational sophistication: a gang that can fine its members for mistakes. Table 14 shows that some 44 percent of the gang members in the Level One group report that their gang has this capability, compared with 63 percent in the Level Three group. Clearly, we see an ongoing interaction between the severity level of the

gang risk or involvement level and the type of organizationally sophisticated gang the person belongs to.

Heterogeneous Gangs: Having Asian Members
It is a complex issue here to explain how a racially or ethnically heterogeneous gang is more organizationally sophisticated than one that is homogeneous, but where it comes into play particularly is in the transition to organized crime forms. Table 14 does show that this trend is consistent. Some 36.4 percent of the Level One gang members reported having Asian members in their gang, but this rises to 48.9 percent for the Level Three gang members.

Gangs That Get Greater Member Mobilization From Intense News Coverage
Table 14 shows that under the condition where there is intense news coverage of their gang, that only 54.7 percent of the Level One gang members report that more members get involved. However, this rises to 76.2 percent for the Level Three gang members. Thus, it is fair to say that like anything else, there exists variation in the kind of impact the mass media has: for some gangs it can increase, and for other gangs it can decrease, membership involvement in the gang. In otherwords, depending on the gang the coverage can have a chilling or warming effect.

Gangs That Gain More New Members From Intense News Coverage
Table 14 also shows an interesting trend in this regard as well. Like anything else, when we examine the effect that the mass media may play in terms of increasing or decreasing gang power, it really depends on the type of gang being given the media coverage. Table 14 shows that 58.5 percent of the Level One gang members report that more new members tend to join under the condition of intensive news coverage of their gang, but this rises to 84 percent in the Level Three group!

Commitment to the Gang Organization: Dropping Their Flag for the Good Life
Finally, Table 14 shows a measure of commitment to the gang group or organization. It is based on yes/no answers to the question: "would you quit gang life if you had the chance to get married, get a good steady job, and live somewhere else". The good news is that apparently we could eliminate two-thirds to four-fifths of the contemporary American gang problem if we simply matched up every alienated gang member in a dating service with a potential spouse and some relocation assistance. In otherwords, a great many are willing to drop their flag, or quit gang life. However, this does vary by the level of gang risk classification. Some 80.4 percent of the Level One group would defect from their gang, compared to two-thirds (66.5%) of the Level Three group.
For the record, we are fascinated with the implications of this finding, enough so to dedicate an entire new national gang research consortium or Task Force style project to examine this and other aspects about gang life. Persons interested in joining this large scale probono gang research initiative should contact the National Gang Crime Research Center.

DEVELOPING A GANG ORGANIZATIONAL SCALE
There have been several previous approaches to investigating gang structures (Project GANGGUNS, 1994; Project GANGECON, 1995) that the researchers have had a role in. The present approach therefore reflects an improved methodology towards this goal. Figure 5 lists the twelve factors that were used to create an additive scale index of gang organizational sophistication. On this scale, the higher the raw index score, the greater the level of

organizational sophistication in the gang the member belonged to. Table 15 provides the actual distribution for the raw scale score results and shows how the index can be broken down into a threat analysis system.

   As seen in Table 15, classifying the gang organizations in terms of known levels of sophistication (Figure 5) can basically provide us with four levels of gang threat in terms of this measure of organizational sophistication. Level Zero in terms of gang organizational sophistication has the low range of scale scores (0 through 3). Level One in this configuration reflects scores of 4 through 6. Level Two includes scores of 7 and 8. And Level Three includes the high range of scores, 9 through 12. Each gang category includes about a fourth of the sample here. It is also important to note for Table 15 that we are examining here only the distribution for those in our sample who have gang behavior index scores of one or higher. This therefore basically includes only gang members in examining gang structures.

FIGURE 5

Twelve Factors Used in Creating An Additive
Index Score of Gang Organizational Sophistication

Does your gang have a special language code, add one point.

Does your gang have written rules, add one point.

Does your gang have adult leaders who have been in the gang for many years, add one point.

Does your gang exist in several different geographical areas, add one point.

Does your gang have a private attorney that you use for defending your members in criminal matters, add one point.

Does your gang keep an account that pays only for legal defense, add one point.

Does your gang hold regular meetings, add one point.

Does the gang you are in have a treasury, add one point.

Does your gang require members to pay regular dues, add one point.

Are the things your gang does approved by a higher up leader, add one point.

Does your gang keep a list of names of the members, add one point.

In your gang, can a member be "fined" for a mistake, add one point.

TABLE 15

Scale Scores in the Additive Index of
Gang Organizational Sophistication
Among Those With Gang Risk Categories of One or Higher

Scale Score	N	%	Gang Threat Classification	
0	272	11.6	0	Level Zero
1	88	3.8	0	
2	115	4.9	0	
3	144	6.1	0	Level Zero^
4	206	8.8	1	Level One
5	192	8.2	1	
6	257	11.0	1	Level One^
7	240	10.2	2	Level Two
8	247	10.5	2	Level Two^
9	212	9.0	3	Level Three
10	172	7.3	3	
11	114	4.9	3	
12	85	3.6	3	Level Three^

THE RELATIONSHIP OF GANG ORGANIZATIONAL COMPLEXITY TO LEVELS OF GANG INVOLVEMENT

   Table 16 provides our test here of the interaction of gang organizational complexity with the levels of gang involvement examined earlier in this chapter. Recall that for the gang member population we are looking at levels one through three in terms of gang involvement, as a level zero would basically be a non-gang member.

   Table 16 shows a very strong clustering effect in the distribution towards two polar extremes.

   The tendency is very pronounced in Table 16 for the less dangerous individual gang members to cluster around the lower level organizationally sophisticated types of gangs. A similar extreme tendency exists in the upper end of the gang-individual threat system: those with the higher level individual gang involvement levels tend to be more highly concentrated in more sophisticated gang types.

   We believe we have helped to solve an important riddle in the gang research literature

here. While gang researchers have argued and debated, with little data we might add, about whether American gangs are loose knit types of "near groups" or whether they are in some cases complex formal organizations, the reality is what we have suggested all along in our research: there is natural variation here. But this also helps to clarify a lot about the nature of findings of gang threat in terms of individual behavior and in terms of what kinds of impact are attributed to the gang. Table 16 shows, without any doubt, that it is the more organizationally sophisticated type of gang that also has the more serious individual gang members. We feel this has enormous implications for gang prevention and gang intervention as will be discussed elsewhere in this report.

What Table 16 tells us is that gang research sampling strategies that only include the lower end of the gang organizational sophistication spectrum are going, more likely than not, to pick up lower levels of actual gang risk behavior as well. Similarly, the higher threat individual gang member appears to be more associated with complex gang structures. A necessary implication of this finding is that much prior research will have to be re-read to classify it where possible for purposes of what kind of "gang" or "gang member" was being studied. Obviously, one is not going to find large scale crack distribution systems studying an "Alfalfa and Spanky" Level Zero type of gang is what our research would predict. Similarly, to speak to the issue of gang violence, a researcher would have to examine gangs and gang members across the spectrum as we have suggested here.

The good news is that the clustering may self-isolate gangs and gang members who are most suitable for using limited resources like the correctional sanction. Similarly, it may prove useful, depending on whether society is willing to think creatively in finding new solutions to old problems, in new approaches to inducing massive gang defection from a tertiary prevention strategy. In any case, any solution is going to take a very strong dose of primary prevention, and we make no guarantees that crime and criminal behavior will cease amongst the high gang threat/high individual gang behavior threat subgroup that may upon closer analysis come to represent the real gang problem in America today.

TABLE 16

Frequency Distribution of The Level of Gang Organizational
Sophistication By the Levels (1-3) of Gang Risk Behavior

| | Levels of Individual Gang Risk Behavior | | |
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Levels of Gang Organizational Sophistication:			
Level Zero	141	142	64
Level One	145	308	202
Level Two	66	212	209
Level Three	44	197	342

Chi-square = 256.8, p < .001

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This chapter has examined gang involvement at the individual level in relationship to the gang as a group or organizational structure using a large national sample of gang members. It helps end debate about whether gangs are primarily loose-knit groups or highly organized almost corporate style entities. The behavior included much that can happen in any context, and a several variables looked at gang behavior behind bars. The research reported here enjoyed one of the largest samples of confined gang members known in the literature to test the value of a classification approach for dealing with security threat groups. By examining the gang as a collective social entity it was possible in this research to identify a number of factors in the nature of the group or organizational structure including its features and capabilities that were significantly related to low or high gang risk behavior at the individual level.

The profile that emerged here was that higher threat levels of individual gang behavior were associated with the following features of more sophisticated gangs: using violence to enforce internal rules; having a special language code; having written rules; having adult leaders who have been in the gang for many years; being a gang that exists in several different geographical areas; being a gang that arose due to exogenous formation (i.e., first arose by contact with the same gang in another city); having a private attorney used for criminal matters; having an account that pays for legal defense; having members from the same family members in a gang; having a treasury; paying regular dues; being required to participate in illegal activities before being considered a full member; having parents as members; parents approving of gang membership; being a gang that knows each member's personal life; being vertically structured gangs (i.e., the things the gang does are approved by a higher up); being a gang that maintains a membership list; being able to fine a member; and having Asian members.

Based on these findings a gang organizational scale was developed to examine the variability in the extent of informality and formality in the gang. In otherwords, measuring the level of sophistication in organizational capabilities in the gang world. A matrix was developed examine gang organizational sophistication levels (0 through 3) in relationship to individual risk behavior levels of known gang members (1 through 3).

A primary research finding here was that the interaction between gang structure and gang behavior showed a strong clustering effect towards two polar extremes. One tendency was for the less dangerous individual gang member to cluster around less sophisticated and less complex social group formations. The other tendency was for the higher threat gang members to be concentrated in more sophisticated types of gang structures.

TABLE 14
Findings About The Gang as a Social Group
or Social Organization Based on
Reports from a Gang Risk Analysis

Level of Gang Involvement	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Have you ever joined a gang?			
Percent YES	57.6	93.6	99.3
Chi-square = 575.3, p < .001			
Are you currently a member of any gang group or gang organization? Percent YES	18.6	68.9	94.0

122

Chi-square = 849.2, p < .001

Have you ever held rank or
any leadership position in
any gang?   Percent YES   25.9   63.4   80.5
        Chi-square = 405.5, p <.001

TABLE 14: Continued

Level of Gang Involvement	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3

Have you ever been "violated"
(received a beating) by your
own gang for a "violation"?
        Percent YES   25.1   42.9   51.8
        Chi-square = 83.7, p < .001

Does your gang have a special
language code?
        Percent YES   34.0   55.9   68.5
        Chi-square = 137.9, p < .001

Does your gang have written
rules?
        Percent YES   42.4   64.6   69.3
        Chi-square = 92.2, p < .001

Does your gang have adult
leaders who have been in
the gang for many years?
        Percent YES   55.6   83.0   91.3
        Chi-square = 237.0, p < .001

Does your gang exist in
several different geographical
areas?
        Percent YES   60.9   68.4   80.4
        Chi-square = 53.5, p < .001

Did your gang first arise
by contact with the same
gang in another city?
        Percent YES   37.1   47.8   51.5
        Chi-square = 23.3, p < .001

Does your gang have a private
attorney that you use for

defending your members in
criminal matters?

    Percent YES   20.3   30.5   45.9
    Chi-square = 85.5, p < .001

Level of Gang Involvement   Level 1 Level 2 Level 3

Does your gang keep an account
that pays only for legal
defense?

    Percent YES   24.5   46.2   51.2
    Chi-square = 80.7, p < .001

Does your gang hold regular
meetings?

    Percent YES   49.5   69.3   86.1
    Chi-square = 188.1, p < .001

Do you have family members
who are in a gang?

    Percent YES   45.6   64.8   86.2
    Chi-square = 252.2, p < .001

Does the gang you are in
have a treasury?

    Percent YES   33.3   58.9   68.4
    Chi-square = 134.5, p < .001

Does your gang require members
to pay regular dues.

    Percent YES   25.7   43.4   44.5
    Chi-square = 44.9, p < .001

In your gang, does a person
have to participate in an
illegal activity before the
person can become accepted
as a member of the gang?

    Percent YES   25.8   37.3   45.9
    Chi-square = 44.9, p < .001

In your gang, are there
members whose parents are

also active gang members?
                    Percent YES   45.4   64.5   79.2
                    Chi-square = 135.3, p < .001

In general, did your parents
approve or disapprove or your
own gang involvement?
          Percent APPROVED   4.3   6.8   11.4
                    Chi-square = 31.9, p < .001

<p style="text-align:center"><strong style="color:red">TABLE 14: Continued</p>

Level of Gang Involvement	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3

In my gang, each member's
personal life is known to
other members.
                    Percent TRUE   37.0   46.8   56.3
                    Chi-square = 39.6, p < .001

In my gang, the things the
gang does are approved by a
higher up leader.
                    Percent TRUE   52.7   61.3   65.6
                    Chi-square = 17.6, p < .001

In my gang, the gang keeps
a list of names of the members.
                    Percent TRUE   40.4   48.3   55.5
                    Chi-square = 23.8, p < .001

In my gang, a member can be
"fined" for a mistake.
                    Percent TRUE   44.0   55.2   63.0
                    Chi-square = 37.4, p < .001

Are there any Asian members
in your gang?   Percent YES   36.4   46.1   48.9
                    Chi-square = 16.0, p < .001

When there is intense news
coverage of your gang, what
effect does this have on
your gang?
  % MORE MEMBERS GET INVOLVED   54.7   70.3   76.2
  % FEWER MEMBERS GET INVOLVED   45.3   29.7   23.8
                    Chi-square = 19.3, p < .001

When there is intense news
coverage of your gang, what

effect does this have on
your gang?

