

">

GANGS AND GUNS:

A TASK FORCE REPORT FROM THE

National Gang Crime Research Center

CO-PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS:

George W. Knox, Ph.D., Director,

National Gang Crime Research Center

James G. Houston, Ph.D., Department

of Criminal Justice, St. Ambrose University, Davenport, Iowa.

John A. Laskey, M.A., professor of
Criminal Justice, Morton College.

Thomas F. McCurrie, M.S.,
Managing Editor of Journal of Gang
Research; adjunct faculty, Dept. of
Criminal Justice, Chicago State
University.

Edward D. Tromanhauser, Ph.D.,
Chairman, Dept. of Criminal Justice,
Chicago State University.

COPYRIGHT 2001: National Gang Crime Research Center.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

of the Gangs and Guns Task Force Research Report

Six gang researchers at three universities collaborated to carry out an extensive study of gangs and guns in the midwest involving 1,206 survey respondents which included 505 gang members. Four social contexts were used for the survey: eight county jails from the farmland to the urban central area (891 inmates), matched pair design samples from a Chicago public high school and an inner city program, and a sample of gang members in a private suburban probation program.

I. The jail study showed:

*** Gang problems in the midwest show a large "ripple effect" where many variables show the consistent effect of increasing in magnitude the closer one is to the urban central area, and decreasing in severity through the outlying areas and heartland to its lowest level in the farmland areas.

*** Gang membership is a variable that significantly differentiates many variables about firearms, violence, behaviors and beliefs.

*** Gang membership can be predicted with 81 percent accuracy using discriminant analysis.

*** Gang density, that is the percentage of inmates who are gang members, using a more restrictive definition of gangs, showed percentages two to ten times higher than the parameter estimated in a recent federal national assessment of gangs in corrections.

II. The high school study showed:

*** Some 87 gang members were matched with 87 demographically identical non-gang members.

*** These are essentially the same gangs represented in other social contexts studied.

*** The gang member profile is similar to that found in other social contexts.

III. The probation program study showed:

*** Some 69 gang members in a suburban-based probation had much the same "gang profile" as elsewhere, but with some new important twists.

*** Fewer suburban gang members originally joined the gang primarily "to make money", but did so mostly for essentially social rather than economic reasons. They are atypical in this regard compared to the jail inmate gang member.

IV. The inner city program study showed:

*** Some 36 gang members were matched with 36 demographically identical non-gang members.

*** The gang member profile is comparable to that found in other social contexts.

V. A Combined Analysis of Gang Members in All Contexts showed:

*** There is no difference on most variables when comparing "Peoples" and "Folks" gang members. That is, on most human traits they are the same thing differing only symbolically, not objectively.

*** There is little difference in the basic gang member profile about guns and violence across social contexts. Gang members show the higher risk profile regardless of social context.

*** A gang risk continuum exists showing a consistent violence escalation effect from the lowest level of risk (non-gang member with no gang friends) to the highest level (active gang member).

*** An analysis of factors associated with gang members who attempt to leave the gang was made. This showed, generally, a hardening effect; where the gang member who has never attempted to quit the gang appears to have a higher commitment to the gang, and is consistently more 'hard core' in regard to findings about gun crimes and gun violence.

VI. Conclusions include the following:

*** It is possible to profile individual gangs by threat analysis. For example, weapons access, acquisition, and usage patterns, level of violence threat (i.e., police shoot-outs), and related variables of interest. But research on a larger scale would have to be done to ensure specific gang identity sample development. The ideal design would ensure at least 100 members of each gang organization of interest.

*** The research findings reported here about gang density demand a serious national assessment of gangs in corrections be undertaken, because a recent federal report is believed to grossly underestimate the problem to the point of mathematical fantasy.

Acknowledgements

We are indebted to a large number of individuals and agencies that helped this research project come to fruition.

We gratefully acknowledge the cooperation of eight county jails for purposes of data collection. We thank the eight sheriff's of these respective counties, and the correctional officers and other staff at these eight jails who assisted us. We did promise full anonymity to the jails if they wanted it, so at this time all we are permitted to say is they exist in Illinois and Iowa.

A probation supervision program allowed us access to a sample of non-incarcerated gang members, and for this we are exceedingly thankful for the assistance of Charla Waxman.

We thank, as well, a high school principal who allowed us to collect a sample from the general student population for the research reported here. The identity of this school must remain anonymous because it is the site of an ongoing research about the impact of gang problems in public schools. Suffice it to say we are very grateful to the administrators and teachers involved.

We are also grateful for the access to three community based social service programs for a sample provided by Reginald King, a graduate student in the Department of Criminal Justice at Chicago State University. We especially thank Beverly Hicks at Chicago State University's Department of Criminal Justice for laboring on this project.

We gratefully acknowledge the help of several research assistants who are Chicago State University criminal justice students for their help in the Chicago area: Dawn Collins, Mary Chambers, Kelly Gandy, and Kendra Evans. We are also thankful for the assistance from the clerical staff of the National Gang Crime Research Center. Finally, we want to thank over a thousand respondents that participated in this survey research. We thank the 505 gang members who completed the survey, and a larger number of non-gang members, for their time and input to this analysis.

GANGS AND GUNS:

A Task Force Report

from the

NATIONAL GANG CRIME RESEARCH CENTER

INTRODUCTION

The issue of "gangs and guns" is one of the more interesting criminological topics and is one of the least researched issues today. This is true in spite of, (1) the enormous social policy implications surrounding the use of firearms by gang members and the devastating consequences in terms of human violence, (2) in spite of the good intentions of federal agencies whose duty it is to promote useful knowledge in this area, and (3) in spite of the fact that this is an enduring issue that is gaining increased salience and public attention.

Empirical research on the relationship between gangs and guns is woefully lacking. Some rather simple questions beg the attention of criminologists and policy makers alike: do gang members represent a significantly higher threat when it comes to armed violence in America when compared to other offenders or the general public? Do gang members really have better access to firearms, including military weapons and explosive devices, and do they really

use such weapons in committing crimes? Do gang members pose a more serious threat of violence in terms of shoot-outs with police? Where is the evidence --- we must ask --- for those most inclined by either academic theory or practitioner insight to claim that gang members seek out weapons more than others, use weapons more than others, and use more deadlier weapons than non-gang members in the United States? Further, we ask for empirical evidence from serious research on the issue, not simply casual answers from a cursory understanding of the complexity of the modern day gang problem.

In spite of millions of dollars spent by government agencies on gang intervention and prevention service programs, no such program that works has yet surfaced in the literature. In addition, little useful knowledge on the issue of gangs and guns has been added to the literature from this source.

The research reported here seeks empirical answers to some of these questions about gangs and guns.

REVIEW OF THE PREVIOUS LITERATURE

The first known document having relevance to gangs and guns is a military report on the long campaign by the British Army to suppress the Budhuk gangs in India (Sleeman, 1849). The robber gangs of India operated much like a guerilla army. These gangs were effectively outfitted through the open and underground market with nearly the same quality of weapons used by the British Army itself. The only weapon that proved effective against the Budhuk gangs that the gangs did not possess was artillery. The strategy that proved most effective in gang suppression according to Sleeman (1849) was intelligence and housing gang inmates in terms of their level of threat.

In the American literature, clearly the parallel to Sleeman is found in Green (1847), which showed that firearms played a significant role in the criminal operations of early American gang. We call any group whose members knowingly benefit from crime a gang. Hate groups are also considered gangs here, because it does not matter if the offense is an income producing crime, it can be a political or ideological crime. Some commentators on the gang problem in America and elsewhere claim much confusion about what a "gang" means. From our point of view, it is sufficient to know that crime is involved in a group or organizational context, be it informal or formal in structure and function. Some would include deviance as a condition defining a gang. Some would be so generalized to define any youth group that is not adult supervised by formal social control agencies as a gang.

The controversy over "what is a gang" is not ours, as we are content with the definition already advanced. Further it is a moot issue, as the kinds of gangs we are examining are those who pose a danger genuine enough to evoke strong penal sanctions from the systems of formal social controls in our society. Many are gangs who do not want to be called "gangs", they want to be called organizations and nations. They have proliferated throughout the United States and their identities are no secret to criminal justice agencies or the general public: Gangster Disciples, Vice Lords, Latin Kings, Aryan Brotherhood, Aryan Nation, etc. Further, these are for the most part highly structured gangs, most of which have written constitutions and a formalized infrastructure (Knox, 1993).

The issue of weapon access is given little attention in the recent NIJ document on gangs and simply cites Spergel for issues of gang homicides. It concludes, without any data, but rather on the basis of impressions, that gangs have more weapons and may have a higher propensity to use deadly weapons. It does cite a school study to the effect that gang members were nearly three times as likely than non-gang members to say firearm access was "easy" (Callahan and Rivara, 1992). Its conclusion is that they are uncertain that gangs today have greater access to guns, it only appears they are more willing to use them. This is based on comments from one prosecutor in one major urban jurisdiction.

The participant observation study by Hagedorn and former gang member Perry Macon gave the estimate that about one half of African-American gang members in Milwaukee reported having one or more guns, never purchased legally, more often than not from the underground or stolen (Hagedorn and Macon, 1988: p.144).

The small quantitative study of gang members in Detroit revealed similarly that most gang members have a gun in their home (Taylor, 1990: p. 130), regardless of the level of gang sophistication. Oral history research on imprisoned gang leaders has recently revealed the interesting and believable story of how in Illinois one such leader routinely carried a fully loaded .25 caliber semi-automatic as an inmate in the Illinois Department of Corrections. Such anecdotal evidence can also be easily found through newspaper coverage of gangs and gang members.

Jankowski (1991: p. 121) provides a paragraph on how the theft and resale of guns is a component of gang business. No statistics are provided, but it is claimed that gangs do have access to fully automatic weapons and routinely buy and sell other guns including sawed off shotguns.

Short and Strodbeck (1965: p. 257) commented to the effect that firearms are status symbols in the gang subculture. We know from a small survey of Illinois National Guardsmen that 9.2 percent report having been at one time approached by a gang member who wanted to acquire military weapons or ordnance (e.g., grenades, etc).

Student survey research on gang problems in schools reveals that gang members are significantly more likely than non-gang members in the public high school population to report carrying a concealed gun for purposes of protection (Knox, Laske, and Tromanhauser, 1992: p. 56).

Some of the most direct empirical evidence on the relationship between gangs and guns to date comes from the research by Sheley and Wright (1993, p. 9). Generally, it found greater rates of possessing and carrying firearms among gang members than among non-gang members using confined juvenile and high school juvenile samples. Sanders analyzed police reports in San Diego, concluding that gun use in gang incidents had increased over time in the 1980s (1994: pp. 56-57).

This brief look at the literature summarizes the overlap between the topics of gangs and guns. Obviously there is a paucity of research material on the subject. We come to a rather sad realization regarding the issue of gangs and guns. It is the notion that so much attention and discussion is given to this relationship, and it is felt by all to be a problem, but few researchers have advanced much generalizable knowledge about the issue. It is in this sense that about a year ago the plan was made to create a small task force to carry out a research project on gangs and guns and present the findings to the criminological community and others interested in the relationship between gangs and guns. This report, providing data collected from a number of different social contexts (jails, high school, juvenile probation) is a result of that plan.

THE TASK FORCE APPROACH

Developing their own unique research agendas and hypotheses to be tested the researchers associated with this project collectively agreed that similar data would to be collected on gang members found in different social contexts. Sharing in costs, and labor, the researchers helped to identify sites for data collection.

At a very early point all researchers submitted their contributions to the item pool that would be used to develop the common survey instrument. There was some overlap and redundancy, but overall the researchers had entirely different interests. Therefore the hypotheses they would test with the data were diverse in nature.

This Task Force approach was planned, coordinated, and implemented for the purpose of developing further empirical knowledge about the relationship between gangs and guns. All researchers are considered equal co-principal investigators. As another element in the Task Force approach it was agreed that a common report would be issued that reflects the basic empirical findings from this collective research project.

While individual researchers were free to develop and extend their individual analyses using the data, the overall report would provide the basis for some consensus between the researchers. All researchers examined and helped edit almost weekly updates of the report over a period of several months of analysis time. Thus, everyone reviewed, edited, and contributed to the thinking in the common report to be issued.

There are many different ways to examine and account for the relationship between gangs and guns, and it was for this reason that the researchers also agreed to present their individual findings at a professional forum --- the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology. This was to be the outlet for presenting individual scholarly analyses of the problems associated with armed gang violence. Thus, individual papers presented at this criminology meeting may extend an analysis far beyond anything that is within this Task Force report. This report simply provides the basic results obtained when different social contexts were used to survey gang members and non-gang members on the issue of guns and gang violence.

THE DIFFERENT SOCIAL CONTEXTS USED FOR THIS STUDY

The plan was to examine the "gangs and guns" issue in a variety of different social contexts. The choice of sites for the research was based on satisfying the need for such variation. The reasoning was that a diverse cross-section of gang members could be obtained if a variety of such different social contexts were used.

One site turned out to be a complete mistake. It was a recreational program serving a large public housing complex on Chicago's southside. This program had recently given a \$30,000 contract for "gang consulting" to a major gang activist who is also a Gangster Disciple advisor. It is a site of "Midnight Basketball" games between rival gangs. The program director at the site asked the gang leaders for their cooperation. The gang leaders agreed to help with the project. It meant they could get some "goodies" if they would fill out the surveys. The gang leaders got enough goodies for 300 surveys and returned 108. Many of these survey instruments were fraudulently completed (usually in the same ink color and same handwriting). We were, simply, the victims of the "hired hand" phenomenon in offender research. All data from this social context were discarded.

However, other sites did prove effective for broadening the social contexts in which to study gangs and guns, because we were personally in charge and one or more of the researchers were on the scene at all times for data collection. The other social contexts include eight jails, a probation supervision program, a regular public high school, and a sample from a social service agency serving inner city youths on Chicago's southside. The way the Task Force worked was to identify the work requirements and find the least costly approach to completing that work. Travel to other cities, overnight stays, etc, were assumed to be personal expenses. Any direct hard costs such as photoduplication and purchases of "goodies" for use as honorariums were shared equally by prior agreement between the researchers.

Overall, the research reported here is therefore based on using the same survey in the following social contexts: (1) Eight county jails (N = 891 inmates), (2) a matched-pair analysis from a large urban public high school (N = 87 non-gang members, N = 87 gang members), (3) a matched-pair analysis from a social service/recreation program (N = 36 non gang members, N = 36 gang members), and (4) a suburban probation program (N = 58 gang members). Thus, combining these social contexts, a total of N = 1,206 respondents are represented in this study, of which 505 are self-reported gang members. We can further break down gang membership categories into the People/Folks alliance as follows in our analysis: N = 161 Peoples, N = 183 Folks.

ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

The first section (I.) examines the findings from an analysis of survey results at eight county jails in the midwest.

The second section (II.) examines results from the same survey where the respondents were high school students in a large urban public high school setting.

The third section (III.) examines the results from the same survey using a suburban probation program sample.

The fourth section (IV.) examines an inner-city service and recreation program where we were able to use the same survey.

The fifth section (V.) combines gang members surveyed from these four social contexts for a closer analysis.

The last section (VI.) presents our overall summary of findings, conclusions, and recommendations for future research.

I. THE SUMMER 1994 STUDY OF EIGHT JAILS

One megajail, four larger jails and three smaller jails were chosen from the midwestern United States. While the sample includes one of the megajails, the sampling strategy intentionally sought out smaller and rural jails as well. The rationale for selecting these settings outside of the context of the large urban setting stems from recent research on gang proliferation and gang migration which showed the gang problem extends far into the "heartland" or geographical areas not previously considered as having a "gang problem".

Another reason has to do with how this type of geographical setting provides an ideal way to test certain assumptions about gang density --- that is, the proportion of gang members within the correctional population. The matter of gang density is addressed in a later section of the report as the "six percenter issue" which stems from the recent conclusion (ACA, 1993) that only six percent of the American prison population are gang members.

The research goal was to achieve this census by having each and every inmate cooperate, not just a sample of some inmates from the overall jail population. This research sought a saturation sample of inmates in seven county jails, a goal that was substantially met. The research procedure required sampling from the megajail, where the most secure unit was chosen. Figure 1 shows the types of jails used in this research.

Figure 1

The Eight Jails Surveyed for the Gangs/Guns Study

The Various Types of Jails Used in This Study

Farmland Areas Heartland Areas Urban Outlier Urban Central

3 in Iowa 2 in Iowa; 1 in Illinois Illinois

1 in Illinois

THE RESEARCHERS VISIT THE JAILS IN THE MIDWEST U.S.A.

The jail inmate component of this study began with surveying smaller jails in the Heartland and culminated with a survey of inmates in the maximum security unit of the megajail located in the urban central area. It is possible then to examine the extent to which a classical "ripple effect" occurs, comparable to the concentric zone hypothesis of early

Chicago researchers, but expanded in geographical scope to the midwestern United States. Our urban central geographical area is the site of the megajail, holding over 5,000 inmates, and it is a thirty minute drive from an outlying county where we also surveyed the entire jail. Three larger sized and three small county jails round out the analysis. The three

larger jails constitute what we call the "heartland" area of the midwest. and the three rural smaller jails are viewed as farmland areas.

One of the larger jails in the Heartland is an old classic lock-up matching the century old architecture of its city. Just minutes away separated by a river one of the other larger jails is a modern new building exemplifying what is meant by the modular style. It is a difference between old and new. In the older Iowa jail, the correctional officers knew the names of most all inmates and open communication existed. In the newer Illinois jail, we watched as an inmate threw a hard plastic cup at correctional officer and we wondered if the social climates of these two jails were really equivalent. In the older jail the inmates could smoke, in the newer jail inmates could not smoke. The newer jail also had more personnel. The newer jail had truly adapted to the times as well in another respect. At the door where the visitors entered the jail, in large conspicuous letters read the warning "NO GANG COLORS OR GANG CLOTHING ALLOWED IN THIS BUILDING". This warning in the newer jail notifies all entrants of its zero-tolerance policy on gangs. These two larger jails, in close proximity to each other, provided the basis for assessing validity and reliability issues.

Overall, however, one megajail, four larger county jails, and three smaller county jails were used for the jail inmate component of this research. Two of the larger county jails are located in Illinois, the other five jails are all located in Iowa; and of course the megajail is that in a large metropolitan area. In none of the jails did a policy exist where all known members of any particular gang were concentrated in a single jail unit. "They are very mixed up" was the general response, implying a concern about any single gang being able to exert too much control in a given area. Staff at the jails generally knew who most of the gang members were, because of the nature of their gang-related offenses that brought them to the jail.

METHODOLOGY

As a collective unfunded pro bono research project all researchers early in the research offered the types of items they wanted to include in the survey instrument. All researchers reviewed the item pool and changes, modifications, and improvements in style, syntax, and construction were made. Further review was given in terms of item order and validity testing contingencies were established. Thus, all researchers had input into item content, item order, phraseology, structure, and length as well as written instructions to be read by the inmates as a normal part of

instrumentation. A complete copy of the survey instrument is provided for the reader in Appendix A of this report.

Access to the jail population was typically obtained through first working with the sheriff's office in each county. Dates were set for data collection and three or four of the researchers were on site during all data collection at the larger jails. The team member based in Iowa was able to survey the three smaller rural county jails alone. The Iowa based researcher had career experience in correctional counseling in the federal bureau of prisons and was remarkably adaptive to the psychological states of inmates encountered in the two jails. This researcher became the first speaker during all social encounters with inmates, although all researchers at one point or another contributed points of explanation on our purpose and intent and plans for use of the data, explaining over and over again this was a completely anonymous survey and "no names were needed".

By prior arrangement the plan for data collection was that of a complete saturation, that is a census of every jail inmate confined on the Saturdays that we visited the county jails for purposes of data collection. Generally, with one jail facility as the exception, almost all inmates participated in the survey. And, of course, at the megajail where we faced a population of nearly ten thousand, a subsystem census approach was used --- surveying all inmates in certain types of divisions within the larger jail complex. In almost all jails, therefore, nearly 95% plus of the inmates who were in the jail participated, and those inmates who were asked to participate who did not participate were rare. In one jail, to illustrate this rare situation of an inmate not participating in the survey, one inmate in the medical ward still had a large wound in his chest from a recent gun shot involving a highly publicized murder case as well. This was the only inmate at the jail who refused to cooperate with us and we suspect it was based on the physical discomfort this particular inmate was facing. Other than the one exception discussed below, the data collection plan for this research was that of a census of the jail facilities, by seeking to have a saturation sample of the inmates. Once in the jails almost all inmates cooperated.

One reason for the high cooperation we received from jail inmates was the honorarium we promised as instant gratification. This was possible in all but two of the jails. In the inmate economy, cigarettes or "squares" are the leading mode of exchange. Thus where it was permissible we offered a free package of name brand cigarettes to anyone who completed a survey. We did tell all inmates as a part of the routine "presentation" that we would physically inspect the surveys when collecting them to make sure they were completed. In point of fact, when we collected the surveys we made only a cursory examination and generally collected them "as is". In the non-smoking jails we provided small commercially packaged bags of cookies and snacks as the honorarium. In two of the larger jails we could not distribute cigarettes or food items or hygiene items (i.e., combs), so we simply spent more time trying to motivate the inmates by appealing to them to help us with this multi-university research project. In the two jails where we could not give out honorariums we were able to get only about half of the inmates to participate in the survey, making this situation the exception to the otherwise general result of being able to generate a complete census of each jail facility.

A usable sample size of $N = 74$ inmates was obtained from three smaller county jails in the "farmland" of the midwest. Additionally, a sample size of $N = 370$ inmates was obtained from three larger county jails in the "heartland" of the midwest. A larger jail in the urban outlying area of the midwest generated a another sample of $N = 211$ inmates. And finally, some $N = 236$ inmates were sampled from the high security division we chose for analysis at the megajail, which we call the urban central area jail. This generates a combined jail inmate sample of $N = 891$ for purposes of analysis here. Details on the validity of this data are discussed next.

VALIDITY

The validity of the survey research on jail inmates was established through a number of different techniques

described here. Seven of these validity issues are discussed in greater detail below. Overall, when all seven issues are combined, we reach the conclusion that little validity threat exists with our data. In fact, for seven different reasons we conclude that high validity exists with the findings reported on our survey research involving jail inmates.

1. Face Validity. The survey instrument itself is easily structured, contains no double-barrelled questions, the items use unambiguous language, and in many cases actually replicates previous well known prior research (e.g., Wright and Rossi, 1986). Face validity here is high.

1. Covert Observation. Opportunity for covert observation of the inmates completing the questionnaires allowed for several other types of validity control. After handing out pencils and surveys the researchers often returned to the control room of the jail where the video monitors allowed watching the inmate behavior in the cell houses. There was no evidence from this type of covert observation that any threat to validity occurred such as one inmate completing another inmate's survey form, nor was there any inmate behavior visible to us that implied any type of collective fraud. Almost all inmates were remarkably cooperative.

2. Overt Observation. Gender is a specific forced-choice item on the questionnaire. However, when collecting the completed surveys from all female inmates their instruments were immediately marked "female" for later comparison with self-report data. We did this for both jails. In no instance did any respondent lie about their gender. If "random responses" been given by the inmates some cases would have emerged which misidentified this gender variable in comparison with the overt observation and marking procedure.

3. Zero Tolerance for Data Entry or Transcription Errors. All survey data stored electronically for purposes of computerized statistical analysis were cross-checked against source documents (i.e., the survey instruments). The data was checked and re-checked and contains no validity threat from transcription errors.

4. Few Unusable Survey Instruments Detected. To illustrate the value of notifying the inmates we would casually check the surveys before giving out the honorariums, at the two larger county jails that border each other, only one random response pattern was found where the jail inmate simply marked the first choice for almost all of the 96 plus questions. This one questionnaire was excluded and not used in the analysis. All other surveys contained well differentiated response patterns implying they were completed by cooperative individuals giving their best level of effort. The inmates were motivated to complete the surveys in one sense because this provided an interesting distraction from the boredom of routine jail activity. No "tainted" data is therefore included in our sample. Generally, we felt the inmates made a good faith effort to complete the survey instruments.

5. An acceptable level of trust was established. Four of the researchers were typically on hand in most jails surveyed where they approached each cell-house area and explained in detail the purpose of the survey research. Much small chit chat and friendly discussion often ensued when we introduced ourselves as professors and three of the four professors were from Chicago. Jokes about legal representation and lawyers generally were common in these informal social exchanges. The survey instrument asks for no name and we told inmates verbally that no names were needed. We told them they could drop the survey's in a box as we would collect them, which is the procedure that we used. In spite of this, however, a goodly number of the inmates put their full name and cell-house unit number on the front, inside, or rear of the survey instrument along with personal memoranda to the effect they would like to "have personal interviews" and provide further information for us. We feel on the basis of the above procedures and observations therefore that a sufficient level of trust was established with the inmates to get relatively honest answers. We recognize generally however as is the criminological axiom: offenders have the tendency to over-report

their positive attributes and under-report their stigmatizable attributes. However this axiom applies to all criminological research involving real law offenders.

6. High Cognition of the Meaning of the Survey Items Implies clearly we are measuring what we purport to measure.

A large number of the inmates had the tendency to write notes and comments in the margins of the survey instrument on a large and wide variety of issues. These are highly emotive comments implying clear cognition of the true meaning of the survey items. For example one respondent in response to the question (CASE # 178) "Did you vote in the last presidential election?" in the survey instrument answered "NO" and commented in his own hand writing in the margin the reason for his non-voting behavior to the effect that "they are all crooks". More typical was a common pattern of emotive accentuation, where for example (CASE # 190) in response to item # 91 ("Do the gangs in prison basically exist in the same form on the streets?") answered "YES" but marked in the column in his own handwriting "Definitely!". Another respondent (CASE # 164) in response to item # 91 answered "YES" and wrote in "I know from my past 16 years in prison". These types of frequent unsolicited explanations for their answers in the survey instrument provide further evidence that these inmates clearly understood the meaning of the questions. The higher the cognition, the higher the validity. There was nothing in this survey an inmate did not understand. We never asked to narrate their opinion of "deterrence theory" or "strain theory" or any abstract concept. The survey contains very concrete survey items. No survey was received with any comment to the effect "I do not understand what you mean here", and there was not a single inmate in either jail who needed help to understand any question from us.

7. High Internal Consistency of Response Patterns Emerged Upon Data Analysis Implying Low Levels of Deceit. In

the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) full form of 566 true or false questions, a "lie scale" exists by being able to compare response to a question early in the form with a similar question latter in the form. The present researchers wanted to anticipate and head off any potential criticism along these lines and developed items rather similar in nature and placed these non-sequentially in the instrument in order to provide this basis for a "validity check" of internal consistency at time of data analysis. Here we explain the nature of this internal consistency validity control technique and how the results support the high validity in the present research.

The first test is one where we would capture an offender who was so paranoid he or she would lie about present age and age of first arrest. Item # 13 on the survey instrument asks for "At what age were you first arrested for any offense?" and provides a blank space for the actual two digits elicited (i.e., "____ Years old"). Item #74 on the survey instrument asks "What is your age in years? I am ____ years old today". An inmate who would engage in early intentional deceit in responses to the survey could therefore be detected by comparing these two items, and deceit cases would obviously exist where the value of Item # 13 exceeds that of Item # 74. A simple computer check allows for directly testing this validity hypothesis. Do we see a lot of cases where an inmate claims his/her first arrest was "24" and then provides several pages later a current age of say "19"?

