

Gangs and Other Problems in American Jails Today: A Special Report of the NGCRC

by

George W. Knox, Ph.D.
National Gang Crime Research Center

Abstract

Recognizing the need to update previous research about how the issues like gangs and security threat groups (STG's) are affecting the climate of jails in America today, the National Gang Crime Research Center (NGCRC) undertook a national survey of jails in 2019 and then again in early 2022. Reported here are the statistical results of that anonymous national survey. Gangs and STG's continue to be a major problem is what emerged from the statistical analysis and indeed there is evidence of certain escalated threats. Findings about other problems impacting on the jails in American society today are also discussed. Replicating survey items from jail surveys dating back to 1993 allowed for analyzing some factors historically associated with the gang/STG problem in jails. The problems of trauma and stress from gang and related problems in jails today are not showing any signs of abatement and rather suggest an increase in the overall threat conditions faced by jail staff.

Chapter 1: Introduction

INTRODUCTION

Why do we have jails in America? Jails exist to provide several functions, the main function of which is to guarantee that a defendant who is accused of a crime will personally appear in court when required to for purposes of trial and sentencing. From this standpoint the main function of jails is to detain persons awaiting trial. Jails have other functions, such as a place of detention for those who have been sentenced for crimes carrying a penalty of less than a year in confinement. Jails are additionally used for a temporary holding center for persons convicted of felony crimes awaiting transfer to a state correctional facility. Jails are used as well to detain persons who have been on probation or parole and who may have violated the terms and conditions of their release and need to be detained awaiting a probation or parole revocation hearing. Jails have been used under contract with federal agencies to detain persons they have authority over, this includes the Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP) and the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE).

Jails serve the primary function of providing a temporary or short-term type of detention. If convicted of a misdemeanor crime that carries a sentence of less than a full year of confinement, a criminal court judge will typically sentence the convicted misdemeanor offender to serve that sentence in the local county jail. Jails are a type of “total institution”

just like their counterparts for long term incarceration: such as prisons, adult state correctional institutions, penitentiaries where the inmates are serving sentences for longer than a one-year period (Goffman, 1961).

TYPES OF JAILS IN AMERICA

The modern American jail is typically administered and funded by the county level of government, but all levels and variations of government authority have their respective types of jails. Moreover there are “federal jails” that exist called “Metropolitan Correctional Centers” that hold inmates who are being tried in federal courts. There are likewise city jails, typically found in the police or public safety building, sometimes a larger city will have several different police lock ups, where criminal suspects are held by police until the arrestee can be transferred to the county jail.

A lot of Americans are employed by the jails that exist in their jurisdiction. The most recent federal report from the year 2020 showed an estimated 184,900 Americans are employed as correctional officers in local jails (see Table 16, Minton and Zeng, 2021). Another 48,400 support staff are employed at the local jails in the USA as well (ibid).

There are additionally what are called Tribal jails that exist on larger Native American Indian reservations. The analysis by Minton (2014) suggests there are at least 79 correctional facilities operated by tribal governments or the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and in 2013 held a total of 2,287 inmates.

A “regional jail” may serve as the jail that accepts inmate intakes from two or more counties. It would operate as a shared cost adventure between the county governments. Each county would pay its fair share proportional to their usage.

The Uniform Code of Military Justice covers all branches of the U.S. military and there are many types of “military laws” the violation of which can result in short-term or long-term detention or confinement. There are temporary confinement facilities on most military installations. In all branches of the American armed forces there are examples of temporary confinement facilities — what might look and sound a lot like jails. In the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard jails are called “Brigs”. In the Army the facility used for jail would be called the “Stockade”. In the Air Force, it is simply called “confinement”. The long term correctional facility or prison in the Army is called the Disciplinary Barracks — for example, Delta Bravo Fort Leavenworth, the only one with a death row.

Just as military jails are unique in many ways it is also fair to say that jails on Native American Indian reservations and those operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) likewise have their own unique laws under which to operate. As one example, a tribal jail under current law can detain a convicted person for up to a maximum of three (3) years on each offense — it might be possible to “stack” the sentences. In some tribal jails, if bail is set at say for sake of argument \$5,000, the tribal law could be that no bond is accepted, and rather the defendant may have to put up a full cash-only bail amount. This kind of jail that can detain someone for a 3-year period is really a kind of hybrid jail — a kind of combination of short and long-term detention functions.

It would be wrong to assume that tribal jails are more abusive or more punitive-oriented than say local county jails. Tribal criminal justice in the USA can be very progressive. For example, the very name of the jail in the Puyallup Tribal Government - - - located near Tacoma, Washington - - - does not include the word “jail” at all, it is officially called the “Tribal Restorative Correctional Facility” (TRCF). Thus, the very name of the jail facility carries the intentional implication of a philosophy of restorative justice. The word “jail” survives in the informal sense: if someone is describing in casual conversation that they visited someone at the Puyallup TRCF, it may not be unusual for that person to say they

visited someone at the Puyallup jail. We can change the names of facilities but as Griffin (1999) reminds us, jails are still coercive organizations where the use of force or the threat of using force rises above everything and remains a constant reminder.

Finally, another type of jail is the “pay to stay” jail. In the State of California, this is an avant guard innovation where inmates who have been sentenced for a period of a year or less, and who can afford a private attorney, and afford to pay for their own costs of confinement, are allowed in Los Angeles and Orange counties, in California, to stay at any one of 26 different city jails under the terms and conditions negotiated by the attorney and the sentencing judge. Costs per night are comparable to hotel rooms. In the example from southern California, the “pay to stay” jails are a way for the defendant to avoid having to serve the sentence in county jail. The “pay-to-stay” jails in California are therefore a way for a person convicted of a misdemeanor to serve their time and be released during the day as well to go to work, returning at night to the jail to serve their sentence. Again, these are kind of hybrid jails, as they are city jails converted to serve the function of a county jail.

The term “pay to stay” jail has a different meaning in the State of Michigan. In Michigan, under law, county jails can require anyone confined there to “pay” for their confinement. The county jail typically sends an invoice to the inmate for their stay where the cost billed to the inmate ranges from \$20 to \$60 per day. Therefore with an average cost of \$40 per day, someone serving a six month sentence would in this example receive a bill for \$7,200 dollars. The inmate would be responsible for eventually paying this bill after their release.

THE MEGA-JAIL

What is a Mega-Jail? As used by jail experts, a megal jail is any jail holding more than 1,000 inmates. If your jail has 998 inmates on Thursday, it is not a mega jail. If it has 1,001 inmates on Friday, it is a mega jail. The idea is that the mega jail is a larger jail, and a thousand inmates averaged over time. Mega jails have earned more than their fair share of civil law suits as well as bad press or negative mass media coverage. These are basically jails in large metropolitan and urban areas. For example, jails in larger cities (New York, Miami, Chicago, Los Angeles, etc) are typically mega jails.

In some respects the phrase “mega-jail” is just shop talk for referring to the largest jails in the USA as measured by the size of the inmate population count taken daily. It is therefore, conceptually, arbitrary and capricious in terms of what population size to use as the cut-off point to differentiate “mega jails” from all other jails. Carried to its logical analytical extreme, if there are “mega-jails”, then there are also “mini-jails” — perhaps something like that found in a small town. In fact, we had a few as respondents in this survey.

The origin of the term “mega-jail” is not from the mass media or film producers. The origin is from the American Jail Association (AJA) which is the single leading professional organization in the world dealing exclusively with all issues pertaining to the operation of jails. The AJA defines a mega-jail as any jail that has 1,000 or more inmates for their average daily population.

THE DEJURE VERSUS THE DEFACTO FUNCTION OF JAILS

Should jails have a judicial function other than that of guaranteeing that a defendant appear at trial and sentencing? Here is the issue — the vast majority of felony offenders confined in American jails today never go to “trial” in the literal sense of the word. That is, there are two types of trial: (1) trial by jury, very expensive, and (2) trial by judge, called a “bench trial”, which is a lot cheaper, but still a large expense. Restricting our analysis to the typical county jail (i.e., the largest segment of jails), the vast majority of felony offenders

confined in American jails today never go to trial, instead they simply plead guilty usually to a lesser charge. They engage, more often than not, in “plea bargaining”, a very cost-effective way to dispose of felony court cases. It helps the judicial system function efficiently.

So logically, if we can name a local short term detention facility by its legal function, its *dejure* function, then the *defacto* name would have to be something like “judicial plea bargaining facility” — defendants go there with the right to a costly jury trial, but a very high percentage quickly grow tired of the limited creature comforts found in a jail and plead guilty to get it over with and go to an actual prison. In the jail they may not have the right to have what are called “contact visits” (being able to shake the hand of a visitor friend, kiss your spouse, hug your child, etc). But contact visits are often allowed once they arrive at the prison after their case has been fully adjudicated. The research by May, et al (2004) of N = 588 probationers and parolees in Kentucky showed they would prefer prison to serving jail time, that is from the offenders point of view they simply view the Spartan conditions of jail life as too punitive. There are many things they cannot do in a jail environment that they can do in an actual state prison environment. For example, no jail anywhere in America allows what are called “extended family visits”, also known as “conjugal visits”, but there are four states that allow conjugal visiting between prisoners and their legal spouses — the most famous of which is the State of Mississippi (Hopper, 1969).

The *dejure* function of the American jail is to guarantee the defendant shows up at scheduled court dates, while the *defacto* function of the jail could be construed as guaranteeing greater efficiency and cost-effectiveness in court administration — encouraging the confined defendants to plead guilty through the plea bargaining process. This is, however, a debate far beyond the scope of the present research which seeks to focus on the nuts and bolts of very practical policy issues.

DEFINITION OF SECURITY THREAT GROUP (STG)

A gang is any group of three or more persons who are recurrently committing crimes (Knox, 2006). Gangs typically have a number of other superficial features: a name, colors or identifiers or symbols, special rules, secretive organization, etc. A security threat group (STG) is any group of three (3) or more persons with recurring threatening or disruptive behavior (i.e., violations of the disciplinary rules where said violations were openly known or conferred benefit upon the group would suffice for a prison environment), including but not limited to gang crime or gang violence (i.e., crime of any sort would automatically make the group a gang, and as a gang in custody it would logically be an STG). In some jurisdictions the Security Threat Group is also called a “Disruptive Group”. STG’s or disruptive groups would include any group of three or more inmates who were members of the same street gang, or prison gang, or the same extremist political or ideological group where such extremist ideology is potentially a security problem in the correctional setting (i.e., could inflame attitudes, exacerbate racial tensions, spread hatred, etc).

Almost all gangs that exist as an identity on the street can probably be found to exist as an STG inside a correctional facility. Gangs get “imported” into the prison or correctional system for the most part (Jacobs, 1974, 1977) when their members come to the attention of law enforcement and they are prosecuted, found guilty, and have to complete a sentence of confinement. Sometimes they arise inside the correctional facility. Vice Lords first grew out of a self-protection group inside an Illinois juvenile correctional institution (Knox and Papachristos, 2002). The Aryan Brotherhood and Black Guerilla Family are said to have originated inside prison, a more modern example would be the Ghost Face Gangsters. But it is important to note that all prison gangs commit crimes outside the prison as well, on the street, or they try to.

Definitions of STG's do exist which are more liberal and allow for any group of "two or more persons" to define an STG and this apparently became the ACA (American Correctional Association) definition over a decade ago ("two or more inmates, acting together, who pose a threat to the security or safety of staff/inmates, and/or are disruptive to programs and/or to the orderly management of the facility/system", see ACA quote in Allen, Simonsen, Latessa, 2004: p. 196). The problem with two is that this is only a social dyad at best. The social dyad is not capable of the primordial act of any organization: delegation, as can occur in a true social group (which must have three or more persons in it). The definition advanced here is more consistent with the larger literature, and American law, on the definition of "gang".

The definition of an STG in the Arizona Department of Corrections is typical of those definitions which emphasize certain issues and ignore others, let us examine it here: "What is a Security Threat Group? Any organization, club, association or group of individuals, formal or informal (including traditional prison gangs), that may have a common name, identifying sign or symbol, and whose members engage in activities that would include, but are not limited to planning, organizing, threatening, financing, soliciting, committing, or attempting to commit unlawful acts or an act that would violate the departments written instructions, which would detract from the safe orderly operations of prisons" (Arizona Dept. Of Corrections, 2004).

Note that size of the group is not important, but that the STG "may have" a common name or symbol; the list of "may have's" could be very extensive. "May have's" is a logical trap because there is no potential end to the list that could be generated. They may have distinct or unique tattoos, they may use special symbols, they may dress alike in clothing and hair style, they may be a unique subcultural argot or language code. Just as the list of behavior's could be prohibitively long: it may be sufficient to say "any crime, prohibited conduct, or rule breaking". We have always argued that it is sufficient to have a simple definition: a group of three or more recurrently involved in crime.

A prison gang, correctly defined, is any gang (where a gang is a group of three or more persons who recurrently commit crime, and where the crime is openly known to the group) that operates in prison. However, a tradition has developed "in practice" within the context of applied ideas about prison gangs, where the correctional practitioner defines a prison gang exclusively as "a gang that originated in the prison". Thus, gangs like the Aryan Brotherhood and the Black Guerilla Family and the Melanics (Knox, 2002) would be "pure prison gangs" in this respect, because these were not street gangs imported into the prison system, these are gangs that originated within the prison system itself. The Lyman (1989) definition of prison gang centers around the commission of crime, without the crime a prison group could violate rules and regulations and still be a security threat group.

Gangs get imported (Jacobs, 1974) into a correctional facility when the state or federal prosecutors are successful in prosecuting gangs and gang members for the crimes they have committed. So any gang that has existed on the streets can exist in a correctional facility. Inside the correctional facility --- be it a jail or a prison or even a juvenile detention facility --- any gang that is up and running with three or more members is automatically a prison gang whether it has been imported into the facility or whether it emerged for the first time inside the facility. So the phrase "security threat group" is generally reserved for any gang that operates inside a correctional facility.

Can there be a disruptive group that is not necessarily a gang? Yes, of course, if the collective identity of the group is such that it seeks to challenge the legitimacy of the correctional system itself. In Texas, for example, the pre-service and in-service "gang/STG training" includes information about a group called the "Self Defense Family (SDF)". The

SDF is mostly Black with one white inmate, but objectively it is a group that just likes to file law suits against the prison system, the members of the SDF are “prison lawyers”: not real lawyers, self-taught inmates who have become very adept at frivolous law suits. The SDF may not qualify as a “gang”, because after all what they are doing is “lawful”, but they are a “threat” to the Institutional Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice.

“Stigged” to “STG’d” means to the process by which any group of inmates is determined to be and becomes officially labeled as a Security Threat Group. This often goes according to official policy and procedure for declaring an inmate group a STG, there are written guidelines and there usually exists a burden of proof requirement — such as the need to show a pattern of abuses or documenting offenses (disciplinary rules, assaults, violence, etc) over time in a time series approach. Typically this process begins at the institutional level where the group is a problem, and the central administration reviews the recommendation, and then if the evidence is sufficient, the inmate group becomes classified as a Security Threat Group statewide, i.e., throughout the entire prison system.

“Validated” refers to the validation process, a process by which an inmate is determined, usually after continuing to be a gang banger in prison, to be a “security threat group member” by the prison officials. In California, most gang members behind bars are not “validated”, the stigma of “validated” means the inmate would have had a continued career of conspicuous gang banging violence behind bars. Thus, officially for decades, California’s prison system has reported to researchers that it has a “low gang density”, because these estimates of gang density (the percentage of inmates who are gang/STG members) are based upon “validated gang/STG members”. The way “validated” has worked in some jurisdictions like California is that it refers to a process where after posting many warnings and cautioning inmates against engaging in crime or violence on behalf of their gang, after of course being put in prison for the same thing, the inmate continues to be caught for gang violence behind bars, and the correctional system has no other recourse than to say “we’ve had enough, now you are a validated gang member”. Validated gang members can be given special security levels and more restricted housing environments.

Gang denial is a social policy whereby the entity involved — the city, the facility, the company, the school, or the entire state corrections agency — denies there is a gang problem or reports a significantly lower gang problem than actually exists. Sometimes called the “Ostrich phenomenon”, it means ignoring the problem, hoping it will go away on its own. In some jurisdictions, it is politically imposed because awareness could have implications for the local tourism trade. Or more typically, there is an assumption that if the entity reports a gang problem, it attracts further “bad news”. It is hard to attract new employees to low paying high turnover jobs in corrections when the newspapers are reporting gang fights behind bars. It usually takes a serious crisis or a local news media investigation to reverse a “gang denial policy”.

The term “validation process” as used in California was their innovative way of dealing with a high gang density rate: it is reasonable to believe that California’s prison system, as a producer of gangs, that is as a major national epicenter of gangs, is probably comparable to Illinois with regard to gang density. In Illinois, approximately 80 to 90 percent of the inmates coming into the prison system were gang members on the streets. Gang inmates are told to behave, and if they do not, they face the risk of being a “validated gang member”.

Thus, when the California state prison system reports to a prison researcher that “six percent of our inmates are STG/prison gang members” they are couching this unbelievably low statistic in the magical language of “validated gang members”: those who within the inmate population continued to be gang bangers and we caught them doing it in very serious

offenses after being incarcerated. One might ask, of course, is this policy of obscuring the gang problem the way it is reported to the public — a variation on the “gang denial” theme — a policy that could actually encourage a greater personal safety threat to the correctional officers who work there?

For decades, researchers and criminologists believed that California’s state prison system did not have much of a gang problem because the only national research at the time was the limited Camp and Camp (1985) study which reported that only three percent of California’s state prison inmates were gang members, and the report by the American Correctional Association (Baugh, 1993) raised it to six percent.

There are many political dimensions of the gang/STG problem in American corrections and a number of these issues were addressed in the survey. Getting prison wardens and STG coordinators to participate in a gang/STG survey like that conducted and reported herein faces a major obstacle of “prison politics”. Many prisons have formidable obstacles to overcome before representatives of the prison system are allowed to complete surveys.

Some states “hamstring” the wardens and do not allow them to answer any surveys that are not approved by the central office of the state’s director. Many states are facing negative press and some facing lawsuits pertaining to gang/STG issues and as a matter of policy they are not going to talk about gang/STG issues to anyone outside of their agency.

For many years, states like California reported in official reports that they had a gang density rate of 6.0 percent or lower, they would fudge the statistics to make it appear California’s adult corrections agency did not have a gang/STG problem. Actually, when the feds came knocking California reported only 3 percent as a gang density rate (Camp and Camp, 1985), and when ACA came knocking it went up a little to 6 percent (Baugh, 1993) when all along it was probably equivalent to the density rates in Illinois. For many years, the State of Virginia’s state correctional system was in complete gang denial, they even threatened legal action against the NGCRC if we did not cease and desist from trying to collect data from their state prison staff and state correctional programs. Politics in criminal justice is never good but sometimes it has unfortunately reared its ugly head.

Gang density means the percentage of inmates who are members of a street or prison gang. Gang members rarely give up their gang upon being incarcerated, they continue their gang involvement in most cases. Gangs are the dominant subculture in the entire American correctional system today (jails, juvenile and adult correctional facilities, public and private).

Some practitioners in their writing like to make a distinction between traditional prison gangs and untraditional prison gangs, where what they really mean is that the traditional prison gangs were those first on the scene (Aryan Brotherhood, Black Guerilla Family, etc). Under this schema any untraditional or non-traditional prison gang would therefore be “anything else”, that is anyone other than gangs that had their origin within the correctional system rather than being imported into the correctional system. This is not a particularly useful distinction when it is known that some gangs considered “traditional prison gangs” have long ago made the transition to the street. A better, more analytically sound, distinction would be to classify these prison gangs in terms of the level of their organizational threat: are they in a national gang alliance system, do they have a national impact, is there a recognized national leadership in the gang, and a large number of empirical measurements that can be taken on gang groups and gang organizations in terms of the features of their social organization (Knox, 2000).

Examining a Headline in Closer Detail: “Four Charged With “Gang Assault” On Inmate at the Attica State Prison in New York”

This is what might appear in a newspaper, but it is a misleading use of the term. This is not what is meant in the present report for what constitutes a “gang assault” in a prison or correctional environment. This does not involve a well known street or prison gang and its members attacking a rival gang member or neutron. This is the sad story of four correctional officers under indictment for felony charges of gang assault, conspiracy and tampering with evidence.

In mid-December, 2011, four correctional officers (Keith Swack, 37; Sean Warner, 37; Matthew Raddemacher, 29; and Erik Hibsich, 28) were arrested after being indicted on the felony charges. The gang assault charge carries a 5 to 25 year sentence if convicted. The four correctional officers, all of whom worked at the Attica prison, bonded out at \$25,000 each.

The alleged victim is an inmate named George Williams, 29, who suffered broken bones and fractures in an attack on August 9, 2011. The alleged attack was associated with shakedowns for weapons and drugs going on or about the same time frame.

Under New York state law “a person is guilty of gang assault in the second degree when, with intent to cause physical injury to another person and when aided by two or more persons actually present, he causes serious physical injury to such person or to a third person. Gang assault in the second degree is a class C felony” (New York Penal law 120.06). If the intent was to “cause serious physical injury”, then it rises to a class B felony (New York Penal Law 120.07).

These laws were passed to fight against gangs and STG’s, they were not likely designed to be used against correctional officers. Because they are very general, they have been interpreted as allowing for the prosecution of anyone, including correctional officers, regardless of “gang membership”, regardless of gang or STG affiliation by any of the assailants.

The way to make it a gang/STG law would be to use the kind of language like this that specifically targets gangs/STG’s: “A person is guilty of gang assault in the first degree when, with intent to cause physical injury to another person and when aided by two or more persons who are members of the same gang or security threat group, he causes serious physical injury to such person or to a third person”. New York state policy makers did not do that though. They left the law intentionally vague and ambiguous with regard to actual gang status of the assailants.

TYPES OF PROGRAMS AVAILABLE TO COUNTY JAIL INMATES

A cursory review of some U.S. county jail websites tends to suggest that American jail inmates have ongoing regular access to a wide variety of useful programs and services. The fact is, however, there are about 3,200 county jails in the USA. Only some of these offer much information about the availability of program services to their inmates. There exists no centralized regularly updated database on the scope and quality of jail program services nationwide. No one has responsibility for the function of surveying and evaluating jail program services nationwide. In spite of this, it is still useful to review the some of the programs and services claimed to exist and function.

One county jail in Illinois near Chicago was able gain a lot of positive publicity in the spring of 2022 when it announced a someone unique type of rehabilitative program for jail inmates - - - free gang tattoo removal services. Removing gang tattoos is a great idea for any gang prevention and gang intervention program. It is often necessary to make the person “employable” if they are heavily tattooed with threatening ink images. At the DuPage

County Jail inmates have the option to remove their gang tattoos or to have them covered up.

Some county jail websites claim to offer a wide array of impressive programs and services for their inmates (<https://www.co.washington.us/Sheriff/JailPrograms/index.cfm>). The Washington County Jail in Oregon is an example. It offers religious services, drug and alcohol prevention, religion-based life skills and substance abuse classes, drug and alcohol relapse prevention groups, cognitive and behavioral groups targeting violence prevention, personal control, and problem solving skills. It has women's groups on anger management and domestic violence prevention. It offers life skills classes in parenting, computer skills, and finding and keeping employment. And a variety of educational programs including: General Educational Development (GED) testing preparation, basic adult education classes, GED completion, individual tutoring, credit recovery, high school completion, and English as a second language (ESL) classes.

A similar long list of inmate programs is illustrated at the website for the Lake County Jail, in Lake County, Illinois (<https://www.lakecountyil.gov/702/inmate-programs>). Located just north of Chicago, this county jail has what it calls course offerings that include: anger and aggression control, Bible study groups, book study groups, cognitive behavior/criminal and addictive thinking, creative writing, ESL classes, GED classes and tutoring and testing, health education, inmate mentoring, money management, morning and evening computer classes, parenting and family life, substance abuse education, Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous meetings, "Ted Talks" conversations, work readiness and life skills, and yoga.

There are even university level courses being taught to county jail inmates in some jurisdictions. Cook County Jail is one of those lucky recipients of outside educational services. A program called the Northwestern Prison Education Program (NPEP) operated by Northwestern University serves both prison inmates in Illinois and some Cook County Jail inmates (<https://sites.northwestern.edu/npep/about/>). It is unique in serving incarcerated students for liberal arts education. At the Cook County Jail it offers four-week long introductory college mini-courses in both the mens and women's divisions.

The Jail Education Project run by the Merrimack College specifically serves jail inmates by providing inmates at the Essex County Correctional Facility in Middleton, Massachusetts with the opportunity to take college level introductory courses. First started in 2017, the college credit earned can be transferred to a degree program. In 2019 the project expanded to include a second jail, the Middlesex House of Correction in Billerica, Massachusetts.

The website for the Brevard County Jail in Cocoa, Florida has an extensive and impressive list of programs and services (<https://www.brevardsheriff.com/home/how-do-i/get-inmate-information/inmate-improvement-programs/>). For educational upgrading there is the GED prep and testing program, and for juveniles there is grade level education provided through Brevard County Public Schools. There is free HIV information and testing for inmates. A faith-based parenting education 12-hour program is available for inmates who are parents. Reentry program services are provided, including application for food stamps when they are within 60 days of release. It has the traditional AA and NA programs for alcohol and substance abuse. Inmates who are military veterans can benefit from a special program for vets called Saving American Veterans Everyday (SAVE). It even offers vocational training programs in digital garment printing, dog boarding and training, female inmates can work with kittens in a kennel environment (called Project HOPE), inmates can learn sewing and farm skills, and a full range of chaplain services are also provided.