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
% MORE NEW MEMBERS JOIN	58.5	72.3	84.0
% FEWER NEW MEMBERS JOIN	41.5	27.7	16.0

Chi-square = 26.7, p < .001

TABLE 14: Continued

Level of Gang Involvement	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Would you quit gang life if you had the chance to get married, get a good steady job, and live somewhere else?			
Percent YES	80.4	73.7	66.5

Chi-square = 23.5, p < .001

Chapter 7

SOCIAL SERVICE CONSUMPTION LEVELS AMONG YOUTHS IN RELATIONSHIP TO GANG RISK FACTORS

INTRODUCTION

An unresolved philosophical issue pivots around the problem of triage in the allocation of scarce resources such as those represented by our Nation's social service industry. Simply put there is now, as probably has always been the case, more problem cases deserving of help and assistance than there are sufficient helping professionals with resources to allocate to the needy. In the arena of gang problems the triage issue also appears if a threat analysis suggests greater bang for the buck in terms of resource allocation at the lower end of the gang risk spectrum. Expressed somewhat differently, any recommendation to focus national policy with a predominant emphasis on pure primary prevention, with less emphasis on secondary prevention, and much less emphasis if at all on tertiary intervention, basically boils down to a triage decision based on the risk-benefit decision tree.

Another issue complicating a national needs assessment on gang prevention is the notion that to some extent it may be argued that the social service experience history among modern youths can also be a surrogate measure of the extent to which social control agencies have focused on the same youths. In an earlier section of this report we found, for example, that in regard to some types of prevention and intervention services: gang members have benefited more from these services than their non-gang member counterparts in the youth population. This chapter will explore some of the implications of this issue.

DEVELOPING A SOCIAL SERVICE CONSUMPTION SCALE

The analytical question we had was measuring the extent to which a person had been the consumer of social services, the likes of which are designed to be preventative in nature, or at least commonly used in delinquency and gang prevention and intervention. The idea here was simple: developing a scale score or index that reflects the natural variation in social service experiences. That is, there is a need to have a measure of the extent to which a person has had the benefit of an assortment of social service resources commonly available in American society.

Our methodology was that of developing an additive index based on a variety of separate forced choice questions. For purposes of an additive index we are not examining the intensity of the consumption, but rather the extent of the general consumption of available prevention services. It is important at this point to mention that the time ordering inference is also not made here, as it cannot from the present data be determined if the services are a cause or

response to the extent of gang behavior. Rather the issue here is much simpler and elementary in nature: taking a look at the overall variation in the scope and extent of social service consumption.

The index developed used twelve different variables and therefore had a logical range of scores between a low of zero for no such social service consumption to a high of 12 for the highest level of social service consumption. The social service consumption index therefore tends to measure the extent to which these youths have had the benefit of a vast array of social services. The twelve types of social services included: having used a hotline service; having had court-mandated psychological counseling or therapy; having been involved in group-therapy; have had a one-on-one professional tutor; having been in a drug/substance abuse counseling program; having ever been in a job skills program; having ever been in a job training program; having ever had parents active in the PTA at their school; having been involved in any counseling program court-mandated or not; having ever been in a big brother/big sister program; having ever been in the YMCA recreational program; and having ever completed the DARE anti-drug abuse program.

Table 15 shows the distribution of index scale scores for our entire sample in this study.

TABLE 15

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF
SOCIAL SERVICE CONSUMPTION INDEX SCORES
IN A NATIONAL SAMPLE OF YOUTHS
THAT INCLUDES A LARGE NUMBER OF KNOWN GANG MEMBERS

Index Score	N	%
0	282	8.4
1	233	7.0
2	353	10.5
3	373	11.1
4	422	12.6
5	477	14.2
6	442	13.2
7	334	10.0
8	217	6.5
9	121	3.6
10	54	1.6
11	30	.9
12	10	.3

As seen in Table 15, there is great variation in the extent to which these respondents have had or have not had the benefit of twelve different delinquency prevention services. While not all respondents in our sample are gang members, we have very few who are without any delinquency experience in this sample. Thus, the value of looking at social service consumption levels is worthwhile here in as much as these are program service components that are often used in delinquency as well as gang prevention programs.

Our approach to analyzing this issue of individual social service experience history or the

scope of social service consumption can now proceed to differentiation. A close inspection of the distribution of the social service consumption index scores in Table 12 shows much variability. Someone scoring zero on this index is someone who has not reported being the beneficiary of any of twelve different types of social service intervention. Someone with an index score of "12", on the other hand, is someone who has literally had the benefit of almost every social service arrangement that society has to offer.

By using this natural variation that is shown to exist in Table 15, it can be seen that almost half (49.7%) have an index score of "4 or less". Thus, we created two categories: low and high levels of social service consumption, based on this distribution. Those classified as having a low level of social service consumption were those with index scores from zero to 4. Those classified as having a high level of social service consumption were those with index scores ranging from 5 to 12. This basically divides the sample in half.

A LOOK AT GANG MEMBERS ONLY

Here we will examine only that subset of the overall sample that are self-reported gang members. This means the question "have you ever joined a gang" was answered yes by the respondent. By using the social service consumption variable (low/high) it is now possible to more directly answer the question: have certain types of gang members enjoyed more or less such prevention resources. It is also possible to examine gang member behavior differences in relationship to this measure of social service consumption levels.

Table 16 provides some of these important findings in this regard. First of all, one consistent trend is noted among this sample of self-reported gang members: those with more serious gang conduct have also generally had a higher level of social service consumption. We are not prepared to speak to the causality issue here of which came first: the threatening behavior or the social services. One possibility that cannot be ruled out here is that the levels of social service consumption are actually social control responses to threatening gang behavior.

We must as criminologists be very careful in our recommendations of responses to gang behavior, for gang history shows that some things can in fact contribution to greater gang cohesion and larger membership in the gang --- this was true when Chicago's Rev. John Fry tried to coopt what was then a small gang, making the gang leaders administrators of a heavily funded program, only to find the gang leaders were able to manipulate the program funding to build their weapons arsenals and expand their gang organizations. More recently some criminologists in the gang specialization field have hypothesized that a law enforcement focus on the gang as a group might add to cohesion and membership rather than reduce the problem. This argument could, logically, be extended to social services as a social control response.

TABLE 16
DISTRIBUTION OF GANG MEMBERSHIP BEHAVIOR FACTORS BY
LEVELS OF SOCIAL SERVICE CONSUMPTION
AMONG A NATIONAL SAMPLE OF GANG MEMBERS

	Social Service Consumption Levels		
	(N) LOW	(N) HIGH	(%) High
Have you ever held rank or any leadership position in any gang?			
NO	346	315	47.6
YES	540	702	56.5

Chi-square = 13.6, p < .001

Have you ever been "violated"
(received a beating) by your
own gang for a "violation".

| | NO | 525 | 478 | 47.6 |
| | YES | 332 | 467 | 58.4 |

Chi-square = 20.7, p < .001

Table 16 Continued

	Social Service Consumption Levels		
	(N) LOW	(N) HIGH	(%) High

Have you ever fired a gun
at anyone because they were
threatening the drug business

| of your gang? | NO | 442 | 396 | 47.2 |
| | YES | 375 | 516 | 57.9 |

Chi-square = 19.6, p < .001

Have you ever fired a gun at
someone because you were
defending your "turf"?

| | NO | 306 | 302 | 49.6 |
| | YES | 559 | 686 | 55.1 |

Chi-square = 4.83, p = .02

Have you ever been a shooter
in a drive-by shooting?

| | NO | 468 | 452 | 49.1 |
| | YES | 399 | 540 | 57.5 |

Chi-square = 13.1, p <.001

Are you willing to die for
your gang friends?

| | NO | 428 | 434 | 50.3 |
| | YES | 388 | 501 | 56.3 |

Chi-square = 6.34, p = .01

   This report does not evaluate these reaction formation issues here. Rather our focus here is a different question entirely, and revolves around the much simpler question of does variation exist by gang threat behavior and the response of society in the form of social service experiences.

   It appears there are some differences, although small. Table 16 shows there is a slight tendency for the more hard core gang member to have had the benefit of a higher level of social service consumption.

   Anyone who has held a position of leadership in the gang, for example, shows a higher level of social service consumption than a gang member who has never held rank. Mostly, the experiences with violence among gang members are the variables in Table 16 that suggest

differences in social service consumption. The greater the violence proneness of the gang member, or the higher the violence experiences of the gang member, the more likely the same gang members are to have had a higher level of social service consumption. Again, we cannot rule out the possibility that what we are measuring here in social service consumption levels is not actually a social control response from society to this threatening behavior.

In summary, it may be worthwhile to examine gang risk behavior in relationship to social service consumption levels. All we have done here is examine these levels in a known subpopulation of gang members. The differences that emerged were suggestive, and justify examining the larger sample that includes non-gang members as well.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL SERVICE CONSUMPTION AND RISK/THREAT BEHAVIORS IN THE CORRECTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

In this section of the analysis we examine the entire sample that includes gang members and non-gang members. The questions included in Table 17 were available only to those respondents who were studied inside correctional environments. Recall that we used two versions of the survey instrument in this research project. A slightly longer form of the instrument was used for those surveyed in correctional environments, in order to empirically examine risk and threat behavior. Obviously, in this analysis we are including all in the sample who provided data from some form of custody. So the analysis reported in this section includes gang members and non-gang members alike, but is limited to those in our national sample who were in some form of correctional facility (i.e., the institution was their residence). Typically this meant short or long term juvenile correctional institutions.

The trend that emerges in Table 17 is very consistent and very clear: higher threatening behavior is associated with a higher level of social service consumption. In fact, the more serious the violence, the stronger the nature of this relationship. One might be tempted to want to assume that social services were therefore an experience reserved as a social control reaction to threat, rather than being used as a systematic mechanism to prevent the threat or risk behavior in the first place. Some authors of this report are certainly aware of the vast discrepancy that exists between the current federal government approach to gang prevention (i.e., in terms of what gets funded, and what gets cited as an "exemplary program", etc) and what gang members actually say might work.

If what we have in the national picture of gang prevention and intervention is really social control in reaction to existing gang problems, then what we also have is a misplaced and illogical emphasis that lacks a coherent and theoretically based strategy. In otherwords, is persons get social services only when they manifest the threatening behavior, we are not talking primary prevention nor secondary prevention, we are dealing with tertiary intervention or rehabilitation.

In one sense it is not necessarily untrue that the more deviant and disruptive one is the more social service benefits one receives, at least this is suggested from Table 17. We are not prepared to interpret this as evidence that gang threat behavior is being systematically reinforced or accelerated by society's response in terms of social services. However, we are very fascinated with the trend that has developed in this national study. For it may add additional support for the need to drastically restructure publicly funded initiatives in the area of gang prevention.

To recap, in examining the levels of social service consumption in our national sample of confined youths, those with the more disruptive behavior behind bars are those with higher levels of benefiting from social services. Again, we cannot from our present data ascertain time-ordering or causality, although the trend is very suggestive. What Table 17 actually tells us is this: among the confined those with greater behavior problems that are threatening to

the institution (having had privileges taken away, having been in physical fights, having threatened someone, having carried an improvised weapon, having threatened staff members, starting a fight, trying to smuggle in illegal drugs, etc) are those who also consistently report higher levels of social service consumption. In fact, the more disciplinary reports these youths received, as seen in Table 17, the higher their social service experiences as well. Social services used as a disciplinary function are not social services in a prevention function is all we would like to point out here.

Some would say that these findings are as they should be: those presenting problems need more services. These are, after all, primarily youths in our sample. So the greater the problem, the greater the services they need. If we look at it from this viewpoint, they we simply have additional evidence of the validity of our data generally. Because there are some remarkably consistent findings in this regard.

This chapter began by examining the subgroup of those who were self-reported gang members and this finding held. In this section we looked at the subpopulation in custody to see that additional evidence accrued. We will now turn to the entire sample for additional analysis.

TABLE 17

DISTRIBUTION OF THREAT FACTORS IN THE CORRECTIONAL ENVIRONMENT THAT SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENTIATE LOW AND HIGH LEVELS OF SOCIAL SERVICE CONSUMPTION

	Social Service Consumption Levels		
	(N) LOW	(N) HIGH	(%) High
Have you had any "privileges" removed or taken away while in this facility? NO	413	325	44.0
YES	541	726	57.3
Chi-square = 32.8, p < .001			
Have you been in a physical fight with anyone in this facility? NO	580	519	47.2
YES	418	579	58.0
Chi-square = 24.6, p < .001			
Have you threatened anyone with violence in this facility? NO	624	529	45.8
YES	373	563	60.1
Chi-square = 42.1, p < .001			
Have you carried a homemade weapon (knife, etc) in this facility? NO	794	770	49.2
YES	177	301	62.9
Chi-square = 37.7, p < .001			

Have you threatened any
facility staff member or
officer in this facility?

		(N) LOW	(N) HIGH	(%) High
	NO	825	741	47.3
	YES	167	346	67.4

Chi-square = 62.7, p < .001

Table 17: Continued

		Social Service Consumption Levels		
		(N) LOW	(N) HIGH	(%) High

How many "disciplinary"
reports have you had while in
this facility?

		(N) LOW	(N) HIGH	(%) High
	NONE	366	281	43.4
	ONE	118	124	51.2
	TWO	78	86	52.4
	THREE	79	88	52.6
	FOUR	68	81	54.3
	>= FIVE	195	330	62.8

Chi-square = 44.2, p < .001

Did you start a fight or
attack someone while in
this facility?