Using a simple compute statement a variable was made called LIETEST1 and was calculated for all cases in the sample as follows:

```
COMPUTE ITEM1374 = missing  
  
IF ITEM13 > ITEM74 THEN LIETEST1 = 1  
  
/***COMMENT "1" means deceit  
  
IF ITEM13 <= ITEM74 THEN LIETEST1 = 0
```

/****/COMMENT "0" means consistency, it is logically possible

IF ITEM13 = missing THEN LIETEST1 = missing

IF ITEM74 = missing THEN LIETEST1 = missing

Upon creating this new internal validity check variable called "LIETEST1" it was simply analyzed for a full frequency distribution. The results showed that 11.9 percent qualified as missing, having missing data on one or more of the two variables, but that 88.1 percent were "0". Thus no cases emerged where this type of deceit could be detected.

Several other types of internal deceit were tested for. One was where a respondent indicated he/she had served in the U.S. military or armed forces, if they indicated "yes", this group was examined for its frequency distribution on education. The military does not take high school drop outs. None appeared in our sample as well among those self-reporting military service. Another test of suspect validity we reasoned would be if many cases emerged where someone first declares they did vote in the last presidential election and then later in the survey indicates they are not a currently registered voter. The fact is, only about a fourth (24.4%) of the jail inmates claimed to vote in the last presidential election, a figure far below the national average and a believable figure. Further, when asked if they are currently a legally registered voter, some 39 percent claimed this status. But there was not one case in the sample where someone claimed to have voted in the last presidential election and who presently reported they were not a legally registered voter. Thus, high internal consistency emerges in our data.

Finally, the issue of validity threats from "macho" behavior where inmates who claim or brag about their criminal exploits particularly against police was not a pattern found in this research. In point of fact, when asked in a series about firearms use only a small percent of the entire sample claimed this high level of intensity (11.3%). A bragger would have claimed more shooting with police than with other contexts reported below in our findings.

RELIABILITY

Reliability in this kind of survey research on inmates has two major meanings: (1) whether the same questions yield the same results at different points in time, and (2) whether the same questions yield the same results on relatively equal populations in different locations? The reliability issue here, however, relates only to the second of these reliability issues (e.g., inter-jail reliability). The reason is that this research was an anonymous survey and therefore was not designed for longitudinal follow-up on the same respondent.

The issue of inter-jail reliability is still an important one for several reasons. The same survey instrument used in the two larger jails in close proximity to each other should yield rather similar background profiles of the inmate population. Both of the two larger county jails are about the same size population and are geographically located only minutes apart by automobile travel. There are more reasons why the populations should be similar on a number of background risks because of the homogenizing process. That is there is more commonality in the general offender population than differences, especially in two jails located in the same area, separated by only a state line and a river, but otherwise only about two miles apart.

The hypothesis tested here, therefore, ascertains if the same questions generate relatively equal background and risk profiles for the inmate populations in the two larger county jails that are separated only by a short distance and a

river. If major differences emerge in basic background factors and on other variables where no reason exists to hypothesize such differences, then a problem of inter-jail reliability would exist, and it could be said that the same questions may yield different results in similar jails. The item analysis results should be relatively equal and this is what an intensive comparative analysis of both jail populations revealed. The item analysis undertaken here involved over 100 variables comparing the distributions between both jails using the Chi-square distribution. There was not one single variable for which a significant difference existed between the two jails which also held up within the gang member subgroup population comparing both jails.

Missing data was not a major problem in this analysis. There was a small amount of missing data which is typical of most survey research of this kind. However, it was random and not systematic in nature. In most cases it meant a respondent skipped over an entire page while folding back the seven page questionnaire.

GENERALIZATIONS BASED ON THE JAIL DATA

While both validity and reliability are at acceptable levels for survey research of this kind, it is important to point out that this research design was not intended to be a national probability sample. Thus, the generalizations based on this jail data cannot be applied to the entire United States local detention population. Further, by intentionally seeking out smaller rural jails in the "Farmland" and in the "Heartland" where the gang problem was not expected to be as large of a problem as it is in large urban areas such as Chicago and Los Angeles, our research strategy captures the parameters at both the lower end of the gang threat level and the higher end of the gang density problem (i.e., Chicago). This differs then from the correctional research strategy employed by Sheley and Wright (1993) who sought out geographical areas known to have serious gang problems. The correctional research strategy employed in this report was therefore designed to capture not only the large urban area known for its gang problems, but also geographical areas not traditionally known for having a large gang problem.

WHERE THE RIPPLE HAS NO EFFECT

The comparison of the four types of jails, which range from the farmland to the central urban location, were expected to vary by gang density. Gang density is the proportion of inmates who are gang members. So any comparison by the geographical area of the jail is also a comparison by gang density. The purpose of this section is to describe those findings from the survey where there are no significant differences in comparing the results for the four types of jails.

The findings in this section are those where no statistically significant difference exists when comparing the four types of jails. The concept "statistically significant difference" is used here in its common social science meaning as the .05 probability level. Thus, any probability level less than .05 ($p < .05$) is generally considered statistically significant, meaning it could occur by less than one out of twenty times by chance alone. Conversely, a difference is not significant if the probability level is greater than .05 (i.e., $p > .05$).

The basic four types of jails compared in this analysis are: Farmland, Heartland, Urban Outlying area, and Urban Central area. This type of classification system is not a typology commonly used in jail research. This is a construct that allows us to analyze the jails in terms of what many regard as the geographical origin of most of these gangs (i.e., Chicago and Cook County) and how their effects spread outwardly, like the ripple pattern from a rock hitting the surface of water. Unlike the concentric zone approach which looked at the city area as the total "zone", we are examining a large geographical section of the midwestern United States, where Chicago is assumed to be the starting point of many of the gangs analyzed here.

Attitudes and Beliefs

There exist some attitudes and beliefs for which no significant difference emerges in comparing inmates across the four types of jails. For example, the attitude about whether bail is excessive is not substantially different from one jail to the next. Overall, some 80.4 percent of the inmates felt that bail was excessive, but no significant difference exists in comparing the attitudes of inmates in the four types of jails.

Similarly, the belief that poor people are disproportionately represented in American jails today is another common denominator. No significant difference exists comparing results for this variable across the four types of jails. Overall, some 88.2 percent of the inmates did feel that the poor are overly represented in jails today.

No Difference In Whether They Would Take an \$8.00/Hour Job

When given the scenario that if they had the training and the job were available, paying \$8.00 per hour, most inmates say they would in fact take the job (94.9%). No significant difference emerges for this variable among inmates across the four types of jails. Actually, there is little variation to explain here, as almost all inmates indicated they would take the job. In the subsequent section of this report where we discuss significant differences, it is fair to alert the reader now that other differences appear to exist which have implications regarding employment for the gang member or inmate population.

No Difference In School Extracurricular Involvement

The survey asked the inmates whether they participated in any adult supervised extracurricular activities such as sports, band, service clubs, etc, while they were in school. The results show that 72.2 percent of all inmates report they did in fact have the benefit of such socialization services while in school. No significant difference exists comparing the inmates on this factor across the four types of jails (farmland, heartland, urban outlying, urban central).

No Difference In School Suspensions/Expulsions

The survey asked the inmates whether they have ever been suspended or expelled from a school for disciplinary problems. Overall, some 60.9 percent of all inmates reported they had in fact experienced this type of school disciplinary sanction. No significant difference emerged in comparing the results from the four different types of jails.

No Difference in Availability of Handguns

The inmates were asked in the survey "how difficult do you think it would be for you to get a handgun when you are released from jail". Some 14.2 percent of the inmates indicated it would be "very difficult". Some 11.7 percent indicated it would be "somewhat difficult". But most of the inmates (74.1%) indicated that it would not be difficult at all to acquire a handgun after their release from jail. No significant difference exists in comparing the level of difficulty for the availability of handguns to these inmates across the four types of jails.

No Difference in Engaging in Civil Law Suits

The survey asked the inmates "have you sued anyone in civil court for a wrong that was done to you". Some 15.4 percent of all inmates reported that they have sued someone in civil court. However, no significant difference emerged in comparing this variable across the four different types of jails.

Beliefs About The Deterrent Value of Strict Laws

The survey asked the inmates whether they felt we would have less crime if our laws were more strict. Only 27.5 percent of the inmates overall actually agreed that there was any deterrent value in stricter laws. Most of the inmates (72.5%) disagreed with the idea that less crime would ensue if our laws were more strict. Thus, no significant difference exists in this belief comparing the four different types of jails.

Believing The Legal System is Best Way To Settle Conflicts

The survey asked the inmates whether they agreed or disagreed with the idea that "the legal system is the best way to handle disputes and settle conflicts". Overall, 41 percent of the inmates agreed that the legal system is the best way to settle conflicts, and 59 percent disagreed. No significant difference emerged in comparing this factor across the four different types of jails.

Beliefs Supporting Lex Talionis: An Eye for An Eye

The survey asked the inmates whether they agreed or disagreed with the idea that "the best form of justice is simply an eye for an eye". This is the classical lex talionis concept of justice. Some 39 percent of the inmates agreed that the best form of justice is an eye for an eye. Most (61%) disagreed with this idea. No significant difference emerged in comparing this belief across the four different types of jails.

Beliefs About Whether it is Better to Live by the Law of the Jungle Than the Law of the Land.

The survey asked the inmates whether they agreed or disagreed with the belief that "it is better to live by the law of the jungle than the law of the land". Some 43 percent of the inmates, overall, agreed that it is better to live by the law of the jungle than the law of the land. On the other hand, some 57 percent of the inmates overall disagreed with this belief. However, no statistically significant difference emerged when comparing the four different types of jails (farmland, heartland, urban outlying, urban central) regarding this belief.

No Difference in Whether Inmates Have Used a Silencer

The survey asked the inmates whether they have ever used a gun equipped with a silencer or sound suppressor. Some 16.8 percent of the inmates overall reported that they used a gun equipped with a silencer. However, no significant difference emerged in comparing this variable across the four different types of jails.

No Difference in Availability of Explosive Devices

The scenario presented to the inmates in the survey was as follows: "after you are released from jail, and if you really needed to get your hands on some illegal explosives (dynamite, military explosives, hand grenades, etc), how hard would it be for you to do so". This vignette style question yielded the result that about half (47.8%) felt it would be "very hard" to acquire such explosive devices. Just over a fourth (28%) felt it would be "somewhat hard" to acquire

explosive devices. But a fourth (24.2%) felt it would not be hard at all to acquire such illegal explosive devices. Further, no statistically significant difference emerged in comparing the availability of explosive devices across the four different types of jails. The implication here is that explosive devices are as hard or as easy to acquire in Chicago as they are in the rural areas; that is, geographical area makes no difference in this study which is limited to the midwestern United States.

No Difference in Preferences for Assault Rifles Vs. Handguns

The survey asked the inmates whether they would "prefer an **assault rifle** or a **handgun** for criminal activity". Some 22.7 percent of the inmates preferred the assault rifle for criminal activity. Most of the inmates (77.3%) preferred the handgun for criminal activity. Thus, the handgun not the assault rifle appears to be the weapon of choice for criminal activity among the majority of inmates surveyed here. Further, no statistically significant difference emerges in comparing this preference for assault rifles or handguns across the four different types of jails (farmland, heartland, urban outlying, and urban central areas).

Beliefs About Whether Most Criminals Are Morally Impaired

The survey asked the inmates whether they agreed or disagreed with the idea that "most criminals have not benefited from a fully developed set of moral beliefs". Most inmates (62%) agreed with the idea that most criminals are morally challenged individuals. Some 38 percent disagreed with this idea. However, no statistically significant difference emerged in comparing this variable across the four different types of jails. It should be pointed out, and will be detailed in a later section about significant differences, that a related question about their own moral development was significant and appears to further have some relationship to gang membership and type of jail surveyed as well.

Believing That There Are Many White People Who Are Not Prejudiced

The survey included two different questions about race relations, the one discussed was not significant comparing the four types of jail inmate populations. The survey item asked the inmates whether they agreed or disagreed with the idea that "there are many white people who are not prejudiced". Most of the inmates (79%) agreed that there are many white people who are not prejudiced. Still, 21 percent disagreed with this assumption about race relations. The fact is, however, that no significant difference emerged in comparing inmate beliefs about this factor across the four different types of jails studied (farmland, heartland, urban outlying, and urban central areas).

Believing That Physical Punishment is More Effective Than A Monetary Fine

The survey asked the inmates whether they agreed or disagreed with the idea that "physical punishment is more effective than a monetary fine". Some 36.5 percent of the inmates agreed that physical punishment is more effective than a monetary fine. Most of the inmates (63.5%), however, disagreed with the idea that physical punishment is more effective than a monetary fine. What we do know for sure is that no significant difference emerged in comparing inmate beliefs about this factor across the four different types of jails.

Whether There Are Many Effective Ways Available to Inmates to Settle Grievances Other Than Through Violence Or the Threat of Violence

The survey included a number of questions about conflict and dispute resolution and the predisposition of respondents along these lines, for possible analysis regarding gang membership. The specific language of the survey item asked whether the inmates agreed or disagreed with the idea that "there are many effective ways available to me to settle grievances with other persons other than violence or the threat of violence". Our research indicates that most inmates are certainly cognizant of such alternatives to violence, such that the problem may lay within the area of the extent to which impulsivity overrides the rational assessment of viable alternatives to settling grievances by means of violence. The data shows that 86.3 percent of the inmates agreed that there are such effective non-violent solutions to resolving grievances. Still, some 13.7 percent felt that there were not many effective recourses other than violence. The fact remains, however, that no statistically significant difference emerges on this variable comparing the four different types of jail inmate populations.

Whether They Have Ever Committed A Crime In Or On A Public Housing Project

It is important to point out here that two separate questions were included in the survey about public housing. The one about whether the inmate had ever lived in a public housing project was a variable significantly differentiated by type of jail, and is discussed in a subsequent section of this report. Another question about public housing revealed no such significant differences comparing types of jail inmate populations. This was the question about whether the inmate had ever committed a crime on the property of or inside an apartment of a public housing project. Some 21.8 percent of the inmates reported that they had in fact previously committed a crime in or on the property of a public housing project. However, no significant difference emerged in comparing the four types of jails regarding this aspect of committing crimes in public housing projects. It will be made further clear in examining other samples in this larger study about gangs and guns that there are apparently a number of "outsiders" who commit crimes in public housing projects, that is persons who have never actually lived there who commit crimes there.

Whether They Have Ever Assaulted A School Teacher

The survey asked the inmates whether they had ever assaulted a school teacher. Some 14.3 percent of the inmates, overall, reported that they had previously assaulted a school teacher. No significant difference emerged here comparing the four different types of jail inmate populations on this variable. This is, though, an important variable that contributes to the gang member profile discussed elsewhere in this report.

Whether They Feel Vulnerable to the "Risky Shift" Effect

The survey asked the inmates whether they agreed or disagreed with the self-description that "I am more likely to be violent in the situation of being with my group than I am as a lone individual". In the risky shift phenomenon a person may do things in a group context that they might be less prone to do if they were alone. Some 31.8 percent of the inmates felt they were vulnerable to this "risky shift" phenomenon. There was no significant difference for this variable in comparing the four types of jails studied.

Whether Natural Life Sentences Would Prevent Them From Using A Gun In A Crime

The survey asked the inmates "do you think that if judges had to give an automatic natural life prison sentence for using a gun in any crime that this would really prevent you from ever using a gun in a crime". Overall, 62.4 percent of the inmates expressed the belief that this would in fact prevent them from using a gun in a crime. Yet some 37.6 percent of the inmates indicated that this type of harsh anti-gun measure would not deter them from using a gun in a crime. No significant difference emerged in comparing the four types of jails on this variable.

Whether There Is Anything Police Can Do To Prevent A Gang From Getting Started In Any City in America

The survey asked the inmates whether they felt there was anything that police can do to actually prevent a gang from getting started in any city in America. Most of the inmates (72.2%) felt there was nothing that the police could do to actually prevent a gang from getting started in any city in the USA. There was no significant difference comparing the four types of jails regarding this variable.

Whether The Gangs in Prison Basically Exist In The Same Form On the Streets

The survey asked the inmates whether the gangs in prison basically existed in the same form on the streets. Most of the jail inmates (70.9%) felt this was true. No significant difference existed comparing this variable across the four different types of jails. Obviously, groups like the Aryan Brotherhood were once thought to be only prison-based gangs. Even in Illinois prisons and jails the "Northsiders" were felt to be a prison-based only gang. The fact remains that both of these two types of gangs do exist outside of the social context of prison life. Most serious gangs in correctional institutions today have their counterparts, and usually their origins, in the community.

Whether The Same Internal Gang Codes of Behavior That Apply To Prison Gang Members Also Apply To The Members Of The Same Gang On The Streets

Two-thirds of the inmates (68.3%) reported that the gang codes apply in or out of a correctional facility. Examples of such gang codes of behavior behind bars have been reported in the literature (see American Jails, The Magazine of the American Jail Association, 1993, January-February, pp. 45-48). This research found no significant difference regarding this particular variable (whether gang codes or its internal written laws and rules) comparing the four different types of jails.

Whether The Inmates Ever Thought They Might Be Caught

So much traditional criminological thinking about law offenders tends to assume that human beings all benefit from rationally calculating the risks and benefits of current behavior in relationship to a potential future reward or punishment. The survey specifically asked the inmates "prior to committing a crime did it ever occur to you that you might be arrested". Two-thirds of the inmates (67.6%) did in fact acknowledge the possibility of being caught for their crime. Still, some 32.4 percent of the inmates state that it did not occur to them they might be arrested prior to committing a crime. No significant difference exists on this variable comparing the four different types of jails.

The Cultural Universal: The Natural Law of Opposition Group Formation Applied To Gangs

There is a social phenomenon applied to gangs (Knox, 1993) that is called the law of opposition group formation. It basically means that in any social system, where one group threat arises that its natural counterpart (Crips, then Bloods; Folks, then Peoples; etc, etc) arises as well. This cultural universal is very consistent with our knowledge about race relations, racial conflicts, and the rise of gangs along ethnic or racial dimensions. For example, a Chinese

gang arising in response to threats or conflicts with a non-Chinese gang in a New York City environment; or a Middle Eastern gang like The Arabian Posse (aka: TAP Boyz, or TAPN for The Arabian Posse Nation) in a city like Chicago during the enmity towards Arab-Americans which arose during the Gulf War, which was when the TAP Boys first arose.

In the present research two techniques were used to ascertain the type of gang alliance that is typical of gangs in the midwestern United States: the difference between "Peoples" and "Folks". The present research cannot speak directly to the issue of the etiology of opposition gang group formation, that is when it occurs over time, but it can speak to the related issue of parity in gang alliances. That is to say, if the name of an inmate's gang is obtained and this is cross-checked with known alliances along the People-Folks dimension, and additionally if the inmate self-identifies as being aligned with either the People or Folks, then the present study is in fact able to assess whether one or the other type of alliance dominates or whether parity exists between these two alliances.

First it is important to note for the non-researcher, that the distinction called the "Peoples/Folks" dimension is not a classification system that covers all gangs in corrections, nor is it a typology that covers all gangs in any city in the midwestern portion of the United States nor anywhere else. There will always be gangs that exist that will be an exception to such larger "Gang Nation" identifications. Some white extremist gangs, for example, would not be included in any group identifying itself as "People" or "Brothers"; nor would white extremist gangs be likely to identify with "Folks" or the "Brothers of the Struggle" (B.O.S.). However, like the west coast distinction between B-Boys (Bloods) and C-Boys (Crips) there is such a large amount of data to work with that it is still worthwhile to examine differences if any in terms of their own density represented within the jail inmate population.

Figure 2 below shows the various type of individual gang names represented in the present sample of inmates from eight different jails in the midwest. These are classified outside of the correctional environment as either People or Folks in the exact same way they are on the streets. These are obviously the more structured, or more organized criminal gangs.

FIGURE 2

THE TYPES OF GANGS IN THE PRESENT JAIL INMATE STUDY
CLASSIFIED BY THE PEOPLE-FOLKS DIMENSION
OF GANG ALLIANCES

Peoples Gangs Folks Gangs

Four Corner Hustlers Almighty Ambrose

Black P. Stone Nation Brothers of the Struggle

Conservative Vice Lords Black Disciples

Familia Stones Black Gangster Nation

Honky Heads Black Souls

Insane Unknowns Gangster Disciples

Insane Vice Lords F.B.I.

Latin Counts Harrison Gents

Latin Kings Insane Spanish Cobras

Loco Boys Insane Two-Twos

Northsiders Simon City Royals

Mickey Cobras Maniac Disciples

Traveling Vice Lords Satans Disciples

Twin City Boys Two Six Nation

Unknown Vice Lords Young Latin Organization

Vice Lords

Figure 2 does not include the following gangs in this particular type of gang alliance: D.A.S.H. (Des Moines Area Skin Heads), Aryan Brotherhood, Aryan Nation, Aryan Resistance, Black Guerilla Family, Crips, Grim Reaper M.C. gang, Mexican Mafia, Nation of Islam, and the New Nation. The inmates of these gangs are not a part of the type of alliance known as the difference between "Peoples" and "Folks" gang nations.

Finally, we can now examine the data where we know the type of gang alliance (People or Folks) in relationship to the presence of such gang members within the gang member population of the four different types of jails. These results are shown in Table 1 below.

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF INMATES FROM PEOPLE OR FOLKS GANGS
BY THE FOUR DIFFERENT TYPES OF JAILS STUDIED
IN THE MIDWESTERN UNITED STATES

The Four Different Types of Jails Studied

Urban Urban

Alliance: Farmland Heartland Outlying Central

People 2 13 31 73

Folks 0 11 40 83

Chi-square = 3.07, p = .38

As seen in Table 1, no significant difference emerges in comparing the relative proportions of people or folks among

inmate gangs represented in the jail inmate populations of the four different types of jails studied in the midwest. Relative parity exists along the dimension of this type of gang alliance in the jails studied here.

All this means is that inmate gang members do have such alliances and that because an individual gang member may be the only representative of his or her particular gang inside the facility, that the convenience of gang alliances allows the inmate to "ride with" other inmates along potential lines of conflict and violence. Some individual types of gangs do dominate, for example the GD's or the Gangster Disciples are the single largest individual "Folks" gang represented in this sample. Where an inmate may be the only one represented from his gang in the jail, there is obviously more than some benefit to having a larger alliance however tenuous it may be.

Clearly, once classified along the dimensions of the People and Folks alliance, inmate gang members are about equal in their proportions in the four types of jails studied here. This is consistent with the law of natural group opposition formation.

Within The Inmate Gang Population

Among the jail inmates who were self-reported gang members as measured by having ever joined a gang, there was no significant difference comparing the four types of jails by whether or not their gang was racially mixed, nor by whether the members are really treated equal. Nor was there any difference by whether or not they had attempted to leave the gang across the four types of jails. Nor was there any significant difference in terms of those who said they would rather die than give up their allegiance to the gang. Nor was there any significant difference in terms of whether the respondents agreed that gang membership helps in obtaining firearms. Nor was there any difference in whether or not the respondent indicated he had been "violated" (i.e., received a beating) by their own gang for a "violation" (one third of the gang members reported being violated). Nor was there any difference in whether or not they had been beaten up by a member of a gang they did not belong to (over half, 56.7%, of the gang members report such a beating).

THE RIPPLE EFFECT IN MIDWEST JAILS

Eight county jails in the midwestern United States were used to create the jail inmate sample. This was further divided into the geographical area for the jails to create four different types of jails: (1) farmland jails, (2) heartland jails, (3) urban outlying area, and (4) urban central area. Most of the gangs in Figure 2 discussed earlier --- the types of gangs represented among the inmates studied here --- have their origins in Chicago. It is well known from other research that gang proliferation in recent years basically means that today many Chicago-based gangs, just as many Los Angeles based gangs, can be found in many different parts of the United States. In fact, such gangs have been reported as being a problem throughout almost all states including Alaska, Hawaii, and the commonwealths of Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Here we examine where the "ripple effect" has a significant impact. This means that statistically significant differences exist among the inmates the further out we get from the urban central area jail. If the stone hits the water, the issue is how far out does the ripple extend geographically, where the stone in this analogy is the fact that most of these gangs have their origins in Chicago, and also where it will be demonstrated that significant variation in gang density exists when comparing farmland, heartland, urban outlying, and urban central types of jails.

Thus, this section of the our larger study of gangs and guns deals specifically with those factors for which significant differences exist comparing the four different types of jails studied in the midwest.

Whether Inmates Feel More Betrayed By Friends and Family

The survey asked the inmates whether they felt that some persons who may have been friends or even family members find it easier to break promises to persons like themselves who are in jail. Table 2 provides the results of this inmate feeling of betrayal by the four different types of jails studied in the midwest.

TABLE 2 THE DISTRIBUTION OF FEELINGS OF BETRAYAL AMONG INMATES IN FOUR DIFFERENT TYPES OF JAILS IN THE MIDWEST The Four Different Types of Jails Urban Urban Farmland Heartland Outlying
Central

Do you think that some				
persons who may have				
been friends or even				
family find it easier				
to break promises to				
persons like yourself				
who are in jail?				
False	14	47	40	25
True	58	312	167	201
Percent True	80.5%	86.9%	80.6%	88.9%

Chi-square = 7.99, p = .04

As seen in Table 2, urban central area jail inmates feel the most betrayal, but this is not a straight linear difference in terms of the four types of jails.

Difference in Type of Family Structure

The inmates reported a simple majority of being from intact families (i.e., composed of both father and mother and siblings) outside of the large urban central area jail. However, a significant difference does exist here in comparing the four different types of jails. In the farmland jails 17.5 percent of the inmates indicated they come from a mother-only family structure, compared with 31.8 percent for inmates in the heartland, and 35.8 percent for inmates in the urban outlying area, and 49.1 percent for inmates in the urban central area. This is a very significant difference ($p < .001$) that is completely consistent with the expected "ripple effect". The further one goes from the central urban area jail, the less likely we are to find inmates who come from a mother-only family structure.

Difference in Percent Not Completing High School

The inmates also reported their last grade completed in the survey. From this data it was possible to calculate the percentage of inmates who were not high school graduates nor had they completed the GED. In the farmland jails 17.5 percent had not completed high school, compared with 31.8 percent for inmates in the heartland jails, compared with 35.8 percent of the inmates in the urban outlying jail, and finally 49.1 percent of the inmates in the urban central jail. This is a very significant difference ($p < .001$) and it is consistent with expected ripple effect: the further away from the central urban area jail one goes, the more likely the inmate is to have completed high school; or conversely, the closer one is to the central urban jail area the more likely the jail inmate is to have not completed high school or the GED.

Difference in Percent Who Have Never Had a Full-Time Job

The inmates were asked about their employment status at the time they were arrested and had to be detained in jail. One of the possible response modes was "never had a full time job". Thus, the inmate who never had a full-time job in his or her life is a measure of socialization and economic opportunity. Our data shows that there is a significant difference along this dimension comparing the four different types of jails. For example, in the farmland jails only 5.4 percent of the inmates reported that they had never held a full-time job in their life. Some 8.1 percent of the inmates in the heartland jails, and 9.3 percent of the inmates in the urban outlying jail, reported that they had never held a full-time job. In the urban central jail, however, some 27 percent of the inmates reported never having held a full-time job. This is a significant difference by employment experiences ($p < .001$) that is consistent with the ripple effect. The further one goes from the central urban area, the more likely the inmate is to have had such full-time job experience. The lack of any such previous full-time work experience is most profoundly felt in the urban central area.