Jail websites include information for public relations purposes and therefore the information presented is a chance to toot their horn about accomplishments. We simply recognize that a lot of basic work on surveying and understanding these inmate programs still needs to be done. Thus, the tendency to exaggerate the scope and extent of actual program services available to jail inmates could be a built-in bias when relying on an analysis of official website information.

OUTLINE OF THIS RESEARCH REPORT

In chapter 2 we will review the previous literature on American jails. The goal is to review the major issues facing American jails today. The chapter will therefore address: (1) Gangs in Jails, (2) Riots and Disturbances in Jails, (3) Educational Programs for Jail Inmates, (4) Visiting Issues, (5) Jail Work and Industry Programs, (6) Drug Treatment in Jail, and (7) Suicide Among Jail Inmate.

Chapter 3 describes the research methodology and provides the descriptive statistical analysis of primary research findings from the 2022 research. Included in this analysis are new variables not previously explored in addition to an analysis of what the expectations are for the future of American jails in relationship to gang issues. One innovation in jail research is reported here as well - - - the first major study that was able to rank order a long list of problems facing American jails today.

Chapter 4 more closely examines, by way of crosstabulation analysis, the issue of gang members assaulting jail staff. It is shown that some key factors are known to be associated with this kind of risk of violence in jails today. Finally, a prediction model is used to simulate what factors can predict with a high level of accuracy.

Finally, Chapter 5 provides an executive summary of major findings. Moreover it provides a summary of changes over time, comparing previous findings with these new 2022 survey findings. A summary of the conclusions on the major security problems like gang violence in jail is also provided.

Chapter 2: Major Issues Facing American Jails Today

INTRODUCTION

A myriad of jail safety issues exist when dealing with American jails today. These arise from the challenging nature of administering a jail. These are dangers and threats that must be managed to prevent injury and loss of life to inmates, staff and visitor to the jail facility. Gang violence among inmates, escape attempts, assaults on staff, riots, suicide prevention, and fires set by inmates are typical examples of major jail safety issues.

1. Gangs in Jails.

One report that appeared in the professional literature about gangs in the jail environment seemed to claim gang violence could be stopped by a computer. It was the idea from the New York City Department of Corrections that by creating a gang database they could vastly reduce gang violence among its jail inmates (Nadel, 1997). Admittedly, a gang database is essential to any effort to collect gang intelligence and to responsibly try to manage some of the problems caused by gangs. Recall as well that New York City has the largest jail system in the United States, with at the time of the publication an average daily population of 20,000 inmates. It clearly has a significant gang problem in its city overall and of course among its many inmates.

It is not a believable claim in light of the fact that there is no baseline data on gang violence in New York City jails and no longitudinal data was reported showing how gang violence has increased or decreased over time. It would be essential to show reductions in improvised weapons production, improved race relations, reduced gang control over the “inmate rackets” (e.g., drug and contraband sales inside the jail, protection), reduced attacks on rival gangs, reduced attacks on inmates and staff. The thing about gangs is they are violent to their own members — it is a ritual deeply embedded into their belief system and no computer software or database can remove it.

The research on gang members in jail by Alarid (2000) involved a self-report survey of N = 802 jail inmates. It made a valuable contribution to the literature by analyzing the factor of race relations in relationship to understanding gang problems in the jail environment. It also helped to explain how less gang violence is being reported among female inmates.

The research by Ruddell, Decker, and Egley (2006) was based on a survey of N = 134 jail staff in 39 states. It found that inmates are vulnerable to gang recruitment, that gang members are more likely to be involved in jail violence, and more likely to assault other inmates. It was concluded that the single most effective method of controlling gangs was the collection and sharing of gang intelligence. It is true that in the last three decades jails and prisons have created a new kind of occupational specialization — that of the gang intelligence officer, also called the gang and security threat group (STG) coordinator. These are full time staff who specialize in the collection of gang intelligence. In addition they spend a lot of time acting on and using that intelligence, mostly for purposes of criminal prosecution and to support other ongoing federal, state, and local criminal investigations that may overlap with their jurisdiction. Obviously, smaller jails are at a staffing and organizational disadvantage in not being able to cost-justify this kind of position. One of the unique findings reported by these authors was a national gang estimate of 13 percent for gang density in the jail populations at the time of their study. The gang density level reported in the present research tends to corroborate the findings of Ruddell, Decker and Egley (2006).

The report by Stinchcomb and McCampbell (2008) showed how the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) identified the most important policy issues facing jails. They held two meetings bringing together 45 practitioners (sheriff’s and/or jail administrators) to brainstorm about problems facing jails. They wanted things like evidence-based approaches and better ways to educate the public and elected officials about jail issues. A primary concern was how to effectively provide medical and mental health services.

The research by Knox (2012) analyzed both adult state prisons and county jail staff, where the mail survey was sent to the warden or the STG Coordinator at the prison or the Jail Director or Gang Investigator at the jails. The research concluded that gangs have the ability to exert illegitimate social control in the jail environments — basically controlling many aspects of inmate life. One major finding was that corrections staff were very pessimistic about the future in terms of any ability to control the gang problem. The research did outline methods used by prisons and jails to control and manage gangs. The study showed how other management issues in adult correctional environments (inmate religion, racial conflicts, various money-making rackets gangs control, and drug importation) were completely intertwined with the gang/STG problem.

One very interesting research finding about gang members in jails comes from the research by Fox, Lane, and Akers (2013). Their research method relied on self-report surveys of N - 2,414 Florida inmates and they compared gang members and non-gang members on crime victimization and self-control. They found that inmates who were gang affiliated (members of a gang) were more likely to be victims of personal and property crimes than when compared to non-gang member inmates. Some of our gang exit strategy

programs need to use this kind of research finding to point out to gang members the objective material “benefits” of gang membership include some unseen and generally unknown high costs of joining a gang — in this case a greater guarantee of being a crime victim. Their 2010 study based on the same data had also reported that gang members are significantly more likely to be offenders and victims of property and personal crimes (Fox, Lane, and Akers, 2010).

2. Riots and Disturbances in Jails

Most riots and disturbances in jails today are gang-related or gang-motivated. Only gangs of inmates or inmates affiliated with a security threat group (STG) have the capability of self-defense and acting in concert for defensive or offensive purposes. It is the ordinary non-gang affiliated inmate who faces the most risk — the neutron. A neutron is an inmate who is “neutral” on gang affiliation, he or she is not yet affiliated with a gang. A neutron has no group to hang out with, no group for protection to rely on.

Many persons have a conception of a jail riot that is based on what they have seen on the television or movie screen. For example, “jail house rock”, or some situation where the inmates are collectively fighting against the authorities, for example, food strikes or some kind of inmate protest.

Today there is a new dynamic that surrounds security issues in American jails today — gang affiliation. Inmates who come into the jail with a pre-existing gang affiliation, and those inmates who affiliate with a gang for the first time while in jail, are those who can be expected to be listed in a gang/STG database. Both the actual members of the gang and the associates of the gang are likely to be listed in a gang/STG database. Gang associates are those who hang out with the gang, and through this association they gain certain benefits (e.g., protection). In some gangs, like motorcycle gangs, before a person can become a “member” of the gang, they have to serve in some kind of “associate” capacity.

An example of a mini-riot at the Allegheny County Jail. This example comes from news coverage reported by Bradbury (2019). About six inmates, on August 21, 2019 were involved in this “melee” or fight that was quickly put down by jail staff. No serious injuries resulted from the fighting, no one was hospitalized, and no staff were harmed. The primary weapon used is a typical “improvised weapon” for jail and prison inmates: the “loaded sock”. Anything hard can be loaded into a sock, for example, “lock in a sock”, or rocks, or a hard block of soap. In this fashion, the sock is swung in a way to generate blunt force as the end of the sock hits a blow.

3. Educational Programs for Jail Inmates

One of the most beneficial programs a jail can offer to inmates is that of literacy and educational education and GED/High School Equivalency Test preparation. A number of such programs have operated in U.S. jails that are noteworthy of mentioning here. The program described by Smith and Silverman (1994) involved computer-assisted literacy training for jail inmates in Hillsborough County, Florida where in a six week long program the inmates gained 2.4 grade levels. Tewksbury (1994) described a literacy improvement program for inmates in Jefferson County, Kentucky that was also focused on improving the employability of the inmates, it was called Real Opportunity Behind Bars for Employment (ROBBE). Finn (1997) reviewed one of the largest adult basic education programs known to exist in the Orange County, Florida jails where 70 full-time instructors also focused on a wide array of rehabilitative services.

The Friends of Island Academy (FOIA) GED program operated at the Rikers Island jail in New York City and was also focused on inmate re-entry services (Lisante and

Navon, 2000). Similarly, the research by Gee4 (2006) showed a GED program could also be coupled with other program needs such a drug rehabilitation and substance abuse support groups. The study by Nelson and Olcott (2006) analyzed the Incarcerated Education Program (IEP) in Onondaga County, New York where about 250 inmates at a time participated in either day or evening adult basic education and vocational training classes. In Chicago, certainly the PACE Institute at the Cook County Jail must be regarded as an exemplary program simply because it has such a long history of successful service in educational upgrading for jail inmates — and, of course, it is operated by an umbrella organization that is the Nation’s premier program for re-entry services and job placement.

These inmate education programs can be large programs or small-scale initiatives. Shaw and Berg (2009) described an educational program for inmates that involved one simple component — spelling ability — that could be easily implemented in any jail as a short two-week training program for inmates.

4. Visiting and Correspondence Issues

A study of jail inmate visitation by Sturges (2002) showed what a lot of jail managers already knew — jail officials are mostly concerned about security and visitors are more concerned about whether the jail staff are being courteous and respectful. Visitors to jails must submit to the existing security procedures — which inevitably will mean a search of your person to make sure you are not concealing anything that would be considered contraband. Almost anything can be considered contraband in a jail. Sturges spent time in a jail visiting room, interviewed 34 jail visitors, and concluded that jails do need increased security. Most jails require visitors to be approved in advance and to go through a background check (Perroncello, 2000). Video-visiting is one technological innovation used by some jails to overcome the security issue of outsiders physically entering the secure jail facility — they can do it digitally.

It was interesting to observe that in reviewing the previous research literature on jail work and industry programs, that one of the things offered to jail inmates in lieu of actual salary, was that of more visiting time. In fact, it was not uncommon for the inmates performing supportive tasks such as cleaning, laundry, and food service to receive contact visits when all other inmates could not have such forms of visitation.

If the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King had been in a kind of “Birmingham City Jail” today somewhere in the United States where a more restrictive kind of inmate correspondence policy is in effect called the “post-card only option”, we may have never seen his now famous “Letter from Birmingham Jail” — written April 16, 1962. The reason: you cannot write that kind of lengthy essay on a post card. So the postcard only policy that began in 2007, and which is being used in jails in 18 states, is somewhat controversial (Sakala, 2013).

5. Jail Work and Industry Programs

The phrase “jail work program” is somewhat of a misnomer but again it can be argued that whatever we call it, it probably has a valuable function in the jail. Some jails allow inmates to work for the jail itself and historically this has meant creating a special social status for the inmate — such as “trustee”, or “jail worker”, or “food service worker”, etc. They may wear a distinctive easy to identify at a distance work uniform. But they are still inmates, not employees of the Sheriff’s Department. A federal study of work by jail inmates (CRS, Inc, 1994) showed the inmates do menial labor such as cleaning, laundry, food service, even grounds work to beautify the outside of the jail complex. Sometimes the inmates are paid a small “stipend”, but not a real “wage”, not a prevailing wage, more like a prison wage —

the average wage was only \$4.00 per day per inmate. Some jails (62%) paid their inmates in a “time off” their sentence scheme. Some jails paid their inmates with commissary items, extra food, extra visiting time, extra jail privileges (e.g., more television viewing time), basic amenities making it easier to do time in a jail.

A lot of jails have something along the lines of a work program where the inmates are able to perform work tasks on behalf of the jail itself. But the concept of a “jail work program” in this context should not be confused with what is called a “work release program”. A work release program or study release program (going to school full time or some combination of both school and work) is clearly beneficial for inmates and larger society and are often regulated by law. Work release means the inmate will leave the jail to go to work at a real job somewhere and be paid a real wage, and then returns to the jail after work. This scheme allows the inmate to earn a living to pay off child support, or court costs, or traffic fines and still provides a sanction because the inmate spends non-work time in the jail.

If a jail has inmates working in any industry that generates profit, it has a jail industry. Jacobsen (1992) showed that the State of Minnesota had some interesting examples of jail industry programs. For example, Hennepin County jail in Minnesota has one of the oldest continuously operating jail industry programs in the USA. It was called the Hennepenn County Work House, but officially it is the Hennepin County Adult Corrections Facility Industries program. This is real “jail industry”, it uses inmates to produce things, factory style, and employs over 10 percent of the sentenced inmates, and “provides light assembly and packaging services to Minnesota-based private-sector companies” (Jacobsen, 1992). A similar but small program exists in the Winona County, Minnesota jail. In the Fillmore County, Minnesota jail the jail industry program consists of a wood-working shop — producing carved wood products, desk name plates, custom cabinets, even carved wood miniatures — but only for 2 or 3 inmates who earn \$5.00 an hour.

An example of a diversified jail industry program would be the York Street Industries in the Hampden County Jail (Trevathan, 2000). About 50 inmates participate on a yearly basis, earning 50 cents to \$1.00 an hour; making and repairing furniture; silk screening t-shirts; manufacturing uniforms, mattresses, and mattress covers; and custom wood restoration, upholstery, and assembling hygiene kits (Miller and Trevathan, 2003).

The definitive guide to jail industry programs by Quirk and Miller (2002) provides a jail director all the information needed to start such a program. It defines a jail industry as “any activity that rewards inmates with pay, privileges, or other benefits to create a product or service having value for a public or private client” (Quirk and Miller, 2002). The website for the National Jail Work and Industry Center provides a great deal of useful information about these two topics.

“Example of a Jail Industry Program: A True Story About a Hero Who Worked in One”

The “candle factory” was a jail industry program that was operated by the Graves County Jail. In this program, inmates could get away from the jail lockup and work in a kind of hobby room arts and crafts setting where they could learn a profitable hobbyist skill — making candles. The inmates worked to help manufacture candles and they learned practical vocational training skills in the process.

There is always a correctional officer that accompanies the inmates to the “candle factory” to ensure public safety and to protect the general well being of the community. On a dark day in December 2021 it was correctional officer Robert Daniel who accompanied seven inmates to work at the candle factory that day (Sandoval, Mzezewa, and Hauser,

2021). This was that day when a series of tornadoes left a 223-mile long path of destruction that left houses, businesses, buildings and structures in complete wreckage. The “candle factory” was located in that same path, in Mayfield, Kentucky.

When the tornado was about to hit the “candle factory” Officer Robert Daniel quickly got all seven of the jail inmates to safety in a nearby bunker. Then Officer Daniel went to check and make sure no one else needed a rescue. That was when the tornado hit the candle factory. All inmates survived without injury. The candle factory was destroyed. Officer Daniel was among one of the 74 people who were killed in the disaster.

6. Drug Treatment in Jail

Detoxification is the default for helping inmates cope with their drug addiction. In fact, research by Fiscella, et al (2005) showed that only one percent of American jails use methadone or other opiate based medications for helping newly arriving inmates cope with their addiction.

The belief that drug maintenance for addicts is the best form of drug treatment is simply a viewpoint that does not enjoy universal support among jail administrators. Inmates would presumably like to have more drug maintenance services in jails. But as aptly described by Schwartzapfel (2019):

“Most jails and prisons around the country forbid methadone and a newer addiction medication buprenorphine, even when legitimately prescribed, on the grounds that they pose safety and security concerns. The drugs are frequently smuggled into facilities and sold or traded among prisoners” (Schwartzapfel, 2019: p. 2).

There are other variations in what constitutes drug treatment services. Certainly, a modified therapeutic community or a drug abuse support group like AA or NA or a 12 step program would count in that regard. The therapeutic value of interactive journaling has in fact been used as an intervention for inmates who met DSM-IV-TR criteria for “substance dependence”. In one test of interactive journaling those addicts who journaled in the jail had a significantly lower recidivism rate than those inmates who did not journal (Proctor, Hoffman, and Allison, 2012).

Clearly, much research recommends the use of substance-abuse treatment for inmates (Linhorst, Dirks-Kinhorst, and Groom, 2012). In fact, some research has shown that in a comparison of buprenorphine and methadone as drug maintenance medications, a randomized clinical trial showed that the buprenorphine group was significantly more likely to continue with their post-release treatment (Magura, et al, 2009).

The evidence is strongly supportive of the idea that jail-based drug and alcohol treatment programs for inmates reduces recidivism (Turley, et al, 2004). For example, in a drug treatment program in the Monroe County, New York jail, three consecutive and separate cohorts of drug treatment clients showed substantially lower recidivism rates (Turley, et al, 2004).

7. Suicide Among Jail Inmates

Suicide is a leading cause of death among jail inmates in the United States (Blasko, Jeglic, and Malkin, 2008). There is a growing body of literature devoted to the many things a jail administrator can do to reduce the risks of inmate suicides. It is possible that a review of this richly detailed literature allows for the development of a detailed social-psychological profile for understanding which inmates are at the highest risk for suicide in jail.

First it is important to keep in perspective the difference that emerges in comparing suicide rates in jail and those found in prisons. It has been argued in this paper that jails can be considered in some respects “harder time” than confinement in prison. For example, the

research by Mumola (2005) showed that suicide rates in jails are three times higher than suicide rates found in prisons.

Other “suicide risk” background factors of the profile include:

*** Mean age of 29.2, single, under the influence of alcohol at time of arrest (Winter, 2003).

*** Most likely to occur within the first 24 to 48 hours after being admitted to jail (Tartaro, 2003).

*** Typical day for suicide is a Monday in January; 97.1% of the time a male inmate; 97.1% of the time uses hanging as a suicide method (Winter, 2000).

*** Not to challenge the research finding by Winter about the risk being mostly a male inmate status, but one piece of research has suggested that women in jail have a higher incidence of some risk factors for suicide than men (Charles, et al, 2003)..

*** Solitary confinement will increase the likelihood of suicide and self-harm (Kaba, et al, 2014).

*** Suicides are more likely to occur in jails with a higher level of inmate-inmate assaults (Tartaro and Levy, 2008).

*** Suicide risk is increased if there is shame from being jailed and where there is fear of the unknown and fear of other inmates (U.S. Marshals Service, 2012).

SMUGGLING CONTRABAND INTO JAILS: A HISTORICALLY RECURRENT PROBLEM

There are a lot of ways that inmates have used to smuggle contraband into jails. They have things concealed on their body, they have things brought in by attorneys and clergy, they may corrupt vendors working at the jail to bring in something extra, they may even try to use drones. But the one main method historically is through corrupting the persons running the jail --- offering cash or sex bribes in exchange for having the correctional officer bring in contraband.

It is useful to examine an actual case study of this.

EXAMPLE OF A FEDERAL PROSECUTION OF A CORRECTIONAL OFFICER FOR HELPING TO SMUGGLE CONTRABAND INTO A JAIL

This is the case of Alex Lewis (26) who worked as a correctional officer at the Indiana County Jail located in Pittsburgh, PA. In open court on July 15, 2021 he admitted to accepting bribes from a federal inmate during the summer of 2019. The inmate was a federal inmate in a county jail because the inmate was being held at this jail through the U.S. Marshall’s Service. Many county jails have this kind of arrangement where under contract with the U.S. Marshall’s Service, the local jail will detain inmates in federal custody.

Lewis admitted to meeting with an intermediary who paid him in cash or by payment to his Cash App account to deliver contraband items to the inmate. A typical Cash App payment in this case was the amount of \$400 to smuggle in cellphones for the inmates.

As a person with no prior convictions or criminal history to speak of, Lewis asked the court for a sentence of probation. Instead he was sentenced on Nov. 10, 2021 to federal prison for his role in accepting bribes from inmates to assist with smuggling contraband. He was sentenced not to probation, but two years federal prison time followed by 18 months of supervised release.

The sentencing judge in this case was U.S. District Judge Cathy Bissoon who remarked “if the people we place in trusted positions cannot be trusted, the entire system breaks down” (U.S. Department of Justice, Press Release, Nov. 10, 2021).

SUMMARY

There has not been much prior national research that provides any insight into what the national gang density rates are for jail inmates in the United States. The 1993 NGCRC research showed that 5.09 percent of jail inmates were gang members. The study by Ruddell, Decker, and Egley (2006) was based on a survey of $N = 134$ jails in 39 states and showed that 13 percent of jail inmates were gang members. We will see a comparison with the 2022 gang density rate in the next chapter.

Some of the other issues reviewed in this chapter that are addressed in the next chapter with reference to actual empirical findings include these topics: inmate visiting, jail industry, drug treatment, and inmate suicide — all of which will be examined through the lens of fresh new data from the 2022 survey research findings in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 3: DESCRIPTIVE FINDINGS FROM THE 2019 JAIL SURVEY

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to briefly explain the research methodology and to make a presentation of the descriptive statistical research findings from the NGCRC's 2022 Jail Survey. As the 2022 survey instrument contains survey questions that were directly replicated from the NGCRC's 2019 and 1993 surveys, where appropriate in this chapter, we will additionally note the difference if any in comparing the results from these two time periods.

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

A pool of survey items for this research project was developed primarily around a straight forward replication of the NGCRC's 1993 survey of jails in America. A variety of new items were developed and included in the 2019 NGCRC jail survey and its results were recently also reported in the American Jails Association magazine (Knox, 2022: pp. 32-36). This 2022 national jail survey is based on survey research methodology involving the use of an anonymous mail questionnaire sent to all known county jails in the United States.

A mail questionnaire survey methodology was used here. There are approximately 3,000 county jails in the United States. The NGCRC sent a cover letter and a copy of the 4-page printed booklet questionnaire, containing approximately 100 survey questions, mostly forced choice items but some opened ended items. A copy of the survey instrument is provided in Appendix A. A prepaid postage Business Reply Mail (BRM) #9 envelope was also enclosed with the cover letter and survey instrument.

The surveys were mailed out on January 1, 2022. Incoming survey data was cut-off after two months. At which time a total national sample of $N = 132$ existed representing 41 states or more. We were able to ascertain a conservative estimate of how many states responded from a simple count of the addresses of respondents who requested a free copy of the final report. Not everyone wanted a copy of the report. We allowed totally anonymous responses. Respondents who wanted a copy of the final report were able to request it and were the first ones mailed a copy of the final report seen here.

Any survey responses received after March 1, 2022 were not used in the research, but we automatically made sure even late respondents were included on the "priority" dissemination list for a free copy of the full report.

DESCRIPTIVE SURVEY RESULTS

1. Background Factors About American Jails in this Sample

ABOUT A FIFTH FEEL THEIR AGENCY IS ADEQUATELY FUNDED

The survey asked, “do you feel your agency receives adequate funding?”. About one out of five of the jails responding to the 2022 survey reported that they felt their agency was receiving adequate funding (N = 27, 20.9%). Most jails (N = 102, 79.1%) did not feel their agency receives adequate funding.

RATED CAPACITY OF THE JAILS

The survey asked, “what is your rated capacity for inmates?”. The results showed a range from a low of six to a high of 2,500. By the standard of rated capacity, some 7.3 percent of the sample would be considered mega-jails, having the rated capacity to hold 1,000 or more inmates. The arithmetic mean for this variable was 280.8 inmates as the average rated capacity. The sum total in terms of jail capacity represented in this sample is 34,830.

JAILS ARE MOSTLY MEDIUM TO HIGH SECURITY FACILITIES

The survey asked, “what level of security is your facility?”. The results showed that only 10.9 percent (N = 14) were classified as minimum security facilities. Some 25.6 percent (N = 33) were medium security and most (63.6%, N = 82) rated their facility as being a high security level. Basically, 89.1 percent of the jails are classified as either medium or high security.

YEAR THE JAIL’S PHYSICAL PLANT WAS FIRST CONSTRUCTED

The survey asked, “in what year was your physical plant first constructed?”. The results showed a range in values between the oldest being built in 1800 to the newest being built in 2021. A fourth of the jails (27.7%) were built before 1980. The mean value was 1987.3, meaning the average jail in the USA was built in 1987 and is now over thirty five years old.

INMATE COUNTS BY GENDER AND AGE RANGE

The survey asked the jail respondents to report the separate inmate counts by male and female inmates. The counts for male inmates ranged from a low of zero to a high of 1,164. The counts for female inmates ranged from a low of zero to a high of 242. The mean scores were 140.4 males and 25.5 females for the overall sample.

The survey asked “what is the age range of the inmates in your facility today?”. The youngest inmate age range was from 12 to 31 with a mean of 19.1 years of age. The oldest inmate age range was from 25 to 100 years old with a mean of 65.8 years of age.