		(N) LOW	(N) HIGH	(%) High
	NO	700	622	47.0
	YES	288	464	61.2

Chi-square = 41.2, p < .001

Have you tried to smuggle
in any illegal drugs while
in this facility?

		(N) LOW	(N) HIGH	(%) High
	NO	814	824	50.3
	YES	177	262	59.6

Chi-square = 12.1, p <.001

FACTORS DIFFERENTIATING LOW AND HIGH LEVELS OF SOCIAL SERVICE CONSUMPTION IN THE ENTIRE SAMPLE

Here we take the largest view of the data possible, and examine the social service consumption variable in the entire national sample of gang members and non-gang members alike, regardless of whether they were interviewed in or out of custodial environments. Summarized here, then, are those factors that are differentiated by this condition of low or high levels of social service consumption. Table 18 presents these results.

These findings will now be briefly summarized.

The Higher the Gang Behavior Threat Level, the Higher The Service Consumption

Table 18 uses the gang involvement index described in a previous chapter. At the lowest level of gang risk 43 percent were in the high level of social service consumption, compared to 57.7 percent at the highest level of gang involvement. Another way of interpreting this finding is gang members consume more social services the higher up they go in the gang risk continuum.

Hopeful News: Those With Higher Social Service Consumption Are More Optimistic About Gang Prevention

Those who were in the higher level of social service consumption were more likely (53.5%) to believe gang prevention programs can be effective in preventing persons from joining gangs. Those with lower levels of service consumption were less likely (46.7%) to be optimistic about gang prevention.

Being Bullied Has Higher Service Consumption Level

Ever being "bullied" in school is shown in Table 18 to be associated with a higher level of service consumption. Some 58.8 percent of those bullied in school had high levels of social service consumption, compared to 45.4 percent for the others.

TABLE 18

FACTORS SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENTIATING
SOCIAL SERVICE CONSUMPTION LEVELS
IN A LARGE NATIONAL SAMPLE

	Social Service Consumption Levels		
	(N) LOW	(N) HIGH	(%) High
Level of Gang Behavior Risk:			
(LOW) Level Zero	572	432	43.0
(MEDIUM-LOW) Level One	329	315	48.9
(MEDIUM-HIGH) Level Two	415	463	52.7
(HIGH) Level Three	347	475	57.7
Chi-square = 42.2, p < .001			
Do you think gang prevention programs can be effective in preventing persons from joining a gang? NO	783	688	46.7
YES	836	962	53.5
Chi-square = 14.6, p < .001			
Were you ever "bullied" by anyone in school? NO	1044	870	45.4
YES	557	796	58.8
Chi-square = 56.7, p < .001			
Did you every "bully" someone in school? NO	793	565	41.6
YES	795	1097	57.9
Chi-square = 84.8, p < .001			

Have you received a high school
degree or G.E.D. degree?   NO   1341   1335   49.8
                           YES   205   301   59.4
                Chi-square = 15.6, p < .001

Table 18: Continued

	Social Service Consumption Levels		
	(N) LOW	(N) HIGH	(%) High

Have you ever completed any
religious training by a church,
synagogue, or mosque?   NO   1027   843   45.0
                        YES   414   656   61.3
            Chi-square = 71.7, p < .001

Have you ever been demoted
in school?   NO   904   844   48.2
                        YES   609   794   56.5
            Chi-square = 21.5, p <.001

How would you describe your
race/ethnicity?
   African-American or Black 720   682   48.6
          Asian or Chinese   98   70   41.6
American Indian or
Native American   46   74   61.6
               Mexican   271   170   38.5
           Puerto Rican   50   38   43.1
     White or caucasian   222   391   63.7
               Other   60   82   57.7
            Chi-square = 86.4, p < .001

Do you think social workers can
be effective in reaching out to
persons who might want to
quit the gang?   NO 694   568   45.0
                       YES 848   1058   55.5
            Chi-square = 33.5, p < .001

Do you think social workers
can be effective in helping
kids stay out of gangs?
                       NO 738   645   46.6
                      YES 780   945   54.7

Chi-square = 20.3, p <.001

Do you feel that when gangs
are seen in T.V. news reports
that this makes people want
to join gangs?   NO   905   854   48.5
                     YES   629   758   54.6
                     Chi-square = 11.5, p = .001

Table 18: Continued

	Social Service Consumption Levels		
	(N) LOW	(N) HIGH	(%) High

Do you feel that gang members
like seeing themselves on
the news?   NO   574   460   44.4
                     YES   958   1161   54.7
                     Chi-square = 29.5, p < .001

Do you feel that gang members
like seeing themselves in
the newspapers?   NO   577   472   44.9
                     YES   936   1130   54.6
                     Chi-square = 26.2, p < .001

Do you feel that gang members
would like being part of a
"study" where an important
professor might be willing
to hang out with them
in the hood?   NO   861   792   47.9
                     YES   658   810   55.1
                     Chi-square 16.4, p < .001

Do you feel that if less
attention was given to gangs
on television, in newspapers
and in movies that fewer
people would join gangs?
                     NO   905   810   47.2
                     YES   634   815   56.2
                     Chi-square = 25.5, p < .001

When a school teacher or
principal "negotiates" with
a gang member, does this
encourage more gang activity?
                     NO   908   803   46.9

YES   612   781   56.0
Chi-square = 25.6, p < .001

	Social Service Consumption Levels		
	(N) LOW	(N) HIGH	(%) High

Do you feel that if parents
cannot keep their children
out of gangs, the children
should be taken away

from the parents?	NO	1264	1243	49.5
	YES	283	385	57.6

Chi-square = 13.6, p < .001

Do you feel that some parents
benefit financially from having
a child who is a gang member?

	NO	943	879	48.2
	YES	573	719	55.6

Chi-square = 16.5, p < .001

Have any of your friends or
family been killed because

of gang trouble?	NO	760	634	45.4
	YES	793	990	55.5

Chi-square = 31.5, p < .001

Do you want your children

to be in a gang?	NO	1392	1339	49.0
	YES	153	287	65.2

Chi-square = 39.7, p < .001

Do you think anyone in your
family uses drugs or drinks

too much?	NO	765	613	44.4
	YES	789	1022	56.4

Chi-square = 44.7, p < .001

	Social Service Consumption Levels		
	(N) LOW	(N) HIGH	(%) High
What is the ONE best kind of program you think is most effective in getting young people to stay out of gangs?			
EMPLOYMENT	538	491	47.7
COUNSELING PROGRAMS	125	165	56.8
LIVE-IN RESIDENTIAL PROGRAMS WITH COUNSELING & EDUCATION	248	349	58.4
VOCATIONAL/EDUCATIONAL- PROGRAM	148	139	48.4
SOCIAL WORKER WHO WORKS WITH YOUTHS IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD	274	271	49.7

Chi-square = 22.6, p < .001

Have you ever been expelled from school?				
	NO	721	600	45.4
	YES	806	1029	56.0

Chi-square = 34.9, p < .001

Being A Bully is Also Associated With Higher Service Consumption
Some 57.9 percent of those who were bullies in school had higher levels of social service consumption, compared to 41.6 percent of those who had not been a bully in school.

Completing Educational Credentials is Associated With Higher Service Consumption
Some 59.4 percent of those who had received a high school degree or G.E.D. had high levels of social service consumption, compared to 49.8 percent for those who had not achieved these educational credentials.

Strong Relationship: Religious Training is Associated With Higher Service Consumption
Some 61.3 percent of those who have completed any religious training had high levels of social service consumption, compared to 45 percent of those without such religious training.

Being Demoted in School is Associated With Higher Service Consumption
Some 56.5 percent of those who had been demoted in school had higher levels of social service consumption, compared to 48.2 percent for those who had not been demoted in school.

Higher Service Consumption Levels Vary With Race: Whites Get The Most, Mexicans Get the Least

Some 63.7 percent of the whites in this sample had higher levels of social service consumption, compared to only 38.5 percent for Mexicans. African-Americans or Blacks showed 48.6 percent in the high social service consumption level.

Belief That Social Workers Can Be Effective is Associated With Higher Service Consumption

Some 55.5 percent of those who believed social workers can be effective in reaching out to persons who might want to quit the gang were in the higher level of social service consumption, compared to 45 percent for those who did not accept this belief.

Similarly, 54.7 percent of those who thought social workers can be effective in helping kids stay out of gangs had higher levels of social service consumption, compared to 46.6 percent for those who did not share this view about social workers.

A Number of Mass Media "Contagion Effect" Variables Are Associated With Higher Service Consumption

Four different variables about the potential negative impact of mass media coverage of gangs and gang members were all associated with higher levels of social service consumption: those who believed in the contagion effect had the higher service consumption levels. This included: television coverage increasing gang membership, gang members enjoying news coverage or seeing themselves in the newspapers, and whether less such coverage would result in fewer persons joining gangs.

Somewhat related was the finding about beliefs of whether gang members would like having an ethnographer or participant observer hanging around with them, those with higher social service consumption felt this would be more feasible.

Similarly, those with higher social service consumption levels were also more likely to view as negative the situation of a principal negotiating with a gang member.

Several Family Factors Are Associated With Higher Service Consumption

Table 18 shows that those with a higher social service consumption level were more likely to believe that if parents cannot keep their children out of gangs that the children should be taken away from the parents. Similarly, those with higher social service consumption were more likely to believe that some parents benefit financially from having a child who is a gang member. Those with higher social service consumption were also more likely to report having friends or family killed because of gang trouble. Those with higher social service consumption were also more likely to want their own children to be in a gang, and to report substance abuse in their family.

Program Preferences For Primary Gang Prevention

Table 18 also shows the question about program preferences for effectively keeping kids out of gangs also varies by the social service consumption variable.

Being Expelled From School is Associated With Higher Service Consumption

Some 56 percent of those with high service consumption had been expelled from school compared to 45.4 percent of those who had not been expelled from school.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Everyone is familiar with the expression "the wheel that squeaks is the wheel that gets the grease", implying one needs to speak up to get attention. In another variation on this theme, it is not untrue to also say "the hand that does harm is often as well more likely to receive a hand out from social services". Clearly, in the correctional context those who caused the most problems were those with the higher level of social service consumption: but we also pointed out that we cannot categorically state that the services came before or after the bad behavior. The critical issue here, one we cannot resolve with our present data, is whether this amounts to reinforcing or rewarding bad behavior. There are findings in this chapter that would certainly suggest the most risky individuals get the most social services and perhaps the higher level of social service consumption is associated with a kind of "softening up".

However, there are also some troubling findings in this chapter as well. One of these was the fact that race varied by low or high levels of social service consumption, where whites had the highest representation in the higher level of social service consumption and Mexicans had the lowest level of representation in the higher level of social service consumption. The fact that substantial differences also existed favoring whites over African-Americans, who fared slightly better than Mexicans, might suggest that race and language interact as barriers to the delivery of such services. It is certainly a factor worthy of additional investigation.

Chapter 8

Factors Differentiating Female Gang Members

INTRODUCTION

Females constitute a small proportion of our overall national sample to the same extent that females represent a small percentage of the overall correctional population. The researchers in the present project do, however, recognize that there is a genuine need to have more knowledge about the female gang member. This chapter therefore adds to our understanding of the female gang member population with an emphasis on gang prevention and gang intervention. Because our data also speaks to the issue of female gang member behavior inside correctional institutions (fights, threats, carrying improvised weapons, smuggling drugs, etc), we believe it will be useful to further examine the beliefs, background experiences, and behavior of the female gang member.

COMPARING FEMALE GANG MEMBERS WITH FEMALE NON-GANG MEMBERS

A sufficiently large sample of female respondents exist in our national sample to allow comparisons along the dimension of gang membership. This section will therefore present those factors which were significantly different among females in comparing gang members and non-gang members. Of particular value in the validity of this kind of comparison for this sample is the fact that no significant differences existed comparing female gang members and female non-gang members on other demographic variables.

What this section describes, therefore, are those significant differences in behavior and beliefs that do emerge when we compare female gang members with their non-gang member female counterparts in the same troubled environments.

The operational definition of gang membership used here is the basic self-report question: "have you ever joined a gang?".

The discussion of findings that follows are based on the results reported in Table 19. This is a large reference table and is found at the end of this chapter.

Female Gang Members Are More Skeptical About Gang Prevention Programs

Several different variables show a consistent significant trend towards greater skepticism among female gang members about the potential effectiveness of gang prevention programs. In this respect, female gang members share a commonality with the larger predominantly male gang member sample as well, which was previously documented in this report. In otherwords, there is not disparity here in this respect between male gang members and female gang members; rather there is convergence: both males and females alike who are gang members have a more fatalistic outlook is the finding that seems to emerge here.

The survey asked "do you think that programs can be effective in preventing kids from

getting involved in gangs". Some 64.2 percent of the non-gang member females felt such programs could be effective compared to only 47.1 percent of the female gang members.

The survey also asked "do you think gang prevention programs can be effective in preventing persons from joining a gang". Again, some 60.7 percent of the non-gang member females felt programs could prevent persons from joining a gang. However, only 43.6 percent of the female gang members felt such programs could be effective.

The survey asked the respondents to agree/disagree with the statement "I feel that gang problems can be prevented by school education". Examining the distribution in Table 19 shows that some 36.6 percent of the non-gang member females agreed or strongly agreed with this idea. However, only 23.4 percent of the female gang members felt that gang problems can be prevented by school education.

Another question along these lines asked the females to agree/disagree with the statement "I feel that gang problems can be prevented by means of effective drug prevention and drug education". Examining the distribution in Table 19 shows that some 37.2 percent of the non-gang members agreed or strongly agreed. However, only 25.9 percent of the gang members agreed or strongly agreed with this statement.