Difference in Percent of the Inmates Who Have Previously Served Time in a Juvenile Correctional Institution

A significant difference emerges here, but it is not strictly consistent with the ripple effect. Some 27 percent of the inmates in the farmland jails, 29.3 percent of the inmates in the heartland jails, 19.7 percent of the inmates in the urban outlying jail, and 30.7 percent of the inmates in the urban central jail all acknowledged they had in fact been incarcerated as juveniles. The only difference that does emerge here is a much lower percentage for juvenile incarceration among inmates in the urban outlying jail. This may be a statistical artifact. Thus, no consistent pattern or ripple effect appears here regarding whether the inmates have been previously incarcerated as a juvenile.

Difference in Whether the Inmates Have Permanent Tattoos

A significant difference emerges here in comparing the four types of jails by whether the inmates report having

permanent tattoos, however it is not a pattern that is consistent with the ripple effect. In the farmland jails some 55.4 percent of the inmates had permanent tattoos. In the heartland jails, this was 48.3 percent and in the urban outlying jail this was 47.1 percent. In the urban central jail some 62.5 percent of the inmates had permanent tattoos. Thus, again, the difference that emerges here is the much higher proportion for this variable among inmates in the urban central area.

Difference in Gang Density: The Percentage of Inmates Who Report Having Ever Joined A Gang

Table 3 below shows the ripple effect for gang density among inmates in the four different types of jails studied in the midwest. Here we see a relatively consistent pattern in terms of gang density. Gang density is the percentage of inmates who are gang members in any correctional institution or system. Gang density is measured here by whether the inmates report having ever joined a gang. As previously discussed, for the most part the types of gangs included in this study are of the more organized variety where it not easy to just "walk away" from the gang. These are rather "blood in, blood out" types of gangs and are more formalized in their organization.

TABLE 3 THE DISTRIBUTION OF HAVING EVER JOINED A GANG AMONG INMATES IN FOUR DIFFERENT TYPES OF JAILS IN THE MIDWEST

The Four Different Types of Jails Urban Urban Farmland Heartland Outlying Central

Have you ever joined a gang?

NO 61 299 124 66

YES 13 63 83 165

Percentage Yes 17.5% 17.4% 40% 71.4%

Chi-square = 189.7, p < .001

The trend in Table 3 shows there is really no major difference in gang density among the farmland and heartland jails, but rather that a consistent ripple effect exists outward to the heartland area. These findings have enormous implications for recent federally funded research, where a national assessment of the gang problem in corrections basically concluded that only six percent of the American prison inmate population were gang members. This matter will be discussed in a later section of this report as the "six percenter issue".

Table 3 shows that gang density dissipates the further one moves from the urban central area. Geographical variation therefore exists in the gang density problem facing American jails today. All of the eight jails surveyed in the present research yielded inmates who were self-reported gang members. Obviously, this differs dramatically in terms of the ripple effect.

Gang Density: Using Current Gang Membership In Testing the Ripple Effect

Further evidence for this comes from a completely separate question in the survey which asked the inmate whether they were currently a member of a gang or gang organization. The results for this test are provided in Table 4.

TABLE 4 THE DISTRIBUTION OF CURRENTLY BEING A MEMBER OF A GANG AMONG INMATES IN FOUR DIFFERENT TYPES OF JAILS IN THE MIDWEST The Four Different Types of Jails Urban Urban Farmland Heartland Outlying Central

Are you currently a member				
or associate of any gang or				
gang organization? NO	60	311	149	81
YES	11	48	49	133
Percentage Yes	15.4%	13.3%	24.7%	37.8%
Chi-square =	166.0, p < .001			

Thus, the same linear effect is noticed here in Table 4 for current gang membership as that found in Table 3 for having ever joined a gang. The effect extends consistently away from the urban central type of jail up to the point of the heartland. The farmland and heartland jails are relatively equal in gang density. The larger increase occurs the closer one gets to the urban central jail inmate population.

Difference In Having Ever Owned an Assault Rifle

The survey asked the inmates whether they have ever owned what could be considered an "assault rifle". While a significant difference emerges here comparing the four types of jails, the real effect is that higher effect from the urban central jail compared with all outlying and rural jail inmates. A third (33.3%) of the inmates in the urban

central jail reported having owned an assault rifle. This compares with a fourth of the inmates in all other jails having ever owned an assault rifle (22.5% farmland; 21.6% heartland, and 23.7% urban outlying jail).

The Real Difference About Assault Rifles: Having Ever Used An Assault Rifle in Committing A Crime

A separate survey question asked whether they had ever used an assault in committing a crime. The results of this test are provided in Table 5.

TABLE 5 THE DISTRIBUTION OF USING AN ASSAULT RIFLE
IN COMMITTING A CRIME AMONG INMATES

IN FOUR DIFFERENT TYPES OF JAILS IN THE MIDWEST The Four Different Types of Jails Urban Urban
Farmland Heartland Outlying Central

Have you ever used an assault
rifle in committing a crime?

NO 68 322 175 183

YES 3 35 29 45

Percentage Yes 4.2% 9.8% 14.2% 19.7%

Chi-square = 17.4, p = .001

Table 5 shows the consistent ripple effect for this variable about using an assault rifle in committing a crime as reported by inmates in the four different types of jails. The closer one is to the urban central area, the more the inmate is likely to report having used an assault rifle in committing a crime.

The Difference In Carrying Concealed Firearms Behavior

The replication of a survey item used in a well known previous study of firearms use among offenders (i.e., Rossi and Wright), asked the inmates about their concealed gun carrying behavior. What emerges here is that again a consistent ripple effect is seen. Some 77.9 percent of the farmland jail inmates report having never carried a concealed gun. This reduces to 63.7 percent for heartland jail inmates, and 57.5 percent for urban outlying jail inmates. Finally, in the urban central jail some 40.6 percent of the inmates report having never carried a concealed gun. Thus, the significance here is that the closer one is to the urban central area, the more likely the inmate is to have engaged in some form of this behavior of carrying a concealed firearm.

The Inconsistent Difference In Stealing Firearms

When the inmates were asked about whether they had ever stolen a pistol or rifle, the real difference that emerged here is the low rate of this behavior in the farmland area (12.5%). Some 25.4 percent of the heartland jail inmates admitted to having stolen a firearm, compared with 30.3 percent of the inmates in the urban outlying area jail. But 24.8 percent of the urban central jail inmates also admitted to stealing firearms. Thus the effect here is not consistent with the ripple effect.

The Ripple Effect in Offenders Using Sawed-Off Shotguns to Commit a Crime

The survey asked the inmates whether they had ever used a sawed-off shotgun to commit a crime. Here, as seen in Table 6, a consistent ripple effect emerges comparing the results for the four different types of jails.

TABLE 6 THE DISTRIBUTION OF USING A SAWED-OFF SHOTGUN
TO COMMIT A CRIME AMONG INMATES IN FOUR

DIFFERENT TYPES OF JAILS IN THE MIDWEST The Four Different Types of Jails Urban Urban Farmland
Heartland Outlying Central

Have you ever used a				
sawed-off shotgun to				
commit a crime?	NO	70	331	179
	189			
	YES	2	28	23
		38		
Percentage yes	2.7%	7.7%	11.3%	16.7%
Chi-square =	16.8,	p =	.001	

As seen in Table 6, the closer one gets to the urban central jail area, the more likely the inmate is to report having ever used a sawed-off shotgun to commit a crime. This ranges from a low 2.7 percent among jail inmates in the farmland jails, to 16.7 percent of the inmates who have used this type of firearm in committing a crime in the urban central area.

The Ripple Effect in Offender Firearm Ownership

The survey asked the inmates whether, since 1968, they have ever legally owned any firearm (this means legally purchasing it yourself, and registering it in your name). The data from the jail inmates studied here shows a consistent ripple effect where at the urban central area the inmates report the lowest extent of legally owning firearms, which increases incrementally the further one moves from the urban central area. These results are shown in Table 7.

TABLE 7 THE DISTRIBUTION OF HAVING LEGALLY OWNED A GUN SINCE 1968 AMONG INMATES IN FOUR DIFFERENT

TYPES OF JAILS IN THE MIDWEST The Four Different Types of Jails Urban Urban Farmland Heartland Outlying
Central

	Urban	Urban	Farmland	Heartland	Outlying
Since 1968 have you ever					
legally owned any firearm					
(this means legally purchasing					
it yourself, and registering					
it in your name)?	NO	53	295	182	202
	YES	19	61	19	17
Percent Yes	26.3%	17.1%	9.4%	7.7%	

Chi-square = 22.9, p < .001

Thus, Table 7 shows again that it is not legal ownership of firearms that is most associated with those areas that have the highest concentration or density of gang members. In fact, the obverse is true: legal ownership of firearms since 1968 is lowest in the urban central area, and highest in the farmland area. The logical paradox here should haunt those who advocate legalizing heroin and other drugs, because by the same logic we might be able to say from this data that firearms ownership should similarly be legalized for offenders, a logical fallacy of course which we do not entertain seriously. Legal firearms ownership here translates as being inversely related to other problems such as gang density and the like. Also it is simply more reasonable to believe that gun controls are stricter in urban areas than they are in rural areas. This does not mean offenders in urban areas have less objective material access to guns,

it simply means they are not legally owned firearms.

The Predisposition for Retaliation as a Preferred Option for Conflict Resolution: Another Ripple Effect

The survey asked a question about conflict resolution, more specifically the scenario where "if someone does you wrong, which is one the most likely solution you would use", and among the choices were: call the police, use a third party to negotiate, ask the person for an apology/restitution, and retaliate against the person. Table 8 shows the distribution for this conflict resolution preference by the four types of jails studied.

TABLE 8

THE DISTRIBUTION OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION PREFERENCES AMONG INMATES IN FOUR DIFFERENT TYPES OF JAILS IN THE MIDWEST The Four Different Types of Jails Urban Urban Farmland Heartland Outlying Central

If someone does you wrong,

which is the one most likely

solution you would use?

Call the police 23 89 61 57

Use third party to

negotiate 10 43 8 17

Ask for apology
/restitution 17 92 51 58
Retaliate against
the person 16 111 71 79
% who prefer
retaliation 24.2% 33.1% 37.1% 37.4%
Chi-square = 17.4, p = .04

Table 8 shows very little difference in the percentage of inmates who prefer retaliation in both the urban outlying and urban central jails. Rather the predisposition towards retaliation decreases the further one goes out from the urban area generally, where it is lowest in the farmland and highest in the urban areas.

Gun Registration: Another Ripple Effect

A separate question explored the issue of gun registration by asking the inmates whether any of the guns they have ever owned were legally registered with the police or authorities. Table 9 shows the results of this test, again yielding a consistent ripple effect.

TABLE 9 THE DISTRIBUTION OF LEGALLY REGISTERING GUNS AMONG INMATES IN FOUR DIFFERENT TYPES OF JAILS IN THE MIDWEST The Four Different Types of Jails Urban Urban Farmland Heartland Outlying Central

Of any guns you have ever owned or used, where these guns legally registered with the police or authorities?

NO 29 187 118 152

YES 30 121 54 42

Percent Yes 56.6% 39.2% 31.3% 21.6%

Chi-square = 25.0, p < .001

Thus, Table 9 shows the further one moves from the urban central area the more likely the jail inmate is to report having legally registered guns.

Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft Revisited: How The Value of Formal Social Control Varies Along The Rural-Urban Dimension

The 1887 book Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft by Ferdinand Tonnies spells out how in the "gemeinschaft" type of social system more informal types of social control are used, while in the "gesellschaft" type of social system a greater dependence on the government and formal laws exists. It is one of the early sociological concepts that also expresses the difference between rural and urban life. This provides the framework for inquiring into whether or not inmates believe that for the most part justice gets done by the police and the courts. The police and the courts are taken to represent the formal social control mechanisms. Table 10 shows the results of this test, again showing a consistent ripple effect about the declining value of formal social controls among inmates. The survey asked the inmates whether they agreed or disagreed with the idea that "for the most, justice gets done by the police and the courts". Clearly, the lowest amount of justice being carried by the formal social control mechanism is in the urban setting, and the highest value placed on the police and the courts for justice is found in the rural areas. This runs against the grain of the conceptualization by Tonnies, with the caveat that here we are dealing strictly with the offender population who are often thought to have an upside down value system.

TABLE 10 THE DISTRIBUTION OF BELIEFS ABOUT WHETHER
JUSTICE GETS DONE BY THE POLICE AND THE COURTS

AMONG INMATES IN FOUR DIFFERENT TYPES OF JAILS IN THE MIDWEST The Four Different Types of
Jails Urban Urban Farmland Heartland Outlying Central

	For the most part, justice gets done by the police and the courts.	
AGREE	34 128 69 51	
DISAGREE	39 229 133 172	
% Agree	46.5% 35.8% 34.4% 22.8%	

Chi-square = 17.8, p < .001

The results in Table 10 therefore suggest major differences exist in what may a larger cluster of beliefs about respect for the law itself, along the rural-urban dimension. Whatever is going on here within the offender population on this issue of the value of formal social control for purposes achieving justice, it suggests a greater breakdown in legitimation for the urban setting.

Beliefs About the Value of "Caning" or Whipping An Offender As a Way to Reduce Certain Types of Crime

The survey asked the inmates to agree or disagree with the statement "caning or whipping an offender might reduce certain types of crime in America". While a significant difference emerged comparing the four types of jails, it is not one strictly consistent with a ripple effect. Among inmates in the farmland jails 56.9 percent agreed that caning or whipping an offender might reduce certain types of crime. In the heartland jails, 37.1 percent agreed with the idea of whipping, compared with 35.6 percent for the urban outlying jail. But 41 percent of the inmates in the urban central jail agreed as well.

Beliefs Among Inmates That You Cannot Expect Justice Through the Legal System

Consistent with other findings reported here, inmates in the urban central area are the most likely to reject the idea that they can expect justice through the legal system. That is, inmates in the urban central jail were the most likely to agree that justice cannot be obtained by means of formal social control, that is legitimately through the legal system. Some 44.9 percent of the inmates in the farmland jails agreed that you cannot expect justice through the legal system. This compares with a relatively equal proportion of inmates in the heartland (58.2%) jails and in the urban outlying jail (55.9%), but the highest amount of agreement was found for the urban central jail, where 69.9 percent agreed that you cannot expect justice through the legal system.

Attempts to Acquire Weapons From Military Personnel

The survey item for this variable measures whether the jail inmate had ever asked someone in the military if they could help in getting military weapons. Here we find a consistent ripple effect for this type illegal weapons behavior comparing the results from the four types of jails. These results are provided in Table 11.

TABLE 11 THE DISTRIBUTION OF HAVING EVER ATTEMPTED
TO ACQUIRE WEAPONS FROM MILITARY PERSONNEL
AMONG INMATES IN FOUR DIFFERENT

TYPES OF JAILS IN THE MIDWEST The Four Different Types of Jails Urban Urban Farmland Heartland Outlying
Central

Have you ever asked someone

in the military if they could
help you in getting military
weapons?

NO 66 311 164 181

YES 4 31 29 33

Percent Yes 5.7% 9.0% 15.0% 15.4%

Chi-square = 9.54, p = .02

As seen in Table 11, the closer to the urban central area the more likely the inmates are to report attempting to acquire weapons from military personnel.

Shooting Behavior: Another Ripple Effect

The difference between those inmates who have fired a gun at someone stands out here as another consistent pattern for the ripple effect. The closer to the urban central area, the more likely the inmates are to report such behavior involving the discharge of a firearm at an intended victim. These results are shown in Table 12.

TABLE 12 THE DISTRIBUTION OF HAVING EVER FIRED A GUN AT SOMEONE AMONG INMATES IN FOUR DIFFERENT TYPES OF JAILS IN THE MIDWEST The Four Different Types of Jails Urban Urban Farmland Heartland Outlying Central

Have you ever fired a
gun at anyone? NO 59 238 119 90
YES 12 114 76 125
Percent Yes 16.9% 32.3% 38.9% 58.1%

Chi-square = 54.0, $p < .001$

Did it involve a family
fight?
Percent Yes 10.6% 16.5% 16.9% 29.5%

Chi-square = 14.6, $p = .002$

Did it involve a
gang fight?
Percent Yes 17.0% 19.1% 35.2% 54.8%

Chi-square = 64.8, $p < .001$

Did it involve a
drug deal?

Percent Yes 15.2% 23.8% 20.1% 38.6%

Chi-square = 19.4, $p < .001$

Did it involve a police
shootout?

Percent Yes 2.1% 6.7% 10.8% 20.8%

Chi-square = 23.6, $p < .001$

The illegal use of firearms as shown in Table 12 is for the most part consistent as well in terms of four different contexts: whether it involved a family fight, a gang fight, a drug deal, or a police shoot out. The police shoot-out results appear to be most dramatic, where the urban central jail area has inmates reporting this behavior at a rate of nearly ten times higher than that found in the farmland jails.

Illicit Opportunity: The Availability of Fully Automatic Weapons

The survey posed the situation to the inmate "after you are released from jail, and if you really needed a fully automatic machinegun, how hard would it be for you to get one?". Here again we see the ripple effect. The results of this test are provided in Table 13.

TABLE 13

THE DISTRIBUTION OF LEVELS OF DIFFICULTY
IN ACQUIRING FULLY AUTOMATIC WEAPONS

AMONG INMATES IN FOUR DIFFERENT TYPES OF JAILS IN THE MIDWEST The Four Different Types of Jails Urban Urban Farmland Heartland Outlying Central

After you are released from

jail, and if you really

needed a fully automatic

"machinegun", how hard would

it be for you to get one?

VERY HARD TO GET 29 104 49 53

SOMEWHAT HARD TO GET 14 89 58 43

NOT HARD AT ALL 23 140 82 110

% Not Hard At All 34.8% 42.0% 43.3% 53.3%

Chi-square = 16.6, p = .01

Where Gangs Spend Their Treasury Money to Buy Firearms

The survey asked the jail inmates if they have ever personally known of situations where a gang spends its treasury money to buy firearms. Here again we see a consistent ripple effect in comparing this factor across the four types of jails. The results of this test are provided in Table 14.

TABLE 14 THE DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONALLY KNOWING OF
SITUATIONS WHERE A GANG SPENDS ITS TREASURY MONEY

TO BUY FIREARMS AMONG INMATES
IN FOUR DIFFERENT TYPES OF JAILS IN THE MIDWEST

The Four Different Types of Jails Urban Urban Farmland Heartland Outlying Central

Have you ever personally known

of situations where a gang spends

its treasury money to buy

firearms? NO 52 226 110 85

YES 16 82 72 121

ercent Yes 23.5% 26.6% 39.5% 58.7%

Chi-square = 60.6, p < .001

As seen in Table 14, the closer to the urban central area the more likely jail inmates are to report knowing of situations where a gang spends its treasury money to purchase firearms. It is possible that this variable correlates with some other factor about the criminal subculture, perhaps the exchange of stories, communication itself, bragging, etc.

Supporting the Laws of Nature: Not Formal Social Control --- Another Ripple Effect Among Inmates

The survey asked the inmates to agree or disagree with the statement "the laws of nature are better at solving conflicts than the laws of man". Here again we see another consistent significant ripple effect comparing the four types of jails on this type of repudiation of formal social control measures among inmates. The results of this test are provided in Table 15.

TABLE 15

THE DISTRIBUTION OF BELIEFS THAT THE LAWS OF NATURE ARE BETTER FOR SOLVING
CONFLICTS THAN THE LAWS OF MAN

AMONG INMATES IN FOUR DIFFERENT TYPES OF JAILS IN THE MIDWEST The Four Different Types of
Jails Urban Urban Farmland Heartland Outlying Central

The laws of nature are better
at solving conflicts than the
laws of man.

AGREE 28 151 92 121

DISAGREE 37 178 98 86

Percent Agree 43.0% 45.8% 48.4% 58.4%

Chi-square = 9.50, p = .02

As seen in Table 15, the closer one gets to the urban central area the more the inmates are likely to repudiate formal social control in favor of the laws of nature. One might be willing to assume here that the laws of nature include the "survival of the fittest" concept for these inmates.

Beliefs That The Laws of God Are Better For Solving Conflicts Than The Laws of Man

Here again we find inmates repudiating the value of formal social control over the preference for the laws of God for solving conflicts. A previous research project on gangs among probationers by the National Gang Crime Research Center used a fill-in the blank response mode, asking the inmates to fill the ten commandments. Not one of about 500 were able to correctly recall all ten commandments. So we are doubtful here that the sincerity of religious convictions is at the heart of explaining the preference for the laws of God over the laws of man for purposes of solving conflicts. The inmates do not get visits from fire and brimstone ministers who condemn them to everlasting torment and damnation for their lifelong patterns of crime, rather the inmates get visits from evangelical or social work types of clergy of all denominations.

The findings here show that in the farmland jail, some 64 percent of the inmates agreed that the laws of god are better. The results in the heartland (76.6% agree) were similar to those in the urban outlying jail (76% agree). But the inmates in the urban central jail were the highest in agreeing with the idea that the laws of God are better for solving conflicts than the laws of man (94.3%). So the real difference here is between the extremes, the farmland and the urban central areas.

Racial Conflict As A Perceived Barrier to Getting Justice From Any Means In America

Our survey asked the inmates to agree or disagree with the statement that "racial conflicts being what they are, there really is no way to get justice from any means in America". We are quick to point out that racism is a real and not just a perceived problem. But this type question comes closest to capturing the state of mind of some inmates who reject the notion of obtaining any justice by any means because of the perceived pervasive problem of racism. The results of this inquiry are provided in Table 16.

TABLE 16

THE DISTRIBUTION OF BELIEFS ABOUT RACIAL

CONFLICT PREVENTING JUSTICE FROM ANY MEANS IN AMERICA

AMONG INMATES IN FOUR DIFFERENT TYPES OF JAILS IN THE MIDWEST The Four Different Types of Jails Urban Urban Farmland Heartland Outlying Central

	Urban	Urban	Farmland	Heartland	Outlying	Central
Racial conflicts being what they are, there really is no way to get justice from any means in America.	32	187	113	138		
AGREE						
DISAGREE	35	156	83	67		
Percent Agree	47.7%	54.5%	57.6%	67.3%		
Chi-square = 11.9, p = .008						

As seen in Table 16, here again we see a consistent ripple effect for this variable about racism and justice. Again, the closer we come to the urban central area the more the inmates express this belief that racial conflict undermines justice from any means.

The Morally Challenged Individual: Another Ripple Effect

We tried to design a question measuring the ultimate cop-out and excuse for criminal behavior, just to see if in the psychology of the offenders studied here whether this would vary by geographical area and other factors (i.e., gang membership, etc). The survey therefore asked the inmates to agree or disagree with the statement "In my childhood troubles I simply did not have a chance to fully develop a set of moral beliefs". Here again we find the ripple effect as seen in Table 17 comparing this variable across the four types of jails.

TABLE 17

THE DISTRIBUTION OF BLAMING CHILDHOOD TROUBLES FOR NEVER DEVELOPING A SET OF MORAL BELIEFS

AMONG INMATES IN FOUR DIFFERENT TYPES OF JAILS IN THE MIDWEST The Four Different Types of Jails Urban Urban Farmland Heartland Outlying Central

In my childhood troubles, I

simply did not have a chance

to fully develop a set of

moral beliefs. AGREE 18 115 84 95

DISAGREE 49 223 107 114

Percent Agree 26.8% 34.0% 43.9% 45.4%

Chi-square = 13.2, p = .004

As seen in Table 17, the closer we get to the urban central area the more the inmates tend to claim that in their childhood troubles they did not have a chance to develop moral beliefs. For a lack of a better term, we have called this the morally challenged individual variable.

Distrust of Whites: Another Ripple Effect In Inmate Attitudes

While it is reasonable by demographic distributions alone to expect a larger white representation among inmates in rural areas of the midwest than in urban areas of the midwest, the issue of distrust towards white people is a separate issue. It is an issue of race relations. The survey therefore asked the inmates to agree or disagree with the statement "It is usually a mistake to trust a white person". The results do show a consistent ripple effect, as shown in Table 18.

TABLE 18 THE DISTRIBUTION OF DISTRUSTING WHITE PERSONS

AMONG INMATES IN FOUR DIFFERENT TYPES OF JAILS IN THE MIDWEST The Four Different Types of Jails Urban Urban Farmland Heartland Outlying Central

It is usually a mistake

to trust a white person.

AGREE 10 79 55 86

DISAGREE 59 260 136 129

Percent Agree 14.4% 23.3% 28.7% 40.0%

Chi-square = 25.2, p < .001

As seen in Table 18, the closer one moves to the urban central area, the greater the distrust towards white people.

Knowing The Store Owner Was Armed With A Gun, Would That Prevent You From Still Robbing That Store?

This scenario was presented to the inmates in the survey. Some 20 percent of the inmates in the farmland jails indicated that even having advance knowledge that a store owner was armed that this would not prevent them from robbing that store. In the heartland jails, some 28.4 percent of the inmates would still rob the store knowing the store owner was armed. Just over a third of the inmates in the urban outlying jail (36.5%) and the urban central jail

(36.8%) would still rob the store. Thus, there is little difference between the urban outlying and the urban central areas, the real difference here is comparing the urban areas with the heartland, and the farmland. This does yield a significant difference by jail areas (Chi-square = 9.28, p = .02).

Offenders Who Wear Body Armor While Committing Crimes

Our survey asked the jail inmates whether they have ever worn a bullet-proof vest during a crime. It is here that we see a classic ripple effect, emanating out from the urban central area to nearly a null effect in the farmland area. Table 19 provides the results of comparing responses from inmates in the four types of jails on this issue of wearing body armor.

TABLE 19 THE DISTRIBUTION OF OFFENDERS WEARING BODY ARMOR AMONG INMATES IN FOUR DIFFERENT TYPES OF JAILS IN THE MIDWEST The Four Different Types of Jails Urban Urban Farmland Heartland Outlying Central

Have you ever worn a

bullet-proof vest

during a crime? NO 64 293 158 152

YES 1 33 24 44

Percent Yes 1.5% 10.1% 13.1% 22.4%

Chi-square = 24.9, $p < .001$

The Declining Deterrent Value of Formal Social Control Sanctions in Preventing Armed Crime: Comparing Farmland, Heartland, And Urban Inmates

The survey asked the inmates to agree or disagree with the statement "I would never use a gun in a crime if it carried a really long prison sentence". Some 76.6 percent of the inmates in the farmland jails agreed, indicating a long prison sentence for armed crime would deter them from this behavior. However, the percentage of inmates who share this fear declines dramatically for the heartland and urban outlying jails (62.5% heartland, and 63.2% urban outlying). Finally, only 54.1 percent of the inmates in the urban central jail would be deterred from armed crime by long prison sentences. Here again we see the significant effect of geographical location on risk of violence factors (Chi-square = 10.5, $p = .01$).

The Differential Support For Stiffer Penalties Against Armed Offenses By Gang Members: Another Ripple Effect

A vignette style question was designed to examine a stiffer sentencing scenario of formal social control for the suppression of illegal firearms use by gang members. The scenario was as follows: "Because people are more likely to be violent in a group that supports violence, do you think it would be fair to require that gang members caught committing crimes with guns should receive double the amount of the ordinary prison sentence". The inmates were asked to respond whether this type of penal sanction was fair or it was unfair. The results of comparing this variable across the four different types of jails is provided in Table 20.