TOTAL INMATE POPULATION COUNTS

The survey asked, “what is the total inmate population count for your facility as of today?”. The survey was completed during January-February of 2022. The results show a range from a low of zero to a high of 1,600. Three jails had no inmates that day. Most of these jails are smaller jails, for example nearly half of the sample 53.5 percent had less than 100 inmates in their count. Only 3.1 percent of the sample were “mega-jails”, having 1,000 or more inmates in custody. The arithmetic mean for this variable was 204.8 inmates as the average inmate population count. The sum total of inmates by population count in this sample is 26,427.

By way of comparison, the last report available from the Bureau of Justice Statistics for

jail inmates in the U.S. showed there were 549,100 men and women confined in American jails in June, 2020 (Minton and Zeng, 2021).

HALF OF AMERICAN JAILS HAVE A WEBSITE WHERE THE PUBLIC CAN VIEW PICTURES AND ARREST INFORMATION ON INMATES DETAINED IN THEIR JAIL

The survey asked, “does your jail provide a website available to the general public to view the pictures and arrest information on inmates detained in your jail?”. About one half of the jails in the United States today (51.2%, N = 66) now report that their jail website offers pictures and arrest information on the inmates they detain for public viewing. Some 48.8 percent (N = 63) of American jails do not yet offer this website feature.

2. JAIL STAFFING AND MANAGEMENT ISSUES

VAST MAJORITY OF JAILS FEEL THEIR AGENCY IS UNDERFUNDED

The survey asked, “do you feel your agency receives adequate funding?”. The survey results show showed that the vast majority (N = 102, 79.1%) felt “no”, that their agency does not receive adequate funding. About a fifth (20.9%) reported that their agency receives adequate funding.

A second follow-up question asked, “what percentage increase in your budget would be necessary to assure no overcrowding, adequate staff, training, and services?”. The resulting responses to that open-ended question showed a range of values between a low “zero” and a high of “500 percent”. A mean score of a 46.7 percent budget increase would be necessary to achieve these goals is the finding here. This finding is remarkably similar to that found originally in the 1993 jail survey were a mean score of 42.2 percent budget increase would be necessary.

MOST JAILS IN AMERICA DO NOT OFFER TUITION REIMBURSEMENT FOR COLLEGE CLASSES TO THEIR CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS

The employer that invests in the human capital of its employees is one that earns higher retention, higher morale, and less turnover. The survey asked, “do your correctional officers receive tuition reimbursement for college classes?”. The results show that the vast majority of jails in America, N = 97 (76.4%) do not offer tuition reimbursement for college courses to jail staff. Only 23.6 percent of the jails in this survey indicated that jail staff can receive this kind of employment benefit. It would seem that this is an area deserving of immediate legislative action to spur more professional growth in staff who take the kind of risks they do to provide such an important protection for their society.

The 1993 jail survey results were similar, only 22.9% of jails reported providing tuition reimbursement.

MOST CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS RECEIVE ONGOING IN-SERVICE TRAINING IN AMERICAN JAILS TODAY

The survey asked, “do your correctional officers receive ongoing in-service training?”. The survey showed that 84.5 percent (N = 109) of the jails do in fact provide this valuable on-going in-service training to their jail staff. Only 15.5 percent (N = 30) of the jails reported no such ongoing in-service training for their staff.

A follow-up question in this regard asked “how many hours” of ongoing in-service training per month. The mean, or arithmetic average, was 6.14 hours per month of ongoing

in-service training.

Has this situation of staff training changed dramatically in the last 30 years? Not dramatically, but there is a slight improvement when comparing these 2022 findings to the original 1993 jail survey results. In the 1993 survey, some 20.9% of jails did not provide ongoing in-service training, and where they did, it has a mean value of 3.45 hours per month. Thus, the comparison with the benchmark for the original 1993 jail survey findings would suggest some small improvements have been made in terms of investing in staff by means of in-service training.

AVERAGE JAIL IN AMERICA HAS AN ASSAULT ON STAFF FROM AN INMATE ONCE EVERY THREE MONTHS

The survey asked the jails to “please estimate the total number of assaults by inmates against your correctional personnel in the last twelve months”. The results showed a range from a low of zero or none — no inmate assaults on staff — to a high of 96 such assaults during the last one-year time period. The mean, or arithmetic average, was 4.42 such assaults on staff for the typical jail in the USA today. That means that on average, a jail in America has at least one assault against a staff member every three months. In other words, in your budget plan for one or more assaults on staff from inmates each quarter. It is a predictable and ongoing risk to jail staff.

In the 1993 survey, 43.8 percent of the jails reported zero such assaults on staff from inmates during the last one-year period. In the 2022 jail survey replicating the same survey item, 31.3 percent of the respondents indicated “zero” such assaults. The trend seems to be an increasing incidence of assaults on staff over the last three decades.

ONE IN FIVE JAILS REPORT SERIOUS STAFF INJURIES FROM ATTACKS/CONFRONTATIONS WITH INMATES IN THE LAST YEAR

The survey asked, “have any of your staff received serious injuries from attacks or confrontations with inmates within the last twelve months”. The results show that 18.9 percent (N = 25) of the jails report having staff injuries from attacks or confrontations with inmates during the last year. In most cases (N = 107, 81.1%) jails report no such staff receiving serious injuries from attacks or confrontations with inmates during the last one-year time frame.

There is a slight upward trend in this problem is what emerges when comparing this 2022 survey result to the 1993 original jail survey. In the 1993 survey, the same question showed only 13.4% of jails reported such serious staff injuries from inmate attacks. This is frankly a kind of occupational risk that can bring about post-traumatic stress. It would appear from the findings here that this problem is creeping upwards as an occupational risk for jail staff.

3. INMATE PROGRAM AND REHABILITATION/TREATMENT ISSUES

CONTACT VISITS IN JAILS ARE THE EXCEPTION TO THE RULE

The study by Sturges (2002) showed among other things that the persons visiting the inmates at the jail really wanted to have contact visits. For security reasons, contact visits in American jails today are the exception to the rule. The survey asked, “are contact visits allowed for inmates in your facility?”. Less than a fifth of the jails in the United States today actually permit inmates to have what are called contact visits. A contact visit allows for an inmate to hug or hold his child, or to hug and kiss, or to shake the hand of a clergy person visiting the inmate.

Only 17.8 percent (N = 23) of the jails in this survey indicated that they allow such contact visits. Thus, the vast majority of American jails (82.2%, N = 106) do not allow contact visits. By way of comparison, very few prison inmates face the same deprivation. Most prison inmates do have contact visits.

OVERWHELMING VAST MAJORITY OF JAILS BELIEVE CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS SHOULD BE COMPASSIONATE

The survey asked, “do you believe correctional officers who work in the jail should be trained to calm inmates’ emotional distress?”. Almost all respondents (N = 122, 94.6%) indicated “yes” that correctional officers in jail should be trained to calm an inmate’s emotional distress. Only 5.4 percent (N = 7) of the respondents did not feel correctional officers needed to have this kind of compassionate care training.

The original 1993 jail survey had similar high responses — 99.2% of jail staff should be trained to calm inmate distress,

THREE FOURTHS OF JAIL RESPONDENTS BELIEVE THE SUPREME COURT HAS GONE TOO FAR ON RULING IN FAVOR OF THE RIGHTS OF INMATES

The survey asked, “in general, do you believe the Supreme Court has gone too far on ruling in favor of inmate rights?”. Three fourths of the sample (75.9%, N = 198) agreed with the statement that in general the Supreme Court has gone too far on ruling in favor of inmate rights. Only a fourth (24.1%, N = 63) disagreed with this notion.

Results from the 1993 jail survey were similarly high for believing the Supreme Court had gone too far in ruling in favor of inmate rights (83.5%).

DURATION OF VISITING HOURS IN AMERICAN JAILS

There appear to be no standardization of the duration of visiting hour for jail inmates. The survey asked, “what is the maximum number of visiting hours an inmate can receive on a weekly basis in your facility?”. The major finding for this factor of visiting time from the survey is this: the mode visiting time, most common length of visiting time, for American jails would be one or two hours per week. The mean amount of visiting time is 4.66 hours per week. But the range of visiting time on a weekly basis varied from a low of “minutes” to a high of over 40 hours. Some 98.2 percent of the jails reported visiting hours less than or equal to 40 hours on a weekly basis.

Video visiting is probably the future way of visiting jail inmates. Remember that from the point of view of jail officials, it is a security issue to have people enter the jail environment even for visiting. In this way, Swager (2000) showed how video visiting was being used in the Falkenburg Road jail in Hillsborough County, Florida; simple enough, visitors and inmates talk to each other over a video monitor. It could probably be done via an app on a smart phone as well. Video visiting in the Falkenburg Road jail began in 2017 to use video visiting by internet and an inmate can have three visits per week.

CODE FOR CONJUGAL VISITING: PRIVATE CONTACT VISITS WITH SPOUSES

It is probably not something a jail would want to advertise, as it would draw the wrong kind of public attention and mass media coverage could be very damaging. But it does happen, it does exist. But on any large scale is what this research shows.

The survey asked, “are private contact visits allowed for spouses under special arrangements for deserving inmates?”. Only 1.5 percent (N = 2) of the jails indicated this

was a possibility. The vast majority of jails represented in this research (98.5%, N = 129) Report that their jails would not offer this kind of visiting arrangement. Still the idea is somewhat mind boggling from the viewpoint of wealthier defendants who could afford to ask for or negotiate with federal agencies for a placement in such a jail. This research has clearly shown there are some jails where if you did have to be in jail, these would be great jails to be locked up in (e.g., ones where you could have visiting daily for 8 hours for 6 days a week, that offer contact visiting, in a low gang problem jail facility that also provides internet access).

BELIEFS ABOUT INMATE REHABILITATION

The survey asked, “do you feel society wants to help inmates be rehabilitated”. There is just no consensus on this issue among those who actually work in jails. Respondents are evenly divided on this matter. About half (52%, N = 65) do in fact believe that society wants to help inmates be rehabilitated. Yet, on the other hand, the other half (48%, N = 60) do not believe that society really wants to help inmates be rehabilitated.

The 1993 jail survey results on this same question showed more conservative views: 25.8 percent “yes” society wants to help inmates be rehabilitated, 74.2% “no”, society does not want to help inmates be rehabilitated. The trend would seem to be that at least in the last three decades when it comes to this basic belief there has been a slight upward tick in favor of inmate rehabilitation.

HALF BELIEVE ELECTRONIC MONITORING COULD BE MORE COST-EFFECTIVE THAN LOCAL DETENTION

The survey asked, “do you believe electronic monitoring could be more cost-effective than local detention while awaiting trial”. The results are evenly divided on this issue. About half (54%, N = 67) believe that yes — electronic monitoring could in fact be more cost-effective than local detention. And the other half (46%, N = 57) do not believe that electronic monitoring could be more cost-effective than local detention.

The results from the 1993 jail survey on this same survey item were almost identical: some 48.4 percent said “yes”, electronic monitoring could be more cost-effective.

Still it is clear that electronic monitoring is an alternative to local detention. County Boards and taxpayers alike should be happy to hear that half of the jails themselves believe it could be more cost-effective to use electronic monitoring. Further, this level of supportive belief about the cost-effectiveness of electronic monitoring has been stable over a period of 30 years.

BELIEFS ABOUT PUNISHMENT AND REHABILITATION

The survey asked, “in your opinion, which of the following correctional goals/philosophies is most effective in reducing recidivism, punishment or rehabilitation”. The issue of what works the best in comparing punishment and rehabilitation is shown here to still be somewhat of a philosophical debate. But if it was a vote, rehabilitation would win the election here. Just over half of the jail respondents (58%, N = 69) stated that rehabilitation was the most effective. Some 42 percent (N = 50) indicated that punishment was most effective. The jail respondents are just being very candid in their survey responses is what this data shows.

The 1993 jail survey reported 55.9 percent for punishment, 44.1 percent for rehabilitation.

INTERNET ACCESS FOR AMERICAN JAIL INMATES STILL RARELY AVAILABLE

The survey asked, “do inmates have access to computers or the internet to access their email”. The way this works in practice, where it does exist, is that just as a phone can be passed from cell to cell to call home, in some jails inmates can have access to a think pad device that is passed from cell to cell. In this way the inmates can access their emails. While inmates may love this kind of thing, it is rarely available in American jails according to the findings from this jail research. Only 25 percent of the jails (N = 32) reported that they give inmates internet access to respond to emails. Thus, 75 percent (N = 96) of the jails did not allow internet access for their inmates.

INMATES USING PHONES/MAIL TO THREATEN WITNESSES

The survey included the question “in the last one year time period, how would you rate the problem of inmates using phones, mail and other forms of communications to threaten or intimidate witnesses”. The response options were: not a problem, small problem, large problem. Some 42.3 percent (N = 55) reported this as a non-problem. About half of the jails (47.7%, N = 72) felt this was a small problem. And only ten percent (N = 13) felt this was a large problem.

ARE GANG MEMBERS MORE LIKELY THAN NON-GANG MEMBERS TO THREATEN WITNESSES IN COURT CASES

The survey asked “are gang members generally more likely or less likely than non-gang members to attempt to threaten or intimidate witnesses in their court cases”. Most of the jails (79.4%, N = 91) report that gang members are more likely than non-gang members to attempt to threaten or intimidate witnesses in their court cases. Only about a fifth of the jails (21.6%, N = 25) reported that gang members are less likely to threaten witnesses in court cases.

JAIL INDUSTRY PROGRAMS FOR JAIL INMATES: NOT WIDELY AVAILABLE IN THE USA

The survey included the question “does your jail have any kind of jail industry program? (A jail industry is any activity that rewards inmates with pay, privileges, or other benefits to create a product or service having value for a public or private client)”. The results show that less than a fifth of American jails (N = 23, 18.1%) offer any kind of jail industry program. Most American jails (81.9%, N = 104) do not offer any kind of jail industry program.

RARE FOR JAILS TO EMPLOY OMBUDSMEN OR ADVOCATES FOR INMATES

The survey included the question “does your facility have any full-time staff employed as ombudsmen or advocates for inmates”. Less than one out of ten of the jail respondents (8.7%, N = 11) reported that their jail had such full-time advocates for their inmates. Thus, the vast majority (91.7%, N = 116) of the jails did not have such social workers for the inmates.

The 1993 jail survey produced similar low results for this variable, only 5.4% reported any full-time staff employed in the role of an ombudsman.

THE POSTCARD ONLY OPTION FOR INMATE CORRESPONDENCE

The survey asked, “does your jail use some version of the “postcard-only” option (in your jail, is incoming or outgoing mail to inmates limited to post-cards and not letters with

envelopes)". The results show that 21.1 percent (N = 27) of the jail respondents are reporting that they currently use some version of this more restrictive inmate correspondence policy. Most jails (78.9%, N = 101) do not use this kind of "post-card only" inmate correspondence policy.

IS LITERACY A PROBLEM AMONG INMATES?

The survey asked, "do you believe illiteracy is a problem among the offenders in your facility". About half of the respondents (N = 66, 50.4%) answered yes. The other half (49.6%) did not believe illiteracy is a problem among the offenders in their jail facility.

These 2022 survey results were comparable to those from the 2019 survey when 48.7 percent answered "yes".

HALF THE JAILS IN AMERICA OFFER A GED PROGRAM FOR INMATES

The survey asked, "does your jail have a GED program for inmates". The results show that 50 percent (N = 65) of the jails nationwide do in fact report that their jail has a GED program for inmates. It may not be called specifically a "G.E.D." or General Equivalency Diploma, it may have a variety of names similar in meaning (e.g., High School Equivalency Diploma). Still, about half of the jails (50 percent, N = 65) report that they do not have such an educational upgrading program for inmates.

A legislative proposal that would seem to have great merit would be to provide funding to jails directly from the National Institute of Corrections within the U.S. Department of Justice in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Education to establish new GED programs for inmates nationwide.

A MAJORITY OF AMERICAN JAILS DO NOT HAVE A DRUG TREATMENT PROGRAM TODAY

The survey asked, "does your facility have a drug treatment program". The results showed that 63.8 percent (N = 83) of the jails did not have a drug treatment program. About a third of the jails in the USA (N = 47, 36.2%) do report that they have a drug treatment program.

Not much has changed in the last 30 years about drug treatment behind bars. The 1993 jail survey showed that 47.3% of the jails reported having a drug treatment program. The direction of change is noteworthy, it is in the direction of not providing these kind of services.

A follow-up question asked the jails to rate the effectiveness of their drug treatment program on a scale from a low of "1" (for not effective) to a high of "10" (for highly effective). The results showed a full range from 1 thru 10, and a mean score of 3.95 which is in the low range of the evaluative scale.

TWO-THIRDS OF AMERICAN JAILS FORBID THE USE OF METHADONE AND BUPRENORPHINE FOR INMATES WITH ADDICTIONS

The survey posed the following true/false question to the jail respondents: "our jail forbids methadone (and a newer addiction medication - buprenorphine) for inmates even when legitimately prescribed, on the grounds that these drugs pose safety and security concerns". The results show that two-thirds of the jails (66.7%, N = 82) currently forbid methadone and buprenorphine for inmates even when legitimately prescribed, on the grounds that these drugs pose safety and security concerns. One of the security grounds is that addicts routinely sell their supplies of methadone to other addicts and in theory could sell it to another inmate. On the other hand, one of the most common forms of the methadone drug is a liquid form, and that would be very hard to sell once it is swallowed by an inmate.

Some 33.3 percent (N = 41) of the jails indicated that they do not forbid methadone or buprenorphine for addicts.

ESTIMATES OF THE NEED FOR DRUG ADDICTION COUNSELING

The survey asked the jails to “estimate what percentage of your inmate population need drug addiction counseling services”. The results showed a true range from zero to a high of 100 percent. The mean score was 69.1 percent for the entire national sample. As a needs assessment, clearly there is justification for the development and implementation of sorely needed services of this kind in the modern American jail environment.

The beliefs about the need for drug addiction counseling services for American jail inmates exceeds the level of actual programmatic response to these pressing problems. It is encouraging that some such programs are able to exist and persist over time.

A THIRD OF THE JAILS REPORT THEY OFTEN FIND ILLICIT DRUGS WHEN THEY HAVE A “SHAKE DOWN”

The survey asked, “do you often find illicit drugs when you have a shake-down in your facility?”. The results showed that about a third (N = 43, 33.1%) reported “yes”, that they do find illicit drugs when they have a shake-down. Still, about two-thirds of the jails report that they are not finding illicit drugs when they have a shake down. Drugs are, after all, considered the number one type of “contraband” sought after by inmates.

This question, like others in the 2022 jail survey, is a direct replication of the previous study of jails made by the NGCRC in 1993. In 1993, only 16.8 percent of the jails reported finding illicit drugs in shakedowns. This problem appears to have doubled in the last 30 years.

SPECIAL JAIL HOUSING UNITS FOR INMATES NEEDING VICTIM/WITNESS ASSISTANCE

It is not uncommon for jails and even long-term correctional institutions to have a special housing unit to protect informants and inmates who are actively assisting the government with the prosecution or investigation of certain crimes. This is the special situation where the inmate has the right to victim/witness protection. Gang issues regarding victim/witness assistance have been generally neglected in the research literature. It is likely due to the stigma associated with gang membership or inmate status generally, society may not be as open to viewing them as deserving of the special services commonly rendered to crime victims, witnesses, and survivors outside of the jail context. But they have a legal right to those services if they are a cooperating victim, witness, or survivor of violent crime like gang violence.

New to the 2022 jail survey was the question “does your facility have special separate housing for inmates who help jail staff with the investigation and prosecution of incidents that occur inside the jail?”. Just over a third of the jails nationwide (37.3%, N = 47) Report that they do in fact have such special housing for inmates needing this type of victim/witness assistance.

The important finding here is that in over half the cases (62.7%, N = 79) American jails today lack this capability to provide vital victim/witness assistance services to inmates. In most American jails, today there may not exist suitable special jail housing units for inmates needed victim or witness protection services.

A separate follow-up question tried to identify the name of these special units. The results included such names as: Administrative Segregation, Barrack, Charlie Pod, Different Cell, F Pod,

Holding, Isolation, Protective Custody, Segregation, Special Housing Unit, Special Management Unit, and The Trustee Pod. One of the most well known “snitch farms” at the state prison level is called the “Special Management Unit” formally but is referred to locally by officers as the “Smurf unit”.

IS THE PROBLEM OF THE RADICALIZATION OF INMATES INCREASING OR DECREASING?

The 2022 jail survey included a new question on the issue of the radicalization of inmates. The survey asked “have you seen an increase or decrease in the radicalization of the inmates in your facility during the last year?”. About half report an increase, about half report a decrease is what we found. We will recommend changing the response modes in the future for this item to include the option of “remained the same”.

The results show that about half (55.2%, N = 48) Of the jails are reporting an increase in the radicalization of inmates in the last year. And about half (44.8%, N = 39) Of the jails are reporting a decrease in the problem. There was a higher than usual amount of missing data for this variable (N = 45 cases) suggesting that respondents may have had trouble answering the question. In the future we will include “remained the same” as a response mode for this survey item. But even if we include the missing data in the percentage distribution we see that 36.4 percent of the jails would still be reporting an increase in the radicalization of inmates. So no matter how it is dealt with, it is a growing concern.

OVERWHELMING SUPPORT FOR A PROGRAM TO HELP CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS DEAL WITH EXPOSURE TO TRAUMA

The 2022 jail survey included a new question on the issue of the helping correctional officers deal with exposure to trauma and stress on the job. The survey asked “do you feel it would be useful to have a national program aimed at helping correctional officers deal with exposure to trauma and stress on the job?”. Some 94.5 percent (N = 121) of the respondents indicated “yes” that they felt this would be useful to have in place. It could be something administered through an appropriate federal agency like the National Institute of Corrections within the U.S. Department of Justice. The problem is, it is a pipe dream of social policy because a close look at bills introduced into Congress for the current term reflect no such concern for these kind of front line essential workers in our society.

RARE FOR JAILS TO ALLOW INMATES TO EXCHANGE FUNDS WITH EACH OTHER

The 2022 NGCRC jail survey included the question “do you allow inmates to exchange funds with each other?”. Only one in ten jails in the U.S. (10.9%, N = 14) are reporting that they allow inmates to exchange funds with each other. Thus, in most U.S. jails (89.1%, N = 114) it is not permitted for inmates to exchange funds with each other.

4. GANG AND SECURITY THREAT GROUP (STG) ISSUES

DEFINITION OF GANGS OR STG’S NOT NATIONALLY STANDARDIZED

The survey asked “does your facility require the use of a specific definition of a gang or security threat group”. In the best of all worlds the answer would be defined by existing state law governing the county jails. There is really no push towards standardization. National funding incentives for jail safety might be a way to achieve this. But for now, the reality is clearly the vast majority of jails are free to use whatever definition suits their local usage.

The survey results for 2022 show that only N = 17 of the respondents (or 13.1 percent) report that they are required to use a specific definition of a gang or security threat group (STG). So most jails (86.9%, N = 113) report that they are not required to use any specific definition of gang or STG.

Common definitions used that were reported in the survey include:

*** Three or more in a group that commit criminal acts, have a common gang name, color, symbol, and rank statement.

*** Three or more person primary activities is commission of criminal activity.

*** Any organization or group that through its activities, actions, criminal listing, and facility history, poses a risk or threat to the safety and security of the pub, the community, and this County Detention facility.

*** Self reporting: Answer yes to gang question in booking process.

*** Self admittance, affiliation with known members, tattoos, possession of gang paraphernalia.

ESTIMATES FOR GANG DENSITY IN AMERICAN JAILS TODAY

The survey asked the responding jails to provide gang density estimates for both male and female inmates. The survey asked specifically “Among staff who know about gang members, what is the current estimate of what percentage gang members are of the total inmate population”, with separate estimates for males and females. For male jail inmates the results ranged from a low of zero percent to a high of 98.0 percent. For female jail inmates the results ranged from a low of zero percent to a high of 80.0 percent. The arithmetic mean scores showed that overall in American jails today, about 20.6 percent of male inmates and 5.1 percent of female inmates were gang members. This would be the national gang density estimate for jail inmates. It appears to have not dramatically increased since the gang density level of 13 percent reported by Ruddell, Decker and Egley (2006). But the 1993 NGCRC study of gangs in jails, basically the first analysis of its kind for the jail environment, had reported a mean of 5.09 percent for males and 2.2 percent for females. From this historical viewpoint the gang problem is increasing in the jail environment.

Male Gang Density in Jails Over Time

1993	2006	2019	2022
5.09%	13%	15.5%	20.6%

AT WHAT THRESHOLD OF GANG DENSITY DOES A SEVERE GANG PROBLEM EXIST?

The 2022 NGCRC jail survey included the question “The threshold or density of gang inmates refers to the percentage of the inmate population who are gang members. At what percentage of the inmate population (% who are members of gangs or STGs) would you feel that a severe gang problem exists?”. Is it five percent, ten percent, or does it change over time with the ability of the jail to respond to the gang problem in its population? The survey results showed that the threshold for when a severe gang problem exists could range from zero to 95 percent. But the mean score, the arithmetic mean value, for this threshold was 19.6 percent.

This means that at a gang density level of 19.6 percent jails in the 2022 national survey were saying that severe gang problem exists. Note for the record that the actual density for 2022 exceeded this threshold (20.6% was the gang density estimate for American jails in 2022).