Another Significant Difference: The Role of Law Enforcement

The survey also asked the respondents to agree/disagree with the statement "I feel that strict law enforcement is the best solution to the gang problem". Examining the distribution in Table 19 shows that 36.1 percent of the non-gang member females agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, compared to only 22.6 percent among female gang members.

Female Gang Members Are More Likely To View Education and Counseling In Secondary Prevention Efforts As A Waste of Time

The survey asked the respondents to agree or disagree with the statement "for kids at risk of joining a gang, getting involved in educational programs is a waste of time". Some 24.8 percent of the non-gang member females agreed with this assessment. However, a much larger percentage (38.5%) emerged among the female gang members in viewing such secondary prevention efforts as a waste of time.

A second and similar question but focused on counseling asked the respondents to agree or disagree with the statement "for kids at risk of joining a gang, getting involved in counseling programs is a waste of time". Here again, the same trend emerged. Among the non-gang member females, about a fourth (25.5%) agreed that counseling would be a waste of time for kids at risk of joining a gang. However, Table 19 also shows that some 38.6 percent of the female gang members viewed counseling programs as a waste of time for kids at risk of joining a gang.

Thus, in terms of skepticism towards gang prevention programs, there is substantial evidence of commonality in the views and beliefs of male and female gang members it would seem.

Female Gang Members Fit the Profile of Male Gang Members in Being More Likely to Have Engaged in Bullying Behavior While in School

Here we see a behavioral commonality that female gang members have with their male gang member counterparts. The survey asked "did you ever bully someone in school". Some 74.3 percent of the female gang members reported engaging in this bullying behavior, compared to only 44.5 percent of their non-gang member female counterparts. This is a very significant difference.

Female Gang Members More Likely to Have Been in Court-Mandated Psychological Counseling or Therapy

This was, the reader will recall, a finding shown to be true of the larger predominantly male sample. Thus, here again we find a profile factor for female gang members that is consistent with the male gang members as well. Some 59.3 percent of the female gang members reported having ever been in court-mandated psychological counseling or therapy compared to only 43.8 percent of the female non-gang members.

Female Gang Members Less Likely to Report Parents Active in PTA

The survey asked "were or are your parents ever active in the PTA". Here the non-gang member females showed a higher percentage of parents active in the PTA (39.6%). The female gang members were somewhat less likely (29.2%) to report parents active in the PTA.

Female Gang Members Put Less Faith In "Boot Camps" As A Gang Deprogramming Tool

The survey asked "do you think a boot camp could influence some people to get out of a gang". It is the non-gang member that is more likely to believe boot camps could be effective in this capacity of severing ties to the gang (50.5%). Female gang members were less likely (39.7%) to believe boot camps could be effective in this capacity.

Female Gang Members Show Less Educational Achievement Than Their Non-Gang Member Counterparts

The survey asked "have you received a high school degree or G.E.D. certificate". This measure of educational achievement did significantly differentiate female gang members from female non-gang members. Some 19 percent of the non-gang members reported having such educational achievement credentials, compared to only 9.2 percent of the female gang members.

Like Male Gang Members, Female Gang Members Are More Likely to Have a Permanent Tattoo

This profile factor is documented in other research, but appears here again as well. It is a substantial difference. While some 36.5 percent of the non-gang members among the females had such permanent tattoos, this almost doubles (66.2%) for female gang members. Having a permanent tattoo, then, remains a common profile factor for both male and female gang membership.

Female Gang Members More Likely to Be Possessed With the Belief of Their Own Damnation

The survey used a somewhat unique measure about religiosity. The survey asked "Assume there is a God. So if you died right now, where would you go? __To Hell __To Heaven". Three-fourths (78.1%) of the female non-gang members felt they would go to Heaven. However, only two-thirds (66.2%) of the female gang members thought they would go to Heaven. Thus, female gang members are more likely to manifest a religious belief about their own damnation.

Female Gang Members Attribute Less Effectiveness to Social Workers in Gang Intervention and Prevention

Two somewhat related but separate questions yielded a similar pattern: female gang members are more skeptical about the effectiveness of social workers in a gang

prevention/intervention role. Some 64.6 percent of the female non-gang members felt that social workers can be effective in reaching out to persons who might want to quit the gang, compared to only 53.5 percent of the female gang members. Similarly, some 60.2 percent of the non-gang member females felt that social workers can be effective in helping kids to stay out of gangs, compared to only 46.1 percent of the female gang members.

Female Gang Members Are Less Likely To Blame the Media

Whether it is called the "contagion effect", or desensitization, some people would like to blame the media for the spread of gangs or the escalation of gang problems. If we listen to the female gang member, changing media coverage about gang life would not likely result in fewer people getting involved in gangs. The survey asked "do you feel that if less attention was given to gangs on television, in newspapers, and in movies that fewer people would join gangs". Half (50%) of the female non-gang members felt that reducing media coverage would reduce new gang recruits. However, only 38.1 percent of the female gang members felt that reducing media coverage would reduce gang recruits. In otherwords, females actually involved in gang life are less likely to attribute blame to the media than are non-gang members.

Female Gang Members Are Much More Likely To Have Had Friends or Family Killed in Gang Violence

Early childhood experiences with gang trauma were shown to be common for gang members in an earlier section of this report examining the human development sequence. Apparently female gang members also experience this kind of violent trauma, not unlike that of a new kind of violent civil war, one fought from block to block, where the new Mason-Dixie line is any street or avenue that divides one neighborhood from the next in American cities today. The survey asked "have any of your friends or family been killed because of gang trouble". The results show that 46.1 percent of the non-gang member females reported experiencing such gang violence trauma, compared to 78.5 percent for the female gang members.

A Fifth of the Female Gang Members Want Their Own Children To Be in a Gang

Another troubling finding is evident in Table 19, and this should be coupled with previous research showing that female gang members at a young age also tend to have higher fertility rates, again because of higher health risk behaviors. The survey asked "do you want your children to be in a gang". Some 19.7 percent of the female gang members reported that they did in fact want their children to be in a gang. Perhaps the good news here is the fact that four-fifths would not want their own children to be in a gang.

The validity of this finding is evidenced by a much differently worded item in the survey located several pages away in the item order of the survey. This second question basically measured the same thing and produced identical results. The second question asked "if you have or plan to have children, would you encourage them or discourage them from joining a gang". Again, a fifth (21.8%) of the female gang members would encourage their children to be gang members.

Female Gang Members Are More Likely to Report Coming From a Family With Substance Abuse Problems

The survey asked "do you think anyone in your family uses drugs or drinks too much". Table 19 shows a substantial difference in this regard of comparing female gang members

with female non-gang members. Some 56.5 percent of the female non-gang members reported this condition of a family with a substance abuse problem, compared to 74 percent among the female gang members.

Female Gang Members Were More, Not Less, Likely to Report Having Had A Good Relationship With An Adult Who Tried to Steer Them Away From Gang Life
We have found a number of fascinating and sometimes perplexing results in this study of gang prevention and gang intervention. The present finding is one of those. Gang members do not appear to have basically "fallen through the cracks" of the social service apparatus of American society, with some notable exceptions when we look at this issue from a consumption level point of view discussed in the previous chapter (i.e., the possible interaction effect of racial discrimination with linguistic exclusion resulting in less service options for Mexican American youths). The issue here is that female gang members have had more not less of a chance to interact with an adult to tried to steer them away from gang life: it just did not work apparently.
Table 19 shows that while some 61.9 percent of the non-gang member females report having had a good relationship with an adult who tried to prevent them from getting involved with gangs, that this rises to 76.9 percent among actual female gang members.

Like Male Gang Members: The Female Gang Member Includes A Greater Likelihood of School Failure
The survey asked "have you ever been suspended from school". Table 19 shows that while high among non-gang members in this sample of troubled teens (77.7%), it gets even higher (90.5%) among female gang members to the point where not being suspended is the exception to the rule.
The difference in school failure is more acute when we examine the powerful stigma and label of failure/incorrigibility that comes with being "expelled" from school. The survey asked "have you ever been expelled from school". Here some 40.2 percent of the female non-gang members reported being expelled from school. However, over two-thirds (69.5%) of the female gang members report this early developmental experience of being expelled from school.

Another Commonality Between Male and Female Gang Members: Threat Behavior Behind Bars
Five different factors are listed at the end of Table 19 that apply to a subset of females who were surveyed inside correctional institutions. These variables measure disruptive and threatening behavior. In all instances, female gang members manifest a significantly greater problem than do their non-gang member counterparts.   This includes: fighting behavior, threats of violence, carrying improvised weapons, threatening facility staff, and trying to smuggle illegal drugs into the correctional facility.
The survey asked "have you been in a physical fight with anyone in this facility". Clearly, female gang members are about twice as assaultive is what Table 19 suggests. Some 22.8 percent of the female non-gang members had been in a fight compared to half (49.2%) of the female gang members.
The survey asked "have you threatened anyone with violence in this facility". Again, a very significant difference emerges here. While only 17.3 percent of the female non-gang members in custody reported making threats of violence while in custody, half (50%) of the female gang members had made such threats.
The survey asked "have you carried a homemade weapon (knife, etc) in this facility". Here as well we see that female gang members are twice as likely to report carrying an improvised

weapon. Some 14.2 percent of the non-gang members reported carrying an improvised weapon, however some 28.3 percent of the female gang members reported such behavior.

The survey asked "have you threatened any facility staff member or officer in this facility". Here again we see that the female gang member shares this aspect of behavior with male gang members in having a higher probability of being a disruptive or threatening figure inside the correctional institution. Some 12.6 percent of the female non-gang members had threatened facility staff, compared to a third (33.3%) of the female gang members.

Finally, the same trend appears in attempts to smuggle illegal drugs into the correctional institution. The survey asked "have you tried to smuggle in any illegal drugs while in this facility". Some 11.7 percent of the female non-gang members reported having attempted to smuggle in illegal drugs into the correctional institution, compared to a fourth (26.7%) of the female gang members.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This chapter has examined the female subset of the overall national sample to make comparisons along the lines of self-reported gang membership. This comparison of female gang members with female non-gang members produced results that are remarkably similar to findings from some previous research on female gang members. Still, by the nature of the type of focus in the present research, some new and additional insights have been developed as well on the female gang member.

First and foremost among the findings of this chapter is that the female gang member shares profile traits of the male gang member. This includes a strong, perhaps somewhat fervent, skepticism about the efficacy of gang prevention and intervention efforts generally. This includes health risk behaviors, such as having permanent tattoos, engaging in fighting behavior, experiences with gang violence trauma, etc. This includes, most importantly, the fact the female gang members inside correctional institutions are comparable to their male gang member counterparts behind bars in reporting significantly more threatening and disruptive behavior while in custody.

Secondly, consistent with much previous research on the issue, female gang membership manifests another profile factor that is common as well to male gang members: school failure. This includes a lower rate of achieving academic credentials and a higher rate of experiencing school suspensions as well as being expelled from school.

Thirdly, female gang members like their male counterparts in the gang, appear to have not been neglected by their society in terms of gang prevention and gang intervention services. Like their male counterparts in the gang, females tend to report having been more likely to have received court-mandated psychological counseling or therapy. Further, the female gang member is more likely than the female non-gang member to have had the benefit of some adult who tried to steer them away from gang influence.

As another commonality with male gang members, which has been previously called the combative personality syndrome, female gang members like their male counterparts in the gang are more likely to have been "bullies" in school. Another factor added to this negative self-image is the belief about damnation: that if they died, they would go to hell. This tendency towards a denunciation of society and all it stands for is further reflected in how female gang members would be more likely to want to raise their own children to be gang members. Fortunately only about a fifth of the female gang members would want to raise their own children to be gang members.

TABLE 19

FACTORS SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENTIATED BY COMPARING FEMALE GANG MEMBERS WITH FEMALE NON-GANG MEMBERS

	Ever Join A Gang? Frequency (N)	
	NO	YES

Do you think that programs can be
effective in preventing kids from

getting involved in gangs?	NO	65	83
	YES	117	74
	% Yes	64.2	47.1

Chi-square = 10.0, p = .001

Do you think gang prevention
programs can be effective in
preventing persons from

joining a gang?	NO	71	89
	YES	110	69
	% Yes	60.7	43.6

Chi-square = 9.90, p = .002

I feel that gang problems can
be prevented by school education.

STRONGLY AGREE	38	15
AGREE	28	22
NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	48	37
DISAGREE	39	33
STRONGLY DISAGREE	27	51
% Agree or Strongly Agree	36.6	23.4

Chi-square = 18.6, p = .001

I feel that gang problems can be
prevented by means of effective
drug prevention and drug education.

STRONGLY AGREE	35	16
AGREE	31	25
NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	53	27
DISAGREE	40	41

STRONGLY DISAGREE   18   49
% Agree or Strongly Agree   37.2   25.9
Chi-square = 29.5, p < .001

Table 19: Continued

	Ever Join A Gang? Frequency (N)	
	NO	YES
I feel that strict law enforcement is the best solution to the gang problem.		
STRONGLY AGREE	30	20
AGREE	35	16
NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE	43	26
DISAGREE	41	40
STRONGLY DISAGREE	31	57
% Agree or Strongly Agree	36.1	22.6

Chi-square = 19.7, p = .001

For kids at risk of joining a gang, getting involved in educational programs is a waste of time.

	NO	YES
AGREE	45	62
DISAGREE	136	99
% Agree	24.8	38.5

Chi-square = 7.38, p = .007

For kids at risk of joining a gang, getting involved in counseling programs is a waste of time.