TABLE 20 THE DISTRIBUTION OF SUPPORT FOR DOUBLING THE

PRISON SENTENCES OF GANG MEMBERS WITH GUNS

AMONG INMATES IN FOUR DIFFERENT TYPES OF JAILS IN THE MIDWEST The Four Different Types of Jails Urban Urban Farmland Heartland Outlying Central

Do you think it would be fair
to require that gang members
caught committing crimes with
guns should receive "double"
the amount of the ordinary
prison sentence?

IT'S FAIR 38 168 83 63

IT'S UNFAIR 24 161 93 132

Percent It's Fair 61.2% 51.0% 47.1% 32.3%

Chi-square = 24.0, p < .001

As seen in Table 20, support for stiffer sentences for gang members caught with guns declines progressively as one gets closer to the urban central area. Obviously we recognize as well that gang members are the least likely to want stiffer sanctions against their own kind, and that gang density therefore affects this and other many other factors in this survey of inmates.

The Differences by Area For Being Assaulted By A Gang

The survey asked the inmates whether they have ever been beaten up by a member of a gang the inmate did not belong to. So for gang members this means a rival gang most likely and for non-gang members this means any other gang, obviously a gang they did not belong to. There was very little difference between the farmland jails (27.5%) and the heartland jails (25.8%), the real increase in risk goes up as one approaches the urban outlying area and becomes most dramatic in the urban central area. In the urban outlying jail some 37.7 percent of the inmates reported such an assault by a gang, compared with 51.8 percent for inmates in the urban central jail. The difference in risk here is significant (Chi-square = 36.1, p < .001).

HOW GANG MEMBERSHIP DIFFERENTIATES JAIL INMATES ON MANY FACTORS

The variable of gang membership is an important behavioral, legal, and classification concern to correctional administrators and others. Self-reported gang membership is clearly shown in the wider research literature to be a variable that significantly differentiates a number of risk factors. The general tendency in the research literature is that the higher risk behavior is associated with gang membership. The thrust of this line of inquiry therefore examines whether gang members, when compared to non-gang members, by the common form of self-report alone, generates statistically different differences within the inmate population. A variety of such factors are examined here showing that gang membership clearly differentiates between types of inmates along a number of factors.

Gang Members More Likely to Come From Mother-Only Headed Families

The structure in the family of orientation differs significantly by comparing gang membership among inmates; among inmates who have never joined a gang 47.6 percent came from "intact" family units composed of mother, father and siblings, compared to 29.7 percent among gang members (Chi-square = 35.0, $p < .001$). Some 46.9 percent of the gang members compared with 28.9 percent of the non-gang members indicated they came from a mother-only headed household.

Gang Members More Likely to Have Not Completed High School

Some 30.6 percent of the non-gang members had not graduated from high school or obtained the GED, compared with 45.3 percent among gang members.

Gang Members More Likely to Have Never Had A Full-Time Job

Employment status prior to be arrested among these jail inmates is significantly differentiated by gang membership; among inmates who have never joined a gang only 6.7 percent have never held a full-time job, compared to 24.2 percent among gang members (Chi-square = 55.9, $p < .001$).

Gang Members More Likely to Have Served Time as Juveniles

Gang members are significantly more likely to report also having served time in a juvenile correctional institution (39.1%) than are inmates who have never joined a gang (20.2%) (Chi-square = 36.2, $p < .001$).

Gang Members More Likely to Have Permanent Tattoos

Gang members are significantly more likely to report having permanent tattoos (66.8%) than are inmates who have never joined a gang (44.1%) (Chi-square = 42.0, $p < .001$).

Gang Members More Likely to Be Kicked Out of School

Gang members are significantly more likely to report having ever been suspended or expelled from a school for disciplinary problems (75.9%) than are inmates who have never joined a gang (51.9%) (Chi-square = 49.3, $p < .001$).

Gang Members More Likely to Have Gang Friends

Gang members are significantly more likely to report having one or more close friends and associates who are gang members (87.6%) than are non-gang members (24.8%) (Chi-square = 366.5, $p < .001$).

Gang Members More Likely to Have Drug Using Friends

Gang members are significantly more likely to report having one or more close friends and associates who use illegal drugs (83.7%) than are non-gang members (70.2%) (Chi-square = 25.1, $p < .001$).

Gang Members More Likely to Have Owned Assault Rifles

Gang members are significantly more likely (43.7%) than non-gang members (14.8%) to report that they have owned what could be considered an "assault rifle" (Chi-square = 87.3, $p < .001$).

Gang Members More Likely to Use Assault Rifles in Crimes

Gang members are also significantly more likely (28.3%) than non-gang members (3.9%) to report that they have used an assault rifle in committing a crime (Chi-square = 104.4, $p < .001$).

Gang Members More Likely to Carry Concealed Gun

Gang members are significantly more likely to report carrying concealed guns than are non-gang members. Among gang members only 28 percent reported never carrying a concealed gun compared to 75.3 percent among non-gang members (Chi-square = 187.4, $p < .001$).

Gang Members Twice as Likely to Steal Firearms

Gang members are significantly more likely to report having ever stolen a pistol or rifle (38.3%) than are non-gang members (17.7%) (Chi-square = 43.9, $p < .001$). We also know that some gangs like the Insane Popes have initiation rituals and opportunities for achieving higher rank in the gang that involve a specific type of firearm burglary --- they specifically target the homes of police officers to steal their guns. The Popes are a smaller gang comparatively, and as will be revealed in a later chapter where we combine gang members from all social contexts, we would really have to oversample enormously in order to derive sample size large enough to provide a meaningful analysis of this issue for specific gangs like the Popes. However, it would be an enormously worthwhile endeavor for future research, because it would allow perhaps for the first time the opportunity to systematically profile and generate threat assessments of the gang as a unit.

Gang Members Have Easier Access to Handguns

Gang members are significantly more likely to report that it would not be difficult at all for them to get a handgun when they are released from jail (81.6%) than are non-gang members (69.4%) (Chi-square = 16.1, $p < .001$).

Gang Members More Likely to Use Sawed-Off Shotguns in Crimes

Gang members are significantly more likely to report that they have ever used a sawed-off shotgun to commit a crime (22%) than are non-gang members (3.9%) (Chi-square = 67.5, $p < .001$).

Gang Members Less Likely to Have Legally Owned Firearms

Gang members are significantly less likely to report that since 1968 they have ever legally owned any firearm in the specific sense of having legally purchased it themselves and registering it in their name (9.8%) than are non-gang members (16.3%) (Chi-square = 6.97, $p = .008$).

Gang Members Twice as Likely to Prefer Retaliation for Problem Solving

Gang members are significantly more likely to choose the option of retaliation as their primary solution to "wrongs" done to them (51.5%) than are non-gang members (24.2%) (Chi-square = 62.5, $p < .001$).

Gang Members Less Likely to Use Legally Registered Firearms

Gang members are significantly less likely to report that of any of the guns they have ever owned or used were actually legally registered with the police or authorities (24.7%) than are non-gang members (40.4%) (Chi-square = 19.2, $p < .001$).

Gang Members Less Likely to Believe Justice Gets Done by the Police and the Courts

Gang members are significantly less likely to agree that for the most part, justice gets done by the police and the courts (24%) than are non-gang members (38.3%) (Chi-square = 18.1, $p < .001$).

Gang Members Less Likely to Believe in Value of Stricter Laws

Gang members are significantly different than their non-gang member counterparts in the jail inmate population in terms of agreeing with the notion that "we would have less crime if our laws were more strict". Some 30.9 percent of the non-gang members agreed there would be less crime if our laws were more strict. This compares with 21.2 percent of the gang members in jail who agreed with this deterrent effect of stricter laws (Chi-square = 9.22, $p = .002$). This finding deserves further analysis in terms of ascertaining the extent to which the gang inmate may be expected to be more likely to reject conservative beliefs and be reciprocally supportive of more liberal beliefs.

Gang Members Less Likely to See the Legal System as Best Way to Handle Disputes and Settle Conflicts

Gang members are significantly less likely to agree that the legal system is the best way to handle disputes and settle conflicts (33.8%) than are non-gang members (45.2%) (Chi-square = 10.3, $p = .001$).

Gang Members Are Greater Believers in Lex Talionis

Gang members are significantly different from their non-gang member counterparts in the jail inmate population in terms of believing that the best form of justice is simply "an eye for an eye" (Chi-square = 16.3, $p < .001$). It is the gang member inmate however who is more likely to endorse this principle of "lex talionis" (47.7%). This philosophy of retaliation enjoyed less support among jail inmates who had never joined a gang (33.6%).\

-

Gang Members More Likely To Believe They Cannot Expect Justice Through the Legal System

Gang members are significantly more likely to agree that they cannot expect justice through the legal system (64.5%) than are non-gang members (56.4%) (Chi-square = 5.21, $p = .02$).

Gang Members More Likely to Believe it is Better to Live by the Law of the Jungle than the Law of the Land

Gang members are significantly more likely to agree that it is better to live by the law of the jungle than the law of the land (50.9%) than are non-gang members (Chi-square = 14.1, $p < .001$).

Gang Members More Likely to Get Guns From Gang Associates

Gang members are significantly more likely to report that if they had to quickly acquire a handgun successfully they would go to gang associates (57.5%) than are non-gang members (13.3%). Similarly gang members are less likely (10.4%) to go to a "fence" than are non-gang members (21.3%) (Chi-square = 170.1, $p < .001$).

Gang Members More Likely to Know Illegal Gun Merchants

When it comes to have better connections for guns, gang membership makes a significance difference. The question on the survey asked "do you know any persons in the gang or criminal subculture who specialize in selling stolen, illegal, or unregistered guns" and 57.1 percent of the gang members answered "yes" compared to 32 percent among their non-gang member counterparts among jail inmates (Chi-square = 49.7, $p < .001$).

We cannot in this research profile the variation in gun merchants. We do recognize there are those who do this as a full-time occupation, and many others who sell guns more in an opportunistic fashion (i.e., when the opportunity arises). Typical of the latter was the recent case in a Chicago suburb where several offenders burglarized an attorney's office and stole twenty weapons, which were to be sold to a southside street gang for \$5,000, until one of the burglars accidentally shot himself in the brain looking down the barrel trying to determine if it was loaded or not.

Gang Members More Likely To Shoot in All Situations

In potential deadly situations where firearms have been fired a significantly higher likelihood of engaging in gun violence exists for gang members in several different types of situations.

This is true in terms of simply ever having fired a gun at anyone (69% for gang members versus 22.3% for non-gang members, Chi-square = 173.7, $p < .001$).

This is true in terms of having ever fired a gun at anyone involving a family fight (31.8% for gang members versus 11.7% for non-gang members, Chi-square = 36.4, $p < .001$).

This is true in terms of having ever fired a gun at anyone involving a gang fight (67.1% for gang members versus 7.2 percent for non-gang members, Chi-square = 243.9, $p < .001$).

This is true in terms of having ever fired a gun at anyone involving a drug deal (43% for gang members versus 15.4% for non-gang members, Chi-square = 55.1, $p < .001$).

This is true in terms of ever firing a gun at anyone involving a police shoot-out (4.3% for non-gang members and 21.1% for gang members) (Chi-square = 39.6, $p < .001$).

Whether Gang Membership Helps in Obtaining Firearms

The belief that gang membership helps in obtaining firearms is a factor significantly differentiated by gang membership among jail inmates (Chi-square = 26.0, $p < .001$). Among gang members in the jail some 73.5 percent felt that gang membership helps in obtaining firearms. A significantly lower percentage (54.6%) of the inmates who had never joined a gang believed that gang membership helps in obtaining firearms.

Gang Members Report Easier Access to Machineguns

How easy, or how difficult, it would be for an inmate to acquire a fully automatic "machinegun" after release from jail is a perceived condition for which significant differences emerge in comparing gang members and non-gang members in the jail (Chi-square = 45.4, $p < .001$). Gang members clearly perceive greater opportunity when it comes to being able to get their hands on a machinegun after release from jail if they really needed one. While 36.3 percent of the non-gang member inmates felt it would not be hard at all to acquire a fully automatic machinegun upon the release from jail, some 58 percent of the gang members felt it would not be hard at all.

Gang Members More Likely To Have Used Silencer-Equipped Guns

Illegal firearms usage, specifically the experience of having ever used a gun with a silencer or sound suppressor, is a factor significantly differentiated by gang membership among jail inmates (Chi-square = 36.77, $p < .001$). Gang members clearly report greater illegal firearms usage of silencers (26.8%) than do their non-gang member counterparts in jail (10.5%).

Gang Members More Likely to Have Possessed or Used Illegal Explosive Devices

Gang members are significantly more likely to report that they have ever possessed or used any illegal explosives, specifically "dynamite, military explosives, hand grenades, etc" (32.4%) than are non-gang members (18.1%) (Chi-square = 22.0, $p < .001$).

Gang Members Have Greater Access to Illegal Explosive Devices

How easy or how difficult it would be for an inmate to acquire illegal explosives (dynamite, military explosives, hand grenades, etc) after release from jail is also weapons access issue where gang membership plays a significant role (Chi-square = 26.2, $p < .001$). Gang members clearly report great access in terms of indicating it would not be difficult (28.4%) to acquire illegal explosives compared to non-gang members in jail (21.3%).

Using the Gang Treasury Money To Buy Firearms

Having personal knowledge of situations where a gang spends its treasury money to buy firearms is a factor as expected that is significantly differentiated by gang membership (Chi-square = 181.6, $p < .001$). Some 18.5 percent of the inmates who had never joined a gang have personally known of situations where a gang spends treasury money to buy firearms. However, among the inmates who have joined gangs, some 67.2 percent of these gang members report having personally known of situations where a gang spends their treasury money to buy acquire firearms.

Gang Members More Likely to Attempt to Acquire Weapons From Military Personnel

Experience in having ever attempted to acquire illegal military issue weapons directly from military personnel who could be compromised is a factor significantly differentiated by gang membership (Chi-square = 41.3, $p < .001$). The inmates were asked on the survey "have you ever asked someone in the military if they could help you in getting military weapons". Some 21.1 percent of the gang members reported such attempts at acquiring military weapons in this fashion compared with 6.1 percent of the inmates who had never joined a gang.

Gang Members More Likely To Prefer Laws of Nature than the Laws of Man for Solving Conflicts

Gang members are significantly more likely to agree that "the laws of nature are better at solving conflicts than the laws of man" (56.8%) than are non-gang members (44.8%) (Chi-square = 10.4, $p = .001$).

Gang Members More Likely to Prefer Laws of God than the Laws of Man for Solving Conflicts

We do not interpret this to mean that gang members are more religious or God-fearing than non-gang members, but gang members are significantly more likely to reject the legitimacy of the legal system in general and the criminal justice system in particular is the larger issue here. Gang members are significantly more likely to agree that "the laws of God are better for solving conflicts than the laws of man" (85.4%) than are non-gang members (76.7%) (Chi-square = 8.73, $p = .003$).

Gang Members More Likely To Feel That Because of Racial Conflicts There Really Is No Way To Get Justice From Any Means in America

Gang members are significantly more likely to agree that "racial conflicts being what they are, there really is no way to get justice from any means in America" (65.5%) than are non-gang members (53.6%) (Chi-square = 10.7, $p = .001$).

Gang Members More Likely To Describe Themselves as Morally Challenged

The extent to which inmates claim that because of their childhood troubles they never really had a chance to fully develop a set of moral beliefs is a condition on which significant differences exist comparing gang members and non-gang members (Chi-square = 29.1, $p < .001$). Some 50.8 percent of the gang members made this claim that their childhood troubles prevented them from developing a set of moral beliefs compared to 31.4 percent among inmates who had never joined a gang.

Gang Members More Likely To Describe Criminals as Morally Challenged

Gang members are significantly more likely to agree that "most criminals have not benefited from a fully developed set of moral beliefs" (67.9%) than are non-gang members (58.8%) (Chi-square = 6.49, $p = .01$).

Gang Members More Likely To Distrust White People

Racial distrust is a factor that varies significantly with gang membership among inmates (Chi-square 25.7, $p < .001$). The variable used here to measure racial distrust was a question for which inmates could agree or disagree and specified "it is usually a mistake to trust a white person". Some 38.3 percent of the gang members agreed it is usually a mistake to trust a white person compared to 21.6 percent among non-gang members among the jail inmates.

Do Gang Members Fear Going to Jail or Prison?

The issue that gang members really do not fear going to jail or prison is a belief for which significant differences exist comparing gang members and non-gang members among jail inmates (Chi-square = 13.9, $p < .001$). The fact is, however, some 48.5 percent of the gang members agreed with the statement "gang members really do not fear going to jail or prison" which is significantly lower than their non-gang member counterparts in the jail (62.1%). This difference may have something to do with the image that gang members project to others, particularly non-gang member inmates, and it is an issue worthy of further analysis.

Gang Members More Likely To Have a Feud Than To Forget When They Have Been Wronged

Gang members are significantly more likely to agree that "it is better to have a feud than to forget when you have been wronged" (35.6%) than are non-gang members (25.3%) (Chi-square = 9.64, $p = .002$).

Gang Members More Predisposed to Responding to Verbal Insult With Violence

Gang members apparently not only have more physical fights than non-gang members, but they also have the predisposition for violence. This is true in the sense that beliefs about whether a verbal insult to one's self is best settled by violence or the threat of violence is a factor significantly differentiated by gang membership (Chi-square = 37.3, $p < .001$). Some 39.4 percent of the gang members agreed with this belief that a verbal insult to one's self is best settled by violence compared to 19.6 percent among their non-gang member counterparts in the jail.

Gang Members More Violent Towards Attacks on Their Group Identity

The issue of "insults" as a precipitating condition of gang violence is also known as the social phenomenon of "status

threats" (Short and Strodbeck, 1965). Clearly as indicated above this goes on at the individual level, but apparently it also goes on at the level of the gang as a "group identity" as well. Another question on the survey measured beliefs about whether "a verbal insult to one's gang group, organization, or nation is best settled by violence or the threat of violence". Here again a significant difference emerges in comparing gang members and non-gang members among jail inmates (Chi-square = 32.9, $p < .001$). Some 43.3 percent of the gang members agreed with the belief that such verbal insults to the gang as a group are best settled by violence, compared to 23.3 percent among the non-gang members within the jail inmate population.

Gang Members Feel They Have Slightly Fewer Ways To Settle Grievances Other Than Through Violence

A theoretical issue that will be addressed later in this report about one of the possible causes of gang violence --- the theory of differential access --- on its surface enjoys some support from the finding reported here. According to this concept persons without useful means of resolving conflicts or "getting justice" are more likely to resort to violent solutions. One implication of this theory was measured in the present survey. It was the belief "there are many effective ways available to me to settle grievances with other persons other than violence or the threat of violence", however a significant difference emerged comparing gang members and non-gang members regarding agreement with this belief (Chi-square = 14.2, $p < .001$). More of the non-gang member inmates (89.7%) felt that they had such ways available to settle grievances other than by violent means. Yet a somewhat lower percentage of gang members (80%) felt that they had such available non-violent means of settling grievances.

Gang Members More Likely To Steal Guns

Gang members are significantly more likely to acquire guns by stealing them than are jail inmates who have never joined a gang (Chi-square = 29.2, $p < .001$). Some 78.6 percent of the inmates who have never joined a gang also report they have never stolen a gun, much higher than the 61.3 percent reported by gang members. In fact, 7.6 percent of the gang members have gone out of their way to specifically steal guns, compared with 2.6 percent among non-gang members.

Gang Members Less Likely to Be Prevented From Robbing A Store Even When They Knew The Store Owner Was Armed With a Gun

Gang members are significantly less likely to be prevented from robbing a store even if they knew in advance that the store owner was armed (Chi-square = 22.3, $p < .001$). Some 25.2 percent of the non-gang members indicated that knowing a store owner was armed would not stop them from still robbing the store. Yet 42.4 percent of the gang members indicated they would still rob the store even if they knew the owner was armed.

Offenders Wearing Body Armor During the Commission of A Crime

Gang members are significantly more likely to report that they have ever worn a bullet-proof vest during a crime (Chi-square = 72.6, $p < .001$). Some 26.4 percent of the gang members reported having worn such body armor during the commission of a crime compared to only 4.9 percent among the inmates who had never joined a gang.

Gang Members More Likely To Have Lived in a Public Housing Project

Gang members among the jail inmate population are significantly more likely to report having ever lived in a public housing project than are inmates who have never joined a gang (Chi-square = 16.8, $p < .001$). Some 28.5 percent of

the inmates who had never joined a gang reported having ever lived in a public housing project, compared with 42.7 percent of the gang members.

Gang Members More Likely To Have Committed Crimes in a Public Housing Property

Gang members among the jail inmate population are significantly more likely to report having previously committed a crime on the property of or inside an apartment of a public housing project than are inmates who have never joined a gang (Chi-square = 44.4, $p < .001$). Some 14.4 percent of the inmates who never joined a gang reported having committed a crime in public housing projects compared with 34.5 percent among gang members.

Gang Members More Likely To Assault Teachers

Gang members are significantly more likely to report having previously assaulted a school teacher than are inmates who have never joined a gang (Chi-square = 27.3, $p < .001$). Some 22.8 percent of the gang members report having previously assaulted a school teacher, compared to only 9.5 percent among jail inmates who have never joined a gang.

Gang Members More Likely To Report Being Registered Voters

Gang members are significantly more likely to report that they are currently a legally registered voter than are jail inmates who have never joined a gang (Chi-square = 11.6, $p = .001$). Some 55.8 percent of the gang members report being registered voters compared with 43.4 percent among jail inmates who have never joined a gang. This finding may have something to do with the recent formalization of political agendas by midwest gangs like the Gangster Disciples and their political extension organization called "21st Century V.O.T.E.", and the B.O.S. extension group "Young Voters of Illinois".

Folks Not More Likely Than Peoples To Be Registered Voters

We can test one very interesting hypothesis about of this matter of the extent to which gang members have secured the voting franchise by examining it in relationship to any differences between gang alliances. Recent political involvement by gangs in Chicago has highlighted the role of "Folks" gang members, particularly the Gangster Disciples. If the "Folks" are achieving greater political involvement than "Peoples" as measured through members who report being registered voters, then this would tend to confirm the efficacy of recent political posturing by gang groups in Chicago. The research hypothesis here being that "folks" will have a higher rate of voter registration than "peoples".

Among all gang members in the eight jails, no significant difference emerged comparing voter registration between "Peoples" and "Folks". Further, even when this was delimited to only those gang members in the urban central area jail, the relationship is still non-significant. No difference appears to exist here between "Peoples" and "Folks" regarding whether the gang members report that they are legally registered voters.

Gang Members Not As Effectively Deterred from Gun Crimes As Non-Gang Members By Longer Prison Sentences

Gang members are significantly less likely to be deterred from committing a crime with a gun simply because it might carry a long prison sentence (Chi-square = 20.2, $p < .001$). This variable involved the question "I would never use a gun in a crime if it carried a really long prison sentence". Some 68.5 percent of the non-gang members agreed

with the statement compared to 52 percent of the gang members.

Gang Members Less Deterred From Gun Crimes By Threat of Life Sentences

Gang members are significantly less likely to be deterred from committing a crime with a gun even if it meant that judges had to impose natural life sentences for the offense (Chi-square = 8.94, $p = .003$). Some 55.8 percent of the gang members felt that if judges had to give an automatic "natural life prison sentence" for using a gun in any crime that this would really prevent them from ever using a gun in a crime. Yet some 66.6 percent of the inmates who have never joined a gang felt such automatic "natural life sentences" would prevent them from using a gun in a crime.

Gang Members Less Supportive of Factors of Aggravation for Sentencing Using Gang Membership to "Double" The Prison Sentence Length

Gang members and non-gang members differ significantly in terms of whether it might be fair to add stiffer sentences for crimes committed by gang members involving guns (Chi-square = 48.3, $p < .001$). Some 30.6 percent of the gang members felt it would be fair if gang members caught in crimes involving guns would receive "double" the amount of the ordinary prison sentence, compared to 56.7 percent among their non-gang member counterparts in the jail population.

Whether Prison Gangs Run The Gangs on the Streets

Gang members are significantly more likely to report that the gangs in prison really "run" the gangs on the streets (Chi-square = 5.00, $p = .02$). Some 58.6 percent of the gang members felt that the gangs in prison really run the gangs on the street compared with 49.8 percent among those inmates who had never joined a gang.

Gang Members More Likely to Be Assaulted By Gangs They Do Not Belong To Than Are Non-Gang Members

Gang members are more likely to be victims of gang violence than are non-gang members within the jail inmate population (Chi-square = 69.0, $p < .001$). The way this variable was measured involved the question "Have you ever been beaten up by a member of a gang you did not belong to". Some 20.2 percent of the non-gang members reported such assaults, compared with 56.7 percent among the gang members in this sample.

Summary of Major Life Stages and Developmental Milestones Comparing Non-Gang Members and Gang Members

Figure 3 summarizes some of the major milestones in the life histories of the jail inmates comparing non-gang members and gang members. Gang members do not differ from non-gang members in terms of the mean age at which they first fired any gun. However, gang members began carrying a concealed weapon well before non-gang members in this sample of inmates from eight jails. Similarly, the gang member was arrested at an earlier age. While the gang member is has a somewhat younger mean age than non-gang members, the gang member has more prior arrests. The gang member also reports being involved in more physical fights during the last year.

FIGURE 3

MAJOR LIFE EVENT DATES AND VARIABLES COMPARING GANG MEMBERS

AND NON-GANG MEMBERS AMONG JAIL INMATES

IN EIGHT MIDWEST JAILS

Non-gang Gang

Major Life Event Members Members

Age first fired any gun 13.1 13.2

Age first joined gang n/a 13.8

Age first illegally carried

a concealed gun 17.9 14.8

Age first arrested for any

offense 18.7 15.4

Age today as jail inmate 30.3 24.7

Mean for total number of

all prior arrests 9.6 11.2

Mean for total number of

all prior convictions 4.3 4.4

Mean for total number of all

prior felony convictions 1.6 1.9

Mean number of fights during

the last one year period 1.3 4.5



Summary of the Effects of Self-Reported Gang Membership on Variables Within the Inmate Population.

When comparing gang members and non-gang members by simple means of self-report among the jail inmate population a number of significant differences emerged. From the above narrative description of major findings and from the results in Table 1 it is possible to provide the gang member behavioral and attitudinal profile. The gang member profile that emerges for this jail population is having the following profile components: (1) Background Profile components, (2) Firearms Profile components, (3) Behavioral Profile components, and (4) Belief and Opinion Profile components.

Based on the findings of comparing gang members with non-gang members among the inmates of eight jails in the midwest, each of the four profiles are constructed below. To be considered as a component for these profiles, the variable had to be one showing a statistically significant ($p < .05$) one, that is the variable significantly differentiated gang members and non-gang members in the jail inmate population.

1. Background Profile: GANG MEMBERS ARE MORE LIKELY TO come from mother-only headed families, have not completed high school, have never had a full-time job, to have served time in a juvenile correctional institution, to have a permanent tattoo, to have been suspended or expelled from school for disciplinary reasons; to have lived in a public housing project; to have committed a crime in a public housing project; to have assaulted a school teacher; to be a registered voter; to have more prior arrests and convictions; to have more physical fights during the last year.