MOST JAILS TAKE GANG MEMBERSHIP INTO ACCOUNT IN THEIR INMATE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

A correctional facility has to use a classification system for the proper management of a jail as a formal organization. The survey asked, “does your classification system take gang membership into account”. While the good news is that most of the jails (81.4%, N = 105) do in fact take gang membership into account in their classification system, some others (18.6%, N = 24) clearly do not. Thus, in a little under a fifth of American jails an inmates gang status would not considered in the classification system being used. One of the many great values of an effective inmate classification system is the management of known risks. Gang membership is a clearly known risk.

The 1993 jail survey reported that only 42.6 percent take gang membership into account in their inmate classification system. The increase over time would appear to be a natural progression towards the side of good management where the classification system has its eyes and ears on the problem.

ABOUT A THIRD OF AMERICAN JAILS REPORT THEIR STAFF RECEIVE FORMAL TRAINING IN DEALING WITH THE GANG PROBLEM

The survey asked, “do your staff receive formalized training in dealing with the gang problem”. Only about a third of the jails (N = 42, 32.8%) responding to this survey indicated an affirmative answer that “yes”, the staff in their jails receive formal training in dealing with the gang problem. So, basically the majority of jails (N = 86, 67.2%) report that their staff do not receive formal training in dealing with the gang problem. The 1993 jail survey showed 26.1% of the jails provided training on the gang issue.

A follow-up question on this issue asked, “if yes, how many hours is the gang training session”. The results showed a range of values between a low of zero to a high of 40 hours. The arithmetic mean score was 4.4 hours nationwide.

In the United States today, most jails do not provide their staff with gang training, and when they do it is not very intensive.

Under the doctrine of pessimism, one could speculate that the reason jail staff do not get training on how to deal with gangs and security threat groups (STGs) is that maybe in the opinion of the staff who actually work in jails it would not help anyhow. But no, that is apparently not the case, because an additional follow-up question addressed this very issue. The survey asked, “in your opinion, could your staff benefit from professional outside training dealing with gangs”, and here the results showed nearly three-fourths (73.1%, N = 95) felt “yes”, that such training would in fact be beneficial.

What we know can be more precisely stated as follows: while the vast majority of American jails would welcome it as beneficial for the job of working in a jail, overall in the United States today, most jails do not provide their staff with gang training and when they do it is not very intensive. And yet the gang problem figures prominently in one of the clusters of jail problems that can be a source of trauma and stress for those who work there.

FEW JAILS REPORT RECEIVING NGCRC TRAINING

The NGCRC provides gang training through its yearly international gang specialist training conference always held in Chicago, Illinois. In 2022, the NGCRC held its 25th Annual Gang Training Conference. The survey asked “have any of your county sheriff or jail staff ever attended one of the annual Gang Training Conferences sponsored by the National Gang Crime Research Center in Chicago”. Only 6.4 percent (N = 8) reported receiving NGCRC gang training. The vast majority (93.6%, N = 117) reported no such use of the kind of formal classroom training provided in the NGCRC gang training venue.

WHEN DID GANGS FIRST APPEAR AS A PROBLEM IN THE JAILS?

The survey asked, “in what year did gang problems among inmates first become recognized in your facility?”. The results showed a range from an earliest time frame of 1980 to as recently as 2021 for when the gang problem was first noticed among inmates in their jail facilities. The mean score here was 2004. Some 50 percent of the jails discovered the gang problem on or before 2004.

PREVALENCE OF MILITARY-TRAINED GANG MEMBERS

This is an important area of research that has basically been totally ignored by the federal government. Similarly, no private foundations have ever yet sponsored research in this focal area as well. The “Los Zeta’s” gang in various areas of Mexico is one of the most well-known gangs that has risen to prominence because of the prior military training of their members. Fortunately, as of this date, no single gang of that nature has arisen or been imported into the United States yet. The issue here is the prevalence of military-trained gang members.

The survey included the question “have you had inmates who could be considered military-trained gang members?”. The results showed that from the 2022 jail survey nearly one out of five of the jails, some 20.3 percent (N = 25), reported that yes in fact they have had inmates who could be considered military-trained gang members. And, most (79.7%, N = 98) have not yet seen this phenomenon or are not geared up enough to identify it.

INMATES ARRESTED FOR ORGANIZED RETAIL THEFT

New in the 2022 NGCRC jail survey were two survey items focusing on the relatively new crime phenomenon called organized retail theft. The survey asked “have you had inmates in the last year who were arrested for organized retail theft (e.g., retail theft in a group or crew, where multiple offenders “swarm” a retail store?)”. Only about ten percent of the responding jails (10.9%, N = 13) Reported that yes they have had inmates in the last year who fit this profile. So organized retail theft is probably limited also to larger, more urban, jurisdictions. The vast majority of the jails (89.1%, N = 106) Report having no such type of inmates in the last one year time period.

The other obvious factor driving down the statistics here is that this new type of crime pattern is based on improving the odds of escaping arrest and detention in jail --- simply because it is done as a group, en masse, a kind of mini-riot in which the only hope for making an arrest might be in the chance of having good video surveillance footage that can identify the looters. That is one of the main reasons this type of crime is even committed is that by doing it in a group there is a reduced probability of arrest and an increased probability of getting away with the crime.

There was a follow-up question that followed the above question and it focused on whether this crime pattern had any level of gang involvement. The 2022 survey asked “if yes, were the persons arrested generally gang members or associate members or affiliated in some way with a gang?”. The findings clearly suggest significant gang involvement. The results showed that in about a fourth of the jails in the USA (27.6%) that report holding arrestees for the new offense called organized retail theft, that in fact, yes, gang involvement was a factor (where the arrestee was a gang member or gang associate or affiliated with a gang in some way).

At this point in history organized retail theft is still a kind of statistical rarity. It is not something showing up in most jails and is probably also more likely to be urban focused. Only about one in ten jails in the USA report holding arrestees for this new type of crime.

But they are also telling us that in about a fourth of the cases there was in fact gang involvement.

Table 2 Alphabetical Listing of Names of the Major White Gangs Reported by Jails Today

<u>Name of White Gang</u>	<u># Citations</u>
417 Honkies	(2)
Aryan Brotherhood	(23)
Aryan Brotherhood of Texas	(2)
Aryan Circle	(5)
Aryan Nation	(5)
Aryan Warriors	(1)
Cossacks	(1)
Dead Man Incorporated	(5)
Dirty White Boys	(1)
Family Values	(1)
Fifty-one-fifty	(1)
Ghost Face	(3)
Hells Angels	(1)
Honkies	(1)
Ku Klux Klan	(1)
Latin Counts	(1)
Mongols	(1)
Multi-race	(1)
Nazi Lowriders	(1)
One Percenters	(1)
Outlaw Nazi Skinheads	(1)
Outlaws	(3)
Pagans	(2)
Peckerwoods	(5)
Ridge Runners	(1)
SAC	(1)
Saxon Knights	(1)
SAW	(1)
Seesaw	(1)
Simon City Royals	(1)
Skin Heads	(1)
South West Honkies	(1)
Southern Brotherhood	(1)
Vice Lords	(1)
War	(2)
White Boy Family	(1)
White Night	(1)

VERY COMMON TO FIND THAT WHITE INMATES HAVE A SEPARATE GANG IN AMERICAN JAILS TODAY

The survey asked, “do whites have a separate gang”. The results showed that 44.1 percent (N = 56) of the jails reported “yes”, that white inmates have a separate gang in their

jail. A slight majority of the jails report that white inmates do not have a separate gang in their jail (N = 71, 55.9%).

Consistent with other measures suggesting an upward trend in racial conflict in the jail environment in the last 30 years, it is important to recall that the 1993 jail survey reported only 19.7 percent of the jails reported having white gangs. There has been a two-fold increase in this problem during the last three decades is what jails are currently reporting.

NAMES OF THE MAJOR WHITE GANGS REPORTED BY RESPONDING JAILS

Table 2 Provides the alphabetical listing of names of the major white gangs reported by jails today. We are seeing some proliferation in this problem and a number of new names for new groups and new entities.

But the names of those who appear in the Top Five largest white gangs (see Table 3) Are not surprises: these are long standing and persistent over a long period of American history. The top five being: the Aryan Brotherhood (23 citations), the Aryan Circle (5 citations), Aryan Nation (5 Citations), Dead Man Inc (5 citations), and the Peckerwoods (5 citations).

Table 3: Rank Ordering of the Top Five Major White Gangs Reported in the Jail Survey

- Aryan Brotherhood (23 citations)
- Aryan Circle (5 citations)
- Aryan Nation (5 citations)
- Dead Man Inc (5 citations)
- Peckerwoods (5 citations)

NAMES OF THE TOP WHITE RACIST EXTREMIST GANGS OR GROUPS OPERATING IN THE AREA OF THE JAIL JURISDICTION

Table 4 provides a complete alphabetical listing of all of the names of white racist extremist gangs that emerged from the 2022 survey. This is a secondary and redundant survey measurement of white gangs because it does not limit the identification to the inmates inside their jail but rather is more of a measure of whether the gang or extremist group operates in the area of the legal jurisdiction where the jail is located. So the gangs in Table 4 are not necessarily showing up in the inmate rosters at the jails but are being reported as gangs that operate in their area or jurisdiction. The unit of jurisdiction here is usually the county government.

GANG MEMBERS ARE INCREASINGLY A PROBLEM IN TERMS OF THREATS AND ASSAULTS ON JAIL STAFF

The survey asked, “have gang members been a problem in terms of assaults on your staff”, and the results showed that only 18.3 percent of the jails in the USA today (N = 24) reported that gang members have been a problem in terms of assaults on jail staff. Thus, in most areas of the USA today (N = 107, 81.7%) gangs are not a problem in terms of assault on jail staff.

Still, this finding shows a trend towards increasing severity when compared to the 1993 jail survey. In the 1993 jail survey only 3% of the jails reported that gang members were a problem in terms of assaults on staff. The present research shows that there has been a substantial increase in this problem of assaults on staff in the last 30 year time period. Jails are not becoming friendlier places to work.

Table 4. Distribution of the Names of White Racist Extremist Gangs or Groups Operating in the Area of The Jail Jurisdiction.

211	(2)
21's	(1)
417 Honkies	(1)
AK	(1)
Aryan	(6)
Aryan Brotherhood	(35)
Aryan Brotherhood of Texas	(3)
Aryan Circle	(1)
Asatru Folk Assembly	(1)
Aryan Nation	(8)
Aryan Warriors	(2)
Asatru	(1)
Dead Man Incorporated	(1)
Dirty White Boys	(1)
Family Values	(1)
Hammerskins	(1)
Ghost Face	(1)
Irish Mob	(1)
JNK	(1)
Ku Klux Klan	(4)
Michigan Militia	(1)
MS-13	(1)
Neo-Nazis	(1)
Outlaw Nazi Skinheads	(1)
Peckerwoods	(8)
Posse	(1)
Proud Boys	(2)
PzG	(1)
Saxon Knights	(3)
Silent Aryan Warriors	(2)
Skinheads	(1)
Soldiers of Aryan Culture	(2)
Southern Brotherhood	(1)
Sovereign Citizen	(1)
UAS	(1)
Universal Aryan Brotherhood	(1)
WAR	(1)
White Boy Family	(1)
White Pride	(1)
White Supremacists	(5)

A separate question addressed the lower threshold of this same risk factor involving confrontations with gang members. The survey asked if gang members have been a problem in terms of threats on staff. Here we find that N = 57 jails or 46.7 percent of the respondents currently report that gang members have been a problem in terms of threats against jail staff. The 1993 jail survey showed 26.2% of the jails reported gang members were a problem

in terms of threats against staff. So, here again, we see a trend towards increased gang problems in American jails.

Table 5. The Top Ten White Gangs Among American Jail Inmates: Rank Ordered by Number of Different Jails With These Kind of Gang Members

Aryan Brotherhood (35 citations)
 Peckerwoods (8 citations)
 Aryan Nation (8 citations)
 Aryans (6 citations)
 White Supremacists (5 citations)
 Ku Klux Klan (4 citations)
 Aryan Brotherhood of Texas (3 citations)
 Saxon Knights (3 citations)
 Proud Boys (2 citations)
 Soldiers of Aryan Culture (2 citations)

It is of interest to note that the Proud Boys are cited in tables 4 and 5. The Proud Boys gang profile was published previously in this journal.

A SIMPLE MAJORITY OF JAILS DO NOT REJECT THE IDEA OF NEGOTIATING WITH INMATE GANG LEADERS

Generally, conveying authority to one inmate over another could be construed as a human rights issue dating back to the United Nations standards on the treatment of prisoners. The idea of using inmates to control other inmates — called “Building Tenders” in the Texas penal system — was the basis of prison inmate management in the State of Texas for many years until courts got involved. The idea is not unlike that of using trustees as a supplemental security force or force multiplier, such as in the former prison system of Mississippi. The idea of negotiating with inmate gang leaders can be similar in its effect — giving extra power and authority to specific inmates in the hope that they will use it to keep the peace.

The survey asked, “in your opinion, is giving staff recognition to inmate gang leaders similar to negotiating with terrorists?”. Just over half of the jails (N = 72, 59.5%) felt that giving staff recognition to inmate gang leaders is not similar to negotiating with terrorists. Still, a sizable number of jails, N = 49 or 40.5 percent, felt that “yes”: negotiating with inmate gang leaders is similar to negotiating with terrorists. So it would appear that this matter remains a divisive issue for American jails today. As a rule of thumb, building “goodwill” is essential for correctional staff anywhere and from a practical point of view, gang leaders do exert a lot of control over their members. The other side of this controversy is that there could be substantial liability and significant “blowback” associated with negotiating with inmate gang leaders.

In the 1993 jail survey 53% of the jails felt that giving staff recognition to inmate gang leaders is similar to negotiating with terrorists.

NAMES OF THE MAJOR GANGS IN AMERICAN JAILS TODAY

The survey asked the responding jails to print the names of the major gangs represented among inmates in their jail facility. Table 6 provides the distribution of these results in terms of alphabetical order of the name of the major gangs. Table 6 is loaded with a number of major traditional gangs as well as a lot of new hybrid gangs. A few things stand out in

reviewing this list. It is significant that Native American Indian gangs are appearing very prominently on this list: Native Latin Kings, Native Mob, Native Mob 21's, Native Pride — their presence was not that conspicuous in the 1993 jail survey results.

Table 6: Alphabetical Order of Major Gangs Represented Among Jail Inmates Today

417 Honkies	(2)
ANB Gang	(1)
Aryan	(1)
Aryan Brotherhood	(1)
Aryan Knights	(1)
Aryan Nation	(5)
Aryan Warriors	(1)
Aztec	(1)
Barrio Azteca	(1)
Bailey Ave - Bailey Avenue	(1)
Black Gangster Disciples	(1)
Black Guerrilla Family	(2)
Black Savages	(1)
Bloods	(40)
C Block	(1)
Central Park	(1)
Chuco Tango	(1)
Cincinnati White Boys	(1)
Crips	(40)
Cruas Boys	(1)
Dead Man Incorporated	(6)
East River Skins	(1)
Eighteenth Street	(1)
Family Values	(2)
Firme	(1)
Folk Nation	(2)
Four Corner Hustlers	(1)
Four Hundred Boys	(1)
Gangster Disciple Killer	(1)
Gangster Disciples	(20)
Ghost Face	(2)
Heartless Felon	(1)
Honkies	(1)
Hoovers	(2)
Hybrid	(2)
Irish Mob	(2)
Jangsters	(2)
Juggalos	(2)
KDM	(1)
Ku Klux Klan	(1)
Latin Counts	(1)
Latin Kings	(14)
Little Valley Lokotes	(1)

Table 6: Continued from previous page

Los Carrales	(1)
Money World	(1)
MS-13	(8)
Native Latin Kings	(1)
Native Mob	(2)
Native Mob 21's	(1)
Native Pride	(2)
Nineteen Hundred Pistol Gang	(1)
Nortenos	(6)
NV Trece	(1)
Ogden Trece	(1)
Outlaws	(1)
Paisas	(1)
Skin Heads	(1)
Surenos	(16)
Texas Chicano Brotherhood	(1)
Three Fifty Seven Crips	(1)
Trip Set	(1)
Two One Fatal	(1)
Two-Eleven	(1)
Universal Aryan Brotherhood	(2)
Values	(1)
Vice Lords	(9)
WAR	(2)
Warlocks	(1)
West Texas	(1)
White	(1)
White Aran Nation	(1)
White Boy Family	(1)
White Supremacist	(3)
YC	(1)

Table 7 shows the reduced sized list that contains the names of the major gangs represented among jail inmates today, rank ordered in terms of the frequency they are found in the jails. The Dead Man Inc gang is the only newly added name to the list of the top ten gangs. All the other names of major gangs in Table 5 have been around for many years.

BIG DIFFERENCE EMERGES IN COMPARING JAILS AND PRISONS: SIGNIFICANTLY LOWER RATE FOR ISLAMIC INMATES HAVING A SEPARATE GANG

The only explanation we can offer is that jails tend to hold mostly persons awaiting trial, and that maybe this is something they might be motivated to conceal until after they are transferred to an adult prison. But the fact remains that there is only a small percentage of jails in America that are reporting that Islamic inmates have a separate gang. When we ask the same question of adult state prisons, we find that from a piece of research in 2004 that 44.4 percent of American prisons are reporting that Islamic inmates had a separate gang.

Only 5.3 percent of jails in the 2022 survey reported this same phenomenon. Basically, the vast majority of jails in America (94.7%) report that Islamic inmates do not have a separate gang.

These are some of the names of the Islamic gangs that have been reported: Vice Lords, El Rukns, Nation of Islam, Black P. Stones, and True Somali Bloods.

Table 7: Names of the Top Major Gangs Represented Among Jail Inmates: Rank Ordered by Frequency.

Bloods (40 citations)
 Crips (40 citations)
 Gangster Disciples (20 citations)
 Surenos (16 citations)
 Latin Kings (14 citations)
 Vice Lords (9 citations)
 MS-13 (8 citations)
 Dead Man Inc (6 citations)
 Nortenos (6 citations)
 Aryan Nation (5 citations)

MAJOR FINDING: HIGH PERCENTAGE OF JAILS REPORT INMATES WITH A SOVEREIGN CITIZEN BACKGROUND

The survey asked, “in the last year, has your jail held any inmates who were associated with the Sovereign Citizen’s Movement”. This is a newer problem in American law enforcement and corrections. It is not new to the gang specialist community, as this aspect of security threat group (STG) analysis has been a feature of NGCRC gang/STG training in recent years. As a rule of thumb, the conclusion about this movement is that it is “growing....on the rise”.

It is therefore interesting to find from this survey research that about half of the jails in America are reporting that they have recently had inmates involved in the Sovereign Citizen’s Movement. Some 52.3 percent of the responding jails (N = 67) indicated “yes” that in the last one-year time frame they have encountered inmates from this political extremist movement. And, about half (47.7%, N = 61) report not having such inmates in their custody during the last one-year time period.

FINDINGS CONSISTENT WITH THE VIEWPOINTS FROM MOST CRIMINOLOGICAL RESEARCH: JAIL RESPONDENTS BELIEVE THAT GANG AFFILIATION INCREASES RECIDIVISM

The survey asked, “do you believe that gang affiliation tends to increase recidivism”. The finding here is that the vast majority of the respondents (N = 106, 84.1%) believed that “yes”, gang membership increases the risk of recidivism. Only 15.9 percent (N = 20) of the respondents expressed the belief that gang affiliation does not increase inmate recidivism. It would seem reasonable to conclude that jail respondents in this survey tend to express the same conclusion as most criminological researchers on gang issues — that yes, gang affiliation would tend to be a factor of increased risk for recidivism.

The 1993 jail survey reported that 43.9 percent of the jails believed “yes” that gang membership increases recidivism. Actual empirical research shows gang membership is a factor that increases the likelihood of individual relapse.

ESTIMATES OF THE PERCENTAGE OF DRUGS BROUGHT INTO THE JAILS BY INMATE GANG MEMBERS

The survey asked, “in your opinion, what percentage of all illicit drugs are brought into your facility by inmate gang members”. The results showed a range from a low of zero percent to a high of 100 percent. The mean or arithmetic average was 20.1 percent nationwide.

INMATE GANGS AND IMPROVISED WEAPONS PRODUCTION

The survey asked the question “in your opinion, have inmate gangs tended to result in more improvised weapons production (e.g., shanks) among inmates in your facility”. If there is a gang presence, and gang rivalries exist between the various security threat groups, then as in the prison context it is reasonable to assume a motivation exists for the ongoing production of improvised weapons. But only a fourth of the jails (N = 33, 27.7%) indicated that inmate gangs have tended to result in more improvised weapons production. Most American jails (72.3%, N = 86) are claiming the gang problem is not severe enough to noticeably increase weapons production among inmates.

The 1993 survey found that only 19.5 percent reported inmate gangs have tended to result in more improvised weapons.

STRONG SUPPORT EXISTS: TOUGHER LAWS ARE NEEDED TO CONTROL THE GANG PROBLEM AMONG INMATES

The survey asked, “do you feel we need tougher laws to control the gang problem among inmates”. There are lots of possibilities for this: ideas such as criminalizing gang recruitment of other inmates while in jail custody, or establishing sanctions for gang behaviors behind bars, etc.

Some 79 percent (N = 94) of the jails reported that they felt tougher laws are needed to control the gang problem among inmates. Only 21 percent (N = 25) disagreed with the “get tough” approach to gang legislation.

The 1993 survey showed that 75.9 percent felt we needed tougher laws to control the gang problem among inmates.

MOST AMERICAN JAILS REPORT THEY DO NOT HAVE THE RESOURCES AND PROGRAMS TO CONTROL THE GANG PROBLEM

The 2022 jail survey included a new question “do you believe your facility has enough resources and programs to control the gang problem”? About a third of all U.S. jails in the survey (35.2%, N = 43) Responded that yes in fact they felt their jail facility had enough resources and programs to control the gang problem. Thus, just under two thirds of all U.S. jails (64.8%, N = 79) are reporting that their jail facilities lack the resources and programs needed to control the gang problem.

NAMES OF THE MAJOR MOTORCYCLE GANGS NATIONWIDE AS REPORTED FROM COUNTY JAIL RESPONDENTS

The survey asked, “what are the names of the top motorcycle gangs in your jurisdiction or area”. Table 8 provides the names of the major motorcycle gangs reported by the respondents to this jail survey. What is clear here is that outlaw motorcycle gangs (OMG’s) are flourishing in the United States today, and apparently have a lot of room for expansion.

When we break down the list to the Top Ten major motorcycle gangs, as seen in Table 9, there really are no surprises, these are very stable gang enterprises that have been able to maintain their hegemony in the gang world for a long time.

Table 8: Names of the Major Motorcycle Gangs Represented Among Jail Inmates Today

Aryan Brotherhood	(1)
Bandidos	(21)
Barrons	(1)
Blacktop Mafia	(1)
Brother Speed	(1)
Chosen Few	(1)
Cossacks	(2)
Dirt and Grime	(1)
Gallopig Goose	(2)
Grey Geoses	(1)
Grim Reapers	(1)
Gypsy Jokers	(2)
Hermanos	(1)
Hells Angels	(20)
High Plains Drifters	(1)
Ice Cold Riders	(1)
Iron Coffin	(1)
Iron Horseman	(1)
Iron Order	(1)
Kinfolk	(1)
Loose Wheels	(1)
Los Solitarios	(1)
Midwest Drifters	(1)
Mongols	(12)
Muluch	(1)
Motorcycle Family	(1)
One Precentors	(1)
Outlaws	(20)
Pagans	(12)
Peace Makers	(1)
POBOBS	(1)
Savage Assassins	(1)
Sons of Silence	(10)
Sorenos	(1)
Sundowners	(1)
Thunderguards‘	(2)
Unforgiven	(1)
Vagos	(1)
Warlocks	(1)
Warriors	(2)
Wheels of Soul	(2)

Table 9: Rank Ordering of the Top Ten Motorcycle Gangs Reported by American Jails

Bandidos (21 citations)
Hells Angels (20 citations)
Outlaws (20 citations)
Mongols (12 citations)
Pagans (12 citations)
Sons of Silence (10 citations)
Gypsy Jokers (2 citations)
Thunder Guards (2 citations)
Warriors (2 citations)
Wheels of Soul (2 citations)

HAVE GANGS SIGNIFICANTLY AFFECTED THE JAIL ENVIRONMENT?

The survey asked, “do you believe that the inmate gangs have significantly affected your correctional environment”. By way of comparison, the exact identical question when used in a survey of state prisons in a 2004 NGCRC research report showed 63.6 percent of the prisons in America reported that gangs have significantly affected their correctional environment. Only 37.1 percent (N = 96) of the jails in 2022 are reporting that gangs have significantly affected the jail environment. Over half, and nearly two thirds, of the jails in 2022 are reporting that gangs have not significantly affected the jail environment.

The 1993 survey of jails showed that 11.2 percent report “yes” that gangs had significantly affected their environment.