	NO	YES
AGREE	46	61
DISAGREE	134	97
% Agree	25.5	38.6

Chi-square = 6.62, p = .01

Did you ever "bully" someone in school?

	NO	YES
NO	101	40
YES	81	116
% Yes	44.5	74.3

Chi-square = 30.7, p < .001

Have you ever been in court-mandated psychological counseling or therapy?

```
        NO          96      63
        YES         75      92
       % Yes       43.8    59.3
      Chi-square = 7.81, p = .005
```

		Ever Join A Gang?	
		Frequency (N)	
		NO	YES
Were or are your parents ever active in the PTA?	NO	108	111
	YES	71	46
	% Yes	39.6	29.2
	Chi-square = 3.95, p = .04		
Do you think a "boot camp" could influence some people to get out of a gang?	NO	87	94
	YES	89	62
	% Yes	50.5	39.7
	Chi-square = 3.90, p = .04		
Have you received a high school degree or GED?	NO	149	148
	YES	35	15
	% Yes	19.0	9.2
	Chi-square = 6.75, p = .009		
Do you have a permanent tattoo?	NO	113	55
	YES	65	108
	% Yes	36.5	66.2
	Chi-square = 30.1, p < .001		
Assume there is a God. So if you died right now, where would you go?	TO HELL	36	53
	TO HEAVEN	129	104
	% To Heaven	78.1	66.2
	Chi-square = 5.73, p = .01		

Do you think social workers can
be effective in reaching out to
persons who might want to
quit the gang?

```
          NO      64       73
         YES     117       84
        % Yes    64.6     53.5
       Chi-square = 4.32, p = .03
```

		Ever Join A Gang? Frequency (N)	
		NO	YES
Do you think social workers can be effective in helping kids stay out of gangs?	NO	72	84
	YES	109	72
	% Yes	60.2	46.1

Chi-square = 6.66, p = .01

Do you feel that if less attention was given to gangs on television, in newspapers, and in movies that fewer people would join gangs?	NO	91	99
	YES	91	61
	% Yes	50.0	38.1

Chi-square = 4.86, p = .02

Have any of your friends or family been killed because of gang trouble?	NO	99	35
	YES	85	128
	% Yes	46.1	78.5

Chi-square = 38.1, p < .001

Do you want your children to be in a gang?	NO	169	126
	YES	15	31
	% Yes	8.1	19.7

Chi-square = 9.75, p = .002

Do you think anyone in your family uses drugs or drinks too much?	NO	80	42
	YES	104	120
	% Yes	56.5	74.0

Chi-square = 11.6, p = .001

Have you ever had a good

relationship with an adult
who tried to prevent you from
being involved with gangs?

		NO	YES
	NO	64	36
	YES	104	120
	% Yes	61.9	76.9

Chi-square = 8.55, p = .003

Ever Join A Gang?
Frequency (N)

		NO	YES
Have you ever been suspended from school?	NO	41	15
	YES	143	143
	% Yes	77.7	90.5

Chi-square = 10.1, p = .001

Have you ever been expelled from school?	NO	110	49
	YES	74	112
	% Yes	40.2	69.5

Chi-square = 29.7, p < .001

If you have or plan to have
children, would you encourage
them or discourage them from
joining a gang?

	NO	YES
ENCOURAGE	14	34
DISCOURAGE	166	122
% Discourage	92.2	78.2

Chi-square = 13.4, p < .001

THE REMAINING FINDINGS PERTAIN
ONLY TO FEMALES IN CUSTODY:

Have you been in a physical
fight with anyone in this facility?

		NO	YES
	NO	54	66
	YES	16	64
	% Yes	22.8	49.2

Chi-square = 13.1, p < .001

Have you threatened anyone with violence in this facility?	NO	57	65
	YES	12	65
	% Yes	17.3	50.0

Chi-square = 20.2, p < .001

Have you carried a homemade
weapon (knife, etc) in

this facility?   NO   60   91
                            YES   10   36
                         % Yes   14.2   28.3
                   Chi-square = 4.98, p = .02

                    Ever Join A Gang?
                     Frequency (N)
                     NO   YES

Have you threatened any
facility staff member or
officer in this facility?
                   NO   62   86
                  YES   9   43
               % Yes   12.6   33.3
                 Chi-square = 10.1, p = .001
Have you tried to smuggle in
any illegal drugs while
in this facility?   NO   60   93
                  YES   8   34
               % Yes   11.7   26.7
                 Chi-square = 5.90, p = .01

Chapter 9

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

OVERVIEW

We now come to the matter of summarizing some of the major findings of this large scale interdisciplinary and collaborative research effort by sixteen researchers who over the course of a year devoted their free time to this unfunded project. The purpose of this concluding chapter, therefore, is to summarize these major findings, present our conclusions, and to make recommendations.

SUMMARY

Sixteen researchers gathered extensive information about gang prevention and gang intervention on over 3,000 youths from 24 different juvenile facilities or programs in 8 states during 1995.

The researchers donated their labor to this probono project as part of a national consortium developed to study gang prevention and gang intervention. The study sought to develop a large national sample of the types of gangs in the kinds of environments their presence is most felt. The study more than succeeded in this goal thanks to the volunteer efforts and the costs being assumed by the individuals involved. Thus, this research did not have the benefit of public or private funding. Such funding was simply not sought after: it was felt that the problem was too pressing to wait for funding and the delays in the dissemination of knowledge that accompany such funding from government or other sources. The task force group therefore decided to independently undertake this large study without funding of any kind. To stay on goal for this project basically meant having a weekly newsletter distributed to task force members on the progress and milestones of this national research effort.

As indicated in the executive summary of findings, the typical gang member studied here is male and has a host of background problems. These problems include their family conditions, school experiences, and human development lifespan events --- often characterized by inability to function in society and early traumatic and stressful experiences. The gang for these youths becomes a haven for maladjustment. The gang for these youths becomes an alternative social mechanism for the identity crisis and transition into young adult status. The rituals and ceremonies of the gang become the modern urban equivalent of the rites of passage. Unfortunately, it is a belief and behavior system that represents a threat to not only to their own safety but to that of others as well. That includes the children of gang members, because our data suggests about a fifth of the mothers of gang members would raise their children to also be gang members. So the gang problem basically reproduces itself in modern American society.

Some remarkable insights into the life of gang members have emerged from this study, the first of its kind that could qualify as a national needs assessment for gang prevention and gang intervention: because it used a very large sample of gang members and youths at risk of gang membership for the basic raw data. Studies that rely on what government agencies say the problem is and what should be done are basically suffering from the error of aggregation: those at the top are in the least knowledgeable position of what the real need is. Needs assessment means talking to the clients. We obtain the input from about 2,000 such gang members for this study.

It may very well be that the current structure of gang prevention and gang intervention resources that are publicly funded are not in alignment with the actual needs expressed by youths at risk of gang membership. One strong consistent finding of the present research helps us to understand something else about the gang problem in modern America today: the problem did not emerge without society detecting it and responding to it in some fashion of delivering social services and other types of formal and informal help. The typical gang member had more, not less, help in this regard: the types of services they received just did not work to deter them from their gang involvement. Further, the viewpoints on "what should be done", on "what is effective" and "what is not effective" in gang prevention and gang intervention differ significantly and consistently: gang members are much more skeptical about the effectiveness of almost all strategies currently in use to combat this problem. The non-gang members studied are more willing to assume that current approaches would be effective in reducing the gang problem. Obviously, a difference exists here and this has many implications for program evaluation.

CONCLUSION

Several of the researchers involved in this project have discussed the feasibility of a national strategy for gang prevention and gang intervention that is more empirically based. The idea, while not ready for immediate implementation, would be based on threat-risk analysis: using a quantitative and qualitative rating scheme to assess the nature of the extent of the gang problem represented by any individual, and then match existing resources to that risk level. Some services, it would appear, are simply not new to the gang member. In fact our research supports the merits of such a multifaceted risk-resource response: the more serious the individual gang threat level the individual manifests, typically the greater the number of service resources that same person has already been involved in.

There may be some merit to the idea of something like the G.R.I.P. (Gang Risk Intervention Paradigm) which would allow local neighborhoods, communities, and cities to respond to the gang problem through a logical and reality based approach. Several researchers at the National Gang Crime Research Center, involved in the present research, are currently developing this model and examining how it could be implemented by use of local committees and groups established to develop a strategic plan for the reduction of gang violence.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

One finding about gang members was both instructive and at the same time puzzling: it dealt with the issue of religious damnation. Gang members, when asked to assume there is a God, and asked further that if they died right now where would they go (to Heaven or to Hell), were significantly more likely to report they expect to go to hell. We are reminded of Tom Sawyer's comments along the same line: the youth did not want to go to Heaven because that was where the uninteresting people were, rather Tom Sawyer remarked that Hell might be more of an adventure. So do gang members really sense the religious and spiritual meaning of this damnation, or do they view going to hell as another act of bravado? We do not know, but we believe it would be worthwhile to follow-up on this issue of identity in

relationship to gang membership.

In otherwords, is the tendency for gang members to believe they would be more likely to go to Hell a naive and romantic vision about hell --- like Tom Sawyer thinking the more interesting people are those who go to hell. Or is it a measure of identity and self-concept? We are not certain, but we do believe it is worthy of additional research. Such research is now being planned, it is another national consortium or task force style of collaborative research called Project GANGGEND, to examine gender and identity in much greater detail than ever previously studied in the gang population.

Another pressing research need is to re-examine some of the implications of the present research findings by using retrospective "timeline" measures: date of X service, first time received Y service, last time received Z service, etc. By examining gang prevention and intervention services in this type of lifespan nexus it might be possible to more precisely isolate the exact nature of the differences between gang members and non-gang members in terms of their significant differences about the relative effectiveness of gang prevention and gang intervention services generally. There is also a need to develop some measurements of the intensity of such social services consumption patterns (i.e., hours, duration, etc).

It is also clear that because this was an interdisciplinary team or consortium of researchers that joined to make the research possible, that as many individual analyses of specific trends and problems may exist as there are members of this task force. Such findings are expected to be released shortly by individual members, all of whom have special and unique analyses that were undertaken as a part of this national research effort.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY ON GANG PREVENTION AND GANG INTERVENTION

Ackley, N. 1984 Gangs in Schools: Breaking Up Is Hard To Do, U.S. Dept. of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Washington, D.C.

Ackerley, Ethel G. and Beverly R. Fliegel 1960 "A Social Work Approach to Street-Corner Girls", Social Work (5)(4): 27-36.

Adams, Stuart 1967 "A Cost Approach to the Assessment of Gang Rehabilitation Techniques", Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency (Jan.).

Agopian, Michael 1991 "Evaluation of G.A.P.P. - Gang Alternative Prevention Project in the Los Angeles Probation Department", paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Nashville, Tennessee.

Aiken, Carol; Jeffrey P. Rush; and Jerry Wycoff 1993 "A Preliminary Inquiry Into Alabama Youth Gang Membership", The Gang Journal: An Interdisciplinary Research Quarterly (1)(2): 37-47.

Amandes, Richard B. 1979 "Hire a Gang Leader: A Delinquency Prevention Program", Juvenile and Family Court Journal (30)(1)(Feb): 37-40.

Anderson, James F. 1993 "Review Essay: A Methodological Critique of Islands in the Streets", The Gang Journal: An Interdisciplinary Research Quarterly (1)(2): 49-57.

Arnold, William R. 1965 "The Concept of Gang", The Sociological Quarterly (7)(1): 59-75.

Austin, David M. 1957 "Goals for Gang Workers", Social Work (2)(4): 43-50

Axelson, Roland G. 1984 "The Psychological Influence of Street Gangs on School-Aged Youth: A Case Study in Hartford, CT". The I.N. Thut World Education Center, Hartford, CT.

Bailey, William C. 1969 "Educational and Occupational Experience, Perception, and Future Expectations of Lower Class Negro Gang Delinquents", Master's thesis, Washington State University.

Baird, L.H.1986 "Prison Gangs: Texas", Corrections Today (18)(July): 22.

Baittle, Brahm 1961 "Psychiatric Aspects of the Development of a Street Corner Group: An Exploratory Study", American Journal of Orthopsychiatry (31)(Oct): 703-712.

Barker, George C. 1950 Pachuco: An American-Spanish Argot and Its Social Function in Tucson, Arizona. Social Science Bulletin No. 18 (Vol. XXI)(No. 1)(Jan), Tucson, Arizona: University of Arizona Press.

Beck, L.M. 1962 Three Groups of Delinquents of the Family Court of East Baton Rouge Parish, Ph.D. dissertation, Louisiana State University.

Beier, Ernest G. 1951 "Experimental Therapy With a Gang", Focus (30) (July): 97-102. Bell, J. and D. Sullivan 1987 Jackson, Mississippi Mayor's Task Force on Gangs: Final Report, Jackson, MS.

Bernstein, Saul 1964 Youth on the Streets -- Work with Alienated Youth Groups. New York: Associated Press.

Bloch, Herbert and Arthur Niederhoffer 1957 "Adolescent Behavior and the Gang: A Cross-

Cultural Analysis", <u>Journal of Social Therapy</u> (3): 174-179. 1958 <u>The Gang: A Study in Adolescent Behavior</u>. New York: Philosophical Press.

Block, Carolyn Rebecca and Richard Block 1993 <u>Street Gang Crime In Chicago</u>. National Institute of Justice, Research in Brief. December.

Blumberg, Leonard 1964 "A Possible Application of the Epidemiological-Public Health Model to Civic Action-Research", <u>Social Problems</u> (12)(Fall): 178-185.