2. Firearms Profile: GANG MEMBERS ARE MORE LIKELY TO have ever owned an assault rifle; to have used an assault rifle in a crime; to carry a concealed gun; to steal firearms; to report they have less difficulty obtaining a handgun; to have ever used a sawed-off shotgun in a crime; to have never legally owned firearms; to use non-registered firearms; to name other gang members as their most likely source for obtaining a firearm if they needed to get one quickly; to know persons in the criminal subculture or gang that specialize in selling stolen, illegal, or unregistered firearms; to have shot at persons with guns, including situations involving family fights, gang fights, drug deals, and police shoot-outs; to claim that gang membership helps in obtaining firearms; to claim easier access to machineguns; to have ever used a silencer; to have ever possessed or used illegal explosive devices; to claim easier access to obtaining illegal explosive devices; to know of situations where the gang uses its treasury money to buy firearms; to attempt to acquire weapons from military personnel; to steal guns; to not be stopped from robbing a store even knowing in advance that the store owner was armed with a gun; to wear body armor during the commission of a crime; to not be deterred from gun crimes by longer prison sentences or life sentences; to first carry a concealed gun at a younger age.

3. Behavioral Profile: GANG MEMBERS ARE MORE LIKELY TO have one or more close friends and associates who are gang members, to have one or more close friends and associates who use illegal drugs, to prefer retaliation for problem solving, to distrust white people; to prefer a feud over forgetting a wrong or tort; more prone to respond to verbal insult with violence or threat of violence; more prone to respond to verbal insult to their group with violence or threat of violence; to claim they have fewer ways to settle grievances; to be assaulted by a gang they did not belong to;

4. Belief and Opinion Profile: GANG MEMBERS ARE MORE LIKELY TO not believe that justice gets done by the police and courts, to not believe that stricter laws would reduce crime, to not believe that the legal system is the best way to handle disputes and settle conflicts, to believe in lex talionis or the idea that the best form of justice is simply "an eye for an eye", to believe that they cannot expect justice through the legal system, to believe that it is better to live by the law of the jungle than the law of the land; to prefer the laws of nature than the laws of man for problem solving; to prefer the laws of God than the laws of man for problem solving; to feel that because of racial conflicts there is little chance for getting justice from any means in America; to describe themselves as not having had the chance to fully develop a set of moral beliefs because of their childhood troubles; to describe other criminals as also not having fully developed moral values;

CAN GANG MEMBERSHIP BE PREDICTED IN THE JAIL INMATE POPULATION?

A burning question for classification purposes is whether or not any profile factors are effective in predicting gang membership. The issue here is whether a series of screening questions at intake can effectively identify the jail inmate gang member from the non-gang member. In other words, can prediction based on these variables correctly classify gang membership? This is an issue that will now be examined using the combined data reflecting all survey data from eight different jails in the midwest.

Discriminant analysis is the statistical analysis technique used here. This technique basically compares the "predicted" category with the "actual" category. Many applications of this are used in criminal justice, for example: predicting parole violations means comparing those predicted to recidivate or not with those who actually recidivate or not. The prediction category used here is self-reported gang membership. The effectiveness of the prediction comes in comparing the number of inmates correctly classified. We can use Figure 4 below to illustrate this concept.

Figure 4 below explains the two ways prediction correctly occurs and the two types of prediction errors that can logically occur in any such technique.

FIGURE 4

Depiction of Predicted Versus Actual Categories
of Gang Membership Among Jail Inmates

Actual Category From Survey

Question # 19A Among Inmates

HAVE YOU EVER JOINED A GANG?

NO YES

PREDICTION OF GANG MEMBERSHIP

BASED ON OTHER VARIABLES:

IS NOT A GANG MEMBER **Correctly False Negative:**

Predicts Error in Predicting

Non-Gang Someone To Not Be

Members. A Gang Member Who

Really Is.

IS A GANG MEMBER **False Correctly Predicts**

Positive: Who Is In Fact A

Error in Self-Reported

Labelling Gang Member Based

**Someone in on Surrogate or
a Gang Who Predictive Measures.**

is Not.

-

As seen in Figure 4 above, the upper left quadrant and the lower right quadrant contain "hits" while the upper right quadrant and lower left quadrant contain "misses" in prediction research. Any prediction above chance alone, that is, correctly classifying 50 percent or more of the cases, is probably valuable as a long run bet. However, it is not uncommon for such parole prediction techniques which involve similar predictions (of who was predicted to recidivate compared to who actually recidivated) to be able to correctly classify three-fourths of the sample used. A prediction technique that correctly classified three-fourths of the cases means that in 75 percent of the cases the prediction is going to be correct.

The percentage of cases that are "correctly classified" is a straight forward calculation. Referring to Figure 4 above, if we had 100 cases, and the results were as follows: (1) 25 predicted not to be a gang member who were actually not self-reported gang members, (2) 10 cases where the inmates were predicted not to be a gang member but who actually self-reported gang membership that is the false negative, (3) 15 cases where the inmates were predicted as a gang member but by self-report claim to never have joined a gang that is the false positive error, and (4) 50 cases where an inmate was predicted to be a gang member and who actually self-reported gang membership; then the overall evaluation of this prediction would be "75 percent correctly classified". The two types of erroneous predictions account for 25 percent of the cases in this fictitious example.

But from a behavioral perspective and safety point of view the type of error made in prediction also matters. A high false positive means you are labelling someone as a gang member who is not a gang member, but who simply may be "at risk" of the gang problem. A high false negative means you are allowing real gang members to escape detection through the prediction technique. For practical uses of this kind of prediction or screening for risk research, most practitioners in corrections want a low "false negative" rate. Just a few "false negatives" can cause a lot of trouble if the security level is based on the prediction.

The gang membership prediction issue was not addressed in the recent national assessment on gangs in corrections funded by the U.S. Department of Justice. The reason is no such actual inmate data was collected in that report (ACA, 1993), and thus with no inmates interviewed no prediction research was possible. A small sample of reports from prison and jail administrators is the closest recent federal research got to the problem (ibid).

Admittedly little effort was put into this prediction portion of the analysis using this jail inmate data, but it seems even a small effort yields interesting results, as will be seen below. Further, in the analysis undertaken here only the inmate population from the two larger county jails was used.

The eight variables used as predictors here are: (1) having ever served time in a juvenile correctional institution (add one point); (2) how many close friends and associates are gang members (0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 or more; generally if one or more, add one point); (3) ever having fired a gun at anyone (add one point); (4) having ever owned an assault rifle

(add one point); (5) having ever used an assault rifle in committing a crime (add one point); (6) having ever assaulted a school teacher (add one point); (7) having ever been assaulted by a member of a gang the person did not belong to (add one point); (8) know persons who specialize in selling stolen or illegal guns (add one point).

The results of this discriminant analysis are provided in Figure 5 below.

FIGURE 5

Results of Predicted Versus Actual Categories

of Gang Membership Among Jail Inmates

(Frequency Distribution of Cases)

Admitted Gang Membership HAVE YOU EVER JOINED A GANG?

NO YES

PREDICTION OF GANG MEMBERSHIP

BASED ON THE 8 VARIABLES:

IS NOT A GANG MEMBER 309 48

IS A GANG MEMBER 72 217

Figure 5 shows that the eight variables correctly classify 81.4 percent of all inmates in both jails in terms of predicting gang membership. As a screening or classification tool these eight questions could be expected to correctly identify three-fourths of all gang members in the two jails without ever asking them if they were a gang member. The predictor variables are surrogate measures of gang membership by the nature of the strong association they have to gang membership. If it walks like a duck by these eight variables, there is an 81.4 percent chance it's a duck.

A CLOSER LOOK AT GANG MEMBERS INSIDE EIGHT JAILS

The purpose of this section is to pool all gang members from the eight jails studied and examine this unique group in greater detail. A number of interesting issues beg our attention here. For example, would we expect a gang member

who reports being violated by his gang to be significantly more likely to also report having ever tried to drop his flag (i.e., attempt to leave the gang)? The large sample size of actual gang members behind bars allows us to test this notion.

Table 21 below illustrates that being beaten by one's own gang is not a factor associated with higher attempts to leave the gang.

TABLE 21

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF HAVING EVER BEEN VIOLATED

(I.E., RECEIVED A BEATING FROM THEIR GANG)

BY HAVING EVER ATTEMPTED TO LEAVE THE GANG

AMONG JAIL INMATES WHO ARE GANG MEMBERS

FROM EIGHT JAILS IN THE MIDWEST

Ever Attempt to Leave The Gang?

NO YES

Ever been violated by

your gang? NO 90 91

YES 47 46

Chi-square = 0.016, p = .89

(Not Significant)

Exploring why persons may attempt to leave the gang would seem to have importance for purposes of secondary and tertiary intervention. It also, of course, has much value in the profiling of gang members for cultivation as potential informants. Identifying the gang member who wants to leave the gang would have great value for gang investigation and prosecution. We realize at this point the type of information needed for such analysis will have to wait until results are in from a related large-scale research project dealing primarily with the economics of gang life, but which will also address in greater detail the present issue.

Examining the primary reason why an individual joined the gang in the first place would seem, at least theoretically, to offer a viable avenue of analyzing gang defection behavior. Table 22 below shows the reasons why inmates joined a gang in relationship to whether they have attempted to leave the gang.

TABLE 22

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PRIMARY REASON FOR JOINING A GANG
BY WHETHER THE PERSON HAS EVER ATTEMPTED TO LEAVE THE GANG
AMONG GANG MEMBER INMATES IN EIGHT MIDWEST JAILS

Ever Attempt to Leave Gang?

NO YES % Yes

Primary Reason for Joining Gang:

Protection 1 10 90.9%

To Be With Friends 33 49 59.7%

Was Pushed Into It 0 14 100.0%

To Make Money 44 28 38.8%

Family Member Was In The Gang 35 25 41.6%

Combination: Money & Friends 18 9 33.3%

Chi-square = 32.6, $p < .001$

As seen in Table 22 above, all who joined a gang primarily because they were "pushed into it" have attempted to leave the gang. With the next highest defection rate being for those who joined for purposes of protection. Those who joined "to make money" have one of the lowest rates for having ever attempted to leave the gang. A complete research project could be built around exploring this important issue.

THE SIX PERCENTER ISSUE

In the world of gangs, those who study motorcycle gangs recognize the historical meaning of the phrase "one percenters", originating from the thought that perhaps only one percent of all motorcyclists are "outlaws". In the world of gangs in relationship to corrections, many also recognize what "five percenters" are, and some consider this Islamic religious group a gang or security threat group. We must now add to the lexicon of gangs in relationship to corrections the "six percenter" issue. This is an important issue having enormous implications for national policy on the issue of gangs in corrections. The reason this is true is because it gets to the issue of what is the basic parameter for gang membership in American corrections today and, thus, some explanation is warranted here for explaining the meaning of the "six percenter" issue.

Another important reason why the six percenter issue deserves attention is the implication that using false or unreliable information could have a negative impact in terms of long term policy in American corrections. In one sense it is, as will be seen, the issue of what some call the "denial syndrome" at a macroanalytical level. Let us first examine, however, what is meant by the "six percenter issue".

To understand the "six percenter issue" we must return in gang research history to the Camp and Camp (1985) report.

This was a federally funded research project (1983-1985) which sought to collect fifty observations, one for each state prison "system", and treated the state prison system itself as the unit of analysis. Fifty states were contacted to have one person from each state estimate system parameters about the gang problem for each state. Camp and Camp (1985) reported such rough estimates for the 50 states.

There were many problems in the Camp and Camp (1985) research which made it unreliable. The bottom line here, however, is that Camp and Camp (1985) estimated that only three percent of the prison inmates in America were gang members. The Gondles, et al (1993) research recently completed by the American Correctional Association tries to build upon the Camp and Camp (1985) research. It compares findings to the Camp and Camp (1985) research, and basically estimates that today in America only six percent of the prison population are gang members.

Thus, the Gondles, et al (1993) research relies on the basic parameter estimate of six percent. There is much that is not consistent with this parameter of six percent.

1. Evaluating the "Six Percenter Issue" By Use of Simple Math and Public Information.

It is possible to use public information on the percentage of prison inmates who are thought to be gang members in some states from extant sources to evaluate the "six percenter issue". It would appear from this type of comparison that the ACA research must be questioned using simple gang arithmetic. With an overall prison inmate population in America of just less than one million, six percent would mean approximately 60,000 gang members as the total arithmetic estimate for America. By some estimates as well, California has nearly that number itself. Thus, if we are to believe the "6 percenter" estimate from the ACA research we must logically conclude that no gang members exist outside of California and Illinois or constitute a negligible proportion of confined gang members in America.

Why is this true? Again we must examine the historical record in gang research. Michael Lane was the director of the Illinois Department of Corrections when in an article in Corrections Today (1989) he estimated that 80 to 90 percent of the Illinois inmates were gang members. The Lane (1989) parameter was supported from other research (Knox, 1993), where nearly 97 percent of the inmates at the juvenile maximum security facility in Joliet were estimated to be gang members. Taking the Lane (1989) parameter and applying it to the current Illinois corrections population would yield 27,200 gang members for Illinois. This assumes, simply enough, no increase or decrease in gang problems. However, most would probably want to say that the Lane (1989) parameter is a conservative estimate, because the gang problem has probably increased rather than decreased over time. The recent ACA report contends that now the Illinois prison system has changed and only 48.1 percent of its population are gang members (ACA, 1993: p. 8).

More unbelievable yet is the estimate from ACA that only 3.2 percent of the inmates in the California correctional system are gang members (ibid). California has about 100,000 adult prison inmates, so the 3.2 percent gang density rate would yield an estimated 3,200 gang members. This cannot be reconciled with an independently published estimate that 5,100 of the California Youth Authority wards are gang members. How are we supposed to believe this?

From another independent source, we find the juvenile component of California's correctional system the gang density rate is estimated to be 75 percent. This includes gang members, associates, and sympathizers. Most believe this juvenile parameter mirrors that in the adult component of the California correctional system. Further, the reason the California adult correctional system provides such an unrealistically low estimate for the gang density rate is due to what is called the validation process. Simply being an inmate who was a gang member on the street, convicted of a gang crime, with gang tattoos, would not necessarily be enough in the strict validation process to classify the person as a gang member. So, the truth here is the gang density rate reported for the ACA report for California is actually their "validated" rate. Which means it is a way to underestimate gang density. Clearly, most in the system would agree that California adult correctional institutions alone have more actual gang members than the entire gang population estimated for the United States prison system in the recent 1993 ACA report!

2. Evaluating the "Six Percenter Issue" on the Basis of Previous National Assessments on Gangs in Corrections.

The National Commission on Correctional Health Care (NCCHC) study was a survey of 1,801 juveniles in short-

term and long-term juvenile correctional facilities in five states (NY, MA, TN, WI, and TX) and showed that about half of all confined juveniles --- male and female --- self-reported gang membership (Knox, Laske, Tromanhauser, 1992; Morris, et al, 1994). To the extent that juvenile corrections is a good barometer of what can be found in adult corrections, then clearly the "six percenter" parameter is woefully off target. Further, this type of research using the individual correctional resident as the unit of analysis is preferred above that of the type of research methodology used by Camp and Camp (1985) and the recent ACA (1993) report. The latter criticism is the matter of over-aggregation by treating an entire system as one unit of analysis. It is simply the more precise problem of asking questions to which statewide administrators may not have the answer, or alternatively if they do have the information they may not want to share the answer for political reasons (i.e., the denial syndrome). Thus, the methodology funded by NIJ provides few new answers to the gang problem in corrections and ignored juvenile corrections altogether. A national survey of 174 state correctional institutions in late 1993, similar to the ACA methodology using the individual state facility as the unit of analysis, showed a mean gang member density of 12.2 percent for male inmates (Knox, et al, 1993). This was based on responses from prison wardens and superintendents, and in some instances was delegated to the gang coordinator in that particular facility. This assessment of the gang problem in American corrections further estimates that three-fourths of all state adult correctional institutions in the United States had some level of a gang problem. What we have here, therefore, is a direct contradiction with the ACA study using the very same respondents at about the very same point in history. The somewhat larger sample by Knox, et al (1993) shows wardens estimating double the gang membership than that claimed by the ACA research. How can this be?

One possible reason for the discrepancy may be that ACA is the accrediting body for American correctional facilities and for this reason is least appropriate for professional objective research on prison problems as sensitive as that posed by gangs and gang members. Several state prison systems that reported gang problems to Camp and Camp (1985) suddenly report no such gang problems existing in 1993 to ACA. Those states where the gang problem suddenly disappeared from the 1985 study to the time of the 1993 ACA study include: Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, New York, and North Carolina. This is great news but not readily explained as an accomplishment of gang suppression in the ACA study. Rather some simple calculations of the data collected by ACA in 1992 (ACA, 1993: pp. 8-9) yields rather unbelievable results: gangs in the California system have an average of 6.8 members compared to an average of 596 members per gang in the Illinois system. This remarkable difference is explained nowhere in the ACA research report.

Admittedly, it is not in the best interests of reporting agencies to admit to a gang problem to the very agency that confers accreditation. The agencies cannot be blamed for attempting to meet their needs for accreditation when all concerned know that gang problems overlap with a host of other correctional problems (violence, health, law suits, etc).

Clearly, reliability is suspect when eleven states who claim no gang problem in the 1992 ACA survey (Alaska, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Montana, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Vermont, and Wyoming) admit to a gang problem to university researchers. Obviously, more work needs to be done.

3. Evaluating the "Six Percenter Issue" on the Basis of the Present Jail Survey Data.

Using the inmate as the unit of analysis in the form of anonymous survey research on jail facilities yields gang membership parameters far beyond that claimed by the recent ACA research on gangs in corrections. The national average for the percentage of inmates who are gang members from the ACA report was six percent. It should also be pointed out that the ACA definition for a gang is much broader than that used in the present research. The ACA definition includes any "threat group", which includes groups with a predominantly religious theme that would not be considered a "gang" in the context of the present research on jail inmates. Thus, using a more restrictive definition of

gang for jail inmates should theoretically yield a smaller gang density rating than six percent which the ACA purports is the existing national average.

The hypothesis tested here is an interesting one having only three logical possibilities: using a census of all inmates in two jails in two states separated by a river in the "heartland" of America far away from the large urban centers such as Chicago and Los Angeles,

*** The Lower Bound Scenario: Do we find a much smaller gang density than that predicted by the ACA report,

*** The Middle Bound Scenario: Do we find the means for these four jails tend to roughly mirror the national average of six percent suggested by ACA, or

*** The Upper Bound Scenario: Do we find a much high gang density than that ever predicted by the ACA research?

Logic and the correctional literature favors the first hypothesis, which predicts a rate for jails under 6 percent. Logic because, as already stated, the present research uses a more restrictive definition of gangs and because these geographical areas are in America's "heartland" where conventional wisdom holds that we do not expect the sensationalist crime patterns found in larger cities such as Chicago. The correctional literature recognizes that the jail is the intake point for the adult prison system: however, many in jail never go to prison. In fact, trustees and work release inmates are included in our present census of jail inmates and these are the kinds of "better risk inmates" not likely to be directly heading for prison. On this basis alone we would expect the jail to have a lower overall gang density rate --- because of the greater number of misdemeanor only offenders, and offenders who do not receive prison sentences, perhaps even traffic offenders --- than that which adult state prisons have. Thus logic and literature favors the lower bound scenario that gang density rates in the eight jails studied here should be lower than six percent.

In the present survey research on gangs, no inmate self-reported belonging to a religious group or any "Spanky and Alfalfa" type of unorganized near group, they reported being members of well known gangs found in many states today (Gangster Disciples, Vice Lords, Latin Kings, Aryan Brotherhood, etc). These are highly structured and formalized gangs. As noted earlier in this report, in the farmland jails 17.3 percent of the inmates reported they had joined a gang, 17.4 percent in the heartland jails, 40 percent in the urban outlying jail, and in the urban central jail 71.4 percent reported they had previously joined a gang. Often that is satisfactory for classifying someone as a gang member, that is simply ever having joined a gang. However, we have a more restrictive definition that means the inmates also report being current members of such gangs. Thus, as noted earlier in this report as well, in the farmland jails 15.4 percent of the inmates indicated they were currently gang members at the time of the survey, compared to 13.3 percent in the heartland jails, which rises to 24.7 percent in the urban outlying area jail, and to 62.1 percent in the urban central area jail.

Thus, clearly we can reject the first two hypotheses. The current research finds a significantly higher level of reported gang membership than that claimed by the ACA report. The findings in our research show that the actual gang density rates in jails are at least two to ten times higher than that recently estimated in the ACA report.

4. Summarizing All Known Research on the Six Percenter Issue.

Suffice it so say that current gang research knowledge is insufficient to be able to state with much certainty what the

actual gang member population is in America. The reason this is so is the current crime tracking system most criminological policy and discussion is based upon; the U.C.R. data does not systematically track "gang crime". Some states and smaller jurisdictions are attempting to monitor gang membership now, but this data has not been the source of much secondary analysis.

On the other hand, much research does point toward the conclusion that six percent is a gross underestimate of the actual gang membership parameter for American corrections today.

II. THE 1994 SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAM GANG SURVEY RESEARCH

In a systems approach to assessing the relationship if any between guns and gangs the first section of this report looked at a population where we can expect to find gang members --- in jail. However, not all gang members go to jail, and many can simply be found in the larger population of youths at large who attend public school. This section of the analysis therefore looks at the relationship between gangs and guns using a sample of public school students who were also surveyed during the summer of 1994. The same midwestern public high school used in Knox, Laske, and Tromanhauser (1992) was the site for a large summer school program in 1994 and provided the opportunity for assessing the relationship of firearms to gang issues using the general public high school population.

METHODOLOGY

The survey instrument was slightly modified to provide no mention of "jail" issues and given a different cover title

"ANONYMOUS STUDENT SURVEY", but was basically the same survey instrument, albeit one that was to be used on a public school population. Because of the planned matched-pair design described below the decision was made to provide a complete census of a large summer school program. That is, every single student in attendance on the day of the survey filled it out.

Having all students in attendance on the day of the survey complete the anonymous questionnaire generated a total sample size of $N = 449$ valid surveys. Of these, some $N = 87$ were self-reported gang members. Thus, self-reported gang members constituted approximately 19.3 percent of this summer school program sample. This is not an unusually high base rate for this particular school in a city historically known for its gang problems.

THE MATCHED-PAIR DESIGN

The 87 self-reported gang members were first taken out of the sample, leaving those respondents who reported having never joined a gang ($N=362$). Gang members were then matched with a random non-gang member using the successive demographic matching procedure described here. First gang members and non-gang members were matched by gender. Secondly gang members and non-gang members were further matched by race. Thirdly gang members and non-gang members were further matched by grade level. Fourthly, gang members and non-gang members were further matched by age. Thus four successive demographic variables are used to create the matched-pair design here.

What the above procedure allows is matching gang members by four demographic variables (gender, race, grade level, and age) with non-gang members in a random fashion. The reason the match has the condition of randomness is that we had a surplus of non-gang members in the subset who could be randomly chosen as the qualified match to a gang member having the same four demographic conditions. The data environment here as in many contexts is one where non-gang members outnumber gang members. Thus, taking the features of the gang member is going to be possible to provide an almost exact match by demographic features using the larger non-gang member population to select from.

Four racial groups were used: whites, blacks, Hispanics, and Asians.

As a test on the equivalence of the groups, gang members and non-gang members were compared on gender (perfect match), race (perfect match with whites, blacks, and Hispanics), grade level (almost perfect match), and age (very close match), and none of these tests were significant ($p < .05$) using the Chi-square distribution.

THE TYPE OF GANG ORGANIZATIONS IN THE GANG MEMBER SAMPLE

About half of the gang members were willing to identify the group or organization to which they belonged. A common remark gang respondents would write on their survey instrument in response to the question eliciting the name of their gang is "none of your business", usually which a strong adjective added. Some gangs do advise their members not to reveal such identification to anyone who can "hurt" their organization (e.g., police, etc). In some gangs this is codified into rules and regulations and revealing the gang name even in an anonymous survey could be construed as "revealing gang business" and if detected by other members of the gang could bring about a "violation" involving physical punishment. Among the gangs represented in this sample are: Four Corner Hustlers, Black P. Stone Nation, Cobras, Flying Dragons, various "folks" groups, Gangster Disciples, Insane Dragons, Latin Home Boyz, Latin Kings, Maniac Latin Disciples, Maniac Latin Lovers, and various factions of Vice Lords (Travelor, Insane, Mafia, Conservative, Unknowns, etc). Folks and peoples (aka "Brothers" among African-American gang

members) were about equally represented in the gang identification within this sample. Most of these gangs are highly structured gangs.

Generally, the same "balance" of gang groups previously found at this particular public high school (Knox, Laske, and Tromanhauser, 1992) was also found for this 1994 sample. That is, neither "folks" nor "peoples" had clear hegemony in this school population. There were about equally represented.

HOW GANG MEMBERSHIP DIFFERENTIATES THE SCHOOL POPULATION

The basic issue addressed here is whether self-reported gang membership as measured by having ever joined a gang is a variable that also significantly differentiates important factors within the public school student population. A later section of the report will provide for an overall comparative assessment that summarizes the same findings among inmates, students, and other samples.

The presentation of the findings here is very straight forward. Figure 6 shows those factors that were significantly differentiated by self-reported gang membership among this sample of summer students. Figure 7 shows those factors that are not significantly differentiated by gang membership.

Clearly, a consistent profile emerges in Figure 6 for the gang member. The gang member in the public school context is in fact a statistically unique human being in many ways. This is consistent with most prior research on the effects of gang membership within the school population.

Further some basic differences emerge looking at behavior comparing non-gang members with gang members in this school population. These are the types of differences that also basically define one of the aspects of gang life: crime and violence. Table 23 below shows how gang members are by all four measures of crime and violence are more significantly deviant than their non-gang member counterparts in the school population.

TABLE 23

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF FOUR MEASURES OF CRIME AND VIOLENCE

BY HAVING EVER JOINED A GANG AMONG

A MATCHED-PAIR SAMPLE OF PUBLIC SCHOOL STUDENTS

EVER JOIN A GANG?

No Yes

Does the student report one
or more prior arrests? NO 57 26

YES 27 59

Chi-square = 23.4, $p < .001$

Does the student report one
or more prior convictions? NO 72 42

YES 10 40

Chi-square = 25.8, $p < .001$

Does the student report one
or more prior felony convictions?

NO 71 53

YES 8 26

Chi-square = 12.1, $p < .001$

Does the student report being in
one or more physical fights
during the last one year period?

NO 39 13

YES 37 70

Chi-square = 22.9, $p < .001$

As seen in Table 23 above the gang member is significantly more likely to have a criminal record of arrests and convictions. Further the gang member is significantly more likely to report being in one or more physical fights during the last one year period. These variables of "trouble" were, of course, expected to vary by gang membership if our data was valid. It therefore appears that in addition to having basically "brand name" gangs represented in this sample, these are also the kind of gang members criminologists study: those involved in crime and violence.

FIGURE 6

FACTORS SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENTIATED BY GANG MEMBERSHIP AMONG A MATCHED-PAIR SAMPLE OF PUBLIC SCHOOL STUDENTS_

Description of Factor or Variable:

Whether student has ever served time in a juvenile correctional institution (4.7% non-gang members, 33.7% gang members).

Whether student has a permanent tattoo (11.6% non-gang members, 29.8% gang members).

Whether student has ever been suspended or expelled from a school for disciplinary problems (41.1% non-gang members, 72% gang members).