COMPARING NGCRC AND NIJ ON DISSEMINATING GANG INFORMATION TO JAILS

The survey included several questions about the dissemination of gang information to American jails. The first question was “have you read 1993 NGCRC gang research on American jails or other on-line reports or periodicals about gangs from the NGCRC”. The 1993 study of gangs in American jails was one of the first of its kind national surveys of gang problems in the jail environment. The NGCRC website also includes a “Gang Risk Classification System for Jails” that was validated on a large national sample of actual gang members. This is the kind of “evidence-based approach” that jails are widely interested in adopting along with best practices for responding to the gang problem. The NGCRC “on-line” reports are offered free to the general public and include a variety of other studies dealing with adult corrections and juvenile corrections. The results show that 15.7 percent (N = 20) of the responding jails indicated they have read the 1993 NGCRC gangs in jail research or other on-line reports or periodicals about gangs from the NGCRC. Some 84.3 percent indicated they had not read the 1993 NGCRC report about gangs in jail. The results show that a similar proportion of the jails had read the 2019 NGCRC report on gangs in jail.

By way of comparison, the survey in addition asked, “has your facility been able to make use of any of the research reports about gangs available from the National Institute of Justice (NIJ)”. Only 17.2 percent (N = 20) of the responding jails indicated their facility has been able to make use of any of the research reports about gangs available from the National Institute of Justice. Thus, the vast majority (82.8%, N = 96) of the jail respondents indicated they have not been able to make use of any of the research reports about gangs from the National Institute of Justice.

By way of comparison, over time, in the 1993 jail survey some 45.2% reported making use of the reports from NIJ. We are unable to explain the dramatic downturn over time (1993 - 2022) in the effectiveness of NIJ to disseminate useful information to jail personnel in America.

The NGCRC sends out free reports to all respondents in its research projects. The NGCRC also publishes the *Journal of Gang Research*, now in its 29th year as a professional quarterly journal. And the NGCRC likewise publishes a free newspaper it mails out to thousands of agencies (police, prosecutors, adult and juvenile corrections, jails, probation, etc) free of charge, called *The Gang Specialist*.

Also of interest, the survey included a third question about the NGCRC's ability to disseminate information about gangs, the survey asked, "has your facility ever received the free newspaper publication from the NGCRC called "*The Gang Specialist*". The results show that about a fourth of all jails in the United States (25%, N = 20) do in fact report that they have received the NGCRC's newspaper called *The Gang Specialist*. Still, some 75 percent (N = 90) indicated they had not received the publication.

The NGCRC considers it an important goal to find more effective ways to disseminate useful information for jail staff.

SUBSTANTIAL SUPPORT EXISTS FOR GREATER INVOLVEMENT BY NON-PROFIT GROUPS TO IMPLEMENT GANG DENUNCIATION/RENUNCIATION PROGRAMS

The 2022 NGCRC jail survey included a new question about a relatively new type of program used in the context of dealing with gang problems while in custody. It is called a number of different things: gang denunciation, gang renunciation, gang renouncement, gang exit counseling, etc. There have been versions of this kind of program that work alongside AA and NA groups, because the principle is similar --- using a peer group support context led by responsible persons from the helping community where the participants on a voluntary basis work towards severing their ties and associations with gang life.

In 2011 the NGCRC developed the Gang Denunciation and Gang Renunciation Form (GDGRF) a copy of which is available at www.ngcrc.com. This is an ideal context for the use of cognitive-based group therapy because the clients all are basically doing a 360 turn around in their social worlds --- they are trying to get away from the corrupting influence of other gang associates, gang members, gang leaders, anyone who facilitates the continuity of gang life. A very high percentage of gang members have actually attempted or had serious ideations of quitting their gang. It is just not a very rewarding experience is what most gang members will tell you.

Trying to leave a gang is often harder than trying to leave a cult. The gang has no problem using force likely to cause death or great bodily harm to enforce its "no one quits" rule. Thus, there have been references in the literature about the idea of "gang deprogramming services". It clearly cannot be an easy treatment goal to achieve to leave and avoid any further contact with gang life.

The 2022 survey included the new question "would your jail benefit from working with outside non-profit groups in the implementation of a gang denunciation or renunciation type of program designed to have the inmates sever ties to gang life". The data show that about half of the jail respondents (47.6%, N = 60) expressed the belief that their jail would in fact benefit from working with outside non-profit groups in the implementation of a gang denunciation or renunciation type of program. Of course, the other half (52.4%, N = 66) of the jails do not feel they would benefit from working with outside non-profit groups for this purpose.

Still, there is substantial support in the jail community for this type of program initiative. Clearly, according to these findings a demonstrated need exists for gang exit programs.

GANG EXIT PROGRAMS ARE RARELY FOUND IN AMERICAN JAILS

The 2022 NGCRC jail survey included an additional new question about gang exit programs in American jails today. The survey asked “does your facility have a “gang renouncement” or gang renunciation program or any program designed to help inmates get out of gang life?”. Such programs if they exist at all in any American jails in a formalized way are a statistical rarity is the finding of this research. Only 3.1 percent (N=4) of all American jails indicated they have a gang exit program. Thus, the overwhelming vast majority of U.S. jails do not have any such gang exit programs to help inmates get out of gang life. Some 96.9 percent of the jails in this national sample indicated they had no such gang renouncement/renunciation programs (N = 124).

Inmates who enter the jail as a gang member or who join a gang while in jail would seemingly be receptive to a gang outreach program that offered them a way to get out of the gang. Using the jail as a catchment area may be ideal because you are able to approach the gang members in a controlled setting where direct social services can be safely provided. Timing is everything when it comes to reaching out to gang members with regard to encouraging them to make a major self-improvement decision like that of quitting the gang.

JOINING A GANG WHILE IN JAIL: DOES IT REALLY HAPPEN?

The paucity of information about gang joining behavior and in particular in relationship to conditions of confinement such as juvenile detention centers, jails, and correctional facilities leads the casual reader to conclude that because there is little federal research on it that it must therefore not exist. The sad reality is that correctional facilities, short and long term (jails and prisons), adult and juvenile alike, have always been places where gang joining behavior occurs. People may seek out the gang and volunteer to join it or they may be recruited to join a gang behind bars.

The 2022 NGCRC jail survey included the new question “do you believe that some inmates may have voluntarily joined (sought out) or may have been recruited into a gang while incarcerated?”. Just over half of the jail respondents (59.5%, N = 75) expressed the viewpoint that yes in fact some inmates join a gang while in jail. Two-fifths of the jails (40.5%, N = 51) did not believe this.

TUITION SUPPORT FOR JAIL STAFF AS A WAY TO HELP RESPOND TO THE INMATE GANG PROBLEM

The theory here is the entire history of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) policy impact — once there was an incentive for police to attend college classes, a major push forward occurred to professionalize law enforcement in America. Could it help for jail staff too? Yes, would be our hypothesis. It would definitely not do any harm.

The survey asked, “do you believe that providing tuition support for staff could help control the inmate gang problem?”. Only 44.5 percent (N = 53) of the jails in this sample expressed the belief that this would have any positive effect. The simple majority (N = 66, 55.5%) did not believe tuition support for jail staff would help them respond to the inmate gang problem.

The results from the 1993 jail survey were almost identical, some 37.6% felt tuition support would help to respond to the inmate gang problem.

NO ONE IS BUYING THE IDEA THAT CONJUGAL VISITING COULD BE USED AS A REWARD TO CONTROL GANG PROBLEMS IN JAIL

The survey asked, “in your view, could conjugal visiting be used as a reward to control gang problems in jail?”. Only a small fraction of the responding jails indicated an affirmative response to this question. Only 3.9 percent (N = 5) of the jails indicated that they believed this. The overwhelming vast majority of American jails (N = 122, 96.1%) indicated “no”, that they did not believe conjugal visiting could be used as a reward to control the gang problem.

The idea that conjugal visiting could be offered as a visiting option for inmates and might allow staff to have a lot of informal social control over the behavior of the inmates --- sustained patterns of non-combative behavior --- comes from a book about the Parchman Penitentiary in Mississippi by Columbus B. Hopper where it was clear how the prison staff achieved good inmate behavior during the week: if they fought with other inmates or staff they don’t get conjugal visiting privileges. Was it the Mississippi prison policy of conjugal visiting or the policy of arming some inmate trustees with rifles to watch over the other prisoners that created the atmosphere of higher compliance with inmate rules and regulations?

SPREAD OF THE MS-13 GANG IN AMERICA: MORAL PANIC OR GENUINE THREAT?

The survey included the question “have you ever identified any of your inmates as being a member of the MS-13 gang?”. Certainly, persons attuned to the gang problem in America are familiar with a strong presence of the MS-13 gang in southern California, and in areas of the east coast, because of the kind of news coverage that has surface over the last decade. Sadly, it is clear from this jail research that the Mara Salvatrucha 13 (MS-13) gang problem is not an artifact of negative mass media coverage or any moral panic. Rather, we were surprised as anyone to learn that 47.6 percent (N = 59) of American jails are now reporting that they have identified inmates as belonging to that gang. Just over half of American jails (52.4%, N = 65) report that they have not yet identified any inmates as belong to the MS-13 gang. Clearly while it may not be the largest gang in the United States, the present researchers would still regard it as a genuine threat to public safety. The MS-13 gang has unfortunately not yet disappeared from America’s newspaper headlines for involvement in patterns of ongoing gang violence.

THE SET-OFF METHOD: AN EXAMPLE OF WHERE STANDARDS AND MORE GUIDANCE MIGHT HELP JAILS DEAL WITH GANG PROBLEMS

The survey posed the following scenario and question “some correctional facilities seek to control gangs by the “set off” method, it involves balancing the number of rival gang members” in a living unit/cellhouse/etc, in your opinion, is this an effective way to control inmate gangs”. What this means in practice is this: if the jail unit has 20 single jail cells in it, using the set-off method you would put in 8 Crips, 8 Bloods, and 4 neutrons. The logic used here to justify this gang management strategy is that no single gang will be large enough in numbers to control the entire jail unit. In other words, the strategy is to keep the gangs at approximately equivalent force strength levels.

Another way to define the set-off strategy is to use gang membership in the inmate classification system in a formula where you can achieve a relative numerical balance in the number of rivals living in the same unit. It is actually a somewhat popular method today still used in the gang/STG management plans.

The one problem with this strategy is that some have claimed that it may lend itself to

the promotion of gang conflict.

The 2022 NGCRC jail survey asked this scenario: Some correctional facilities seek to control gangs by the “set off” method. It involves “balancing the number of rival gang members” in a living unit/cellhouse/etc. In your opinion, is this an effective way to control inmate gangs?

The findings of this survey show that 52.2 percent (N = 59) of the responding jails felt that the set-off method is an effective way to control inmate gangs. Thus, 47.8 percent (N = 54) did not believe the set-off method is an effective way to control inmate gangs. There is not strong consensus on this matter among jail staff.

The 1993 survey on the same question reported only 40 percent felt the self-off method was effective.

A recent case provides a sad example of this situation. In Cook County Jail, in early 2020, two rival gang inmates were placed in the same cell: Pedro Ruiz and Christian Gonzalez. Rival gang members are not going to make good cell mates. Christian murdered Pedro in a brutal beating. Pedro was found dead at the next time a jail guard came by for the inmate count.

MOST POPULAR STRATEGIES USED TO CONTROL GANGS IN AMERICAN JAILS TODAY

The survey included a checklist of fifteen (15) different strategies recognized in the previous research literature as ways in which jails and prisons seek to control gang in their correctional environments. The survey asked the jails to identify which of these strategies it actually uses to control gangs. The results of this inquiry are provided in Table 10.

Table 10: Rank Ordering of Gang Control Strategies Reported in Use by American Jails

Gang Control Strategy	Jails Using The Strategy	
	Number Yes	Percentage Yes
Case by case dealings	84	67.2%
Segregation	64	51.2%
Transfers	51	40.8%
Lock downs	50	40.0%
Interrupting communications	43	34.4%
Balance the number of rivals		
living in the same unit	31	24.8%
Prosecution	31	24.8%
Use of informers	20	16.0%
Isolating leaders	20	16.0%
Displacing members	20	16.0%
Meeting with gang leaders		
On “as needed” basis	10	8.0%
Ignoring their existence	7	5.6%
Infiltration	7	5.6%
Coopting prisoners to		
Control gangs	4	3.2%
Joint meetings between		
Various gang leaders	0	0.0%
Other	7	5.7%

As seen in Table 10, the most popular strategy for controlling gangs in jails was that of “case by case dealings”. The problem here is that it really is not a strategy at all, it is a lack of any strategy, and basically saying “we will deal with that problem on a case by case basis as it arises”. A workplace deals with everything and every issue on a case-by-case basis. Another expression that would work here is to call it a “due consideration” strategy: if the gangs mess up the living unit, the jail will give due consideration to all things and all factors when it happens. It might sound good, like a “due process” strategy would sound really good, but its meaning is pretty ambiguous. As seen in Table 10, “case by case” dealings is the single most popular gang control strategy reported by American jails today — some N = 84 jails reported using this “strategy”, that is about two-thirds (67.2%) of the jail sample overall.

The real strategies begin with segregation in the list from Table 10, which most jails are capable of doing in some regard. Transfers work if you have some place to transfer them to, and this option was reported by N = 51 jails. The other problem with transferring them is that prison inmates long ago called this “diesel treatment” — and it has a known blowback that is common when this strategy is used — the reverse intended effect can be achieved whereby the gang is able to “spread” its message and influence to any new place, location, or facility you transfer the gang member to.

Lock downs work to send a message to inmates that gangs do not control the jail, the jail staff control the jail. In Table 10, some 50 jails indicated that they use lock downs as a strategy to control gangs. For example, if there is a “gang fight” or disturbance in a jail living unit, the entire unit would go on lock down. A lock down in response to a gang riot would restrict their movement and activities. It tightens security on the inmates, depriving them of some of their limited pleasures (watching television, playing cards, etc).

The gang control strategy of interrupting communications means to intercept and report written (mail and email) and phone conversations with other gang members. Sometimes this information can be used against them in court to enhance the penalty for a conviction. Sometimes it leads to new gang investigations. As seen in Table 10, N = 43 jails or about a third overall (34.4%) report using some variation of this strategy.

The strategy called “use of informers” means exactly what it implies: encouraging inmates to snitch on each other. This works really good for non-gang inmates. But when you are dealing with gangs there is a new complication. And a major kind of blow back. Gangs do not consider it “snitching” to provide information on a rival gang member. It would be considered snitching to rat out one of your own gang members. But providing information about a rival gang member is considered “doing good work for your gang nation” by weakening a rival gang organization. The fact is there can be a tendency for gangs to make false complaints --- even “set up” rival gangs by planting evidence --- to achieve this kind of unique form of revenge. Still the use of informers emerges in Table 10 as one of the top five strategies used in jails, nationwide (N = 20).

As seen in Table 10, the “set-off” method is the sixth most common technique used for dealing with gang problems in American jails today. It is defined as balancing the number of rival gang members living in the same unit. Some N = 31 jails, about a fourth of the sample overall (24.8%), reported using the set-off technique; or by comparison, it was equal in popularity to prosecuting gangs and gang members, e.g., using prosecution as a control strategy to prevent and reduce gang problems. Three other somewhat common strategies are shown to be prosecution, isolating leaders, and displacing members. The last five strategies listed in Table 10 besides being the least commonly found in jails are actually strategies that carry some potential liability. The strategy of meeting with gang leaders might bring some potential criticism. But the last four techniques are not used widely in jails it

appears, and probably for good reason: ignoring their existence, infiltration, coopting gangs, joint meetings with gang leaders.

In Table 10, another name for the “Infiltration” method of controlling inmate gangs is also called the “Perkins technique”, aptly named after the case of *Illinois v. Perkins* (1990), which involved an undercover police officer posing as a cellmate to gather information. It is shown here to be one of the least frequently reported gang control strategies used in American jails, as only $N = 7$ or 5.6 percent of the jails reported the use of this method.

GANG MEMBERS AS ASSAULT VICTIMS

Not many previous researchers have looked at the gang member as a victim. But the fact is that in some gangs like the infamous Latin Kings, almost all member are at some point beaten by their fellow gang members in the process of getting “violations”. The gang physically punishes members for breaking gang rules. This is typically done in a group setting. The kind of violence is real, and can be a V30 (violation of punches and kicks for 30 seconds), or a V60 for sixty seconds of assault time. The members have no one to complain to about their trauma, because technically it is a kind of group ritualized sadism-masochism - - - where the victim is basically consenting to receive the pain and injury.

Gang members not only get victimized by their own gang for violations like not showing up to meetings on time, or not paying dues, and a variety of issues, but they also routinely get assaulted by rival gang members. So in a jail or correctional custody situation there is special importance to these two routine sources of violence to gang members. We have already reviewed the issue of using the “set off” method as a gang control strategy, and how it might inadvertently increase conflict between gangs.

New in the 2022 NGCRC jail survey was the question “is it common for gang members to be the victim of assaults from rival gang members in the jail setting”. The results from the 2022 Jail Survey showed that just over half of the jails ($N = 73$, 58.9%) are reporting that yes it is common for gang members to be the victim of assaults from rival gang members in the jail setting. Thus, 41.1 percent ($N = 51$) of the jails reported that it is not common for gang members to be the victim of assaults in the jail setting.

A second follow-up question was included that asked “if an inmate is a gang member and is assaulted by rival gang members, please estimate what percentage of the victims will help jail staff with the investigation and prosecution of the assault incident”. The results ranged from a low of zero percent to a high of 75 percent. However, the mean score, the arithmetic mean value for this variable, was only 7.37 percent of the gang members would help jail staff with the investigation of such incidents. This is not surprising considering that it is widely recognized that snitching is a taboo in gang culture.

GRADES GIVEN FOR FEDERAL LEADERSHIP IN RESPONDING TO THE GANG PROBLEM DURING THE LAST YEAR

The 2022 NGCRC jail survey included the question “what grade would you give the federal government for leadership in responding to the gang problem in America during the last year?”. The response mode options were: ___A ___B ___C ___D ___F. First, not one jail respondent was willing to give an “A” grade. Some 69.4 percent of the entire sample either gave an “F” or a “D” grade for federal leadership in dealing with the gang problem in the last year. The mean score here was less than unity, less than 1, meaning less than a “D” value. The mean score was .97 for the overall sample. A GPA of .97 is an “F” grade. But a “D-” might apply here as well, because it is a high “F” grade. Barely passing would be the overall assessment here.

5. OTHER PROBLEMS BEHIND BARS IN AMERICAN JAILS TODAY

SUICIDE ATTEMPTS BY INMATES

The 2022 NGCRC jail survey included the question “are suicide attempts by inmates a problem in your facility?”. The survey results show that 42.4 percent (N = 53) of the jails in the U.S. are reporting that suicide attempts by inmates are a problem in their facility. Thus, just over half of the jails (57.6%, N = 72) are reporting that suicide attempts by inmates are not a problem.

SUICIDE ATTEMPTS BY CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS

The 2022 NGCRC jail survey included the question “are suicide attempts by correctional officers a problem in your facility?”. Some 8.6 percent (N = 11) of the U.S. jails are in fact reporting that suicide attempts by correctional officers as a problem in their jail facility. Thus, in the vast majority of cases (91.9%, N = 117) jails are not reporting that attempted suicide among correctional officers is a problem in their jail facility..

MALES PROFILE AS MOST LIKELY TO ATTEMPT SUICIDE IN JAIL

The survey asked, “which inmates are more likely to attempt suicide in your facility” and the response mode was either males or females. The vast majority of American jails are identifying male inmates (N = 118, 95.9%) as the most likely to attempt suicide while in jail. Only 4.1 percent (N = 5) indicated female inmates are more likely to attempt suicide in jail.

JAIL SUICIDE ATTEMPTS MOST LIKELY AT EARLY STAGES OF ADJUDICATION

The survey asked, “what is the highest risk period for jail suicide attempts” and then gave five different response modes corresponding to the “stage” of the jail stay (intake, pretrial, during trial, before sentencing, after sentencing). Intake reflects the early point of entry during the stages of a jail incarceration experience, and was the single most likely time period or stage or incarceration for jail suicide attempts — some 42.2% (N = 43) of the jails reported this to be the highest risk period. Another 34.3 percent (N = 35) of the jails reported that pretrial was the highest risk period. Only 5.9 percent (N = 6) reported the actual time of trial as the highest suicide risk period. Only 6.9 percent (N = 7) of the jails reported “before sentencing” as the highest risk period. And finally, some 10.8 percent (N = 11) believed that after sentencing was the highest risk period for jail suicides.

These survey findings that male inmates are the predominant group rather than females who attempt suicide and that the attempts are made early in the stages of total control detention are findings consistent with known national norms like those reported by Carson (2021).

MOST COMMON METHOD OF SUICIDE ATTEMPTS IN JAILS

The survey asked, “which is the single most common method of suicide attempts in your facility’s history” and the response modes included: lacerations, inserting head into toilet, hanging/suffocation, chemical poisoning, other self-inflicted trauma. The results show that hanging and lacerations account for nearly 82.6 percent of all jail suicide attempts. Some 10.6 percent (N = 12) of the jails indicated that lacerations were the most common method of jail suicide attempts. The single largest risk area was hanging/suffocation which accounted for 72.0 percent (N = 95) of the suicide attempts — the lion’s share of this problem. Inserting head into toilet accounted for less than one percent (.8%, N = 1) of the

attempts. Chemical poisoning accounted for none ($N = 0$) of the suicide attempts. And finally, the method of “other self-inflicted trauma” (e.g., head injuries) accounted for 3.8 percent ($N = 5$) of the suicide attempts.

JAIL OVERCROWDING IS A PROBLEM

The survey asked, “generally, is overcrowding a problem in your facility?”. The results showed that 41.5 percent ($N = 54$) of the jails admitted that, yes indeed, overcrowding is a problem. And there is the finding that just over half of the national sample (58.5%, $N = 76$) declare that overcrowding is not a problem in their jail. There are two tales in American jails today, about equal in their overall scope nationwide, such that jails are almost equally likely to report a problem or not report a problem with overcrowding.

The 1993 jail survey results were very comparable: some 49.6 percent reported “yes” that overcrowding is a problem in their jail.

RACIAL CONFLICTS AMONG JAIL INMATES VERY COMMON IN THE USA TODAY

The survey asked, “are racial conflicts a problem among the offenders in your facility” in a format where the response modes were “yes” or “no”. The results from the survey showed that 47.7 percent of the responding jails ($N = 62$) reported that racial conflicts are a problem among inmates. Just over half of American jails (52.3%, $N = 68$) report that racial conflicts are not a problem among jail inmates.

In the 1993 jail survey, 41.8% of the jails reported that racial conflicts were a problem. Once again, not much has changed in this regard during the last 25 years. Racial conflicts, for the record, can similarly be a surrogate measure of a gang problem as well. When the inmates are racially polarized and broken into gangs and STG’s that are homogeneous with respect to race, it is difficult to categorize it as a race riot or a gang riot, if a group of AB’s are fighting a group of BGF’s is that a race riot or a gang riot — or is it both?

ABOUT A THIRD OF U.S. JAILS WOULD BE OPEN TO WORKING WITH OUTSIDE NON-PROFIT GROUPS TO IMPLEMENT A RACE RELATIONS PROGRAM DESIGNED TO REDUCE RACIAL AND ETHNIC CONFLICTS AMONG INMATES.

A new type of inquiry was added to the 2022 NGCRC jail survey and it focused on this matter of finding ways to reduce racial conflict among jail inmates. The survey included the question “would your jail benefit from working with outside non-profit groups in the implementation of a race relations type of program designed to reduce racial and ethnic conflicts among inmates in your facility?”. About a third of all U.S. jails (32.8%, $N = 41$) responded that yes in fact they would benefit from working with outside non-profits to reduce racial conflict among jail inmates.

Most U.S. jails in fact about two-thirds of them nationwide (67.2%, $N = 84$) expressed the viewpoint that their jail would not benefit from working with non-profits to reduce racial conflict among inmates.

SERIOUS RISKS LIKE FINDING GUNS BEHIND BARS ARE FORTUNATELY VERY SMALL RISKS ACCORDING TO THE SURVEY RESULTS

Escape and taking hostages are of course some of the higher level risks that have to be addressed in any correctional facility. At a similar level of “peril” or risk faced by jail staff would be the situation of confiscating a firearm from an inmate or finding one in a shakedown. The survey asked, “were any firearms confiscated from inmates or secure areas within the

last twelve months”. The results show that only 1.5 percent of the jails (N = 2) reported confiscating a firearm in the last one-year time frame. Thus, the overwhelming majority of American jails (N = 130, 98.5%) report that no firearms were confiscated in the last year.

Not much has changed in the reported seizure firearms in jails since the 1993 survey. In the 1993 survey, only 2.3 percent of the jails reported having confiscated firearms. So this low risk factor has remained steady for three decades. Of course, this reflects only the smuggling in of firearms into the jail facility, it does not reflect the manufacture of improvised weapons in the tradition of the John Dillinger-style.

IMPROVISED WEAPONS AND INMATE VIOLENCE

A series of questions in the jail survey focused on improvised weapons in relationship to inmate violence. The survey asked, “please estimate how many edged weapons were confiscated from inmate shakedowns within the last twelve months”. The results showed a range of survey item response values from a low of zero to a high of 100. The mean average was 5.12 edged weapons being confiscated during the last one-year period. What this means is that on the average a jail shakedown will turn up at least one “shank” (aka “shiv”) or improvised edged weapon every two or three months.