Bogardus, Emory 1943 "Gangs of Mexican-American Youth", <u>Sociology and Social Research</u> (28): 55-66.

Bolitho, W. 1930 "The Psychosis of the Gang", <u>Survey</u>: 501-506.

Bookin, H. 1980 "The Gangs That Didn't Go Straight", paper presented at the Society for the Study of Social Problems, New York.

Born, Peter 1971 <u>Street Gangs and Youth Unrest</u>. Chicago: Chicago Tribune Educational Service Department.

Bowker, L.H. and Malcolm W. Klein 1983 "The Etiology of Female Juvenile Delinquency and Gang Membership: A Test of Psychological and Social Structural Explanations", <u>Adolescence</u> (18)(72)(Win): 739-751.

Brooks, William Allan 1952 <u>Girl Gangs</u>. A Survey of Teen-Age Drug Addicts, Sex Crimes, Rape, Kleptomania, Prostitution, Truancy, and Other Deviations. New York: Padell Book Company.

Brotman, Richard 1949 <u>A Group Approach to the Treatment of the Aggressive Gang</u>, Master's Thesis, City College of New York.

Brown, Waln K. 1977 "Black Female Gangs in Philadelphia", <u>International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology</u> (21): 221-228. 1978 "Black Gangs as Family Extensions" & "Graffiti, Identity, and the Delinquent Gang", <u>International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology</u> (22)(1): 39-48.

Brueckner, William H. 1960 "Corner Group Work with Teen-Age Gangs", <u>Federal Probation</u> (24)(Dec): 84.

Bryant, D. 1989 <u>Community Responses Crucial for Dealing With Youth Gangs</u>, U.S. Dept. of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Washington, D.C. California Attorney General's Youth Gang Task Force 1981 <u>Report on Youth Gang Violence in California</u>. California: Department of Justice. California Council on Criminal Justice 1986 Final Report: State Task Force on Youth Gang Violence. Sacramento, CA. 1989 State Task Force on Gangs and Drugs. Sacramento, CA: 95823.

Camp, George and Camille Graham Camp 1985 <u>Prison Gangs: Their Extent, Nature, and Impact on Prisons</u>. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Justice.

Campbell, Anne 1984 <u>The Girls in the Gang: A Report from New York City</u>. New York: Basil Blackwell Ltd. 1984 "Girls' Talk: The Social Representation of Aggression by Female Gang Members", <u>Criminal Justice Behavior</u> (11): 139-156. 1987 "Self Definitions by Rejection: The Case of Gang Girls", <u>Social Problems</u> (34)(5)(Dec): 451-466.

Caplan, Nathan S.; Dennis J. Deshaies, Gerald D. Suttles, and Hans W. Mattick 1963 "The Nature, Variety, and Patterning of Street Club Work in an Urban Setting", pp. 135-169 in Malcolm W. Klein and Barbara G. Meyerhoff (eds), <u>Juvenile Gangs in Context: Theory,Research, and Action</u>, Confererence Report, August 25-26, 1963, Youth Studies Center, Los Angeles: University of Southern California. 1964 "Factors Affecting the Process and Outcome of Street Club Work", <u>Sociology and Social Research</u> (48)(Jan): 207-219.

Carey, Sean 1985 "I just Hate 'em, That's All", New Society (73)(1178)(July): 123-125.

Cartwright, Desmond S. and Kenneth I. Howard 1966 "Multivariate Analysis of Gang Delinquency: I. Ecologic Influences", Multivariate Behavioral Research (1)(July): 321-71.

Cartwright, Desmond S.; Kenneth I. Howard; and Nicholas A. Reuterman 1970 "Multivariate Analysis of Gang Delinquency: II. Structural and Dynamic Properties of Gangs", Multivariate Behavioral Research (5)(July): 303-24. ----- 1971 "Multivariate Analysis of Gang Delinquency: III. Age and Physique of Gangs and Clubs", Multivariate Behavioral Research (6)(Jan): 75-90 ----- 1980 "Multivariate Analysis of Gang Delinquency: IV. Personality Factors in Gangs and Clubs", Multivariate Behavioral Research (15): 3-22.

Cartwright, Desmond S.; B. Tomson; and H. Schwartz 1975 Gang Delinquency. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Cavanagh, Suzanne and David Teasley 1992 Youth Gangs: An Overview. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service.

Cellini, Henry D. 1991   Youth Gang Prevention and Intervention Strategies. Albuquerque, NM: Training and Research Institute, Inc.

Chazal, J. 1964 "A Current Criminological Problem: Juvenile Delinquency in Gangs", Quebec Society of Criminology Bulletin(3)(2): 5-11.

Cloward, R.A. and L.E. Ohlin 1960 Delinquency and Opportunity. New York: Free Press.

Cohen, Albert K. 1955 Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

Collins, Jessie. 1993 "Joe: The Story of an Ex-Gang Member", Gang Journal: An Interdisciplinary Research Quarterly (1)(3): 45-50.

Conrad, J.P. 1979 "Who's in Charge? The Control of Gang Violence in California Prisons", in Correctional Facility Planning edited by Robert Montilla and Nora Marlow, pp. 135-147, Lexington, Mass: D.C. Heath.

Cook, James I. 1993 "Targetting Gang Violence in the City of Westminister", Westminister Police Department, Westminister, CA.

Covey, Herbert C.; Scott Menard; and Robert J. Franzese 1992 Juvenile Gangs. Charles C. Thomas Publisher: Springfield, IL.

Cox, V. 1986 "Prison Gangs - Inmates Battle for Control", Corrections Compendium (10)(9)(Apr): 1,6-9.

Crane, A.R. 1951 "A Note on Pre-Adolescent Gangs", Australian Psychology (3): 43-45. 1958 "The Development of Moral Values in Children: IV; Pre-Adolescent Gangs and the Moral Development of Children", British Journal of Educational Psychology (28)(Nov): 201-208.

Crawford, Paul I.; Daniel I. Malamud; and James R. Dumpson 1950 Working With Teenage Gangs. A Report on the Central Harlem Street Clubs Project. New York: Welfare Council of New York City.Crime Control Digest 1976 "Detroit Mayor Against City's Growing Youth Gangs: Citizen Involvement in Crime Prevention", Aug. 30, 1976, p. 5, (10)(35). 1980 "Gangs - Police, Community Relations", Mar. 30, 1980, pp. 7-8, (14)(9). 1984 "Police Community Relations: Gangs - Chicago Police Department: Citizen Involvement in Crime Prevention", Mar. 26, 1984, pp. 5-6, (18)(12). 1987 "Detroit Mayor Unveils Plan to Fight Youth Crime: Gangs and Crime Prevention", Jan 26, 1987, p. 6, (21)(4). 1987 "California's Vietnam Refugees Work on Their Own to Divert Teens from Street Gangs", June 8, 1987, pp. 9-10,(21)(23).

Crowner, James M. 1963 "Utilizing Certain Positive Aspects of Gang Phenomena in Training School Group Work", American Journal of Correction (25)(July-August): 24-27. Cummings, Scott and Daniel Monti (eds.) 1993 Gangs: The Origins and Impact of Contemporary Youth Gangs in the United States. Albany, NY: State University New York Press.

Cusson, Maurice 1989 "Disputes over Honor and Gregarious Aggressions", Revue Internationale de Criminologie et de Police Technique (Geneva, SWITZ) (42)(3): 290-297.

Dahmann, J. 1981 "Operation Hardcore: A Prosecutorial Response to Violent Gang Criminality", interim report, MITRE Corporation, McLean, VA.

Daniels, S. 1987 "Prison Gangs: Confronting the Threat", Corrections Today (29)(2)(Apr): 66,126,162.

Dawley, David 1973 A Nation of Lords: The Autobiography of the Vice Lords. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press. 1992 A Nation of Lords. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Delaney, Lloyd T. 1954 "Establishing Relationships with Antisocial Groups and an Analysis of Their Structure", British Journal of Delinquency (5)(1): 34-42.

De Leon, Aleister 1977 "Averting Violence in the Gang Community", The Police Chief (44)(7)(July): 52-53.

Dumpson, J.R. 1949 "An Approach to Antisocial Street Gangs", Federal Probation: 22-29.

Dumpson, James R., et al 1952 "Gang and Narcotic Problems of Teen-Age Youth", American Journal of Psychotherapy (6)(Apr): 312-46.

Dunbar, Ellen A. 1963 "How to Help the Gang Member Through His Family", Special Service for Groups, Los Angeles: unpublished.

Dunston, Leonard G. 1990 Report of the Task Force on Juvenile Gangs. New York State Division for Youth. Albany, New York.

Duran, M. 1975 "What Makes a Difference in Working with Youth Gangs?", Crime Prevention Review (2): 25-30.

Erlanger, Howard S. 1979 "Estrangement, Machismo and Gang Violence", Social Science Quarterly (60)(2): 235-49.

Fagan, Jeffrey 1989 "The Social Organization of Drug Use and Drug Dealing Among Urban Gangs", Criminology (27)(4): 633-664.

Fagan, Jeffrey and Ko-lin Chin 1989 "Violence as Regulation and Social Control in the Distribution of Crack", in M. De la Rosa; B. Gropper; and E. Lambert (eds.), Drugs and Violence, National Institute of Drug Abuse Research Monograph, Rockville, MD: U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services.

Ferrell, Jeff 1992 Crimes of Style: Urban Graffiti and the Politics of Urban Criminality. New York: Garland.

Fishman, L. 1988 "The Vice Queens: An Ethnographic Study of Black Female Gang Behavior", paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology. Florida House of Representatives 1987 Issue Paper: Youth Gangs in Florida. Committee on Youth. Tallahassee, FL.

Friedman, C.J.; F. Mann; and A.S. Friedman 1975 "A Profile of Juvenile Street Gang Members", Adolescence (10): 563-607. 1976 "Juvenile Street Group: The Victimization of Youth", Adolescence, (44)(Winter): 527-533.

Fry, John. 1969 Fire and Blackstone. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott. 1973 Locked Out Americans. New York: Harper and Row.

Furfey, Paul Hanley. 1926 The Gang Age: A Study of the Pre-Adolescent Boy and His Recreational Needs. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Furman, Sylvan S. (ed). 1952 Reaching the Unreached. "Working with a Street Gang" (pp. 112-121) New York: New York City Youth Board.

Gandy, John M. 1959 "Preventive Work with Street-Corner Groups: Hyde Park Project, Chicago", Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science (323)(Mar): 107-116.

Goldstein, Arnold P. 1991 Delinquent Gangs: A Psychological Perspective. Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Goldstein, Arnold P. and Barry Glick, et al. 1994 The Prosocial Gang: Implementing Aggression Replacement Training. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Gonzalez, Alfredo 1981 Mexican/Chicano Gangs in Los Angeles. D.S.W. dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, School of Social Welfare.

Gordon, Robert A. 1963 Values and Gang Delinquency, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago. 1967 "Social Level, Disability, and Gang Interaction", American Journal of Sociology (73)(July): 42-62.

Gordon, Robert A.; James Short, Jr.; Desmond S. Cartwright; and Fred L. Strodtbeck 1963 "Values and Gang Delinquency: A Study of Street-Corner Groups", American Journal of Sociology (69)(2): 109-128 1970 "Values and Gang Delinquency: A Study of Street-Corner Groups", Chapter 33 in Wolfgang, et al (eds.), The Sociology of Crime and Delinquency, New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc, pp. 319-339.

Gorn, Elliott J. 1987 "Good-Bye Boys, I Die a True American": Homicide, Nativism, and Working-Class Culture in Antebellum New York City", Journal of American History (74)(2)(Sept): 388-410.

Haire, Thomas D. 1979 "Street Gangs: Some Suggested Remedies for Violence and Vandalism", The Police Chief (46)(7)(July): 54-55.

Harding, J. 1952 "A Street Corner Gang and its Implications for Sociological and Psychological Theory", In J.E. Hulett and K.R. Stagner (eds.), Problems in Social Psychology, Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Hardman, Dale G. 1963 Small Town Gangs, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, College of Education. 1967 "Historical Perspectives of Gang Research", Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency (4)(1): 5-27. 1969 "Small Town Gangs", Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Studies (60)(2): 173-81.

Harris, Mary G. 1988 Cholas: Latino Girls and Gangs. New York: AMS Press. Harrison, F.V. 1988 "The Politics of Outlawry in Urban Jamaica", Urban Anthropology (17)(2,3)(Sum/Fall): 259-277.

Helmreich, W.B. 1973 "Black Crusaders: The Rise and Fall of Political Gangs", Society (11)(1)(Nov/Dec): 44-50.

Hogrefe, Russell and John Harding 1947 "Research Considerations in the Study of Street Gangs", Applied Anthropology (6)(Fall): 21-24.

Horowitz, Ruth and Gary Schwartz 1974 "Honor, Normative Ambiguity and Gang Violence", American Sociological Review (39): 238-51.

Houston, James G. 1993 "An Interview with Lewis Yablonsky: The Violent Gang and Beyond", The Gang Journal: An Interdisciplinary Research Quarterly (1)(2): 59-67. 1994 "National Policy Neglect and Its Impact on Gang Suppression", Journal of Gang Research (2)(1)(Fall):35-62.

Hunsaker, A. 1981 "The Behavioral-Ecological Model of Intervention With Chicano Gang Delinquents", Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences (3): 225-239.

Jackson, Pamela Irving 1991 "Crime, Youth Gangs, and Urban Transition: The Social Dislocations of Postindustrial Economic Development", Justice Quarterly (8)(3): 379-397.

Jankowski, Martin Sanchez 1991 Islands in the Street: Gangs American Urban Society. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Jereczek, Gordon E. 1962 "Gangs Need Not Be Delinquent", Federal Probation (26)(Mar): 49-52.