Having five or more close friends and associates who are gang members (53% non-gang members, 84.8% gang members).

Having five or more close friends and associates who use illicit drugs (34.1% non-gang members, 64.2% gang members).

Whether student reports ever having owned an assault rifle (0% non-gang members, 31.3% gang members).

Having used an assault rifle in a crime (2.3% non-gang members, 35.7% gang members).

Having ever carried a concealed gun (15.1% non-gang members, 62.3% gang members).

Having ever stolen a pistol or rifle (3.4% non-gang members, 28.7% gang members).

Having ever used a sawed-off shotgun to commit a crime (0% non-gang members, 22.3% gang members).

Having ever legally owned a firearm (1.2% non-gang members, 13% gang members).

Having ever sued anyone in court for a wrong that was done to you (3.5% non-gang members, 17.6% gang members).

In response to a wrong choosing the solution of "retaliate against the individual" (34.1% non-gang members, 64.1% gang members).

Belief that the legal system is the best way to handle disputes and settle conflicts (53.5% non-gang members, 40.9% gang members).

Belief that it is better to live by the law of the jungle than the law of the land (36.1% non-gang members, 63.4% gang members).

Whether student knows any persons in the gang or criminal subculture who specialize in selling stolen, illegal, or unregistered guns (39.7% non-gang members, 71.6% gang members).

Whether student has ever fired a gun at anyone (4.7% non-gang members, 50% gang members).

Whether student has ever used a gun with a silence or sound suppressor (6.4% non-gang members, 28% gang members).

Figure 6: Continued

Whether student has ever possessed or used illegal explosives (dynamite, military explosives, hand grenades, etc) (12% non-gang members, 36.1% gang members).

Whether student reports it would not be hard at all to acquire such illegal explosives (20% non-gang members, 37.3% gang members).

Whether student reports of having personally known of situations where a gang spends its treasury money to buy firearms (40.7% non-gang members, 69.6% gang members).

Whether student has ever asked anyone in the military if they could help in getting military weapons (6.2% non-gang members, 24% gang members).

Whether student agrees that "in my childhood troubles I simply did not have a chance to fully develop a set of moral beliefs" (30% non-gang members, 48% gang members).

Belief that "it is usually a mistake to trust a white person" (21% non-gang members, 38.7% gang members).

Belief that a verbal insult to one's self is best settled by violence or the threat of violence (38.2% non-gang members, 56.4% gang members).

Belief that "there are many effective ways available to me to settle grievances with other persons other than violence or the threat of violence" (77.9% non-gang members agree, 50% gang members agree).

Whether student reports having gone out of my way to specifically steal guns (3.8% non-gang members, 15.7% gang members).

Whether student reports if you knew that a store owner was armed with a gun would this prevent you from robbing that store (75.3% non-gang members, 47.1% gang members).

Whether student reports having ever worn a bullet-proof vest during a crime (4.1% non-gang members, 18.4% gang members).

Whether student reports having ever committed a crime on the property of or inside an apartment of a public housing project (11.5% non-gang members, 25.6% gang members).

Whether student reports having ever assaulted a school teacher (17.9% non-gang members, 44.8% gang members).

Whether student agrees "I would never use a gun in a crime if it carried a really long prison sentence" (76.3% non-gang members, 46% gang members).

Whether student agrees "is there anything police can do to actually prevent a gang from getin any city in America" (36% non-gang members, 18.6% gang members).

Whether student reports having ever been beaten up by a member of a gang you did not belong to (21.4% non-gang members, 55.8% gang members).

FIGURE 7

FACTORS NOT SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT BY GANG MEMBERSHIP

AMONG A MATCHED-PAIR SAMPLE OF PUBLIC SCHOOL STUDENTS

Description of Factor or Variable:

Belief that jobs could help stop youth crime.

Belief that poor people are overly represented in jails.

Belief that college education should be an American right.

Family structure.

Whether student would take a \$9.00 job if offered.

Whether student participates in extracurricular activities.

Belief that if youngsters were exposed to a man who had once been in a gang and now was "going straight" making it on his own, that this would be a powerful influence for youngsters to also get out of the gang.

Whether student reports it would be difficult to get a handgun.

Whether guns owned were registered with the police.

Belief that for the most part, justice gets done by the police and the courts.

Belief that we would have less crime if our laws were more strict.

Belief that "caning" or whipping an offender might reduce certain types of crime in America.

Belief that the best form of justice is simply "an eye for an eye".

Belief that you cannot expect justice through the legal system.

Whether student reports it would be difficult to get a fully automatic "machinegun".

Whether student would prefer an "assault rifle" or a handgun for purposes of criminal activity.

Belief that the laws of God are better for solving conflicts than the laws of man.

Belief that racial conflicts being what they are there is really no way to get justice in America (note: this approaches significance however, with 51.2% of non-gang members, and 65.8% of gang members agreeing with this belief, $p = .059$).

Belief that most criminals have not benefited from a fully developed set of moral beliefs.

Belief that there are many white people who are not prejudiced.

Belief that gang members really do not fear going to jail or prison.

Belief that it is better to have a feud than to forget when you have been wronged.

Whether student reports voting in the last presidential election.

Figure 7: Continued

Belief that a verbal insult to one's gang group, organization, or nation is best settled by violence or the threat of violence.

Belief that physical punishment is more effective than a monetary fine.

Whether student reports having ever lived in a public housing project ($p = .07$, 12.8% non-gang members, 24% gang members).

Whether student reports being a currently registered voter.

Whether student agrees "I am more likely to be violent in the situation of being with my group than I am as a lone individual".

Whether student agrees "if judges had to give an automatic natural life sentence for using a gun in any crime would this really prevent you from ever using a gun in a crime".

Whether student agrees it is fair to enhance prison sentences for gang members using guns.

Whether student believes the gangs in prison really "run" the gangs on the streets.

Whether student believes the gangs in prison basically exist in the same form on the streets.

Whether student believes the same internal rules that apply to prison gang members also apply to the members of the same gang on the streets.

Belief that gang membership helps in obtaining firearms ($p = .06$, 64.3% non-gang members, 78.2% gang members).

Acknowledgement that prior to committing a crime would it ever occur to you that you might be arrested.

THE GANG MEMBERSHIP PROFILE AMONG STUDENTS

The variables in our survey that were significantly differentiated by gang membership were described in Figure 6. In all of these variables a significant statistical difference exists knowing simply whether or not the person had previously joined a gang (yes or no). Significance is defined here as a probability level of less than .05 by the Chi-square test. Such significant differences therefore mean that in less than one out of twenty times could such a difference occur by chance alone.

The behavioral profile that emerges here for gang members is one having the following characteristics among public school students:

*** Has more prior arrests.

*** Has been in more physical fights.

*** Has served time in some correctional facility.

*** Has a permanent tattoo.

*** Has been suspended/expelled from school.

*** Has many friends who are gang members or drug users.

*** Is more likely to bring a civil suit.

*** Has assaulted a teacher before.

*** Has been assaulted by both rival gangs and his own gang.

*** More likely to have committed a crime in public housing.

The attitudinal, ideological, and psychological profile that emerges here for gang members is one having the following characteristics among public school students:

*** Will retaliate as first choice of conflict resolution.

*** Less confident about using legal means to solve conflicts.

*** Believes in the law of the jungle.

*** Blames current condition on childhood troubles for not developing a full set of moral beliefs.

*** Believes it is a mistake to trust white people.

*** Believes verbal insults to self are best settled by violence.

*** Sees fewer ways to effectively settle grievances other than through violence.

*** Less likely to believe there is anything police can do to prevent a gang from getting started anywhere in America.

The profile about the use of firearms for the gang member that emerges is one having the following characteristics among public school students:

*** More likely to use an assault rifle in a crime.

*** More likely to carry a concealed firearm.

*** More likely to have ever stolen a firearm.

*** More likely to have used a sawed-off shotgun.

*** More likely to have legally owned a firearm.

*** More likely to know illegal gun sources.

*** More likely to have fired a gun at someone.

*** More likely to have used a gun with a silencer.

*** More likely to have possessed/used explosives.

*** More likely to report ease of acquiring explosives.

*** More likely to know personally know of situations where the gang uses its treasury money to purchase firearms.

*** More likely to have asked someone in the military to help acquire illegal military weapons.

*** Less likely to be deterred from robbing a storeowner who is known to be armed.

*** More likely to have used body armor in a crime.

*** Less likely to be deterred from gun offenses by longer prison terms.

The profile that emerges for the summer school student population is one that is largely consistent with that found for gang members in the jail population. This will, however, be discussed in a later section of this report where the commonalities between all data sources are summarized regarding gangs and guns.

III. THE 1994 SUMMER PROBATIONER PROGRAM SAMPLE.

When youths are not in school or in jail, and if they are not involved in community programs, there is one other context in which they might be found: on a probation caseload. Thus, a third component of our survey research sought to develop a useful sample of gang members who from a systems point of view would not be found in jail and would not be found in the public school. We still recognize that there exists an unknown sized group of potential gang members who are by the nature of their social integration into the gang are not going to be easily reached for purposes of an anonymous survey. The fact is some are not confined in a correctional facility and some are not in traditional school settings.

Another sample was therefore developed for analyzing the relationship between gangs and guns. This sample consists of youths and young adults who are on probation and who are subject to supervision and monitoring by a

gang intervention expert. The youths were under felony or misdemeanor probation from Du Page County, Illinois.

The youths were all ordered by the court as part of their probation sanction to participate in an aggression management program. The aggression management program is administered by the Director of the Outpatient Services division of a major suburban hospital. The director of this program personally administered the survey instruments. About half of the respondents completed the survey one at a time, and about half completed the survey in small groups, at all times supervised by the program director who is a research associate on a related gang project.

METHODOLOGY

The data on gang members in a private probation program was collected in July, 1994 corresponding to the same time frame the public school data was collected, and some of the jail data was collected. The survey instrument used with this population is identical to that used with the public school student population. The questionnaire was simply, to recap, given the front page title of "Anonymous Student Survey" and any reference to current status in jail was dropped from the questions it contained for the jail inmate sample.

A total of $N = 69$ usable surveys were collected from the probationers. Most of these youths (84.1%) are gang members. As this is a small sample to begin with, the few cases which are not self-reported gang members provides little opportunity for meaningful comparisons along the dimension of gang membership. It makes more sense to simply summarize the "gang member profile" that emerges from this sample of young probationers. Thus, only the self-reported gang members in this sample of probationers ($N = 58$) are used in the analysis that follows.

PROFILE OF THE GANG MEMBER

The profile that emerges from these 58 gang members on probation is largely consistent with that found in other social contexts.

Demographics: While all are self-reported gang members, these are mostly males (94.3%), with only three females in the sample (5.7%). They are 29.1 percent white, 30.9 percent African-American, 20 percent Hispanic (Mexican), 18.2 percent Hispanic (Puerto-Rican or South American), and one respondent indicated "other" for ethnicity. Their ages range from a low of 16 years old to a high of 28 years old, with the mean or average age being 21.2 years old for this sample of gang members.

Experience in the Criminal Justice System: The number of total prior arrests including those as a juvenile ranged from a low of 1 to a high of 30, with a mean of 4.8 such prior arrests. The number of times they have been convicted of any crime (traffic, misdemeanor and felony offenses) ranged from a low of one to a high of twenty, with a mean of 2.9 such prior convictions of any type. Regarding the specific variable of prior felony convictions, this sample showed a range between a low of zero to a high of six, with a mean or average of 1.4 such prior felony convictions. Their age at time of first arrest ranged from a low of 7 years old to a high of 20, with a mean of 15 years of age for the entire sample for their age at time of first arrest. Just over half of these youths (57.9%) have previously served time in a juvenile correctional institution.

Family, Education, and Employment: Just under half of these gang members (44.8%) come from an intact family.

Nineteen percent come from a father-only family, a fourth (25.9%) come from a mother-only family, and 10.3 percent come from reconstituted families (i.e., composed of one natural parent and one step-parent and siblings or step-siblings). Most have not completed high school, with 8.8 percent having completed the 9th grade, 45.6 percent having completed the 10th grade, 19.3 percent having completed the 11th grade, and about a fourth (26.3%) having completed the 12th grade or obtained their GED. While in school, about a half (48.3%) did participate in adult supervised extracurricular activities (sports, band, service clubs, etc). Some 31 percent of these gang members report having been suspended or expelled from school for disciplinary problems, which is low considering that 63.6 percent of the gang members also report having previously assaulted a school teacher. Still some 29.8 percent reported being currently employed. Yet 35.1 percent had been unemployed for 6 months, and another 21.1 percent had been unemployed for 6 to 12 months, and 14 percent had never held a full-time job. If they had the training and the a job were available paying \$9.00 per hour, still not all would take it; some 70.7 percent would take the job, and 29.3 percent would not take the job. These are suburban youths, so it is not surprising to find that only a small fraction of these gang members (3.6%) report having ever lived in a public housing project. It is of more than some interest to report, however, that 74.5 percent of these same gang members do report having committed crimes on the property of or inside an apartment of a public housing project. Most of these youths (81.8%) are single and never married.

Tattoos, Fights, and Subcultural Friends: This is known to be an aggressive gang sample by the nature of the social context studied (a court-mandated Aggression Management Program for young adults on misdemeanor or felony probation). It is not surprising to find that 81 percent of these gang members have permanent tattoos. Further, all had been in one or more fights during the last one year period. The number of fights involved in ranged from a low of one to a high of 20, with a mean of 5.4 fights during the last year. Almost all (96.6%) had one or more close friends and associates who were also gang members, in fact a third (34.5%) report having five or more such close gang associates. Almost all (94.8%) had one or more close friends and associates who use illegal drugs, in fact 37.9 percent report having five or more such close drug abusing associates.

Gang Joining Behavior: The age at time of first joining the gang ranged from a low of 9 years old to a high of 18, with a mean of 13.2 years old for the entire sample of gang members. Three-fourths (75.9%) were still members of the gang at the time of completing the survey. The types of gangs included here are not the low level, non-descript, innocuous or relatively unknown types of gangs reported in other gang research on social contexts of this type, but are well known criminal gangs: Four Corner Hustlers, Black Gangster Disciples, Insane Deuces, Latin Kings, Maniac Latin Disciples, Simon City Royals, and Spanish Gangster Disciples, and Two Sixers --- all of which have their roots in nearby Chicago. The lowest level gangs represented in this sample are a couple members of the White Aryan Resistance, a Blood in a town with few colleagues, and a couple members of a local group called the Almighty Homeboys. Most of the gang members in this sample, thus, are members of recognized criminal gangs which have their origins in Chicago and now exist throughout the USA. Where it was possible to classify the Chicago-based gangs for purposes of affiliation, two-thirds (66.7%) were folks, and a third (33.3%) were peoples or brothers. A half (50.9%) report that their gang is racially mixed and about the same proportion (57.7%) report that such members are really treated equal. Their reasons for joining a gang were as follows: 7.4% for protection, 22.2% "to be with friends", 13% "was pushed into it", 13% "to make money", a third (33.3%) because "a family member was in the gang", and 11.1 percent for a mixture of money and friends. In this suburban gang sample, then, those joining for the money making opportunities in the gang are truly the exception to the rule.

Most of these gang members (78.6%) have never attempted to leave the gang. What this may be implying is at least a hypothesis worthy of investigation: do youths who join gangs in the suburbs join for non-economic reasons and therefore joining for essentially integrative reasons having to do with the value of social ties to friends and family, do they last longer in the gang --- that is, continue over time longer without attempting to leave the gang? We shall have to wait until later to be able to address this hypothesis generally, and until larger samples are developed using suburban gang members than that developed here (N = 58).

Some 64.9 percent of these gang members agreed with the idea that a reformed ex-gang member might be effective in helping youths get out of the gang.

About one-third (32.7%) of these gang members can be considered highly dedicated to their gang, in that they expressed the opinion that they would rather die than give up their allegiance to their gang.

About half (45.3%) felt that there was nothing that police could do to actually prevent a gang from getting started in any city in America.

About a third (34%) expressed the belief that the gangs in prison really run the gangs on the streets. About two-thirds (69.8%) expressed the view that the gangs in prison basically exist in the same form on the streets. About a third (34%) acknowledged that the same internal rules that apply to prison gang members also apply to the members of the same gang on the streets.

The vast majority of these gang members (86.5%) report that they have been victims of violence from their own gang, that is that they have been "violated" (i.e., received a beating) by their own gang for a "violation". Over half of the gang members in this sample (62.5%) also report that they have been beaten up by a member of a gang they did not belong to. Still, it appears that in this sample of suburban gang members they are more likely to have been a victim of violence by their own gang than from the opposition.

Firearms Access, Use, and Methods of Operation: The suburban gang member of a big city gang appears to be no less armed and no less experienced in firearms use than big city counterparts, however, no comparative empirical analysis is offered at this juncture. Some 22.8 percent of these gang members do report having owned an assault rifle. Some 40.4 percent report having used an assault rifle while committing a crime. Although only 1.8 percent report having used a sawed-off shotgun to commit a crime.

Some 21.4 percent of these gang members claim to never have carried a concealed gun. But a third (33.9%) report being in the habit of carrying a conceal gun all the time. Some 19.6 percent report carrying a gun situationally, only in some situations. And a fourth (25%) report carrying a concealed gun only when doing a crime.

About half (57.1%) report having stolen a pistol or rifle, and about half of these gun-stealing gang members also report having kept one for their personal use.

The age at the time these gang members first fired any gun ranged from a low of 5 to a high of 17 years old, with a mean of 13.7 for the entire sample. The age at the time these gang members first illegally carried a concealed gun on their person for any reason ranged from a low of 12 to a high of 19, with the mean being 15.6 years old.

Only 7.1 percent report ever legally owning any firearm (that is, legally purchasing it themselves and registering it in their name). Similarly, only 5.7 percent of these gang members report that any of the gangs they have ever owned or used were guns legally registered with the police or authorities.

Given the scenario where they had to quickly acquire a handgun and asked to evaluate where they would be most successful in getting it, 72 percent indicated their source would be other gang associates. The other sources were: 4 percent pawnshops, 6 percent family members, 4 percent a "fence", 2 percent a gun shop, 10 percent a drug dealer,

and 2 percent a burglary. For these suburban gang members, then, their most likely source of firearms if they needed to acquire one in a hurry would be from other gang members.

The most frequently preferred types of firearms for these gang members would be: 9mm semi-automatic pistols (30.3%), 45 calibre semi-automatic pistols (18.2%), Tec-9 semi-automatics (18.2%), and revolvers or pistols generally (12.1%).

About a fourth of these gang members (28.8%) report that they do know persons in the gang or criminal subculture who specialize in selling stolen, illegal, or unregistered guns.

Most (79.2%) believe that gang membership helps in obtaining firearms.

Most (83%) have fired a gun at someone. About a third (34.6%) have fired a gun at someone during a family fight. About half (56.9%) have fired a gun at someone during a gang fight. About a third (38.5%) have fired a gun at someone during a drug deal. None report having fired a gun at someone during a police shootout.

Asked how difficult it would be to acquire a fully automatic machinegun, the results were 10.9 percent "very hard to get", 63.6 percent "somewhat hard to get", and 25.5 percent "not hard at all".

Only 9.1 percent report having ever used a gun with a silencer or sound suppressor. About twice as many of these gang members (18.2%) do however report having ever possessed or used illegal explosives. Asked about the difficulty of obtaining illegal explosives (dynamite, military explosives, hand grenades, etc), the responses were 14.5 percent "very hard", 49.1 percent "somewhat hard", and 36.4 percent "not hard at all".

Over three-fourths of these gang members (79.6%) report that they have personally known of situations where a gang spends its treasury money to buy firearms.

Asked if they would personally prefer an assault rifle or a handgun for purposes of criminal activity, most (81.8%) chose the handgun, and those choosing the assault rifle were in the minority (18.2%). However, half (50.9%) of these gang members report that they have previously asked someone in the military if they could help in getting military weapons.

Some 12.7 percent of these gang members do report having previously worn a bullet-proof vest while committing a crime.

Social Controls: In many respects their attitudes and predispositions about conflict and the limited role of formal social control among these gang members is common to the profile developed in other social contexts.

Asked what their most likely solution would be if someone does them wrong, none would call the police, 18.8 percent would use a third party to negotiate, 8.3 percent would ask the person for an apology/restitution, but most (72.9%) would simply retaliate against the person.

Most (69.2%) disagree with the idea that for the most part justice gets done by the police and the courts.

Most (73.2%) disagree with the idea that we would have less crime if our laws were more strict.

Most (71.7%) disagree with the idea that the legal system is the best way to handle disputes and settle conflicts.

Most (74.5%), it is of some interest, agree with the idea that "caning" or whipping an offender might reduce certain types of crime in America.

Most (85.2%) agree with the idea that it is better to live by the law of the jungle than the law of the land.

Other Attitudes and Beliefs. Some 83.6 percent of these gang members felt that "in my childhood troubles I simply did not have a chance to fully develop a set of moral beliefs". Some 63 percent felt that most criminals have not benefited from a fully developed set of moral beliefs.

On the other hand, there was little racial tension in this sample. Only 12.7 percent agreed with the idea that racial conflicts being what they are, there really is no way to get justice from any means in America. Similarly, only 3.7 percent felt it was usually a mistake to trust a white person.

A third (34.5%) agreed with the idea that gang members really do not fear going to jail or prison.

About two-thirds (65.5%) felt it is better to have a feud than to forget when you have been wronged. Some 72.7 percent agreed that a verbal insult to one's self is best settled by violence or the threat of violence. Most (74.5%) recognized the fact that there are many effective ways available to settle grievances other than by violence.

IV. FINDINGS FROM A SURVEY OF YOUTHS IN AN INNER CITY

COMMUNITY PROGRAM.

Previous portions of this report have examined the relationship between gangs and guns in those sectors of society where we can expect to find gang members: in jail, in the public school population, and in juvenile probation programs. Here we find another way to locate gang members who might not otherwise be located in any of those three environments. Here we look at the social context consisting of that found in community-based programs that deals specifically with inner city youths who are at high risk of gang membership and a host of other problems. Three such programs served as sources for purposive sampling: (1) the Sullivan House, a child welfare agency; (2) the Chicago Youth Center, a community center; and (3) The F.O.R.U.M. (Fulfilling Our Responsibility Unto Mankind) Program, which is similar to the Sullivan house.

The fact that these programs offer such a diverse range of social services to inner city youths living on Chicago's southside, makes it a worthwhile social context in which to investigate the relationship between gangs and guns. During the summer of 1994 there were occasions when one of the programs had to "shut down" because in some such instances it was not safe for program participants to get to and from the program site without significant risk of personal harm. Gang warfare during the summer of 1994 in this area was widely covered in the mass media and newspapers. During this period of intensive gang violence one of the programs did have to cancel some of its regularly scheduled activities over fears for the safety of the program participants.

Thus, the social context in which this data was collected is one that speaks directly to the problem of gang violence, particularly armed gang violence.

METHODOLOGY

The same survey instrument used with students and probationers was used for data collection among the program participants during early August, 1994. One of the primary direct service contacts the youths have at these programs was in this instance a person who had previously served on a related gang research task force, and who agreed to have the survey instruments administered in these programs. Shortly after the surveys were completed by about 200 youths who receive services from the programs, this same person who provided such help with data collection reported that the passenger van used for one of the programs was the target of gang graffiti; specifically, a warning from the Gangster Disciples designed to intimidate the program staff. This was, we are told, unrelated to the data collection; and rather was part of the ongoing problem of working with youths who may have strong gang connections.

THE MATCHED-PAIR DESIGN

About a third of the program participants who completed the anonymous survey instrument indicated that they had at some time in the past joined a gang. This allowed implementing the same type of matched-pair design previously discussed with the public school sample. Gang members and non-gang members were therefore matched first by race, then by gender, and then by age or grade level. This procedure generated a total gang member sample of $N = 36$

and an equivalent sized sample for non-gang members (N = 36).

The gang member sample is, by chance alone, roughly half "Peoples" or "Brothers" (Black P. Stone Nation, Mickey Cobra Nation, etc) and half "Folks" (Black Gangster Disciple Nation, Black Disciple Nation, Sisters of the Struggle, etc). Table 24 below shows the commonalities in the matched-pair sample.

TABLE 24

COMMONALITIES IN THE MATCHED-PAIR SAMPLE

Gang Member Non-Gang Member

Sample (N=36) Sample (N=36)

GENDER: % of Males 63.8% 63.8%

% of Females 36.2% 36.2%

RACE: % Non-white 94.4% 97.2%

AGE: % 13-17 yrs. old 80.5% 80.5%

As seen in Table 24 above, the gang member sample and the non-gang member sample is equally matched on gender, race, and age.

These are, we should recall, youths from the very same community area of Chicago's southside. Thus, we can assume they are also homogenous and relatively equivalent with regard to the area in which they live. While these are essentially the same types of youths it will be seen, however, that their experiences in life differ in dramatic ways once we begin comparing these two groups to examine what difference gang membership plays.

A Note on Religious Identity Groups

Those in the gang member sample indicated by self-report that at some time in their lives they had joined a gang. However, there were three cases where religious identity was specifically listed as the type of gang affiliation, and for the following reasons these were excluded from the matched-pair design entirely. We did not include a member of the Nation of Islam as a gang member, just as we did not include an equally fervent Christian respondent who felt so strongly about his church that he remarked "my church is my gang". We were not sure what one respondent was, who indicated his group as the "Sico Nubian Nation" and provided a neat string of six gang symbols similar to the

United in Peace gang truce button, and therefore classification was suspended on this case until it was later determined by follow-up through the program contact that it was in fact a gang identity. This was simply one of the many "put ons" gangs use to describe their gang to the "straight" public (e.g., Gangster Disciples calling themselves "Growth and Development"), but a new one to us in this instance.

We recognize that many correctional agencies may classify some religious identity groups in the same category as organized gangs by calling them all "threat groups". The recent research by ACA (1993), for example, specifically identifies "Nation of Islam" as one such security threat group. However, as discussed by one of the researchers elsewhere (Knox, 1993) religious fervor or even religious zeal is not a crime. There are groups with essentially deviant ideologies and beliefs, but only when this becomes the basis for common criminal acts are we eligible analytically to in this instance classify them as "gangs". Recall that the present researchers adopt a criminological definition to the concept of "gangs", and therefore would not include simple deviance or social differences as the basis for being regarded as a gang. For the types of self-reported gang members throughout this investigation of gang membership in a number of different social contexts (jails, public school, probation supervision, community-based program) we are basically talking about members of more organized gangs whose identity as a criminal organization is widely recognized by criminal justice agencies, the public, and scholars alike.

COMMONALTIES: Factors Not Significantly Differentiated by Gang Membership.

The purpose of this section is to present those findings where gang membership makes no significant difference.

These are therefore commonalities and reflect variables for which, in this social context sample at least, gang membership does not produce a statistically significant difference when comparisons are made with non-gang members. The concept "statistically significant difference" is used here in its common social science meaning as the .05 probability level. Thus, any probability level less than .05 ($p < .05$) is generally considered statistically significant, meaning it could occur by less than one out of twenty times by chance alone. Conversely, a difference is not significant if the probability level is greater than .05 (i.e., $p > .05$). Factors not significantly differentiated by gang membership are therefore commonalities in comparing gang members and non-gang members.