A more serious aspect of this problem involves the use of these improvised weapons against other inmates or staff. The survey asked, “how many assaults were committed with edged weapons among inmates within the last twelve months”. The results showed a range from a low of zero to a high of 10. The mean score was .28 assaults per year. Some 82.8 percent of the jails reported zero assaults of this kind in the last year.

The survey also asked, “how many assaults on staff were committed with weapons of any kind by inmates within the last twelve months”. The results showed a range from a low of zero to a high of 4. Basically, 83.1 percent of the jails reported zero such assaults with weapons against staff during the last year. The mean score was .30 assaults against staff with weapons of any kind in the last year.

STAFF INJURIES FROM INMATE ATTACKS IN THE LAST YEAR

The survey asked “have any of your staff received serious injuries from attacks or confrontations with inmates within the last twelve months”. The results indicated that 18.9 percent (N = 25) of the jails are reporting that they have had jail staff receive serious injuries in the last year from attacks or confrontations with inmates. Most of the jails (N = 107, 81.1%) report no such injuries to staff during the last one year time period.

ATTEMPTED JAIL ESCAPES

The survey asked, “how many escape attempts occurred at your facility within the last twelve months”. The results showed a range of scores between a low of zero to a high of 8. Basically, just over three-fourths of American jails (79.4%, N = 104) are reporting no such attempted jail escapes during the last one-year period. The mean score was .38, meaning that on average a typical jail will have about one escape attempt every two or three years. The mean score from the 1993 survey was .95 attempted escapes.

ARSON INCIDENTS IN JAILS DURING THE LAST YEAR

The survey asked, “how many incidents of fire-setting occurred within your facility during the last twelve months”. The results ranged from a low of zero to a high of 65. Most jails (N = 107, 81.7%) reported no such fire-setting events during the last year. The mean score was 1.12 meaning that again, the typical jail is going to see a fire-setting event at least once every year. The mean score from the 1993 jail survey was higher (.73).

We can review a couple of the common techniques used by inmates to set fires while in jail. The classic method is to set a bed mattress on fire, typically as an inmate protest. One of the easiest ways to set a fire in jail is to simply take some clothing and place it against an existing light source, if the light casing is hot, the trapped heat may result in combustion and the fabric setting on fire. Any electrical outlet that may exist for use in powering a television or microwave is easily used to create a fire — inmates simply “short out” the electrical circuit by sticking anything that will conduct electricity (e.g., aluminum foil) into the outlet and using toilet paper to get fire from the resulting sparks. One arson investigator explained, “jail inmates can cause a flame and smoke damage by simply putting their flip flops into the microwave and turning it on”.

ILLICIT DRUG SEIZURES DURING THE LAST YEAR

Jail can be involved in the seizure of illicit drugs in several different ways. One major way happens during booking, when an inmate may have narcotics concealed upon their body. Another way is through visitors and volunteers who have access to the jail. And, of course, individual inmate body searches and cell shake downs are common ways for jail staff to seize illicit drugs and contraband such as tobacco.

The survey asked, “please estimate how many incidents of illicit drug seizures occurred within your facility during the last twelve months”. The results showed a range from a low of zero to a high of 200. Basically, just over a third of the responding jails (37.2%, N = 48) reported zero such drug seizures. The mean, or arithmetic average, was 7.9.0 such drug seizures during the last one-year time frame.

CELL PHONES CONFISCATED IN AMERICAN JAILS

The survey asked, “has your facility confiscated any cell phones in the past year”. The results show that over a fourth of American jails are reporting this phenomenon of confiscating cell phones from inmates inside the jail. Some 25.2 percent (N = 33) of the jails in this survey are reporting that they have confiscated a cell phone in the past year. Some 74.8 percent (N = 98) report confiscating no phones in the last one-year period.

A follow-up question asked how many cell phones were seized, and the results showed a range of scores as high as 13 during the last year. The mean or average number of phones confiscated was 2.11 phones during the last year — or, on average, approximately 6,000 phones as an estimate of a national yearly total. Which means that if they were smart phones they would in all likelihood contain a lot of criminal intelligence that most agencies are probably not geared up sufficiently to exploit for public safety purposes (e.g., investigating human trafficking, etc).

NO INMATES IN JAIL FOR CRIMES INVOLVING DRONES

A series of questions focused on different aspects of a new type of crime in which the criminal offender uses drones and other types of remotely controlled vehicles.

The survey asked, “do you have inmates in your facility whose crimes involved the use of any of these remotely controlled or piloted vehicles/robots”. No jails reported such inmates now in custody for this kind of new high-tech crime.

ATTEMPTS TO SMUGGLE CONTRABAND INTO JAILS USING DRONES

The survey asked “have there been any attempts to smuggle contraband into your jail facility or complex using drones”. Some 6.3 percent (N = 8) of the jails reported “yes”, that there have been such attempts. The overwhelming vast majority though, 93.7 percent (N = 120), report no such contraband smuggling attempts using drone technology.

ABOUT HALF OF THE JAILS HAVE WEBSITES WHERE THE PUBLIC CAN VIEW PICTURES AND ARREST INFORMATION ABOUT INMATES

The 2022 Jail survey included the question “does your jail provide a website available to the general public to view the pictures and arrest information on inmates detained in your jail?”. Half of the jails in the U.S. (51.2%, N = 66) report that they do in fact have such websites providing this kind of basic information about persons detained in their jail. Thus, about half of all U.S. jails (48.8%, N = 63) in this sample lack this kind of public service.

Prisons seem to provide more detailed information, such as what kind of “tattoos” the inmate or prisoner has, and their location on the body. These permanent tattoo patterns often provide clear information about gang affiliation because of the nature of the symbols and expressions involved in the tattoos. The overwhelming vast majority of jails in America do not provide this kind of detailed information that would allow the educated citizen to take notice of such gang status in their community. As a rule of thumb, jails don’t get involved in taking away the secrecy of gang membership or gang affiliation status for arrestees. But take notice: when gang members are able to continue their operations in the same communities without proper notification and warning to the public, this basically helps give some level of continuity to the gang as a social organizational enterprise.

6. RANK ORDERING OF JAIL PROBLEMS IN AMERICA TODAY

This aspect of the 2022 jail survey research project grew out of a frustration of not finding much in the way of quantitative studies of American jail problems. We looked and looked all to no avail for a definitive list of real jail problems and basically previous research has been piece-meal, a little bit emerge here, a little bit emerges there, but not much in the way of a comprehensive study of American jail problems. We reviewed the professional criminal justice literature on jail, and it would lead us to believe that the major problems are suicide and sexual assault among inmates, both get much coverage. We also reviewed news materials and we did some qualitative inquiries with those in the field as well. We had to generate our own master list of jail problems and make sure we had a good probability of covering almost everything in jails today.

We identified seventeen problems that needed to be compared statistically and then rank ordered so that we could make sense of all these problems. For each jail problem, we had a separate survey question, and the response modes were the same for all of the seventeen jail problems. The response modes asked the respondent to give a rating from a low of zero to a high of ten (0 - 10) for how serious the problem was: zero for not a problem, and 10 for major problem.

Table 11 provides the results of this line of investigation where we were able for the first time to compare how the “gang problem” ranks in relationship to other problems in the jail. As seen in Table 11, “gang fights and gang disturbances” in the jail as a jail problem does not even make the top ten list! The gang problem scores a mean value of 3.25 on a scale from zero to ten.

The major problems in American jails today are shown in Table 11 to be: recruiting, keeping and retaining line staff which had a mean score of 8.19. This was the single highest scoring problem that emerged in this first ever comparative analysis of jail problems. The second highest jail problem as seen in Table 11 was mental health service issues with a mean score of 8.07 on a scale of zero to ten.

Substance abuse issues (mean of 6.51) and inmate re-entry issues (mean value of 6.25) were the third and fourth highest ranking jail problem scores.

The deterioration of the jail over time from age surfaces in two ways: outdated

infrastructure and physical plant issues along with outdated/worn/defective cell locking mechanisms --- problems ranked #5 and #7 respectively. When locks malfunction inmates are able to “jimmy” the lock to open their own cell doors.

Inmate overcrowding was the 6th highest ranking jail problem as seen in Table 11 with a mean score value of 5.22 on a zero to ten scale.

Special needs (diet, meds, etc) of some inmates, illiteracy issues, and dealing with the elderly and infirm inmates are shown in Table 11 to be the 8th, 9th, and 10th highest ranking problems.

Race relations problems among inmates, suicide problems and gang fights/disturbances are shown to be the next three rank ordered jail problems. But note in Table 11 that the arithmetic value of the mean scores is now in the level 3 zone, reduced substantially in comparison with problems #1 thru #10.

The final four problems rank ordered were: prisoner rights issues (mean = 2.81), inmates reporting sexual assaults (mean = 2.15), deaths inside the jail (mean = 2.12), and finally suicide issues among jail staff (mean = 1.61).

So from the point of view of the gang researcher, these are very sobering findings: the gang problem is not showing up in the high end of the rank-ordered types of problems. There are lots of problems faced by American jails today other than those posed by gangs and STG’s. But for the first time we have been able to objectively compare how the gang problem figures in the overall scheme of things. Clearly, there is a gang problem, but there exist other high need areas and concerns as well for jail administrators is what we find in Table 11.

Table 11: The Rank Ordering and Comparison of Seventeen Problems Reported by American Jails Today --- Findings from the 2022 NCGCRC Jail Survey

<u>Jail Problem Description</u>	<u>Mean Score Ranking (0-10 scale)</u>
Recruiting, keeping and retaining line staff	8.19
Mental health service issues	8.07
Substance abuse issues	6.51
Inmate re-entry issues	6.25
Outdated infrastructure/physical plant issues	5.55
Inmate overcrowding issues	5.22
Outdated/worn/defective locking mechanisms	4.66
Special needs (diet, meds, etc) of some inmates	4.49
Inmate illiteracy issues	4.23
Dealing with elderly and infirm inmates	4.09
Racial conflicts/disturbances; race relations issues	3.60
Suicide issues among inmates	3.29
Gang fights/gang disturbances	3.25
Prisoners rights issues	2.81
Inmates reporting sexual assaults	2.15
Deaths inside the jail	2.12
Suicide issues among staff	1.61

7. JAIL EXPECTATIONS OF THE FUTURE

A series of six questions in the 2022 NGCRC jail survey were designed to assess whether certain problems were expected to increase, decrease, or remain the same in next few years. This gives us a way of looking at the future problems facing American jails. From a research point of view, this is probably the closest thing we have to an understanding of the shared collective prediction for what the future holds for American jails. Generally, what we found was a kind of pessimistic view of what the future holds for American jails.

MOST EXPECT THE GANG PROBLEM IN JAILS TO INCREASE IN THE NEXT FEW YEARS

The 2022 NGCRC jail survey included the question “in your opinion, do you expect the gang problem in jails to increase or decrease in the next few years, or do you think the problem will remain at the same level it is now?”. Almost three-fourths (73.2%, N = 93) Answered that they expect the gang problem in American jails to increase in the next few years. Only 3.9 percent (N = 5) Expect the gang problem to decrease in the next few years. And 22.8 percent (N = 29) Expect the gang problem to remain the same in the next few years.

THREE FOURTHS EXPECT THE PROBLEM OF INMATE VIOLENCE FROM GANG MEMBERS TO INCREASE IN THE NEXT FEW YEARS

The 2022 NGCRC jail survey included the question “in your opinion, do you expect the problem of inmate violence from gang members to increase or decrease in the next few years, or do you think the problem will remain at the same level it is now?”. Some 76.2 percent (N = 96) of the responding U.S. jails indicated that they expect the problem of inmate violence from gang members to increase in the next few years. Only 1.6 percent (N = 2) indicated they expected this problem to decrease in the next few years. And 22.2 percent (N = 28) expected that the problem would remain at the same level.

TWO THIRDS EXPECT THE PROBLEM OF GANG MEMBERS ABUSING THEIR RELIGIOUS RIGHTS TO INCREASE IN THE NEXT FEW YEARS

The 2022 NGCRC jail survey included the question “in your opinion, do you expect the problem of gang members abusing their religious rights to increase or decrease in the next few years, or do you think the problem will remain at the same level it is now?”. Inmates have been known to create their own religious functions so that they can meet together as a gang and thus the religious worship service basically becomes a gang meeting. This behavior is more common in the prison system.

The findings from this survey show that two-thirds (69.6%, N = 87) of the jails expect the problem of gang members abusing their religious rights to increase in the next few years. Only 4.0 percent (N = 5) expect this problem to decrease. And 26.4 percent (N = 33) expect the problem to remain the same.

TWO THIRDS EXPECT THE PROBLEM OF GANG MEMBERS ASSAULTING CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS AND STAFF TO INCREASE IN THE NEXT FEW YEARS

The 2022 NGCRC jail survey included the question “in your opinion, do you expect the problem of gang members assaulting correctional officers and staff to increase or decrease in the next few years, or do you think the problem will remain at the same level it is now?”. Two-thirds of the jails (66.1%, N = 84) expect the problem of gang members

assaulting correctional officers and staff to increase in the next few years. Hardly anyone (0.8%, N = 1) believes this problem will decrease in the next few years. And a third (33.1%, N = 42) expect the problem to remain the same.

SLIGHT MAJORITY EXPECTS THE PROBLEM OF RADICAL MILITANCY AMONG INMATES TO INCREASE IN THE NEXT FEW YEARS

The 2022 NGCRC jail survey included the question “in your opinion, do you expect the problem of radical militancy among inmates to increase or decrease in the next few years, or do you think the problem will remain at the same level it is now?”. Some 56.6 percent (N = 69) of the jails expect the problem of radical militancy among inmates in the next few years. Only 1.6 percent (N = 2) expect this problem to decrease. And 41.8 percent (N = 51) expect this problem to remain the same.

SLIGHT MAJORITY EXPECTS THE PROBLEM OF CIVIL DISORDER AND VIOLENT PROTESTS IN THEIR JURISDICTION TO INCREASE IN THE NEXT FEW YEARS

The 2022 NGCRC jail survey included the question “in your opinion, do you expect the problem of civil disorder and violent protests in your jurisdiction to increase or decrease in the next few years, or do you think the problem will remain at the same level it is now?”. Some 52.4 percent (N = 66) of the jails expect the problem of radical militancy among inmates in the next few years. Only 4 percent (N = 5) expect this problem to decrease. And 43.6 percent (N = 55) expect this problem to remain the same.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In this chapter we have reviewed the specific research methodology undertaken in this study of American jails. The research methodology replicated and improved upon the original 1993 jail survey undertaken and previously reported by the NGCRC. This chapter presented the frequencies, the number and percentages, and where appropriate the arithmetic means for all variables.

It is possible that additional and further analysis may be undertaken on this rich data environment.

One area covered was what the expectations are for the future of certain persisting problems facing American jails today. Knowing the empirical data on these expectations in the field allows us to understand the new normal for those working in American jails. It includes these predictions for the future:

- *** The gang problem will increase in American jails.
- *** Inmate violence from gang members will increase.
- *** Inmates will increasingly abuse their religious rights.
- *** The problem of gang members assaulting correctional officers and staff will increase in the future.

CHAPTER 4: OTHER JAIL FINDINGS FROM A BIVARIATE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to go into a little bit deeper analysis of the research findings from this 2022 survey of American jails. Specifically, here we can go beyond the level of descriptive statistics such as percentage statistics or arithmetic means for single variables. Here we will examine how some background factors or independent variables are possibly able to explain or account for differences in conditions of interest --- dependent variables.

To begin this inquiry we can ask ourselves what would explain a very serious situation facing American jails today — the situation where gang members have been a problem in terms of assaults on jail staff. Are there factors that would seem to significantly differentiate this kind of variable of gang violence and help us to better understand it, and better yet perhaps get a handle on what other factors help us to identify what may increase or decrease the likelihood of this kind of risk of harm to jail staff? That is where we can begin — what factors are associated with gang member assaults on jail staff?

1. FACTORS SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENTIATING GANG MEMBERS ASSAULTING JAIL STAFF

Here we examine the results from the analysis that was directed at understanding gang member assaults on jail staff. The kinds of variables that we have identified as factors that significantly differentiate high and low “yes” conditions of this dependent variable are shown for eleven different variables.

Table 11 shows thirteen background factors that can significantly differentiate whether gang members have been a problem in terms of assaults on jail staff. Very clearly, the single strongest factor differentiating assaults on staff by gang members is the factor of whether gang members have been a problem in terms of threats against staff. Here we see a very high Chi-square value (Chi-square = 23.1, $p < .001$). The higher the Chi-square statistic value, and where we see that it is significant in terms of the probability level being less than .05 ($p < .05$), the more certain we can be that these two variables are not independent. In other words, “something is going on” here, knowing we one background variable such as threats against staff helps us to significantly differentiate the dependent variable of whether gang members have been problem in terms of actual assaults on jail staff.

As seen in Table 11, knowing whether gang members have been a problem in terms of threats against staff shows one of the strongest differences in terms of staff members ever being assaulted by a gang member. Only 3.0 percent of jail staff are assaulted by gang members in jails where there has not been a kind of “warning”, in other words that gang members have not made threats against staff. This compares with 37.5 percent of jails reporting an assault on where there has also been a threat from a gang member.

Another factor that is shown to significantly differentiate whether gang members assault jail staff is the variable of whether white inmates have a separate gang. As seen in this table where white inmates do not have a separate gang, only 8.4 percent of staff are assaulted by a gang member. This incidence skyrockets to 29.0 percent when we know the jail has the situation where white inmates have a separate gang. This has a high Chi-square value, and a probability level of $p = .002$ --- meaning we could find this statistical relationship less than two times out of 1,000 by chance alone. Another way to illustrate this is, imagine you had your chance to pick which jail to work in, and you could ask one question, this question “do the white inmates have a separate gang” would help you pick the 8.4% jail that is much safer in terms of the risk of being assaulted by an inmate gang member.

Another variable in Table 11 that significantly differentiates gang members assaulting jail staff is the factor of whether the jail has had inmates who could be considered military-trained gang members. It is a difference between 12.3 percent and 36.0 percent in whether th jail reports a problem of gang members assaulting jail staff. Again, a significant Chi-square statistic emerges here (Chi-square = 7.78, p = .005).

Table 11: Factors Significantly Differentiating Whether Jails Responding to the 2022 Survey Report Gang Members Have Been a Problem in Terms of Assaults on Staff.

		Have Gang Members Been a Problem in Terms of Assaults on Your Jail Staff?		
		<u>No (N)</u>	<u>Yes (N)</u>	<u>% Yes</u>
Have Gang Members Been A Problem in Terms of Threats Against Staff?	NO	63	2	3.0
	YES	35	21	37.5
Chi-square = 23.1, p < .001				
Do You Believe That Gang Members Have Significantly Affected Your Environment?	NO	74	5	6.3
	YES	31	17	35.4
Chi-square = 17.6, p < .001				
Are racial conflicts a problem among the offenders in your facility?	NO	62	5	7.4
	YES	44	18	29.0
Chi-square = 10.2, p = .001				
Do Whites Have a Separate Gang?	NO	65	6	8.4
	YES	39	16	29.0
Chi-square = 9.16, p = .002				
In the last one year time period, how would you rate the problem of inmates using phones, mail and other forms of communications to threaten or intimidate witnesses?				
	Not a problem	52	3	5.4
	Small Problem	45	16	26.2
	Large Problem	8	5	38.4
Chi-square = 12.0, p = .002				
Is it common for gang members to be the victim of assaults from rival gang members in the jail setting?	NO	48	3	5.8
	YES	52	20	27.7
Chi-square = 9.41, p = .002				

Table 11 Continued: Factors Significantly Differentiating Whether Jails Responding to the 2022 Survey Report Gang Members Have Been a Problem in Terms of Assaults on Staff.

Has Your Facility Had Any Inmates Who Could Be Considered Military-Trained Gang Members?	NO	85	12	12.3
	YES	16	9	36.0
Chi-Square = 7.78, p = .005				
Has Your Facility Had Any Inmates Who Are Members of the MS-13 GANG?	NO	59	5	7.8
	YES	44	15	25.4
Chi-square = 6.99, p = .008				
Have Any of Your Staff Received Serious Injuries From Attacks From Inmates Within the Last 12 Months?	NO	91	15	14.1
	YES	16	9	36.0
Chi-square = 6.45, p = .01				
Have Inmate Gangs Tended to Result in More Improvised Weapons Production (e.g., Shanks, etc) in Your Jail?	NO	74	11	12.9
	YES	22	11	33.3
Chi-square = 6.51, p = .01				
Have there been any attempts to smuggle contraband into your jail facility or complex using drones?	NO	100	19	15.9%
	YES	4	4	50.0%
Chi-square = 5.85, p = .01				
Do You Often Find Illicit Drugs When You have a Shake-Down in Your Jail?	NO	75	12	13.7
	YES	30	12	28.5
Chi-square = 4.08, p .04				
Do you believe that some inmates may have voluntarily joined (sought out) or may have been recruited into a gang while incarcerated.	NO	45	5	10.0
	YES	57	18	24.0
Chi-square = 3.91, p = .04				

Some other factors that are shown in Table 11 that significantly differentiate whether gang members have been a problem in terms of assaults on jail staff include:

*** believing that gang members have significantly affected the jail environment

- *** whether racial conflicts are a problem among the inmates
- *** whether inmates have used phones/mail to threaten or intimidate witnesses
- *** whether it is common for gang members to be victims of assault in the jail
- *** whether any inmates were members of the MS-13 gang
- *** whether staff had received injuries from inmates in the last year
- *** whether inmate gangs resulted in more improvised weapons production
- *** whether any attempts were made to smuggle in contraband using drones
- *** whether illicit drugs are often found in jail shake-downs
- *** believing that some inmates joined or were recruited into the gang while incarcerated

Higher rates of having gang members being a problem in terms of assaults on staff are associated with these background variables.

Table 12 shows another set of variables that significantly differentiate whether gang members have been a problem in terms of assaults on jail staff. These are ten factors that all relate to gang/STG policies or practices. These gang/STG policy factors include:

- *** whether the jail uses the strategy of isolating leaders to control gangs.
- *** whether the jail uses the strategy of transfers to control gangs.
- *** the view that giving staff recognition to inmate gang leaders is similar to negotiating with terrorists.
- *** the belief their jail lacks enough resources and programs to control the gang problem.
- *** the belief their jail would benefit from a race relations program designed to reduce racial conflicts among inmates.
- *** whether the jail uses the strategy of prosecution to control gangs.
- *** whether the jail uses the strategy of case-by-case dealings to control gangs.
- *** whether the jail uses the strategy of balancing the number of rivals living in the same unit to control gangs.
- *** whether the jail requires the use of a specific definition of a gang or STG.
- *** whether the jail uses the strategy of segregation to control gangs.

Again, these are the factors associated with higher rates of reported assaults on jail staff from gang members. They are all shown in Table 12 to be statistically significant ($p \leq .05$). Knowing these factors helps to understand higher and lower rates of reported assaults on jail staff from gang member inmates.

Table 12: Gang/STG Policy Factors Significantly Differentiating Whether Jails Responding to the 2022 Survey Report Gang Members Have Been a Problem in Terms of Assaults on Staff.

		Have Gang Members Been a Problem in Terms of Assaults on Your Jail Staff?		
		<u>No (N)</u>	<u>Yes (N)</u>	<u>% Yes</u>
Does your facility use the strategy of isolating leaders to control gangs?	NO	89	15	14.4
	YES	12	8	40.0
Chi-square = 7.26, p = .007				
Does your facility use the strategy of transfers to control gangs?	NO	65	8	10.9
	YES	36	15	29.4
Chi-square = 6.76, p = .009				
In your opinion, is giving staff recognition to inmate gang leaders similar to negotiating with terrorists?	NO	62	9	12.6
	YES	34	15	30.6
Chi-square = 5.82, p = .01				
Do you believe your facility has enough resources and programs to control the gang problem?	NO	58	20	25.6
	YES	40	3	6.9
Chi-square = 6.27, p = .01				
Would your jail benefit from working with outside non-profit groups in the implementation of a race relations type of program designed to reduce racial and ethnic conflicts among inmates in your facility?	NO	73	10	12.0
	YES	29	12	29.2
Chi-square = 5.57, p = .01				
Does your facility use the strategy of prosecution to control gangs?	NO	80	13	13.9
	YES	21	10	32.2
Chi-square = 5.14, p = .02				
Does your facility use the strategy of case-by-case dealings to control gangs?	NO	38	3	7.3
	YES	63	20	24.0
Chi-square = 5.11, p = .02				

Table 12 Continued: Gang/STG Policy Factors Significantly Differentiating Whether Jails Responding to the 2022 Survey Report Gang Members Have Been a Problem in Terms of Assaults on Staff.