Johnson, Gwendolyn 1949 The Transformation of Juvenile Gangs into Accommodated Groups: A Study of Eight Boys' Gangs in Washington. Master's Thesis, Howard University. Juvenile Justice Digest 1980 "Police Community Relations: Crime Prevention of Gangs", Feb. 22, 1980, pp. 7-8 (8)(4).

Kantor, David and William Ira Bennett 1968 "Orientation of Street-Corner Workers and Their Effect on Gangs", In Stanton Wheeler (ed.), Controlling Delinquents, New York: Wiley.

Karacki, Larry and Jackson Toby 1962 "The Uncommitted Adolescent: Candidate for Gang Socialization", Sociological Quarterly (32)(Spr): 203-215.

Klein, Malcolm W. 1965 "Juvenile Gangs, Police, and Detached Workers: Controversies About Intervention", Social Service Review (39): 183-190 1968b From Association to Guilt: The Group Guidance Project in Juvenile Gang Intervention. Los Angeles: Youth Studies Center. 1968c The Ladino Hill Project. Los Angeles: Youth Studies Center. 1969c "Gang Cohesiveness, Delinquency, and a Street-Work Program", Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency (July). 1971 Street Gangs and Street Workers. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. 1990 "Having an Investment in Violence: Some Thoughts About the American Street Gang", The Edwin H. Sutherland Award Address to the American Society of Criminology, Annual Meeting, November 9, 1990.

Klein, Malcolm W. and Barbara G. Meyerhoff (eds) 1964 Juvenile Gangs in Context: Theory, Research, and Action, Conference Report, August 25-26, 1963, Youth Studies Center, Los Angeles: University of Southern California.

Klein, Malcolm W. and Neal Snyder 1965 "The Detached Worker: Uniformities and Variances in Style", Social Work (10)(Oct): 60-68.

Knox, George W. 1978 "Perceived Closure and Respect for the Law Among Delinquent and Non-Delinquent Youths", Youth and Society (9)(4)(June): 385-406. 1980 "Educational Upgrading for Youthful Offenders", Chidren and Youth Services Review (2)(3): 291-313. 1981 "Differential Integration and Job Retention Among Exoffenders", Criminology (18)(4)(Feb): 481-499. 1981 "A Comparative Cost-Benefit Analysis of Offender Placement Programs", LAE Journal of the American Criminal Justice Association (43)(1,2): 39-49. 1984 "How Criminologists View Rehabilitation", Indian Journal of Criminology (12)(1)(Jan): 26-32. 1989 "Family Services in Corrections", The State of Corrections, Proceedings of the Annual Conferences of The American Correctional Association, pp. 179-182. 1991 An Introduction to Gangs. Berrien Springs, MI: Vande Vere Publishing, Ltd.1991 "Gangs and Social Justice Issues", chapter 1 (pp. 1-19), in Sloan T. Letman (Ed.), Prison Conditions and Prison Overcrowding, Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt   Publishing Company. 1992 "Gang Organization in a Large Urban Jail", American Jails. 1995 An Introduction to Gangs, 3rd edition, Wyndham Hall Press, Indiana.

Knox, George W.; Benito Garcia; and Pat Mc Clendon 1983 "Social and Behavioral Correlates of Gang Affiliation", paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American   Society of Criminology, Nov. 10, 1983, Denver, CO.

Knox, George W.; Edward D. Tromanhauser; and David Laske 1992 Schools Under Siege.

Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

Knox, George W.; Edward Tromanhauser; and Thomas F. Mc Currie 1991 "Gangs in Juvenile Corrections: Training Issues", Journal of Correctional Training (forthcoming).

Knox, George W.; and Edward Tromanhauser 1991 "Gangs and Their Control in Adult Correctional Institutions", The Prison Journal (LXXI)(2)(Fall-Winter): 15-22.1991 "Gang Members as a Distinct Health Risk Group in Juvenile Correctional Facilities", The Prison Journal (LXXI)(2)(Fall-Winter): 61-66. 1992 "Comparing Juvenile Correctional Facilities: A Brief Overview", Journal of Juvenile Justice and Detention Services (7)(1)(Spr): 7-13. 1993 "Gang Training in Adult Correctional Institutions: A Function of Intensity, Duration and Impact of the Gang Problem", Journal of Correctional Training.

Knox, George W.; Edward D. Tromanhauser; Pamela Irving Jackson; Darek Niklas; James G. Houston; Paul Koch; and James R. Sutton 1993 "Preliminary Findings from the 1992 Law Enforcement Mail Questionnaire Project", Gang Journal: An Interdisciplinary Research Quarterly (1)(3): 11-27.

Kobrin, Solomon 1959 "The Chicago Area Project - a Twenty-five Year Assessment", Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science (322): 19-29. 1961 "Sociological Aspects of the Development of a Street Corner Group: An Exploratory Study", Amerian Journal of Orthopsychiatry (31)(4): 685-702. 1964 "Legal and Ethical Problems of Street Gang Work", Crime and Delinquency (10)(2): 152-156.

Kobrin, Solomon and Malcolm W. Klein 1983 Community Treatment of Juvenile Offenders: The DSO Experiments. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Kotlowitz, Alex 1991 There Are No Children Here. New York: Doubleday. 1992 There Are No Children Here. New York: Anchor Books.

Krisberg, Barry 1971 Urban Leadership Training: An Ethnographic Study of 22 Gang Leaders. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 1975 The Gang and the Community. School of Criminology, University of California, Berkeley. San Francisco, CA: R and E Research Associates.

Lagree, J. and P.L. Fai 1989 "Girls in Street Gangs in the Suburbs of Paris" (from Growing up Good: Policing the Behavior of Girls in Europe, pp. 80-95, Maureen Cain, editor), Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Leissner, Aryeh 1969 Street Club Work in Tel Aviv and New York. London: Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd. Majors, Richard and Janet Mancini Billson 1992 Cool Pose: The Dilemmas of Black Manhood in America. New York: Lexington Books.

Martin, Richard H. 1993 "Gang Colors: Should Students Be Allowed to Wear Them in College?", The Gang Journal: An Interdisciplinary Research Quarterly (1)(2): 69. 69.

Mattick, Hans W. and Nathan S. Caplan 1962 Chicago Youth Development Project: Street Work, Community Organization and Research, April, University of Michigan Institute for Social Research, Ann Arbor, Michigan. 1964 The Chicago Youth Development Project, February, University of Michigan Institute for Social Research, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Mc Carthy, J.E. and J.S. Barbaro 1952 "Redirecting Teenage Gangs", in S.S. Furman (ed.), New York City Youth Board.

Mc Connell, Elizabeth H. 1990 "Assessing Youth Gangs in an Urban High School", paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Baltimore, MD. 1994 "Youth Gang Intervention and Prevention in Texas: Evaluating Community Mobilization Training", Journal of Gang Research (2)(1)(Fall): 63-71.

Mc Kay, Henry D. 1949 "The Neighborhood and Child Conduct", Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science (Jan): 32-41.

Mc Lean, Gordon. 1991 Cities of Lonesome Fear: God Among the Gangs. Chicago: Moody Press.

Miller, Walter B. 1957 "The Impact of a Community Group Work Program on Delinquent Corner Groups", Social Service Review (31): 396-406. 1962 "The Impact of a 'Total Community' Delinquency Control Project", Social Problems (10)(Fall): 168-91. 1963 "The Corner Gang Boys Get Married", Transaction (1): 10-12. 1969 "White Gangs", Transaction (6)(1).

Milner, John G. 1959 "Working With Juvenile Gang Members", California Youth Authority, Quarterly (12)(Spr): 3-7.

Mitchell, R. 1951 "Capturing Boys Gangs", Human Organization (Summer).

Molland, John, Jr. 1967 Cross Pressures: A Study of the Reconciliation by the Gang Boys of Perceived Expectations of Others, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago.

Moore, Joan W. 1977 "The Chicano Pinto Research Project: A Case Study in Collaboration", Journal of Social Issues (33)(4): 144-158. 1978 Homeboys: Gangs, Drugs, and Prison in the Barrios of Los Angeles, Philadelphia: Temple University Press. 1985 "Isolation and Stigmatization in the Development of the Underclass: The Case of the Chicano Gangs in East Los Angeles", Social Problems (33)(1)(Oct):1-12. 1989 "Is There a Hispanic Underclass?", Social Science Quarterly (70)(2): 265-285. 1989 "Gangs and Gang Violence: What we Know and What We Don't Know", paper presented at the California State University, Los Angeles, CA 1991 Going Down to the Barrio: Homeboys and Homegirls in Change. Philadelpha, PA: Temple University Press.

Moore, Joan W. and J.D. Vigil 1987 "Chicano Gangs: Group Norms and Individual Factors Related to Adult Criminality", Aztlan (18)(2)(Fall): 27-44.

Morales, Armando 1963 "A Study of Recidivism of Mexican-American Junior Forestry Camp Graduates", Master's Thesis, Social Work, University of Southern California. 1982 "The Mexican American Gang Member: Evaluation and Treatment", in Mental Health and Hispanic Americans by Rosina M. Becerra, Marvin Karno, and Javier I. Escobar (eds.), New York: Grune and Stratton. 1989 "A Clinical Model for the Prevention of Gang Violence and Homicide", In A. Morales and B.W. Sheafor, Social Work: A Profession of Many Faces,   Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Morris, Robert E., MD; Edward A. Harrison; George W. Knox; Edward Tromanhauser; Damon K. Marquis; Lydia L. Watts 1995 "Health Risk Behavioral Survey Form Thirty Nine, Juvenile Correctional Facilities in the United States". National School Safety Center 1988 Gangs in Schools: Breaking Up is Hard to Do. Malibu, CA: Pepperdine University Press. National Youth Gang Suppression and Intervention Program 1989 Report of the Law Enforcement Youth Symposium. 1990 Literature Review: Youth Gangs: Problem and Response. University of Chicago, School of Social Service Administration, Chicago, IL.1990 Survey of Youth Gang Problems and Programs in 45 Cities and 6 Sites. 1990 Community and Institutional Reponses to the Youth Gang Problem. 1990 Law Enforcement Definitional Conference - Transcript. 1990 The Youth Gang Problem: Perceptions of Former Youth Gang Influentials. Transcripts of Two Symposia. n.d. Preventing Involvement in Youth Gang Crime.

Neisser, Edith G. and Nina Ridenour 1960 Your Children and Their Gangs. U.S. Children's Bureau.Publication No. 384. Washington, D.C. New York City Youth Board 1960 Reaching the Fighting Gang. New York.

O'Hagan, F.J. 1976 "Gang Characteristics: An Empirical Survey", Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry (17): 305-314.

Oleson, Jim 1988 Treating Street Youth: Some Observations. Community Research Associates, 115 N. Neil Street, Suite 302, Champaign, IL 61820.

Ontario Police Department 1989 "Gangs, Move 'Em Out of Your Life", (video). Ontario, CA 91761.

Padilla, Felix 1992 The Gang as an American Enterprise. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press. Paramount Plan 1988 The Paramount Plan: Alternatives to Gang Membership. City of Paramount, California.

Phelps, Roy David 1988 The History of the Eastside Dudes, a Black Social Club in Central Harlem, New York City, 1933-1985: An Exploration of Background Factors Related to Adult Criminality. Ph.D. dissertation, Fordham University, Bronx, New York.

Pleister, Margaret A. 1963 An Exploratory Study of Factors Influencing Nine Adolescent Girls in their Movement To and From Both School and the Gang, Master's thesis, Social Work, University of Southern California.

Police Chief, The. 1979 "Gangs, Violence, Vandalism: Citizen Involvement in Crime Prevention", (46)(7): 54-55.

Pope, Whitney 1962 Detached Workers, Delinquent Boys and the Theory of Exchange, Master's Thesis, University of Chicago.

Poston, Richard W. 1971 The Gang and the Establishment. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Puffer, J. Adams 1912 The Boy and His Gang. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Co.
        Quicker, John C. 1983 Homegirls: Characterizing Chicana Gangs. San Pedro, California: International Universities Press. 1983 Seven Decades of Gangs: What has been done, and what should be done. Sacramento, CA: State of California Commission on Crime Control and Violence Prevention.

Redl, Fritz 1954 "The Psychology of Gang Formation and the Treatment of Juvenile Delinquency", pp. 367-377 in The Psycho-Analytic Study of the Child, Vol. 1, New York: International Universities Press.

Regulus, Thomas A. 1994 "The Effects of Gangs on Student Performance and Delinquency in Public Schools", Journal of Gang Research (2)(1)(Fall): 1-13.

Ribisl, Kurt M. and William S. Davidson, II 1993 "Community Change Interventions", Chapter 11 (pp. 333- 355) in Arnold P. Goldstein and C. Ronald Huff (Eds.), The Gang Intervention Handbook, Champaign, IL: Research   Press.

Riccio, Vincent and Bill Slocum 1962 All The Way Down: The Violent Underworld of Street Gangs. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Richards, C. 1958 "Can We Get a Focus For Our Working With Hostile or Hard To Reach Youth Gangs," Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago.

Ridgeway, James 1990 Blood in the Face: The Ku Klux Klan, Aryan Nations, Nazi Skinheads, and the Rise of a New White Culture. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press.

Robert, Phillipe and Pierre Lascoumes. 1974 Les Bands D'Adolescents: Une Theorie de la Segregation. Paris, France: Les Editions Ouvieres.

Rodeheffer, I.A. 1949 "Gangdom: Fists to Reasoning", Journal of Educational Sociology (22)(Feb): 406-15.