All of the following were variables not significantly differentiated by gang membership in the community-based inner city program surveyed during the summer of 1994:

*** Beliefs about whether more jobs could stop youth crime. No significant difference emerged comparing gang members and non-gang members in terms of whether they believed that more jobs could help stop youth crime. Both groups were identical in their level of support for this belief (80.5%).

*** Beliefs about poor people in jail.

No significant difference emerged comparing gang members and non-gang members in terms of whether they thought that poor people are overly represented in American jails today. Some 41.6 percent of the non-gang members and 55.5 percent of the gang members agreed with the idea that poor people are overly represented in the American jail population.

*** Beliefs about whether college education should be a right for all Americans.

All of the gang members (100%) felt that quality education including college should be a right for all Americans, which differs dramatically from non-gang members (77.7%), however using the Chi-square test in this instance is affected by the sparsely fitted cell for gang members. Basically, both groups were rather high on this variable, leaving little variation to explain. Thus, it is treated here as a commonality.

*** No Difference In Family Structure Styles.

Overall, comparing gang members and non-gang members no significant difference emerged in comparing the four types of family structure for family of orientation. This question in the survey asked the respondent to indicate what type of family they are from. The results were as follows:

	Non-Gang Member	Gang Member
--	-----------------	-------------

# Intact Family	9	4
-----------------	---	---

# Father-only	2	1
---------------	---	---

# Mother-only	13	26
---------------	----	----

# Reconstructed	8	5
-----------------	---	---

Thus, only 9 of the non-gang members and 4 of the gang members came from family structures composed of mother, father, and siblings. The fewest in either group came from father-only families, that is family structures composed of father only and siblings. However, twice as many gang members (72.2%) came from mother-only family structures than did non-gang members (40.6%), that is a family composed of mother-only and siblings. The two groups did not vary much in whether they came from a reconstructed family, that is one composed of one natural parent and one step-parent and siblings or step-siblings. A later test may therefore reveal a significant difference by collapsing these family structure categories to a two-category comparison which would look at the difference between "mother-only" structures and all other structures.

*** No Difference in Current Employment Status Emerges in Comparing Gang Members and Non-Gang Members.

No statistically significant difference exists comparing gang members and non-gang members in terms of their current employment status. The question on the survey asked "What is your employment status" and here are the results for the four choices:

Non-Gang Members Gang Members

Currently employed 12 14

Unemployed 6 months 1 3

Unemployed 6-12 months 3 2

Never had a full-time job 16 15

As seen here, 50 percent of the non-gang members and 44.1 percent of the gang members report never having had a full-time job. The fact that regarding whether the respondent was currently employed and clearly had a job it is more interesting to note that no difference exists comparing gang members (41.1%) and non-gang members (37.5%) on this measure of legitimate opportunity. This finding is therefore not consistent with the classic theory on gang formation or gang joining behavior advanced by Cloward and Ohlin (1960) which would have hypothesized much lower actual employment opportunity for gang members.

*** No difference emerges between gang members and non-gang members on whether they would take a job paying \$9.00 per hour.

A fascinating economic issue exists with regard to the handling and response to gang problems at a macroanalytical level. Incarcerating a juvenile can cost \$100,000 in a short-term juvenile correctional institution in some areas of the United States. However, paying them a full-time salary of \$9.00 per hour would be less than \$20,000 per year. So not to neglect the obvious, a question on the survey simply asked "if you had the training and the job were available, would you take a job that paid \$9.00 per hour?". All of the gang members said they would take the job, and 91.6 percent of the non-gang members said they would take the job.

From a larger economic perspective, then, one must wonder whether it might make more fiscal sense to simply design a type of work environment that would provide the type of social control equivalent to that of a correctional facility --- a job that like many in the occupational structure of any society systematically controls the context and situation and exposure to the rest of the society --- in a fashion where equal "prevention" could be accomplished for a fraction of the cost of traditional penal responses to the problem. The concept of fiscal good sense is superseded unfortunately by the more base emotional response to the problem in which the popular opinion demanding retribution or incarceration is felt to be an effective solution. It is, as any correctional research knows, anything but an effective solution; the only effect that occurs for the expenditures of juvenile secure detention is that of incapacitation --- removing the juvenile offenders from the context in which they would be prone to continue their delinquent exploits. However, a job could probably do the same thing for most of the daily schedules of many human beings, and it would obviously be a significant reduction in the economic costs paid for by taxpayers.

Let it be clear that we are not, collectively, recommending in this report such a policy to replace juvenile correctional penal sanctions in America with a new artificially created job subsidy program. We are, rather, acknowledging that it is an existing issue of some social policy concern and one deserving of additional analysis for generating future choices to an open and free society. We do want to be brutally honest in recognizing that the equation for the abolition

of prison or its equivalent for juveniles necessarily implies, to achieve benefit-cost positive value, dismantling an existing government employment structure, over time at least, to the effect of eliminating jobs for existing correctional workers --- indeed, occupations that colleges and universities throughout the United States continue earnestly preparing people to enter through the provision of such correctional administration and programming courses at a university level.

***** No difference exists whether the youths did or did not participate in any adult supervised extracurricular activities (sports, band, service clubs, etc) while in school.**

Much popular thinking about youth socialization presupposes a positive long term human developmental benefit from adult supervised extracurricular activities commonly provided in schools today and historically as well. While the purpose and major outcome goal of such services is not specifically that of gang prevention, at least historically where we could argue this activity is cultural and economic in nature whereby the school becomes like the church a multi-social service one-stop type of social institution, taking on ever more responsibilities for the presumed failure of other social institutions to effectively socialize youths, it is we feel somewhat curious why no statistically significant difference exists in terms of whether gang members differ from non-gang members on this socialization or some might argue social control variable.

The fact is almost no difference emerges here on this variable of having ever participated in such extracurricular school-based and adult-supervised activities. Some 74.2 percent of the non-gang members and 69.4 percent of the gang members reported in this sample that they had in fact participated in such adult supervised extracurricular activities while in school. It is likely that the school setting we are talking about in this sample is the Chicago Public School system, which like any large school system, has genuine variation in the quality of such program services; thus, the authors would caution against any knee-jerk reaction to thinking of cutting these programs out of the school budget, because the data here do not qualify as the best form of program evaluation.

***** Gang members generally are more likely to have tattoos, but not significantly different in this social context from their non-gang member counterparts.**

Some 16.6 percent of the non-gang members and 28.5 percent of the gang members reported having permanent tattoos. In some other social contexts this variable has often been found to be significantly differentiated by gang membership.

***** Gang members and non-gang members alike in this youthful sample equally agree about the value of using former gang members in gang intervention services.**

The scenario presented in the survey was "if youngsters were exposed to a man who had once been in a gang and now was going straight making it on his own, do you think he would be a powerful influence for youngsters to also get out of the gang?". Some 72.7 percent of the non-gang members and 67.7 percent of the gang members agreed with this idea. Agreeing with it, we must point out, does not make it ipso facto a necessarily effective strategy overall. What we may be measuring here is some dimension of popular support for the "ex-" everything as spokes-persons or activists in related causes or moral crusades.

***** No significant difference exists comparing gang members with non-gang members in terms of having ever owned an assault rifle.**

Some 17.1 percent of the non-gang members and 31.4 percent of the gang members both claimed to have ever owned what would be considered an assault rifle. The demand for guns among gang members gets most of the attention, but the demand for firearms among non-gang members who feel threatened by or are responding to the perceived threats represented by gangs is an area not previously researched. What we seem to have here are similar levels of such weapons ownership, with the trend being a somewhat higher level for gang members, albeit not a statistically significant difference.

*** Gang Members Steal More Guns, But This Variable Has A Low Base Rate In This Sample.

The Chi-square test comparing gang members and non-gang members on whether they have ever stolen a firearm (pistol or rifle) is significant, however, because of the low base rate we recognize that caution is warranted here. We do not accept it, therefore, as a genuine difference for this small sample. The trend, however, is very predictable: gang members steal more guns than do non-gang members. Some 3 percent of the non-gang members reported having previously stolen a pistol or rifle compared with 25 percent of the gang members. Generally, other contexts show this variable to be differentiated significantly by gang membership. The problem is that only one of the non-gang members reported stealing a firearm, making the base rate so small that there is little variation in the data to explain. This often happens with smaller samples.

*** More gang members have used a sawed-off shotgun, but the base rate is low, and not significantly different from non-gang members in this sample.

The question asked whether the respondent had ever used a sawed-off shotgun to commit a crime. Some 5.8 percent of the non-gang members and 14.2 percent of the gang members self-reported this behavior.

*** As may be deduced from the youthful age of this sample few of the respondents report that they have legally owned the firearms they have used and possessed. The base rate here is very small, and in this sense prohibits any meaningful test of differences in this sample, because there is little variation to be able to explain. Only one of the non-gang members and 3 of the gang members reported having legally owned a firearm since 1968 as defined as "legally purchasing it yourself, and registering it in your name".

*** No difference exists among the small number who have previously sued someone in civil court for a "wrong" that was done to them.

Two of the non-gang members (5.8%) and four of the gang members (11.4%) report having ever sued someone in civil court for a wrong that was done to them. Again, we have such a small base rate for this variable that it precludes any significance testing.

Court remedies are expected to vary by age, and this sample is on the younger end of the age spectrum.

*** No difference exists by whether any of the guns these youths have ever owned or used were actually legally registered with the police or authorities.

Two gang members and two non-gang members reported that of any guns they have ever owned or used, that these guns were legally registered with the police or authorities. In most urban contexts like that used here, youths are not allowed to legally register firearms, only adults are. This variable therefore has little variation in this youthful sample.

***** No Difference Exists Regarding Beliefs About Whether For The Most Part, Justice Gets Done By the Police and the Courts.**

We suspect that the longer the rap sheet the higher the denunciation of this belief about whether for the most part justice gets done by the police and the courts. An actual test of this will have to wait until a later section where we will be able to examine a larger combined sample of gang members pooled together from various social contexts.

However, among this particular sample of inner city youths, it is interesting to note that at this early age in the developmental life span that no significant difference emerges in comparing gang members and non-gang members.

Some 52.9 percent of the non-gang members agreed that for the most part justice gets done by the police and the courts compared to 33.3 percent among gang members. Clearly, the trend is set even at this younger age, however it is not a significant difference for this sample.

***** No difference exists comparing gang members and non-gang members in terms of whether they believe that the legal system is the best way to handle disputes and settle conflicts.**

This is not a problem of a low base rate, it is simply the case that no difference emerges comparing gang members and non-gang members regarding their affirmation of the legal way to settle disputes. The findings here show that 58.3 percent of the non-gang members and 55.8 percent of the gang members do agree with this belief that the legal system is the best way to handle disputes and settle conflicts. Legal system education components in public education, while popular today for a variety of reasons, cannot claim from this finding that they are justified on the basis that gang members might have less confidence in the legal system.

***** No difference exists regarding the value of "caning" or whipping an offender as a way to reduce crime comparing gang members and non-gang members.** Some 44.4 percent of the non-gang members and 44.1 percent of the gang members agreed with the idea that "caning" or whipping an offender might reduce certain types of crime in America. They obviously do not differ at all on this attitude about criminal justice sanctions.

***** No difference in beliefs about whether it is better to live by the law of the jungle than the law of the land.** While no statistically significant difference emerges here, the general trend was that gang members were more likely to express the view that it is better to live by the law of the jungle than the law of the land. Some 45.7 percent of the non-gang members, and 65.7 percent of the gang members, expressed this attitude.

***** No difference in knowing persons in the gang or criminal subculture who specialize in selling stolen, illegal, or unregistered guns.** Clearly there is little that is one-dimensional about the gang problem in the inner city areas of the United States and this finding illustrates that. Some 57.5 percent of the non-gang members and 42.8 percent of the gang members did not know such "gun contacts". Thus, 42.5 percent of the non-gang members and 57.2 percent of the gang members did know such "gun contacts" in the underground economy, but there is no statistically significant difference here. While the trend is that gang members have the better connections, apparently non-gang members also have access to guns.

***** No difference in how difficult it would be to acquire a fully automatic machinegun.** Again, the general trend was for the gang member to have less difficulty than the non-gang member, but there was no significant difference here for how hard it would be to acquire a machinegun.

***** No difference in how difficult it would be to acquire illegal explosives.** Again, generally the gang member expressed slightly more access, but statistically there was no significant difference in comparing gang members and

non-gang members in terms of how difficult it would be for them to acquire illegal explosives.

A number of other such non-significant differences exist in comparing the gang members and non-gang members in this sample, including:

*** Beliefs whether racial conflicts prevent getting justice in America.

*** Belief that childhood troubles prevented them from fully developing a set of moral beliefs.

*** Beliefs that most criminals lack fully developed moral values.

*** Beliefs that it is a mistake to trust white people.

*** Beliefs that there are many white people who are not prejudiced.

*** Beliefs that gang members really do not fear going to jail or prison.

*** Belief that it is better to feud than to forget when you have been wronged.

*** Whether they voted in the last presidential election.

*** Beliefs that an insult to one's gang group are best settled by violence or the threat of violence.

*** Belief that they are more likely to be violent in the situation of being with their group than as a lone individual.

*** Whether a long prison sentence would actually prevent them from ever using a gun.

*** Whether automatic "life sentences" would or would not prevent them from ever using a gun in a crime.

*** Whether there is anything the police can do to actually prevent a gang from getting started in any city in America.

*** Beliefs whether gangs in prisons really run the gangs on the streets.

*** Beliefs whether gangs in prisons basically exist in the same form on the streets.

*** Beliefs whether rules that apply to prison gang members also apply to the same members of the gang on the streets.

*** Whether they have or have not been beaten up by a gang they did not belong to.

DIFFERENCES: Factors Significantly Differentiated by Gang Membership in this Sample.

The purpose of this section is to describe the statistically significant differences that emerged in comparing gang members and non-gang members in this community program sample.

*** Gang members are significantly more likely to report having previously served time in a juvenile correctional institution (Chi-square = 4.15, $p = .04$).

*** Gang members are significantly more likely to report having ever been suspended or expelled from school for disciplinary problems (Chi-square = 8.81, $p = .003$).

*** Gang members are significantly more likely to report having one or more gang friends and one or more drug using friends.

*** Gang members are significantly more likely to report having ever used an assault rifle in committing a crime (Chi-square = 5.16, $p = .02$).

*** Gang members are significantly less likely than non-gang members to believe that we would have less crime if our laws were more strict (Chi-square = 17.01, $p < .001$). Obviously, the non-gang members want strict laws, the gang members do not want stricter laws.

*** Gang members are significantly more likely to believe that the best form of justice is simply an "eye for an eye" than are non-gang members (Chi-square = 7.44, $p = .006$).

*** Gang members are significantly more likely to agree that "you cannot expect justice through the legal system" when compared to non-gang members (Chi-square = 4.84, $p = .02$). Obviously, gang members have less confidence in and attach less legitimacy to the legal system.

*** Gang members are significantly more likely to have ever fired a gun at anyone as compared to non-gang members (Chi-square = 8.80, $p = .003$).

*** Similarly, gang members are significantly more likely to report having fired a gun at someone where it involved a gang fight (Chi-square = 15.5, $p < .001$).

*** Gang members are significantly more likely than non-gang members to report that they have personally known of situations where a gang spends its treasury money to buy firearms (Chi-square = 4.33, $p = .03$).

*** Gang members are significantly more likely than non-gang members to report that they have previously tried to get someone in the military to help them acquire military weapons (Chi-square = 6.74, $p = .009$).

*** Gang members are significantly more likely than non-gang members to agree with the belief that "a verbal insult to one's self is best settled by violence or the threat of violence" (Chi-square = 8.91, $p = .003$).

*** Gang members are significantly more likely than non-gang members in this sample to report that they have ever lived in a public housing project (Chi-square = 5.12, $p = .02$).

*** Consistent with profiling elsewhere, gang members are significantly more likely than non-gang members to report that they have previously assaulted a school teacher (Chi-square = 5.84, $p = .01$).

THE GANG MEMBER PROFILE

Among those who have ever joined a gang in this sample, the age at time of first joining a gang ranged from a low of 8 years old to a high of 16. Among those who have ever joined a gang in this sample, 80.5 percent were still active gang members at the time of the survey. The type of gang organizations involved here were about half and half People/Brothers and Folks. The folks gangs included in ranking order of their numbers in this sample: Gangster Disciples, and Black Disciples. The peoples or brothers gangs included in ranking order: Black P. Stone Nation, Mickey Cobra Nation, and the Latin Kings. These are relatively highly structured gangs that operate not only in Chicago but in many other jurisdictions.

About half of the gang members reported that their gang is racially mixed (51.5%).

Among those who have ever joined a gang, when asked to explain why they originally joined the gang, the single largest reason was that "to make money" (42.8%). Another 10.7 percent could not pick a single reason, but chose a mixture of "to make money" and some other social benefit choice (e.g., be with friends, family, etc). Only 10.7 percent joined for purposes of "protection". Some 14.2 percent joined simply "to be with friends". Zero percent of these self-reported gang members reported that they joined because they were "pushed into it". But 21.4 percent reported they joined the gang because "a family member was in the gang". Thus, a combined and more complex reason that would include joining "to make money and be with friends and family" would appear to account for a majority of the cases here of gang joining behavior.

It is further interesting to note that 61.7 percent of those who have ever joined a gang have attempted to leave the gang. With a larger sample of gang members using the same survey items it would be valuable, therefore, to further examine this aspect of gang life. At a minimum among those who have joined a gang, and who report still being a gang member at the time of the survey, perhaps bringing into play as well the risk factor for gang tenure (number of years of gang membership), it would be analytically possible then to isolate the truly "hard core" gang member in one sense. That is, we might be able to argue that a person with a good amount of experience over time in the gang who has never attempted to quit the gang would in this way of measuring the problem at least be more committed to gang life. There appears to be enough variation in this variable of attempts at quitting the gang to make it a very worthwhile area of additional analysis. A subsequent section of this report, thus, provides such an aggregate look at gang membership across social contexts.

Among gang members, most of those who have stolen a firearm (pistol or rifle) have also kept one for their own use.

The statistical tests comparing gang members and non-gang members in this matched-pair design also showed the following variables can be added to the gang member profile: more likely to have served time in a juvenile correctional institution, more likely to have been suspended or expelled from school for disciplinary reasons, more likely to have one or more gang friends or drug abusing friends, more likely to have used an assault rifle in a crime, less likely to believe that stricter laws will reduce crime, more likely to believe in an "eye for an eye" form of justice, less likely to believe that one can expect justice through the legal system, more likely to have ever fired a gun at anyone particularly in gang fights, more likely to know of situations where the gang uses its treasury money to buy guns, more likely to have tried to acquire weapons from someone in the military, more likely to believe that personal insults are best settled by violence or the threat of violence, more likely to have lived in a public housing project, and

more likely to have previously assaulted a school teacher.

V. COMBINING DATA SOURCES ON GANG MEMBERSHIP FOR ANALYSIS

The purpose of this section is to compare and contrast the variation in the "gangs and guns" relationship using all data sources for the research conducted and reported here. This means examining the gang population from the following social contexts: (1) jail inmates, (2) public school students, (3) juvenile probationers, and (4) those youths in community-based inner city program. We have therefore pooled the gang members from across these various social contexts for a combined analysis here. The analysis here will examine a number of relevant issues.

GOING UP THE GANG MEMBERSHIP LADDER: The Gang Risk Continuum

It is possible in the current analysis to examine whether a consistent effect is found in terms of the level of gang risk that individuals represent. At the lowest level of gang risk would be the person who has never joined a gang and has no close friends and associates who are gang members. Somewhat higher on the ladder of gang risk is the person who may not have ever joined a gang, but who associates with gang members, and reports having one or more close friends and associates who are gang members. Higher still on the ladder of gang integration is the person who may have joined at a gang at some time in their life, but who at the time of the survey had apparently quit the gang, and is basically an ex-gang member or more reasonable still, an inactive gang member. At the highest level of gang risk is someone who reports having joined a gang and who also reports being a current gang member at the time of the survey. This risk format is depicted in Figure 8 below.

Referring to Figure 8, the "problem" here can be any aspect of armed violence, crime, etc.

FIGURE 8

THE GANG RISK CONTINUUM

Never Joined A Gang Joined a Gang

No Gang One or more Quit the Still in the

Friends Gang Friends Gang Gang

Risk Level: Level 0 Level 1 Level 2 Level 3

Risk Type: Not a A Gang Inactive Active

Gang Associate Gang Gang

Member Member Member

Hypothesized

effect: lowest medium low medium high highest

problem problem problem problem

Table 25 below provides some evidence that the gang risk continuum is consistent regarding a variety of crime and violence problems: the higher up we go on the gang integration ladder, the more dangerous individual we face. Table 25 uses the entire sample combining all social contexts (N = 1,206).

Clearly, Table 25 shows the higher we go on the gang risk continuum, the higher the following: being suspended/expelled from school for disciplinary reasons, ever owning an assault rifle, ever using an assault rifle in a crime, ever firing a gun at anyone, being involved in a police shootout, knowing of situations where a gang spends its treasury money to purchase firearms, ever asking military personnel if they could help in obtaining military weapons, the tendency to deny moral responsibility (i.e., agree that "in my childhood troubles I simply did not have a chance to fully develop a set of moral beliefs"), and ever wearing a bullet-proof vest during the commission of a crime.

TABLE 25

THE EFFECTS OF THE GANG RISK CONTINUUM

Never Joined Gang Did Join A Gang

No Gang >=1 Gang But Still A

Friends Friends Quit Member

Ever suspended/expelled from School?

Percent Yes 45.5% 58.9% 66.9% 71.5%

Chi-square = 60.7, p < .001

Ever Own An Assault Rifle?

Percent Yes 12.4% 15.6% 26.7% 42.8%

Chi-square = 109.7, p < .001

Ever Use an Assault Rifle in

Committing a Crime?

Percent Yes 2.7% 6.9% 20.6% 35.4%

Chi-square = 172.3, $p < .001$

Ever Fired A Gun At Anyone?

Percent Yes 16.9% 27.6% 50.8% 71.3%

Chi-square = 253.4, $p < .001$

Ever Involved in Police Shootout?

Percent Yes 3.1% 7.0% 7.6% 20.2%

Chi-square = 47.6, $p < .001$

Have you personally known of

situations where a gang spends

their treasury money to buy

firearms? Percent Yes 15.2% 39.4% 60.8% 72.6%

Chi-square = 250.2, $p < .001$

Have you ever asked someone in

the military if they could help

you in getting military weapons?

Percent Yes 4.6% 9.7% 17.6% 28.7%

Chi-square = 91.8, $p < .001$

In my childhood troubles I simply

did not have a chance to fully

develop a set of moral beliefs

Percent Agree 29.7% 36.4% 45.2% 55.1%

Chi-square = 53.8, $p < .001$

Ever wear a bullet-proof vest

during a crime? Percent Yes 3.7% 8.8% 10.7% 26.9%

Chi-square = 88.8, $p < .001$

REASONS FOR JOINING THE GANG MAY HELP TO EXPLAIN WHY SOME WANT TO GET OUT OF THE GANG

We believe it can be demonstrated that the level of commitment to the gang will vary by the type of reason for originally joining the gang and experiences within the gang. Some tests of this will be made here looking at the combined sample of gang members from four different social contexts.

The reason or motivation for originally joining the gang appears to be diverse in its own right as a variable. It is not easy to reduce this complex aspect of human psychology to a few simple choices, such as integrative versus instrumental types of motivation. These may be neat theoretical concepts, but they are not easily applied to the complexity of the situation we are dealing with here: real gang members, and real reasons for joining the gang. We do believe this variable needs much more research and refinement. The knowledge we gain from this line of inquiry would have many implications for treatment and intervention.

Suffice it so say here that we have a rather common forced choice item for measuring reasons why persons join gangs. It is apparently a variable that also helps us to understand why some persons leave the gang.

Table 26 below, for example, shows the reasons for joining a gang by type of gang member: inactive member, and active member. Here we see the significance begin to emerge in being able to distinguish between inactive and active gang members.

TABLE 26

DISTRIBUTION OF REASONS FOR ORIGINALLY JOINING A GANG
BY WHETHER THE PERSON IS NOW AN INACTIVE OR ACTIVE GANG MEMBER
IN A SAMPLE SIZE OF 427 GANG MEMBERS

Type of Gang Member Today

Inactive Active

Primary Reason for Joining

the gang: PROTECTION 12 19

TO BE WITH FRIENDS 42 77

WAS PUSHED INTO IT 11 16

TO MAKE MONEY 19 93

A FAMILY MEMBER WAS IN THE GANG 27 70

COMBINATION OF MONEY & FRIENDS 5 36

Chi-square = 19.1, p = .002

What Table 26 shows is that the exigency of "protection" is relatively equal to the other social reasons for joining a gang in terms of the percentage who join for that reason who are now inactive (38.7%). Joining a gang for protection

therefore varies little in terms the percentage who become inactive in the gang when compared to the joining purpose of "to be with friends", where 35.2 percent who joined "to be with friends" became inactive in the gang. Similarly, the predominantly social reason of "I was pushed into it", again here 40.7 percent who joined the gang for this reason became inactive. In the close social situation where a person joined the gang because a family member was in the gang, again, 27.8 percent became inactive in the gang. The differences arise when we look at the economic reason for joining the gang. Table 26 shows that gang members are more likely to stay with the gang apparently if they join for essentially economic reasons rather than social reasons. Only 16.9 percent of the persons who joined the gang for the economic reason "to make money" were inactive in the gang at the time of this survey. Similarly, the combination of making money and being with friends/family reduces the gang inactive rate to 12.1 percent.

We believe it can be demonstrated that focusing on the reason for joining a gang may prove very important in accounting for the effectiveness of gang intervention or rehabilitation programs that work with active gang members.

More evidence for this claim is presented in Table 27 below where we examine how the reasons for originally joining a gang do significantly differentiate whether or not the person ever attempted to leave the gang. Someone who has attempted to leave the gang is the ideal candidate for gang intervention services, but there is really no way to be able to provide gets these services to such persons the instant they have second thoughts about staying with their gang organization. Gang tenure and persistence is therefore a factor that appears to vary with the original reason that persons the gang for in the first place. This makes good theoretical sense as well, because if the motivation they joined the gang for represented a need that was not effectively fulfilled by the gang, that type of person is more likely to drop out of the gang.

TABLE 27
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF REASONS FOR ORIGINALLY
JOINING THE GANG BY WHETHER
THE PERSON BECAME INACTIVE OR REMAINED ACTIVE IN THE GANG
AMONG A SAMPLE OF 424 GANG MEMBERS

Ever Try to Quit the Gang?

No Yes % Yes

Primary Reason for joining

the gang: PROTECTION 9 22 70.9%

TO BE WITH FRIENDS 52 63 54.7%

WAS PUSHED INTO IT 7 20 74.0%

TO MAKE MONEY 62 49 44.1%

A FAMILY MEMBER WAS IN THE GANG 62 36 36.7%

COMBINATION OF MONEY AND FRIENDS 27 15 35.7%

Chi-square = 24.1, $p < .001$

What Table 27 shows is that joining for protection or because they were "pushed into it" are the two top reasons for candidates most likely to try to get out of the gang, apparently finding the gang less than satisfying or fulfilling. However, we not find the consistent pattern of economic reasons being the most likely to have the lowest defection rates. Further, the gang joining motivation to be with a "family member" who was in the gang in Table 27 shows only 37.7 percent ever tried to quit the gang. Further research is needed, and is now underway by the National Gang Crime Research Center, to expand and refine the measurement of gang joining motivations to allow for analysis about the potential here for identifying those who maybe would like to get out of the gang.