Does your facility use the strategy of balance the number of rivals living in the same unit to control gangs?	NO	80	13	13.9
	YES	21	10	32.2
Chi-square = 5.14, p = .02				
Does your facility require the use of a specific definition of a gang or security threat group?	NO	95	17	15.1
	YES	11	6	35.2
Chi-square = 4.07, p = .04				
Does your facility use the strategy of segregation to control gangs?	NO	54	7	11.4
	YES	47	16	25.3
Chi-square = 3.97, p = .04				

2. A PRACTICAL ALGORITHM TO PREDICT GANG INMATE ASSAULTS ON JAIL STAFF

Using the variables in Table 11, a statistical procedure called discriminant analysis was undertaken to predict gang inmate assaults on jail staff. The option used was stepwise regression so only three of the variables actually needed to be used. The three variables were: (1) whether gang members had threatened staff in the jail, (2) the belief that inmate gangs have significantly affected the jails correctional climate, and (3) whether there had been any attempts to smuggle contraband into the jail facility or complex using drones.

The discriminant analysis results are reported in Table 13.

Table 13: Discriminant Analysis Results Predicting Gang Inmate Assaults on Jail Staff

		Actual Outcome (N) Gang Inmate Assaults on Jail Staff	
		<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>
Predicted Outcome: Gang Inmate Assaults on Jail Staff	No	89	7
	Yes	18	17
Eigenvalue = .571 Canonical Correlation = .603			

As seen in Table 13, overall we have 80.9 percent of all of the cases correctly classified in terms of statistical prediction and actual outcome. The false negative rate in Table 13 is that 5.3 percent (N = 7) of the cases are predicted to not be gang inmate assaults on staff when in fact they are actually true cases of gang inmates assaulting jail staff. The other type of error that occurs here is the false positive, where we see N = 18 cases in Table 13, or

13.7 percent that were predicted to be gang inmate assaults on staff when in fact they turned out to not be. So this model runs a little hot on being overprotective. But overall, only 5.3 percent of the time would we miss a situation where a gang inmate assaults a jail staff member. This is great news because if we can successfully predict gang violence, well, then in theory it can be prevented.

The eigenvalue statistic is shown to be .57 in Table 13 which is moderately good in the sense that it shows how well the function differentiates the groups. Here we are predicting who would be in the “no” and “yes” groups of whether the jail reports gang inmates assaulting the jail staff. Generally, the larger the eigenvalue the better the function differentiates the groups. If there was a lot of interest in this kind of analysis we believe we could do a lot better if time was spent in model development and further analysis. We may continue, therefore, to do secondary analysis on this data.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In this chapter we have examined bivariate relationships between variables from the jail survey. This included crosstabs, or statistical tables, as well as a discriminant analysis. We have been able to identify some of the stronger variables that significantly differentiate various conditions in the jail. We have also been able to examine how some of these variables correlated with each other in strong and significant ways. We have demonstrated that gang inmate assaults on jail staff can be predicted with high accuracy.

CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is (1) to provide a summary of the major findings from the 2022 survey of jails, (2) provide conclusions, and (3) to provide recommendations with regard to some of these matters.

1. SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS FROM THE 2022 REPORT

The findings from this research on American jails include the following categories: Special Risks to Jail Staff, Inmate Service Issues, Gangs and Related Problems.

JAIL STAFFING:

- * Most (79.1%) do not feel their agency receives adequate funding.
- * On average a 46.7 percent budget increase across the board would be necessary to assure no overcrowding, adequate staff, training and services.
- * Most jails (76.4%) do not offer tuition reimbursement for college classes to jail staff.
- * On average, a jail in America has an assault on staff from an inmate once every three months.
- * Massive support (94.5%) exists to have a national program aimed at helping correctional officers deal with exposure to trauma and stress on the job.

INMATE RIGHTS, REHABILITATION, AND TREATMENT ISSUES:

- * Only 17.8% of the jails allow what are called contact visits.
- * On average an American jail provides 4.6 hours of visiting time each week.
- * An overwhelming majority (94.6%) believe jail correctional officers should be trained

to calm inmates emotional distress.

- * Three fourths (75.9%) believe the Supreme Court has gone too far in ruling in favor of inmate rights.

- * About half (52%) feel society wants to help inmates be rehabilitated.

- * About half (54%) believe electronic monitoring could be more cost-effective than local detention.

- * Some 58% believe rehabilitation is more effective than punishment if the goal is to reduce recidivism.

- * Some 25% of jails allow inmates internet access to respond to emails.

INMATE SERVICES AND PROGRAMS:

- * Only 18.1% of the jails report they have any kind of a jail industry program.

- * Only 8.7% have any full time staff employed as ombudsmen or advocates for inmates.

- * Some 21.1% of the jails use some version of the “post-card only” option for inmate mail.

- * Half of the jails (50.4%) report illiteracy is a problem among inmates.

- * Half of the jails (50%) report they have a GED program for inmates.

- * Most jails (63.8%) do not have a drug treatment program.

- * Two-thirds of the jails in the USA forbid the use of methadone and buprenorphine for inmates with addictions.

- * Some 69.1% of the inmates need drug addiction counseling services.

INMATE PROBLEM AREAS:

- * A third of the jails (33.1%) report they often find illicit drugs when they have a shake down.

- * About half (55.2%) of the jails have seen an increase in the radicalization of inmates during the last year.

- * In most jails (89.1%) it is not permitted for inmates to exchange funds with each other.

THE GANG PROBLEM IN U.S. JAILS TODAY:

* Gang density is the percentage of inmates who are gang members or members of a Security Threat Group (STG). Gang density has been shown to be increasing since the first NGCRC jail survey was undertaken in 1993.

Gang Density Rates in Four Separate NGCRC Jail Surveys

<u>1993</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2022</u>
5.09%	13%	15.5%	20.6%

Gang density rates have steadily increased during the last thirty year time period.

- * Jails report that a severe gang problem exists when gang density is greater than or equal to 19.6 percent. Thus, American jails have now reached that gang density limit level where gang and STG issues represent a severe problem.

- * Most jails (81.4%) take gang membership into account in their inmate classification system.

- * A majority of jails (67.2%) do not train their staff on how to deal with the gang problem.

- * Most jails (73.1%) recognize the potential value of providing professional outside training to their staff on gang/STG issues.

- * The NGCRC provides this kind of outside professional training service but only 6.4% of the jails reported receiving NGCRC gang training.

- * A low percentage (20.3%) of the jails report having inmates who could be considered

military trained gang members.

* Nationwide, some 18.3 percent of the jails report that gang members have been a problem in terms of assaults on their staff.

* Some 46.7 percent of the jails report that gang members have been a problem in terms of threats on their staff.

GANG MANAGEMENT ISSUES:

* 40.5% of jails expressed the belief that negotiating with inmate gang leaders is similar to negotiating with terrorists.

* Almost half (47.6%) think their jail could benefit from working with outside non-profit groups in the implementation of a gang denunciation or gang renunciation program designed to help inmates sever their ties to gang life.

* But it is extremely rare to find a gang exit program in U.S. jails that is designed to help inmates leave the gang (3.1%).

* Half of the jails responding to the 2022 survey (59.5%) do believe that some inmates join a gang for the first time while in jail custody. Inmates can also be “pressured” into joining a gang while in custody, joining less by choice than by compulsion.

* Some 44.5% believe that providing tuition support for staff could help control the inmate gang problem.

* Just under half of all U.S. jails (47.6%) have had inmates who were members of the MS-13 gang.

* When asked what “grade” they would give the federal government for leadership in responding to the national gang problem during the last year, the average score for these jail respondents was that federal officials earned a “D-minus” grade.

GANG IMPACT ON U.S. JAILS:

* It is estimated that 20.1% of all illicit drugs smuggled into jails come from gang members.

* A fourth of U.S. jails (27.2%) report that inmate gangs have tended to result in more improvised weapons production.

* Most jails (84.1%) espouse the belief that gang affiliation tends to increase the probability of inmate recidivism.

* 79% of the U.S. jails expressed the belief that we need tougher laws to control the gang problem among inmates.

* 64.8% of the U.S. jails report that their jail facilities lack the resources and programs needed to control the gang problem.

* 37.1% of the U.S. jails believe inmate gangs have significantly affected their correctional environment.

WITNESS AND VICTIM ISSUES:

* Only 10% report inmates using phones/mail to threaten witnesses is a large problem in their jail.

* Most (79.4%) jails report that gang members are more likely than non-gang members to threaten or intimidate witnesses in their court cases.

* About a third (37.3%) of the jails have special separate housing for inmates who help jail staff with the investigation and prosecution of incidents that occur in the jail.

* Over half of U.S. jails (58.9%) report that it is common for gang members to be the victim of assaults from rival gang members in the jail setting. It is rare for the victims to want to help staff investigate such assaults under the do not snitch doctrine (7.3%).

METHODS USED TO CONTROL GANGS

* About half (52.2%) believe the set-off method (balancing the number of rival gang members in a housing unit) is an effective way to control gangs in a jail.

* The 2022 survey inventoried 15 different popular strategies used to control gangs and the top 5 were:

Five Top Strategies Used by Jails to Control Gangs

<u>Type of Strategy</u>	<u>Percentage Using</u>
Case-by-case dealings	67.2%
Segregation	51.2%
Transfer	40.8%
Lock Downs	40.0%
Interrupting Communications	34.4%

NEW ISSUES FACING JAILS TODAY:

* Only 10.9% of the jails report having inmates who were arrested for organized retail theft where multiple offenders swarm a retail store.

* Among those jails that did have inmates arrested for organized retail theft, about a fourth (27.6%) report that these were gang affiliated offenders.

* About half (52.3%) of the jails report that in the last year they have had inmates who were involved with the Sovereign Citizens, a political extremist movement.

ISSUES IN RACE RELATIONS AMONG INMATES:

* 44.1% of the jails report that white inmates have a separate gang.

* Just under half (47.7%) of U.S. jails report that racial conflicts are a problem among the inmates in their jail.

* About a third of all U.S. jails (32.8%) believe their jail could benefit from working with outside non-profit groups in the implementation of a race relations program designed to reduce racial and ethnic conflicts among jail inmates.

OTHER PROBLEMS IN JAILS TODAY:

* 42.4% of jails report that suicide attempts by inmates is a problem in their facilities.

* 8.6% of jails report that suicide attempts by correctional officers is a problem in their facilities.

* Inmate suicide attempts happen mostly (42.4%) at intake or during pretrial (34.3%).

* Hanging and laceration account for 82.6% of the cases of attempted jail inmate suicide.

* 41.5% of the jails self-report that they are overcrowded.

* It is extremely rare (1.5%) for a firearm to be confiscated from inmates.

* On average a typical jail confiscated 5.1 improvised edged weapons in the last one year period.

* 18.9% report staff seriously injured in the last year from inmate violence.

* Most jails (79.4%) reported no escape attempts during the last one year period.

* Most jails (81.7%) report no incidents of fire-setting by inmates in the last year.

* Some 25.2% of U.S. jails report they have confiscated cell phones from inmates in the last year.

* Only 6.3% of jails report any attempts to smuggle in contraband using drones.

* The top five problems in a ranking of N = 17 different jail problems inventoried in the 2022 jail survey were in rank order of importance: Jail staffing, mental health services, substance abuse issues, inmate re-entry issues, and outdated infrastructure/physical plant

issues.

PREDICTIONS FOR THE FUTURE:

- * Most (73.2%) expect the gang problem in jails to increase in the next few years.
- * Most (76.2%) expect the problem of inmate violence from gang members to increase in the next few years.
- * Most (69.6%) expect the problem of gang members abusing their religious rights to increase in the next few years.
- * Most (66.1%) expect the problem of gang members assaulting correctional officers and staff to increase in the next few years.
- * About half (56.6%) expect the problem of radical militancy from inmates to increase in the next few years.
- * About half (52.4%) expect the problem of civil disorder and violent protests in their jurisdictions to increase in the next few years.

2. CONCLUSIONS

Our primary interest has and continues to center around and focus upon the issue of gangs, gang members, and security threat group (STG) problems as they are experienced in American jails. We began this quest for knowledge with our first national survey of jails in 1993. We have continued, replicated, and expanded our surveys since then, the most recent being this 2022 survey of American jails.

Clearly, the gang problem is a big problem nationally and affects all jails. It is also clear that the gang problem has increased in severity over the last three decades and the conditions today are such that respondents to the present survey expressed a pessimistic doctrine about what to expect in the upcoming years. The general expectation is that things are getting worse. The general belief is they are being expected to deal with a serious problem without help of any kind. And there is little trust in the federal governments role to intervene and be of assistance.

In this 2022 survey of American jails we tried to locate a national source on the scope and extent of program services available to jail inmates. We discovered no such national depository or central clearinghouse exists to provide up-to-date information about these programs and their structure and function over time and their level of effectiveness in serving jail inmates. To a large extent a local sheriff has the primary responsibility to develop and bring in new program services to the local jail. And some sheriff's are more effective than others at identifying and recruiting resources for their local jail.

The men and women who work in our Nation's county jails and detention centers are providing a vital public safety function for our society and it is time that Congress take notice of the special needs for persons who work in corrections - - - including state and federal facilities as well as juvenile facilities and military corrections and lockups in Indian country. Everyday they go to work is a possible day for a gang assault, a gang riot, an attack from gangs or violent extremist groups. It's the roll of the dice whether they make it home from work safely or not. If we want a nation with improvements in justice we need to make improvements in the working conditions that people face when they decide to work in the field of corrections. At a minimum they deserve free mental health services to deal with the trauma and stress they face at their work locations. And they need the federal government to pay for the continuing college courses they may want to take to improve their human skills - - - local county governments and state government funding sources do not exist for this purpose. We need the federal government to take responsibility for this.

New to the 2022 jail survey was a more wider look at what the main problems are in

American jails today. Our analysis was able to track and measure and then rank order the problems reported by American jails today. We have not seen this kind of research finding previously reported in the literature on jails. But it revealed an important truth: gangs and security threat groups (STGs) are certainly a problem in jails, but not the only problem that jails face. When we look at how the gang/STG problem stacks up against other major problems facing American jails we find the gang/STG issue is not at the top of the list. It is in fact towards the bottom of the list because American jails face a wide variety of pressing problems.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

The NGCRC would recommend, first of all, that future research on gangs in jail consider adding a strong component of qualitative staff interviewing such as the method used by Knox (2002) in interviewing prison staff who were gang violence victims in Michigan. This might provide useful additional insight into what has to be a very complicated world — working in the modern American jail environment. What is also striking from the findings of this research is how we can find scant material in the previous literature providing any discussion of the impact of trauma on jail correctional staff. And if there is any single conclusion to be drawn from this research, then it is clearly the issue that not enough is being done about the trauma and violence faced by jail staff, in particular from gangs and gang members and extremist groups.

We would recommend that future jail research also include an analysis of the types of trauma and stress experienced by correctional staff who work in jails. The idea of doing exploratory research on the dimensions of post-traumatic stress in relationship to jail work is justified on the basis of the kinds of routine threats faced in the jail environment: gang disturbances, assaults and attacks from gang and non-gang inmates alike, the constant process of dealing with inmates who seek to manufacture improvised weapons — and use them against other inmates and staff, and of course the never ending risk of those who seek to escape from jails.

The working conditions faced by American jail staff, when viewed in the aggregate, seem to paint a picture that is less than ideal for jail staff recruiting. Let us review some of the research findings from this national jail survey that help us to better understand what people who work in American jails have to look forward to on a daily basis:

*** Most American jails are not accredited by any of the outside professional organizations (American Correctional Association, American Jail Association, and the National Sheriff's Association).

*** Most feel their agency is underfunded.

*** Most are types of employers that do not offer tuition reimbursement.

*** Most of the staff who work in jails are not considered sworn personnel with arrest powers.

We want to add to this point the obvious exacerbation that changes over time in comparing the gang problem in American jails suggests an uptick in severity. What we are seeing over time — as observed in comparing the 1993 results with the 2019 results and these new results from 2022 — is increased gang density, increased threats and assaults, and increased gang threat conditions generally. We are not seeing an abatement of the gang or Security Threat Group (STG) problem in American corrections. It continues to escalate and the prediction is that it will increase in intensity in the future.

It seems reasonable to recommend that future research on jails include new measurements for salary and benefits information, average tenure on the job, and a variety of issues about the occupation of the jail correctional officer. Finally, it is also our view that

county governments with budgetary control over county jails in America need the input from American citizens and criminal justice organizations that jails become a priority for enhanced funding.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thank Vicky Ganieany for all the help with mailing, data entry, transcription, and editing provided during the course of this project. I also want to thank other NGCRC friends and colleagues, specifically Gregg Etter and Robert Mulvaney for sharing information and ideas to help with this project.

REFERENCES

- Alarid, Leanne F. 2000. "Along Racial and Gender Lines: Jail Subcultures in the Midst of Racial Disproportionality", *Corrections Management Quarterly*, Volume 4, Issue 1: pp. 8-19.
- Arizona Department of Corrections. 2004 "S.T.G., Security Threat Groups — Frequently Asked Questions". (See: <http://www.adc.state.az.us/STG/faq.htm>).
- Baird, L.H. 1986 "Prison Gangs: Texas", *Corrections Today* (18)(July): 22.
- Baugh, D.G. 1993 *Gangs in Correctional Facilities: A National Assessment*. April 12, 1993, American Correctional Association, Laurel, MD.
- Blasko, Brandy L.; Elizabeth L. Jeglic; Stanley Malkin. 2008. "Suicide Risk Assessment in Jails", *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice*, Volume 8, Issue 1: pp. 67-76.
- Blazak, Randy. 2002 "American Jihad: Odinism, Prison Gangs and the Threat of Racial Holy War", paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology.
- Bobrowski, Lawrence J. 1988 "Collecting, Organizing and Reporting Street Gang Crime", paper presented at the 40th Annual Meeting of The American Society of Criminology.
- Bonner, Roger H. 2004 "The Brotherhoods: The Rise and Fall of a White-Supremacist Gang Inside a Kansas Prison", chapter 17, pp. 391-406 in *Gang Profiles: An Anthology*, Peotone, IL: New Chicago School Press.
- Bradbury, Shelly. 2019. "Half-Dozen Allegheny County Jail Inmates Involved in Fight", *Pittsburgh Post - Gazette*.
- Butterfield, Fox. 2004 "Inmates Use Smuggled Cellphones to Maintain a Foot on the Outside", *New York Times*, June 21, 2004.
- Camp, George and Camille Graham Camp. 1985 *Prison Gangs: Their Extent, Nature and Impact on Prisons*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Carson, E. Ann. 2021 "Suicide in Local Jails and State and Federal Prisons, 2000 - 2019 - Statistical Tables", U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Charles, Devon R.; Karen M. Abram; Gary M. McClelland; and Linda A. Teplin. 2003. "Suicidal Ideation and Behavior Among Women in Jail", *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, Volume 19, Issue 1, (Feb.): pp. 65-81.
- CNN. 2003 "Police Track White Supremacist Prison Gangs", April 20, 2003. See: <http://www.cnn.com/2003/US/West/04/20/racist.parolees.ap/>
- Corbiscello, G.V. 2004 "A Nation of Gods: The Five Percent Nation of Islam", chapter 8, pp. 183-194 in *Gang Profiles: An Anthology*, Peotone, IL: New Chicago School Press.

- Conrad, J.P. 1979 "Who's in Charge? The Control of Gang Violence in California Prisons", in Corrections Facility Planning Robert Montilla and Nora Marlow (eds.), pp. 135-147, Lexington, Mass: D.C. Heath.
- Cox, V. 1986 "Prison Gangs - Inmates Battle for Control", Corrections Compendium (10)(9)(Apr): 1,6-9.
- CRS, Inc. 1994. "Work in America's Jails: NIJ Provides First National Profile". National Institute of Justice (NIJ). Washington, D.C.
- Daniels, S. 1987 "Prison Gangs: Confronting the Threat", Corrections Today. (29)(2)(Apr): 66,126,162.
- Dodd, David J., and Damon Pearson. 2004 "Black Gods in Red Bank: The Five Percent Nation in Central New Jersey", chapter 9, pp. 195-204 in Gang Profiles: An Anthology, Peotone, IL: New Chicago School Press.
- Earley, Pete. 1992 The Hot House: Life Inside Leavenworth Prison. New York: Bantam.
- Etter, Gregg W., Sr. 2004 "Security Threat Groups: The Threat Posed by White Supremacist Organizations", chapter 16, pp. 367-390 in Gang Profiles: An Anthology, Peotone, IL: New Chicago School Press.
- . 2004 "Skinheads: Manifestations of the Warrior Culture of the New Urban Tribes", chapter 18, pp. 407-420 in Gang Profiles: An Anthology, Peotone, IL: New Chicago School Press.
- Fiscella, Kevin, M.D.; Adrew Moore; Judith Engerman; Sean Meldrum. 2005. "Management of Opiate Detoxification in Jails". Journal of Addictive Diseases. Volume 24, Issue 1: pp. 61-71.
- Fong, Robert S. 1987 A Comparative Study of the Organizational Aspects of Two Texas Prison Gangs: Texas Syndicate and Mexican Mafia. Ph.D. dissertation, Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas.
- 1990 "The Organizational Structure of Prison Gangs: A Texas Case Study", Federal Probation (54)(1)(Mar): 36-43.
- Fong, Robert S. and Salvador Buentello. 1991 "The Management of Prison Gangs: An Empirical Assessment", paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Nashville, Tennessee.
- Fong, Robert S.; Ron Vogel; and Robert Little. 1991 "Behind Prison Walls: Racially Based Gangs and Their Level of Violence", paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Nashville, Tennessee.
- Fox, Kathleen A.; Jodi Lane; and Ronald L. Akers. 2010. "Do Perceptions of Neighborhood Disorganization Predict Crime or Victimization? An Examination of Gang Members Versus Non-Gang Member Jail Inmates". Journal of Criminal Justice. Volume 38. Issue 4. July/August: pp. 720-729.
- Fox, Kathleen A.; Jodi Lane; Ronald L. Akers. 2013. "Understanding Gang Membership and Crime Victimization Among Jail Inmates Testing the Effects of Self-Control", Crime and Delinquency, Volume 59, Issue 5, August: pp. 764-767.
- Gaes, Gerald G; Susan Wallace; Evan Gilman; Jody Klein-Saffran; and Sharon Suppa 2001 "The Influence of Prison Gang Affiliation on Violence and Other Prison Misconduct", Bureau of Prisons, U.S. Dept. Of Justice, Washington, D.C.
- Gaston, A. 1996 "Controlling Gangs Through Teamwork and Technology", Large Jail Network Bulletin, Annual Issue, pp. 7-10.
- Gee, Jeremiah. 2006. "Education in Rural County Jails: Need Versus Opportunity", Journal of Correctional Education, Volume 57, Issue 4 (December): pp. 312-325.
- Geniella, Mike. 2001 "Links Found to Seven Santa Rosa Slayings", The Press Democrat, April 21, 2001, California.

- 2001 "Pelican Bay Inmates Communicated Via Underground Mail", *The Press Democrat*, April 22, 2001.
- Goffman, Erving. 1961. *Asylums*.
- Goodwin, Cory. 1999 *Gangs in Prison: How to Set Up a Security-Threat Group Intelligence Unit*. LRP Publications, Dartnell Corporation, Palm Beach Gardens, FL.
- Gratton, Robert "Huerito". 2003 *The Rise and Fall of the Nuestra Familia*. (See: www.knowgangs.com).
- Griffin, Marie L. 1999. "Influence of Organizational Climate on Detention Officers' Readiness to Use Force in a County Jail". *Criminal Justice Review*. Volume 24, Issue 1. (Spring): pp. 1-26.
- Harris, Kathleen. 2012 "Rise in Prison Gangs Fueling Violence, Drug Trade", *CBS News*, Oct. 24, 2012.
- Haysom, Nicholas. 1981 *Towards an Understanding of Prison Gangs*. Institute of Criminology, University of Cape Town, South Africa.
- Hopper, Columbus B. 1969 *Sex in Prison: The Mississippi Experiment with Conjugal Visiting*. Louisiana State University Press.
- Jacobs, James. 1974 "Street Gangs Behind Bars", *Social Problems* (21)(3): 395-408. 1977 *Stateville*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jacobsen, V. 1992. "Minnesota Jails Continue to "Break Ground" With Inmate Work Programs", *Detention Reporter*, Issue 99 (Jan.): pp. 5-8.
- Kaba, Fatos; Andrea Lewis; Sarah Glowa-Kollisch; James Hadler; David Lee; Howard Alper; Daniel Selling; Ross MacDonald; Angela Solimo; Amanda Parsons; Homer Venters. 2014. "Solitary Confinement and Risk of Self-harm Among Jail Inmates", *American Journal of Public Health*, Volume 104, Issue 3 (March): pp. 442-447.
- Kelley, Debbie. 2020. "PPCC Program Helps El Paso County Jail Inmates Learn to Reinvent Themselves", Feb. 12, 2020, www.gazette.com.
- Knox, George W. 2002. "The Melanics - A Gang Profile Analysis". *Journal of Gang Research*. Volume 9, Number 3, Spring, 2002.
- 2006 *An Introduction to Gangs*. 6th revised and expanded edition. Peotone, IL: New Chicago School Press.
- 2012. "The Problem of Gangs and Security Threat Groups (STG's) in American Prisons and Jails Today: Recent Findings from the 2012 NGCRC National Gang/STG Survey", *Journal of Gang Research*, Volume 20, Issue 1 (Fall): pp. 51-76.
- 2021. "The Proud Boys: A Gang Profile Analysis", pp. 30-56, *Journal of Gang Research*, Volume 29, Number 1, Fall, 2021.
- 2022. "Gang & Security Threat Group Issues in Jails Today", *American Jails*, May/June, pp. 32-36.
- Knox, George W., and Andrew Papachristos. 2002 *Vice Lords: A Gang Profile*. Peotone, IL: New Chicago School Press.
- Knox, George W., and Curtis Robinson. 2004 *Gang Profiles: An Anthology*. Peotone, IL: New Chicago School Press.
- Knox, George W., and Edward Tromanhauser. 1991 "Gangs and Their Control in Adult Correctional Institutions", *The Prison Journal*, (71): 15-22.
- Krajick, K.. 1990 "The Menace of Supergangs", *Corrections Today* (June): 11-14.
- Lane, Michael. 1989 "Inmate Gangs", *Corrections Today* (51)(4)(July): 98-99, 126-128.
- LeDuff, Charlie. 2004 "A Jail Tour in Los Angeles Offers a Peek Into 5 Killings Behind Bars", *New York Times*, May 23, 2004, p. 14.
- Legger, Robert G. 1988 "Perception of Crowding, Racial Antagonism, and Aggression in a Custodial Prison", *Journal of Criminal Justice* (16)(3): 167-181.