Rodriguez, Luis J. 1994 Always Running: La Vida Loca, Gang Days in L.A.. Curbstone Press.

Rosenbaum, Dennis P. and Jane A. Grant 1983 "Gangs and Youth Problems in Evanston: Research Findings and Policy Options", Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research, Northwestern University, July 22, 1983.

Rothman, Edwin, et al 1974 The Gang Problem in Philadelphia: Proposals for Improving the Programs of Gang-Control Agencies. Pennsylvania Economy League (Eastern Division) in association with the Bureau of Municipal Research Liberty Trust

Building, Philadelphia, Pa. 19107, Report No. 375; supported by a grant from the William Penn Foundation.

Sanchez-Jankowski, Martin 1991 <u>Islands in the Street: Gangs in American Urban Society</u>. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Schwendinger, Herman and Julia 1985 <u>Adolescent Subcultures and Delinquency</u>. New York: Praeger.

Schwitzgebel, Ralph 1965 <u>Street-Corner Research: An Experimental Approach to the Juvenile Delinquent</u>. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Schlossman, Steven and Michael Sedlak 1983 <u>The Chicago Area Project Revisted</u>. A Rand Note. Prepared for the National Institute of Justice. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.

Shaw, Clifford R. and Henry D. McKay 1931 <u>Social Factors in Juvenile Delinquency: A Study of Community, the Family, and the Gang in Relation to Delinquent Behavior</u>. Volume II in the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement. U.S. Government Printing Office.

Shaw, Clifford R. and Anthony Sorrentino. 1956 "Is 'Gang-Busting' Wise?", <u>National Parent-Teacher Magazine</u> (50)(Jan): 18-20+.

Sherman, Lawrence W. 1970 <u>Youth Workers, Police and the Gangs: Chicago 1956-1970</u>, Master's thesis, University of Chicago. 1973 "Street Work History Includes Three Stages", <u>The Forum</u> (May): 17-24.

Shireman, Charles H., et al 1957 <u>An Examination and Analysis of Technique Used by a Street Worker</u>. Chicago: Hyde Park Youth Project. 1958 <u>An Analysis of the Dynamics of the Interrelationship of Agency, Group and Community in Providing   S t a f f Service To A "Street Club"</u>. Hyde Park Youth Project. Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago.

Short, James F., Jr. and Fred L. Strodtbeck 1965 <u>Group Process and Gang Delinquency</u>. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Slack, Charles W. 1963 "SCORE -- A Description", in <u>Experiment in Culture Expansion</u>, Report of Proceedings, U.S. National Institute of Mental Health, Bethesda, MD.

Spergel, Irving 1960 <u>Types of Delinquent Groups</u>, D.S.W. dissertation, Columbia University. <u>Dissertation Abstracts</u> (21)(Jan): 2034-35 (1961). 1966 <u>Street Gang Work: Theory and Practice</u>. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc 1984 "Violent Gangs in Chicago: In Search of Social Policy", <u>Social Service Review</u> (58): 199-226. 1986 "The Violent Gang Problem in Chicago: A Local Community Approach", <u>Social Service Review</u> (60)(1)(Mar): 94-131. 1988 "The Youth Gang Problem: A Preliminary Policy Pespective", draft, Prepared for the <u>Juvenile Gang Suppression and Intervention Research and Development Program</u>, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Dept. of Justice. 1989 Youth Gangs: Problem and Response: A Review of the Literature, Executive Summary. U.S. Dept. of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Washington, D.C. 1990 "The Violent Gang Problem in Chicago: A Local Community Approach", <u>Social Service Review</u> (60)(1)(Mar): 94-131.

Spergel, Irving A. and Ron L. Chance 1990 <u>Community and Institutional Responses to the Youth Gang Problem: Case Studies Based on Field Visits and Other Materials</u>. National Youth Gang Suppression and Intervention Project, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago (Jan.).

Spergel, Irving A.; Glen David Curry; R.A. Ross; and R. Chance 1989 <u>Survey of Youth Gang Problems and Programs in 45 Cities and 6 Sites</u> (Technical Report, No. 2, National   Youth Gang Suppression and Intervention Project), Chicago: School of

Social Service Administration, University of Chicago.

Spergel, Irving A.; et al 1994 Gang Suppression and Intervention: Community Models Research Summary. October. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Washington, D.C.

Steward, Samuel M. 1990 Bad Boys and Tough Tattoos. New York: Harrington Park.

Strodtbeck, Fred L.; James F. Short, Jr.; and Ellen Kolegar 1962 "The Analysis of Self-Descriptions by Members of Different Gangs", Sociological Quarterly (24): 331-356.

Swans, Bennie J., Jr. 1985 "Gangbusters! Crisis Intervention Network.", School Safety, Winter, 1985, pp. 12-15, National School Safety Center.

Takata, Susan and Richard Zevitz 1987 "Youth Gangs in Racine: An Examination of Community Perceptions", Wisconsin Sociologist (24)(4)(Fall):132-141 1990 "Divergent Perceptions of Group Delinquency in a Midwestern Community: Racine's Gang Problem", Youth and Society (21)(3)(Mar): 282-305.

Tennyson, Ray A. 1966 Family Structure and Gang Delinquency. Ph.D. dissertation, Washington State University.

Thompson, D.W. 1986 Preventing Youth Membership in Urban Street Gangs: The Evaluation of a Behavioral Community Intervention. Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, 3987B.

Thompson, David W. and Leonard A. Jason 1988   "Street Gangs and Preventive Interventions", Criminal Justice and Behavior (15)(3)(Sept): 323-333.

Thrasher, Frederic M. 1927   The Gang. A Study of 1,313 Gangs in Chicago. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1936 _____. 2nd revised eidition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1968 _____. Third Impression, Abridged and with a Introduction by James F. Short, Jr. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tromanhauser, Edward 1981 "The Problem of Street Gangs", chapter IV in Chicago Safe School Study, Board of Education, City of Chicago.

Webb, Margot 1991 Coping With Street Gangs. New York: Free Press.

Weiner, Arthur K. 1965 "C-r-a-c-k-i-n-g The Hard Core Area", Police Chief (32)(Jan): 27-31.

Weissman, Harold (ed.) 1969 Community Development in the Mobilization for Youth. New York: Association Press.

West, Pat and Tony Ostos 1988 Pilot Study: City of Paramount Alternatives to Gang Membership Program. City of Paramount, 16400 Colorado Ave., Paramount, CA 90723.

Yablonsky, Lewis 1958 A Field Study of Delinquent Gang Organization and Behavior With Special Emphasis on Gang Warfare. Ph.D. dissertation, New York University.

ENDNOTES:

1.Actually, it was a "Twin Cities" gang summit, scheduled for July 14-18, 1993 at the Mount Olivet Baptist Church in St. Paul, Minnesota. Louis Farrakhan who commands a speaking fee $25,000 (a rate quoted by a New York agency in 1991 for a speech fee to a Chicago university --- which could not afford the fee) is listed as one of the speakers at the gang summit entitled "All Nations Under God". The Vice Lords who are heavily involved in the Minneapolis gang summit swear allegiance to Islam in their gang constitution. The Twin Cities gang summit founders (e.g., of the United For and In Peace gang alliance) make no claims of being "ex-" gang members...they readily admit their gang membership. (See "Sharif Willis Shocked By Testimonies in A.C. Ford Trial", by Jae Bryson, Insight: The Journal for Business & The Arts, (20)(23): Monday, June 7, 1993, p. 1).

2.See: Mark Brunswick, 1992, "A Tale of Two Cities and the Gangs that Couldn't Stay Straight", Star Tribune, Metro Edition, Nov. 19, 1992.

3.Most recently Ribisl and Davidson (1993) also argue the need for such a theory at the base of any program; they also cite the work of Lipsey (1988). Well before this Daniel Glaser also showed that one of the biggest mistakes in program evaluation was not having a theoretical approach to work with.

4.One of the most interesting spinoffs of the American gang problem is the emergence of corporate consulting firms that specialize in "gang intervention" and training. The city of Joliet, Illinois hired Urban Dynamics, Incorporated for such consulting services to the Joliet Gang Task Force; but then terminated the contract by a vote of 7-1 from the City Council --- apparently because gang violence did not subside, and rather increased. (See, Jerry Shnay, 1993, "Joliet Cuts Ties With 3rd Firm Hired to Help Fight Gangs", Chicago Tribune (Southwest), section 2, p. 1, Aug. 5, 1993).

5.Founded by LueElla Edwards after her 15-year-old daughter was killed by stray gang gunfire at Chicago's Cabrini Green housing complex, the "Take Our Daughters To Work Club" works on identity and self-esteem issues for young females at a critical age when they may gravitate towards the gang or towards early motherhood. See K.T. Le, 1993, "After Child's Death, Mom Puts Grief to Good Work", Chicago Sun-Times, July 13, 1993, p. 17.

6.Located at 1329 W. Grand in Chicago. Mr. Brandisi passed away in the summer of 1993.

7.See "Cabrini Drummers Are Hard To Beat", Raymond R. Coffey, <u>Chicago Sun-Times</u>, Friday, June 25, 1993, p. 3.

8.See "Jim Brown Joins Anti-Gang Team", <u>Chicago Sun-Times</u>, July 21, 1993, p. 20. The Chicago Housing Authority agreed to pay Jim Brown, from the Amer-I-Can Foundation, $100 an hour plus expenses up to $25,000 for establishing a program for kids at risk.

9.In fact, David Dawley was also involved indirectly with this program and was quoted in the newspapers about the program. Dawley acts today as a consultant on gangs. Dawley was the one who helped the Vice Lords get federal and foundation funding in earlier Chicago gang history. Recall that Dawley claims to be the "only white member of the Vice Lords". See also: Mark Brunswick, 1992, "A Tale of Two Cities and the Gangs That Couldn't Stay Straight", <u>Star Tribune</u>, 1A, Nov. 19.

10.The program is privately, not government, funded and the director prefers it that way (private communication). Of course, like many of the government funded programs too, no evaluation research is ever reported on program success (e.g., number of sinners reached, number of souls converted, followup: commitment to a Christian lifestyle Lord one year later, etc).

11.Fred Williams, an ex-member of the Harlem Crips "who works at the Cross Colours Common Ground Foundation, which helps to rehabilitate gang members", was quoted as one L.A. source who felt the gang truce was for real and the gangs need to be congratulated ("Probers Hint Gangs Used L.A. Riots To Get Guns, But Not All Agree", <u>Chicago Tribune</u>, June 18, 1992: section 1A, p. 41.).

12.For a "kit" by the Mc Gruff people (National Crime Prevention Council), see their <u>Tools to Involve Parents in Gang Prevention</u> that came out in 1993, created in consultation with the Boys and Girls Clubs and the Police Executive Research Forum. NCPC, 1700 K Street, NW, 2nd Fl., Washington, DC 20006-3817.

13. Please note: this refers only to those who completed question # 76A, the basic self-report control variable: "Have you ever joined a gang". Those who answered yes were classified as self-reported gang members. Thus, we have N = 1,994 such self-reported gang members. As will be seen later in our analysis, we can by computer analysis identify other gang members who sought to disguise or conceal their gang membership. We have made an analysis of this small subgroup who sought to conceal or avoid reporting on question #76a, and the item analysis reveals a consistent pattern of that reported in this chapter. Thus, we have left the chapter to basically describe those who

specifically told us they have joined a gang. Analysis revealed that the trends would not change by adding the small other suspected gang members at this point in the analysis.

14. Please note: both this and the following item were modified to isolate gender differences, the original item being used to refer simply to parents, in the authoritarian aggression subscale of the F-scale (see Miller, 1977: p. 415).

15. See "Atheist is Challenging Aurora's Funding of God's Gym Program", Chicago Tribune, Section 2, p. 2 (October 10, 1995). In this instance, well known atheist Robert I. Sherman threatened a law suit demanding any religious component in the gang program be dropped, or else demanding that city funding for the program be withdrawn.

16. A founding editor of the Journal of Gang Research, Dr. Jeff Walker, Department of Criminal Justice, University of Arkansas at Little Rock, was particularly helpful in sharing comments and concerns about the role of the mass media; the ideas for some of these hypotheses therefore came from discussions with Dr. Walker over the last couple years.

17. We are grateful to Wilson Palacios, who began as a member of the Project GANGPINT and suggested this item, but who could not provide data collection help with the project and was therefore not a part of the full Task Force research process.

18. Please note: We are grateful for possible input along the lines of this question from a practitioner who first joined the Project GANGPINT, but could not participate.

19. Please note that this item is a direct replication of an M-scale item, measuring morale, in the Long Form of the Minnesota Survey of Opinions (see Miller, 1977: p. 355; Rundquist and Sletto, 1936).

20. Please note: this is a direct replication of an item from the Dean scale for measuring alienation (see Miller, 1977, p. 355).

21. Please note: this is a direct replication of the F-scale item measuring authoritarian stereotypy (see Miller, 1977: p. 416).

22. Please note: these have been replicated, modified, or adapted from the Hemphill index of group dimensions (Miller, 1977: pp. 246-254).

23. While it is an insignificant finding, it is significant in another respect as a test of psychological approaches to the study of gangs that have tried to caste gang members in the image of being closet homosexuals, i.e., one gender preferring the company of the same gender engaging in highly ritualistic

behavior, the onset of the problem beginning typically when the persons first becomes sexually active. Let it be clear, this is not our belief, we simply recognize there are some wild cards in the gang literature on this issue. What our data actually suggests would challenge that assumption of sexual identity confusion in the gang member population, because our data suggests clearly gang members are no more likely than non-gang members to want or not to want to eventually get married.