- Linhorst, Donald M.; P. Ann Dirks-Linhorst; and Ralph Groom. 2012. "Rearrest and Probation Violation Outcomes Among Probationers Participating in a Jail-Based Substance Abuse Treatment Used as an Intermediate Sanction", *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, Volume 51, Issue 8, (Nov./Dec.): pp. 519-540.
- Lisante, Timothy F.; and Beth Navon. 2000. "New York City Jail-Community Re-Entry Collaboration", *Journal of Correctional Education*, Volume 51, Issue 2 (June): pp. 237-240.
- Lonzo, Gary M. 1994 "Gangs in Prisons and Jails: An AFSCME Resolution", president and delegate, 31st International AFSCME Convention, Resolution No. 65, June 27-July 1, 1994, San Diego, CA (See: <http://www.afscme.org/about/resolute/1994/r31-066.html>).
- Lotter, J.M. 1988 "Prison Gangs in South Africa: A Description", *The South African Journal of Sociology*(19)(2)(May): 67-75.
- Lyman, Michael D. 1989 *Gangland: Drug Trafficking by Organized Criminals*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Magura, Stephen; Joshua D. Lee; Jason Hershberger; Herman Joseph; Lisa Marsch; Carol Shropshire; and Andrew Rosenblum. 2009. "Buprenorphine and Methadone Maintenance in Jail and Post-Release: A Randomized Clinical Trial". *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. Volume 99, Issue 1-3 (Jan.): pp. 222-230.
- Martinez, Pila. 1999 "Novel Attempt to Curb Prison Gang Violence", *Christian Science Monitor*, July 21, 1999.
- May, David C.; Kevin I. Minor; Peter B. Wood; Jennifer L. Mooney. 2004. "Kentucky Probationers' and Parolees' Perceptions of the Severity of Prison Versus County Jail and Probation". *Kentucky Justice and Safety Research Bulletin*. Volume 6, Issue 4 (Winter): pp. 1-11.
- Miller, Lisa. 1999 "Inside the Competitive New World of Prison Ministries", *The Wall Street Journal*, September 7, 1999, p. B1.
- Miller, Rod; and Joseph Trevathan. 2003. "Productive Jails Benefit Many". *Corrections Today*. (April): pp. 96-98.
- Minton, Todd B. 2014. "Jails in Indian Country 2013". Bureau of Justice Statistics. Office of Justice Programs. U.S. Department of Justice.
- Minton, Todd B., and Zhen Zeng. 2021. "Jail Inmates in 2020 - Statistical Tables". Bureau of Justice Statistics. U.S. Department of Justice.
- Mumola, Christopher J. 2005. "Suicide and Homicide in State Prisons and Local Jails", Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Reports, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.
- Nadel, B.A. 1997. "Slashing Gang Violence, Not Victims: New York City Department of Corrections Reduces Violent Jail Incidents Through Computerized Gang Tracking Data Base", *Corrections Compendium*, Volume 22, Issue 10 (October): pp. 20-22.
- NDIC. 2003 Rhode Island Drug Threat Assessment. July. National Drug Intelligence Center. <http://www.usdoj.gov/ndic/pubs3/3979/overview.htm>
- Nelson, Signe; and Lynn Olcott. 2006. "Jail Time is Learning Time". *Corrections Today*, Volume 58, Issue 1 (February): pp. 26, 27-37.
- Perroncello, Peter E. 2000. "Do You Know Who Really Visits Your Jail?", *American Jails*, Volume 14, Issue 5 (Nov./Dec.): pp. 19-21.
- Pfeifer, Paul E. 2002 "The Lucasville Prison Riot", Justice Paul E. Pfeifer's Weekly Column, July 31, 2002, Supreme Court, State of Ohio.
- Proctor, Steven L.; Norman G. Hoffman; and Steve Allison. 2012. "Effectiveness of Interactive Journaling in Reducing Recidivism Among Substance Dependent Jail

- Inmates". *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. Volume 56, Issue 2. (April): pp. 317-332.
- Quirk, Thom; and Rod Miller. 2002. *Business Planning Guide for Jail Industries*. Community Resource Services, Inc.
- Ralph, Paige H.; James W. Marquart; and Ben M. Crouch
1990 "Prisoner Gangs in Texas", paper presented at the 1990 Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Baltimore, MD.
- Riggs, Robert. 2004 "State Offers Way Out for Violent Prison Gang Members", CBS-11 News, July 26, 2004. (See: http://cbs11tv.com/investigations/local_story_208180734.html).
- Ruddell, Rick; Scott H. Decker; and Arlen Egley Jr. 2006. *Gang Interventions in Jails: A National Analysis*. *Criminal Justice Review*. Volume 31, Issue 1 (March): pp. 33-46.
- Sakala, Leah. 2013. "Return to Sender: Postcard-Only Mail Policies in Jail", Prison Policy Initiative, Northampton, MA.
- Sandoval, Edgar; Tariro Mzezewa; and Christine Hauser. 2021. "Jail Officer Who Led Others to Safety Is Among th 74 Killed in Tornadoes". *New York Times*. Dec. 13, 2021.
- Schwartzapfel, Beth. 2019. "When Going to Jail Means Giving Up the Meds That Saved Your Life". Accessed Sept. 24, 2019 at: www.themrshallproject.org
- Shaw, Donita Massengill; and Margaret A. Berg. 2009. "Jail Participants Actively Study Words". *Journal of Correctional Education*. Volume 60, Issue 2 (June): pp. 100-119.
- Smith, L.G. and M. Silverman. 1994. "Functional Literacy Education for Jail Inmates: An Examination of the Hillsborough County Jail Education Program", *Prison Journal*, Volume 74, Issue 4, (Dec.): pp. 414-432.
- Stinchcomb, Jeanne B.; Susan W. McCampbell. 2008. "American Jails: Raising the Research Profile". *Corrections Today*. Volume 70, Issue 1 (Feb.): pp. 72-74.
- Stone, Sandra S. 2000 *Contemporary Gang Issues: An Insides View*. Peotone, IL: New Chicago School Press.
- Sturges, Judith E. 2002. "Visitation at County Jails: Potential Policy Implications", *Criminal Justice Policy Review*. Volume 13, Issue 1 (March): pp. 32-45.
- Sturges, Judith E. 2005. "Survey of Pennsylvania Jail Wardens: An Examination of Visitation Policies Within the Context of Ecosystem Theory". *Criminal Justice Review*. Volume 30, Issue 2 (Sept.): pp. 141-154.
- Swager, Brent. 2000. "Visitorless Jails: Our Future is Arriving", *Corrections Technology and Management*, Volume 4, Issue 1 (Jan./Feb.): pp. 26-29.
- Tartaro, Christine. 2003. "Suicide and the Jail Environment: An Evaluation of Three Types of Institutions". *Environment & Behavior*. Volume 35, Issue 5. (Sept.): pp. 605-620.
- Tartaro, Christine; and Marissa P. Levy. 2008. "Predictors of Suicide in New Generation Jails", *Justice Research and Policy*, Volume 10, Issue 1: pp. 21-37.
- Tewksbury, R. 1994. "Literacy Programming for Jail Inmates: Reflections and Recommendations From One Program", *Prison Journal*, Volume 74, Issue 4 (December): pp. 398-413.
- Thompson, Don. 2004(a) "U.S. Attorney Says No Abuses After 2002 Folsom Prison Riot", *Associated Press*, June 17, 2004.
- Thompson, Ginger. 2004(b) "Shuttling Between Nations, Latino Gangs Confound the Law", *New York Times*, p. 1, 14-15.
- Toller, W., and B. Tsagaris. 1996 "Managing Institutional Gangs: A Practical Approach Combining Security and Human Services", *Corrections Today* (58): 100-111.
- Trevathan, Joseph T. 2000. "Jail Industries: Real Work, Real Value", *Sheriff*, Volume 52,

- Issue 6 (Nov./Dec.): pp. 10-12.
- Trout, Gregory C.. 2004 "DRC Wins Major Victory: Sixth Circuit Strikes Down the Portion of the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act (RLUIPA) That Applies to Inmates", *The Docket*, Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction.
- Turley, Alan; Tim Thornton; Craig Johnson; and Sue Azzolino. 2004. "Jail Drug and Alcohol Treatment Program Reduces Recidivism in Nonviolent Offenders: A Longitudinal Study of Monroe County, New York's Jail Treatment Drug and Alcohol Program". *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. Volume 48, Issue 6. (Dec.): pp. 721-728.
- U.S. Department of Justice. 2021. Press Release dated Nov. 10, 2021, "Former Corrections Officer Sentenced to Prison for Role in Bribery Conspiracy Involving Contraband Cellphones Smuggled into the Indiana County Jail". <https://www.justice.gov/usao-wdpa/pr/former-corrections-officer-sentenced-prison-role-bribery-conspiracy-involving>
- U.S. Marshals Service. 2012. "Basics and Beyond: Suicide Prevention in Jails". U.S. Marshals Service, Washington, DC.
- Washington Post. 2012 "Mexican Officials Negotiating With Vigilantes Who Seized Control of Town After Killing by Gang", *The Americas*, November 2, 2012.
- Wilkinson, Reginald A., and Tessa Unwin. 1999 "Intolerance in Prison: A Recipe for Disaster", *Corrections Today*, June, 1999.
- Winter, Melinda M. 2000. "County Jail Suicides in a Midwestern State: A Description of the "Typical" Suicidal Act from 1980 through mid-1998", *Corrections Compendium*, Volume 25, Issue 1 (January): pp. 8-23.
- . 2003. "County Jail Suicides in a Midwestern State: Moving Beyond the Use of Profiles", *The Prison Journal*, Volume 83, Issue 2. (June): pp. 130-148.
- [www.tackleose.state.tx](http://www.tackleose.state.tx.us/Guidlines/HTML/1007/22.%20Disruptive%20Groups.html) 2004 "Disruptive Groups". See: [http://www.tcleose.state.tx.us/Guidlines/HTML/1007/22.%20Disruptive@20Groups.html](http://www.tcleose.state.tx.us/Guidlines/HTML/1007/22.%20Disruptive%20Groups.html)
- Yancey, George A. 1996 *Beyond Black and White: Reflections on Racial Reconciliation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.

Appendix A: Copy of the Survey Instrument

The 2022 NGCRC Jail Survey

1. Do you believe illiteracy is a problem among the offenders in your facility? ___Yes ___No
2. Do you feel your agency receives adequate funding? ___Yes ___No
3. What percentage increase in your budget would be necessary to assure no overcrowding, adequate staff, training, and services? _____% increase in current budget
4. Among staff who know about gang members, what is the current estimate of what percentage gang members are of the total inmate population? _____% of the males _____% of the females
5. Do your jail and detention staff receive formalized training in dealing with the gang problem? ___Yes ___No
If YES, how many hours is the gang training session? _____hours
6. In your opinion, could your staff benefit from professional outside training dealing with gangs?
___Yes ___No
7. Have any of your county sheriff or jail staff ever attended one of the annual Gang Training Conferences sponsored by the National Gang Crime Research Center in Chicago? ___Yes ___No
8. Have gang members been a problem in terms of assaults on your staff? ___Yes ___No
THREATS ON STAFF? ___Yes ___No
9. Are racial conflicts a problem among the offenders in your facility? ___Yes ___No
9. Do white inmates have a separate gang? ___Yes ___No
If yes, what is it called? _____
10. In the last one year time period, how would you rate the problem of inmates using phones, mail and other forms of communications to threaten or intimidate witnesses?
___Not a problem ___Small problem ___Large Problem
11. In your opinion, is giving staff recognition to inmate gang leaders similar to negotiating with terrorists? ___Yes ___No
12. What are the names of the top three major gangs that are represented among inmates in your facility?
1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____
13. Does your facility have a drug treatment program? ___Yes ___No
14. Does your facility require the use of a specific definition of a gang or security threat group? ___Yes ___No
(if yes, what is the definition of gang or STG in use at your facility, feel free to attach supplemental documents)

15. Please rate the effectiveness of your drug treatment program (circle one number).
NOT 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 HIGHLY _____Not applicable
EFFECTIVE EFFECTIVE (we don't have such a program)
16. Do you often find illicit drugs when you have a shake-down in your facility? ___Yes ___No
17. Please estimate the total number of assaults by inmates against your correctional personnel in the last twelve months. _____inmate assaults on staff
18. Were any firearms confiscated from inmates or secure areas within the last twelve months?
___Yes ___No
19. Please estimate how many edged weapons were confiscated from inmate shakedown within the last twelve months. _____
20. How many assaults were committed with edged weapons among inmates within the last twelve months? _____

21. Are gang members generally more likely or less likely than non-gang members to attempt to threaten or intimidate witnesses in their court cases? More likely Less likely
22. How many assaults on staff were committed with weapons of any kind by inmates within the last twelve months? _____
23. Have any of your staff received serious injuries from attacks or confrontations with inmates within the last twelve months? Yes No
24. Do your correctional officers receive ongoing in-service training? Yes No
IF YES, how many hours per month _____ Hours
25. How many escape attempts occurred at your facility within the last twelve months? _____
26. How many incidents of fire-setting occurred within your facility during the last twelve months? _____
27. Please estimate how many incidents of illicit drug seizures occurred within your facility during the last twelve months? _____
28. How many lock-downs occurred at your facility during the last twelve months? _____
29. Has your facility confiscated any cell phones in the past year? Yes No #Seized _____
30. Do you believe correctional officers who work in the jail should be trained to calm inmates' emotional distress? Yes No
31. Which inmates are more likely to attempt suicide in your facility? Males Females
32. What is the highest risk period for jail suicide attempts?
 Intake Pretrial During trial Before Sentencing After sentencing
33. Which is the single most common method of suicide attempts in your facility's history.
 Lacerations Inserting head into toilet Hanging/suffocation Chemical Poisoning
 Other self-inflicted trauma
34. A. Have you had inmates who are military-trained gang members? Yes No
B. Have you had inmates in the last year who were arrested for organized retail theft (e.g., retail theft in a group or crew, where multiple offenders "swarm" a retail store)? Yes No
If "yes", were the persons arrested generally gang members or associate members or affiliated in some way with a gang? Yes No
35. Do Islamic inmates have a separate gang? Yes No
If yes, what is it called? _____
36. Do your correctional officers receive tuition reimbursement for college classes? Yes No
37. In the last year, has your jail held any inmates who were associated with the Sovereign Citizen's Movement? Yes No
38. Do you believe that gang affiliation tends to increase recidivism? Yes No
39. Are private contact visits allowed for spouses under special arrangements for deserving inmates? Yes No
40. Are contact visits allowed for inmates in your facility? Yes No
41. What is the maximum number of visiting hours an inmate can receive on a weekly basis in your facility? _____ Hours per week
42. In what year did gang problems among inmates first become recognized in your facility? 19 _____ or 20 _____
43. Do you feel society wants to help inmates be rehabilitated? Yes No
44. In your view, could conjugal visiting be used as a reward to control gang problems in jail? Yes No

45. Is it common for gang members to be the victim of assaults from rival gang members in the jail setting?
 Yes No
46. If an inmate is a gang member and is assaulted by rival gang members, please estimate what percentage of the cases generally will volunteer to help jail staff with the investigation and prosecution of the assault incident?
 ___%
47. Does your facility have special separate housing for inmates who help jail staff with the investigation and prosecution of incidents that occur inside the jail? Yes No
 If Yes, what is the name of the special housing unit: _____
48. In your opinion, have inmate gangs tended to result in more improvised weapons production (e.g., shanks, etc) among inmates in your facility? Yes No
49. Do you feel we need tougher laws to control the gang problem among inmates? Yes No
50. What are the names of the top two motorcycle gangs in your jurisdiction or area?
 1. _____
 2. _____
51. Do you believe your facility has enough resources and programs to control the gang problem? Yes No
52. Would your jail benefit from working with outside non-profit groups in the implementation of a gang denunciation or renunciation type of program designed to have the inmates sever ties to gang life? Yes No
54. Some correctional facilities seek to control gangs by the "set off" method. It involves "balancing the number of rival gang members" in a living unit/cellhouse/etc. In your opinion, is this an effective way to control inmate gangs? Yes No
- 55a. What is the total inmate population (count) for your facility as of today? _____
 55b. What is your facilities' rated capacity for inmates _____
56. What level of security is your facility? (Check all that apply)
 Minimum security Medium security High security
57. Do inmates have access to computers or the internet to access their email? Yes No
58. Do you believe that providing tuition support for staff could help control the inmate gang problem? Yes No
59. In what year was your physical plant first constructed? _____
60. Have you ever identified any of your inmates as being a member of the MS-13 gang? Yes No
61. Does your jail have any kind of jail industry program? (A jail industry is "any activity that rewards inmates with pay, privileges, or other benefits to create a product or service having value for a public or private client").
 Yes No
62. Does your facility have any full-time staff employed as ombudsmen or advocates for inmates?
 Yes No
63. What are the names of the top two white racist extremist gangs or groups in your area?
 1. _____
 2. _____
64. Estimate what percentage of your inmate population need drug addiction counseling services.
 ___%
65. Would your jail benefit from working with outside non-profit groups in the implementation of a race relations type of program designed to reduce racial and ethnic conflicts among inmates in your facility? Yes No
66. Does your classification system take gang membership into account? Yes No
67. Generally, is overcrowding a problem in your facility? Yes No

68. Does your jail have a GED program for inmates? Yes No
69. What strategies does your facility use to control gangs? (check all those that apply)
 transfers Use of informers Segregation Isolating leaders lockdown
 prosecution interrupting communications case by case dealings ignoring their existence
 infiltration displacing members to different facilities coopting of prisoners to control gangs
 meeting with gang leaders on "as needed" basis joint meetings between various gang leaders balance the
 number of rivals living in the same unit
 other: _____
70. How many felony crimes committed by inmates in your facility were court prosecuted during the last year?

71. Does your jail provide a website available to the general public to view the pictures and arrest
 information on inmates detained in your jail? Yes No
72. In your estimate, how many felony crimes committed by inmates in your facility COULD HAVE
 LEGALLY BEEN PROSECUTED UNDER STATUTE during the last year? _____
73. In your opinion, which of the following correctional goals/philosophies is most effective in reducing
 recidivism (Check one only): Punishment Rehabilitation
74. A. Does your jail use some version of the "postcard-only" option (in your jail, is incoming or outgoing mail
 to inmates limited to post-cards and not letters with envelopes)? Yes No
 B. Have there been any attempts to smuggle contraband into your jail facility or complex using drones?
 Yes No
75. Our jail forbids methadone (and a newer addiction medication - buprenorphine) for inmates even when
 legitimately prescribed, on the grounds that these drugs pose safety and security concerns. True False
76. What is the MOST INNOVATIVE way you have ever heard of for controlling gang activity in jail?

77. Do you believe that the inmate gangs have significantly affected your correctional environment? Yes
 No
78. What is your total inmate count as of today? _____ male inmates _____ female inmates
79. What is the age range of the inmates in your facility today. Youngest is _____ years old Oldest is _____ years
 old
80. Have you read 1993 NGCRC gang research on American jails or other on-line reports or periodicals about
 gangs from the NGCRC? Yes No
81. Have you read the 2019 NGCRC gang research report on American jails? Yes No
82. Has your facility been able to make use of any of the research reports about gangs available from the National
 Institute of Justice? Yes No
83. Has your facility ever received the free newspaper publication from the NGCRC called "*The Gang
 Specialist*". Yes No
84. In your opinion, what percentage of all illicit drugs are brought into your facility by inmate gang members?
 _____%
85. Do you believe electronic monitoring could be more cost-effective than local detention while awaiting trial?
 Yes No
86. A. Do you feel it would be useful to have a national program aimed at helping correctional officers deal with
 exposure to trauma and stress on the job? Yes No
 B. Are suicide attempts by inmates a problem in your facility? Yes No
 C. Are suicide attempts by correctional officers a problem in your facility? Yes No
87. Do you have inmates in your facility whose crimes involved the use of remote control drones? Yes
 No
88. Do you allow inmates to exchanges funds with each other? Yes No
89. Do you believe that some inmates may have voluntarily joined (sought out) or may have been recruited into
 a gang while incarcerated. Yes No
90. Does your facility have a "gang renouncement" or gang renunciation program or any program designed to
 help inmates get out of gang life? Yes No
 If Yes, what is the name of the program: _____
91. Have you seen an increase or decrease in the radicalization of the inmates in your facility during the last year?
 Increase Decrease
92. The "threshold" or density of gang inmates refers to the percentage of the inmate population who are gang
 members. At what percentage of the inmate population (% who are members of gangs or STGs) would you feel
 that a severe gang problem exists? _____%
93. What grade would you give the federal government for leadership in responding to the gang problem in
 America during the last year? A B C D F
94. In your opinion, do you expect the gang problem in jails to increase or decrease in the next few years, or do
 you think the problem will remain at the same level it is now?
 Increase Decrease Remain at same level
95. In your opinion, do you expect the problem of inmate violence from gang members to increase or decrease
 in the next few years, or do you think the problem will remain at the same level it is now?
 Increase Decrease Remain at same level

___Increase ___Decrease ___Remain at same level
 96. In your opinion, do you expect the problem of gang members abusing their religious rights to increase or decrease in the next few years, or do you think the problem will remain at the same level it is now?

___Increase ___Decrease ___Remain at same level
 97. In your opinion, do you expect the problem of gang members assaulting correctional officers and staff to increase or decrease in the next few years, or do you think the problem will remain at the same level it is now?

___Increase ___Decrease ___Remain at same level
 98. In your opinion, do you expect the problem of radical militancy among inmates to increase or decrease in the next few years, or do you think the problem will remain at the same level it is now?

___Increase ___Decrease ___Remain at same level
 99. In your opinion, do you expect the problem of civil disorder and violent protests in your jurisdiction to increase or decrease in the next few years, or do you think the problem will remain at the same level it is now?

___Increase ___Decrease ___Remain at same level
 100. Please give each of these problems below (“A” thru “N”) a rating between a low score of zero (0) for “not a problem” to a high of ten (10) for “major problem”.

A. Inmate overcrowding issues.
 Not a problem Major Problem
 ___0 ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 ___8 ___9 ___10

B. Mental health service issues.
 Not a problem Major Problem
 ___0 ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 ___8 ___9 ___10

C. Deaths inside the jail.
 Not a problem Major Problem
 ___0 ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 ___8 ___9 ___10

D. Prisoners Rights Issues.
 Not a problem Major Problem
 ___0 ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 ___8 ___9 ___10

E. Special Needs (Diet, medication, etc) of some inmates
 Not a problem Major Problem
 ___0 ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 ___8 ___9 ___10

F. Dealing With the Elderly and Infirm Inmates
 Not a problem Major Problem
 ___0 ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 ___8 ___9 ___10

G. Outdated Infrastructure/Physical Plant Issues
 Not a problem Major Problem
 ___0 ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 ___8 ___9 ___10

H. Gang Fights/Gang Disturbances
 Not a problem Major Problem
 ___0 ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 ___8 ___9 ___10

I. Suicide Issues Among Inmates.
 Not a problem Major Problem
 ___0 ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 ___8 ___9 ___10

J. Suicide Issues Among Staff.
 Not a problem Major Problem
 ___0 ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 ___8 ___9 ___10

J. Recruiting, Keeping and Retaining Line Staff.
 Not a problem Major Problem
 ___0 ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 ___8 ___9 ___10

K. Substance Abuse Issues.
 Not a problem Major Problem
 ___0 ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 ___8 ___9 ___10

L. Outdated/Worn/Defective Locking Mechanisms: inmates reported “jimmying their own cells open”
 Not a problem Major Problem
 ___0 ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 ___8 ___9 ___10

M. Racial Conflicts / Racial Disturbance / Race Relations Issues
 Not a problem Major Problem
 ___0 ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 ___8 ___9 ___10

N. Inmate Re-Entry Issues.
 Not a problem Major Problem
 ___0 ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 ___8 ___9 ___10

O. Inmate Illiteracy Issues.
 Not a problem Major Problem
 ___0 ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 ___8 ___9 ___10

P. Inmates Reporting Sexual Assaults.
 Not a problem Major Problem
 ___0 ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 ___8 ___9 ___10