THE LEVEL OF COMMITMENT TO THE GANG

The level of commitment to the gang as represented by whether the person would rather die than give up their allegiance to the gang is clearly one that is significantly differentiated by whether the person is an inactive or active member. This is shown in Table 28 below.

TABLE 28

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF 459 INACTIVE AND ACTIVE GANG MEMBERS
BY WHETHER THEY WOULD RATHER DIE THAN
GIVE UP THEIR ALLEGIANCE TO THE GANG

<u>Would Rather Die Than</u>	
<u>Give Up Gang Allegiance?</u>	
<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
TYPE OF GANG MEMBER:	
Inactive	15 109
Active	114 221
Chi-square = 21.5, p <.001	

Table 28 shows, as would be expected, that inactive gang members are significantly have a significantly lower level of commitment to the gang as measured by whether they would rather die than give up their allegiance to the gang.

Apparently, what we are measuring in the distinction between the inactive gang member and the active gang member may also have something to do with knowledge about gang operations and functions as well. For example, there is a significant difference (Chi-square = 5.99, p = .01) comparing inactive gang members (60.8%) and active gang members (72.6%) in terms of whether they report also personally knowing of situations where a gang spends its treasury money to buy firearms.

Yet the distinction between inactive and active gang members is also one of the declining level of commitment to the gang in terms of defending it from status threats. For example, a significant difference emerges in comparing inactive gang members (34.4%) and active gang members (51.3%) in terms of whether they agree that a verbal insult to one's gang is best settled by violence or the threat of violence (Chi-square = 10.2, p = .001). Clearly, commitment to the gang and its defense rapidly declines with moving to an inactive gang member status.

We had hypothesized that perhaps the gang member who has been beaten by his own gang, that is he has been "violated" for a "violation" of gang rules, that such a person might be more prone to want to move to the inactive status. The test of this shows how wrong we were. In fact, a significant difference does exist here in comparing inactive and active gang members in terms of whether they have received a beating from their own gang for a violation of gang rules (Chi-square = 8.94, p = .003). However, it is not a finding that suggests the more one is beaten by the gang the more one is likely to move to an inactive status. In fact, quite the obverse is true. The inactive gang members had the lower percentage of being beaten up by their own gang (32.5%). It was the active gang member who reported the higher rate (48.4%) of being beaten up by his own gang.

We felt this issue of commitment to the gang needed another separate test, but it too reinforces the above conclusion: being beaten by one's own gang is not a factor associated with a lower commitment to the gang. The additional test made here was to examine whether having ever been beaten up by one's own gang was a factor that significantly differentiated the variable of having ever attempted to leave the gang. The test for this is provided in Table 29 below.

TABLE 29

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF 427 GANG MEMBERS COMPARING
THOSE WHO HAVE BEEN "VIOLATED" BY THEIR OWN GANG
WITH THOSE WHO HAVE EVER ATTEMPTED TO LEAVE THE GANG

Ever Attempt To Leave the Gang?

NO YES

Ever "Violated" by your own

gang? NO 116 120

YES 106 85

Not significant

As seen in Table 29, there really is no significant difference in attempts to leave the gang by whether the same person has been "violated" (i.e., received a beating from his own gang for breaking gang rules) by his own gang. The search for factors that will help us predict who might attempt to leave the gang will apparently have to look at variables other than this type of illegitimate social control that the gang exerts --- the ability to physically punish its own. This ability of the gang to inflict bodily harm to its errant members is one that also appears to neither strengthen nor deteriorate commitment to the gang, at least in terms of whether the gang member attempts to leave the gang.

FACTORS THAT SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASE OR DECREASE ATTEMPTS TO QUIT THE GANG

It is a worthwhile analysis to examine in some greater detail those factors that significantly differentiate attempts by gang members to leave their gang. In the analysis described here, the group of persons we are analyzing are all persons who have ever joined a gang, regardless of the social context in which we surveyed them. Nearly half of all persons who had joined a gang in our survey also reported that they had attempted to leave the gang. This natural variation among gang members to attempt to leave the gang therefore was systematically analyzed in relationship to a large number of other factors affecting gang life. The results presented here therefore describe those factors that significantly increase or decrease attempts to quit the gang.

Table 30 presents the results of those factors shown to significantly increase or decrease attempts to quit the gang.

Those Who Will Not Take \$9.00/Hour Jobs Less Likely To Attempt To Quit The Gang

Whether the gang member would take a job paying \$9.00 per hour is itself a variable of some import here. Among those who have never attempted to quit the gang some 16.9 percent would not take a job paying \$9.00 per hour. Among those who had attempted to quit the gang, only 6.2 percent would not take a job paying \$9.00 per hour. The more hard core gang member who has not entertained the thought of leaving the gang is the one least likely to want to accept a \$9.00 per hour job.

Those Who Participated in Adult Supervised Activities While in School More Likely To Attempt To Quit The Gang

A socialization variable about whether the person had participated in adult supervised extracurricular activities while in school was significant in relationship to attempts by gang members to quit the gang. Among those who had never attempted to quit the gang, some 61.5 percent had the benefit of such adult supervised extracurricular activities while they were in school. Among those who had attempted to quit the gang some 72 percent reported that they had the benefit of this type of early socialization experience (i.e., participating in adult supervised extracurricular activities while in school). Clearly, there seems to be a lingering positive effect to early socialization experiences such as participating in adult supervised extracurricular activities while in school. Those who join a gang and who have had the benefit of such early socialization experiences are more likely to attempt to quit the gang.

Those Who Have Served Time in Juvenile Correctional Institutions Less Likely To Attempt to Leave The Gang

The trend seems to be the less hard core gang member is the one more likely to report having attempted to quit the gang, and vice versa. This is certainly true in terms of whether these persons received a penal sanction as juveniles. That is, those persons who had been labelled sufficiently as delinquents by formal social control agencies, enough so that these same persons had some additional criminal justice experience by being placed in a juvenile correctional institution --- it is among this group, those who were formally sanctioned early in life that are among the least likely to attempt to quit their gang. This is seen in Table 30 where among those who never attempted to quit their gang, some 43.7 percent had served time in a juvenile correctional institution. Yet among those who had attempted to quit the gang, only 34.5 percent had served time in a juvenile correctional institution.

Those With Permanent Tattoos Less Likely To Attempt To Quit The Gang

Among those gang members who have never attempted to leave the gang, some 64.3 percent had permanent tattoos.

Among those who had attempted to leave the gang, a significantly smaller percentage had such permanent tattoos (53.8%). With the recent growth of medical service specializations in tattoo removal using laser technology, this area of facilitating the gang members attempt to leave the gang is a natural area for such experimental medical research services. The larger issue is would more gang members give serious consideration to leaving their gang if their many conspicuous gang tattoos could be effectively removed? We believe this is an area worthy of additional research.

This factor gains even more importance when a gang member has "flipped", and has cooperated with law enforcement agencies, and now needs to drop not only the gang affiliation but also give up any symbolization or reminders of the gang, and for his own protection any outwardly noticeable information like tattoos that others can recognize as such and thus identify the informant as a gang member. This is true particularly when the gang puts a "money bag" or contract hit out on the gang informant, that is a large reward for his execution as a gang traitor. Our qualitative information from dealing with such informants is that they are very receptive to tattoo removal services. There have been some recent breakthroughs in laser-based tattoo removal by physicians in Texas and California that could potentially be put to use effectively in a larger strategic plan for witness protection involving gang informants, and provide the context for some useful research as well.

Those Who Attempt to Leave The Gang Are More Likely to Now Have No Close Friends And Associates Who Are Gang Members

Clearly, those who have attempted to leave the gang have not certainly given up on the extensive social network they call their close friends and associates who are also in the gang. Rather, the finding here is among the percentage who report having no such close friends and associates who are gang members. Among those who have never attempted to leave the gang, only 6.7 percent say that they have no close friends and associates who are gang members, however this doubles when we look at those who have attempted to leave the gang (14.3%). It would seem entirely logical that just as in other types of deviance, such drug abuse, that a person trying to seriously sever such ties to

those who facilitate the deviance is a good theoretically based prescription. The implication for gang deprogramming is that to increase the likelihood of "dropping the flag" or giving up the gang, one would have to restructure the social life of the gang member in such a way as to systematically give up gang friends and replace them with equally satisfying non-gang friends.

Those Who Joined The Gang For Protection or Because They Were "Pushed Into It" Are The Most Likely To Attempt To Quit The Gang

Table 30 shows the distribution for the various reasons why the person originally joined the gang in relationship to whether these same gang members have ever attempted to quit the gang. What this shows is that the two top reasons for joining a gang that are associated with the highest percentages of attempts to leave the gang are joining for "protection" or because the person felt he was "pushed into it". Among those persons who originally joined the gang primarily because of "protection", some 70.9 percent of these persons have attempted to quit the gang. Among those persons who originally joined the gang because they felt they had been "pushed into it", some 74 percent have attempted to quit the gang. Only 44.1 percent of those who joined the gang primarily for the reason to "make money" have attempted to leave the gang. Similarly, where the person joined because they reported that "a family member was in the gang", only 36.7 percent of these persons have attempted to leave the gang. The lowest level of attempting to quit the gang therefore appears where the person joined because of a combination of money and friends were in the gang (35.7%).

Those Who Have Not Attempted To Leave The Gang Are More Likely To Report Having Owned An Assault Rifle

The "hardening effect" appears here in relationship to whether the gang member has ever owned an assault rifle. Those who have not attempted to leave the gang are more likely (44.2%) to have also owned an assault rifle. Those who have attempted to leave the gang are less likely (34.6%) to report having owned an assault rifle. We suspect the firearms ownership, use, and access variable to be one that increases with the level of commitment to the gang. Thus, here we see as elsewhere that a kind of "hardening effect" occurs, where the more hard core gang member (i.e., one who has owned an assault rifle) is also the one with a lower likelihood of attempting to leave the gang.

Those Who Have Not Attempted To Leave The Gang Are More Likely To Report Having Used An Assault Rifle in Committing A Crime

Here again we see the hardening effect, where 40.5 percent of those who have not attempted to leave the gang also report having used an assault rifle to commit a crime. This compares with 23.4 percent of those who have attempted to leave the gang who reported having used an assault rifle to commit a crime. Call this the hardening effect or the point of no return, the effect is the same: a decreased likelihood of attempting to leave the gang exists where the greater level of violence is found in the individual gang member.

Those Who Have Not Attempted to Leave the Gang Are More Likely To Report Carrying A Concealed Gun

As seen in Table 30 the variable for concealed weapons carrying behavior significantly differentiates any attempt to ever leave the gang. The trend here is very consistent with other findings about gangs and guns. Among those who have never attempted to leave the gang, some 35 percent report carrying a concealed gun "all the time". However, among those who have attempted to quit the gang only 16.5 percent report carrying a concealed gun "all the time". This greater preparedness for armed violence therefore is most characteristic of the hardcore gang member who has never attempted to leave the gang.

Those Who Have Not Attempted to Leave the Gang Are More Likely To Report Using A Sawed-Off Shotgun to Commit a Crime

Those who have never attempted to leave the gang are nearly three times as likely to report using a sawed-off shotgun to commit a crime (28.8%). This compares with only 9.5 percent of those who have attempted to leave the gang who also report having used a sawed-off shotgun to commit a crime. The trend, therefore, is very consistent overall with other findings on gangs and guns: the more hard core gang member, exemplified here by the one who is more likely to use a sawed-off shotgun in a crime, is the one who has not attempted to quit the gang. The hardening effect is seen here again regarding the use of sawed-off shotguns in committing crimes.

The "Chicken And The Egg Controversy" Revisited: Does The Gang Produce the Retaliatory Individual, Or Is The Combative Personality Attracted To The Gang?

There are several things that are clear from our research, including the fact that gang members generally are more prone to prefer retaliation over all other forms of dispute resolution. We can also demonstrate in Table 30 that among those who have not attempted to quit the gang, the more hard core gang member that is, we find 68.8 percent prefer retaliation as the solution for "wrongs". This is significantly higher than the 42.3 percent who prefer retaliation among those who have in fact attempted to quit the gang. But survey data of the type analyzed here cannot address the aspect of causality: which came first? Thus, it is impossible here to answer the question whether the gang produces and systematically shapes a "combative personality", or whether this type of individual is naturally attracted to the culture of the gang.

Beliefs in the Value of Formal Social Control: The Decreased Legitimation Among Hard Core Gang Members

Table 30 shows again an ideological hardening effect where among those who have never attempted to leave the gang only 19.6 percent agreed that "for the most part, justice gets done by the police and the courts". A significantly higher value on legitimating this aspect of formal social control appears within the group of gang members who have in fact attempted to leave the gang. Among those who have attempted to leave the gang, some 33.9 percent agreed that justice gets done by the police and the courts. The trend here is logically consistent: among the more hard core gang members, we find a lower degree of legitimation is attached to formal social control as a vehicle for justice.

Beliefs in the Deterrent Value of Stricter Laws: The Decreased Legitimation Among Hard Core Gang Members

Here again the ideological or belief system among hard core gang members is consistent with other findings. Among those who have never attempted to get out of the gang, some 19.4 percent agreed that we would have less crime if our laws were more strict. This belief in the deterrent value of stricter laws increases significantly when we look at those who have attempted to leave the gang: where among this group who have considered dropping their flag, some 32.3 percent agreed that stricter laws would result in less crime.

The Ultimate Outlaw: How The Hard Core Gang Member Rejects The Idea That the Legal System Is the Best Way to Handle Disputes and Settle Conflicts

In trying to get a profile of those factors that significantly differentiate the gang member who remains totally loyal to his gang and the person may consider defecting from the gang, here again we find an important ideological difference. It again shows the hardening effect, but again we cannot tell from this type of survey research data which came first: the gang, or the attitude. But the finding here is clear: among those who have never attempted to leave the gang, only 24.7 percent support the belief that the legal system is the best way to handle disputes and settle conflicts. This differs significantly when we look at those who have in fact attempted to quit the gang, where we find that 48.3 percent agree with the idea that the legal system is the best way to handle disputes and settle conflicts.

The Ultimate Gang Warrior: How the Hard Core Gang Member Would Rather Fight Than Switch

The ideal typical gang warrior is one who would rather die than give up his allegiance to the gang. Table 30 shows that on this variable a significant difference emerges comparing those who have not and those who have attempted to quit the gang. Among those who have not attempted to quit the gang, the die-hards, some 40.1 percent agreed they would rather die than give up their allegiance to their gang. Yet among those who have attempted to quit the gang, only some 14.2 percent were willing to die rather than drop their allegiance to the gang. Thus, the more hard core gang member was more than twice as likely to claim he would rather die than give up his allegiance to the gang.

Living By The Law of the Jungle, Not The Law of The Land

The hard core gang member does appear to identify with the idea of the survival of the fittest, especially when he is armed and his victim is not, appears to be a reasonable conclusion of much of this research into the social-psychological-behavioral profile of the midwestern hard core gang member. As an ideological or attitudinal predisposition, again Table 30 shows a significantly increased "hardening effect" for this variable among those gang members who have never attempted to leave the gang. For among those who have never attempted to leave the gang, some 70.6 agreed that "it is better to live by the law of the jungle than the law of the land". The belief in this survival of the fittest concept drops off significantly when we look at those who have attempted to leave the gang, where only 43.8 percent agreed with this concept.

The Taste of Blood Phenomenon: Harder To Quit After The Hit

Four separate variables measuring the extent of firearms violence among gang members tend to support the idea that at some point after such firearms violence it becomes harder to separate the gang banger from the gang. Some who have investigated homicides call this the taste of blood phenomenon; that is, there is no turning back after the first kill or the first blood. A type of slippery slope in moral values may operate here, particularly in the context of conflict with other gangs, where once the gang member has engaged in a shoot-out it becomes harder to quit the gang. Still, exceptions to this trend are well known, particularly when only one shooting incident is involved, for example a drive-by shooting as a part of a gang initiation process. Like anything else in this report, nothing is absolute in social research, but the trend here is consistent and significant.

Whether the person has ever fired a gun at anyone, Table 30 shows that among those who have never tried to leave the gang some 76.8 percent report this compared to 55.7 percent among those who have attempted to quit the gang.

Similarly, among those who have never attempted to leave the gang some 75.2 percent report firing a gun at someone where it involved a gang fight. This is significantly different from those who have attempted to quit the gang where 54.6 percent have fired a gun at someone in a gang fight.

Among those who have never attempted to leave the gang some 50.7 have fired a gun at someone where it involved a drug deal, compared with only 30.9 percent among those who have attempted to leave the gang.

Finally, among those who have never attempted to leave the gang some 24.3 percent of these gang members report having fired a gun where it involved a police shoot-out. This compares with only 9.5 percent among those who have attempted to leave the gang.

Access to Fully Automatic Weapons Is Greater For Those Who Have Not Attempted To Leave The Gang

Table 30 shows that a significant difference emerges comparing those who have not attempted to leave the gang and those who have attempted to leave the gang, in terms of how difficult it would be for these gang members to acquire a fully automatic "machine gun". Again, the trend here is very consistent. It is the more hard core gang member, the one who has never attempted to leave the gang, who is more likely to report that it would not be difficult at all to acquire a fully automatic weapon. In fact, among those who have never attempted to leave the gang, some 57.3 percent felt that it would not be hard at all to get their hands on a machinegun. This compares with 45.4 percent who felt it would not be hard to get a machinegun among those who have attempted to leave the gang.

Illegal Use of Guns With Silencers or Sound Suppressors: Another Hardening Effect Among Gang Members

While this variable is significant, it makes only a marginal overall difference in the percentage of gang members who have used guns equipped with silencers. Again, however, the trend is in the direction where the more hard core gang member is more likely to profile in this particular type of firearms use. Among those who have never attempted to quit the gang, some 29.5 percent report using a gun equipped with a silencer, compared to 20.7 percent among those who have attempted to quit the gang.

Possession or Use of Illegal Explosive Devices Among Gang Members

Table 30 shows another significant difference by whether or not the gang member has attempted to leave the gang in terms of having ever possessed or used any illegal explosive devices, specifically dynamite, military explosives, and hand grenades. It is not uncommon for gang members to use "molotov cocktails" in setting fire to houses that are also targets of gunfire (i.e., the home of a rival or opposition member, the home of a witness in a criminal case, etc). But this variable does not include molotov cocktails, but is rather limited to commercially produced explosive devices (dynamite, military explosives, and hand grenades). The findings show that among those who have never attempted to leave the gang, some 36 percent of these more hard core gang members report having possessed or used such destructive devices, compared with 23.5 percent among those who have attempted to leave the gang.

The Greater The Commitment To The Gang The Greater The Access To Illegal Explosive Devices

When it comes to having access to illegal explosive devices, again it is the hard core gang member who has greater access according to our survey. Among those who have never attempted to quit the gang, some 35.3 percent of these gang members report that it would not be hard at all to acquire illegal explosives (dynamite, military explosives, hand grenades, etc). Those who had attempted to leave the gang reported greater difficulty in their access to illegal explosives. Among those who had attempted to quit the gang some 24 percent had indicated that it would not be hard at all to acquire illegal explosives.

Attempts to Acquire Military Weapons From Military Personnel

The difference here is significant in comparing those who have and who have not attempted to quit their gang. The variable significantly differentiated here by this level of commitment to the gang specifically asked the gang members "have you ever asked someone in the military if they could help you in getting military weapons". Table 30 shows that among those who have never tried to quit the gang, some 33.1 percent report having attempted to acquire military weapons from military personnel, compared to only 19.5 percent among those who have tried to quit the gang.

The Greater the Commitment To the Gang The More The Person Claims To Be Morally Underdeveloped

The significant difference here is consistent with the hardening effect. The difference examined is the percentage who agree with the statement "in my childhood troubles I simply did not have a chance to fully develop a set of moral beliefs". Among those who had never attempted to quit the gang, some 59.2 percent agreed they were morally underdeveloped, compared to 48.2 percent among those who had attempted to quit the gang.

The More Hard Core Member Has A Greater Distrust of White Persons

The extent to which gang members agree with the idea that it is usually a mistake to trust a white person appears to also vary significantly by whether or not the gang member has tried to quit the gang. The trend here is consistent with the hardening effect, the greater the commitment to the gang the greater the distrust of white people. Among those who had never attempted to quit the gang some 44.4 percent agreed with the statement that "it is usually a mistake to trust a white person". Among those who had tried to leave the gang, only 23.5 percent agreed with the idea that it is usually a mistake to trust a white person.

Pessimistic Perceptions of Race Relations: A Predictable Predisposition Among Hard Core Gang Members

With greater distrust of white persons and a lower perception that there may be unprejudiced white persons, what this seems to measure is either an actual problem in race relations or an ideological predisposition. The additional question about race relations examines the extent to which gang members agree with the idea that "there are many white people who are not prejudiced". This additional variable on race relations shows it is the more hard core gang member who perceives greater prejudice among white people. Among those who had never attempted to quit the gang, some 64.9 percent agreed with the idea that there are many white people who are not prejudiced, compared to 78.8 percent among those who had attempted to leave the gang.

The Limits of Formal Social Control: How Fear of Prison Varies Inversely With Level of Commitment to the Gang

The penultimate mechanism of formal social control in American society is the penal sanction, sending someone to prison or jail. Our data suggests that fear of imprisonment varies inversely with commitment to the gang organization. This is consistent with the fact that among the types of gangs studied here, these are also gangs that are capable of controlling operations on the street from behind bars, or the so-called "neo-mob" style of gang organization. With such hierarchical structures for leadership among gangs that can be regarded in many ways as formal organizations, going to prison may mean getting a chance to "hook up" with the top leadership, and it is easier to make rank in prison that out of prison is another claim from qualitative data.

Our data speaks directly to the level of fear of imprisonment. The variable measures the percentage who agree with

the statement "gang members really do not fear going to jail or prison". Our findings are consistent with the hardening effect: those who are more hard core, are less likely to fear the penal sanction. Among those who have never attempted to quit the gang, some 55 percent of these gang members agreed that gang members really do not fear going to jail or prison, compared with 44 percent among those who had attempted to leave the gang. It appears true that many gang members do not fear imprisonment, and it is also true that the higher the commitment to the gang (as measured by not attempting or by attempting to quit the gang), the lower the fear of the penal sanction.

The Combative Personality Syndrome: The Traits of Conflict Dependence Among Gang Members

Conflict is at the heart of most gang etiology and persistence. Gangs thrive on conflict. This has often been regarded as a larger social structural problem rather than as a personality trait of the individual. However, some gang researchers have identified the single over-riding character trait of gang members as being "defiant" (Sanchez-Jankowski, 1991). Our data suggests it is stronger than simply being defiant, and rather that a cluster of related traits tend to suggest the greater the commitment to the gang, the greater the combative personality syndrome.

In the combative personality syndrome, the person prefers conflict even where it is not necessary, the person is almost preprogrammed for only conflict-oriented responses, that is, combat is the primary orientation. The extent to which this type of personality syndrome does exist among gang members means that any attempt to use "conflict resolution" program services or related "aggression replacement" counseling services, is going to be effective primarily with the lower end of the gang membership threat level, and much less effective with the more hard core gang member. It is significant that in the limited literature suggesting the viability of such types of psychological services for gang members that we have not had any statistical appraisal surface where a "baseline" could be established, perhaps using the types of variables analyzed here.

We would argue that the combative personality syndrome includes all of the social, behavioral, and attitudinal variables included in this overall analysis of how hard core gang members (i.e., those who have never attempted to leave the gang) differ from softcore gang members (i.e., those who have tried to quit the gang). It constitutes a cluster of consistent hardening effects associated with gang membership. Depending upon the opportunities for publishing this research, we are contemplating a further test of this concept where we can isolate a more refined continuum of the hardening effect. This more in-depth statistical analysis would examine more levels of risk in the gang risk continuum. This data environment is capable therefore of examining gang risk levels zero through four:

Level Zero: Person has never joined a gang and has no
gang friends.

Level One: Person has never joined a gang but has one
or more gang friends.

Level Two: Person has joined a gang, but is not inactive.

Sublevel 0: Has no more close friends and
associates who are gang members.

Sublevel 1: Has one or more close friends

and associates who are gang members.

Level Three: Person has joined a gang, is still active,

but has attempted to quit the gang.

Level Four: Person has joined a gang, and has never

attempted to quit the gang.

In this analytical framework for analyzing the continuum of gang risks, therefore, level four would be the hard core gang member, and level three would be the softcore gang member. We believe, further, that years of experience with the gang (i.e., gang tenure) will figure prominently in this paradigm, as will achieving rank or leadership roles within the gang. We are not prepared at this point to discuss such findings, but this type of analysis is intended in a more detailed analysis of our data for purposes of future publication.

The combative personality syndrome certainly includes three additional variables which also vary significantly in relationship to attempts to quit the gang. These are presented here now.

The first of these variables is the personality trait that prefers feuding to forgetting when the person has been wronged. The variable specifically measures the percentage who agree with the statement "it is better to have a feud than to forget when you have been wronged". Among those who have never tried to quit the gang, some 52.7 percent agreed with this preference to feud over forgetting. Among those who have tried to quit the gang, some 37.3 percent agreed it was better to feud than to forget.

The second of these variables is the personality trait that prefers violent solutions in response to individual status threats. The individual status threat is where a verbal insult is directed at the individual identity, not the gang organizational identity. Specifically, the variable measures the percentage who agree that "a verbal insult to one's self is best settled by violence or the threat of violence". Among those who have never attempted to leave the gang, some 57.6 percent agreed with this question, preferring violent solutions to individual status threats. Among those who have attempted to quit the gang, some 37.5 percent preferred violent solutions to individual status threats.

The third of these variables is the personality trait that prefers violent solutions to group status threats. The group status threat is where the verbal insult is to the gang organization or gang group rather than to the individual gang member. Specifically, the variable measures the percentage who agree with the statement "a verbal insult to one's gang group, organization, or nation is best settled by violence or the threat of violence". Among those who have never attempted to quit the gang, some 51.9 percent preferred violent solutions to the group status threat situation. Among those who have tried to get out of the gang, some 41.7 percent preferred violent solutions to the group status threat situation.

Differences in Stealing Firearms

It seems rather clear from this overall Task Force report that to a large extent, a lot of the guns that gang members get

are not acquired legally, thus traditional restrictions on the purchase of guns are not likely to affect gang members, particularly when it can be demonstrated that the more hard core gang member is more willing to steal guns if necessary. The hardening effect occurs here regarding whether gang members steal firearms. The more hard core gang member is more likely to steal firearms.

The variable examined here specifically asks the respondent "some persons go out of their way to steal guns. Other persons steal guns only when the opportunity arises. Which best describes you?". Table 30 shows that among those who have never tried to quit the gang that 46.9 percent have never stolen a gun. This compares with 64.3 percent who have never stolen a gun for those who have tried to quit the gang.

Gang Members Who Wear Body Armor While Committing Crimes

The hardening effect takes on a new meaning here when examining the variable for whether or not these gang members report having ever worn a bullet-proof vest during a crime. Table 30 shows this variable to vary significantly in relationship to whether the gang member has or has not tried to quit the gang. Among those who have never tried to quit the gang, some 26.8 percent have worn body armor during a crime. Among those who have tried to quit the gang, some 18.3 percent report wearing body armor during a crime. We have reason to believe, further, that it is the hard core gang member who also commits more crimes or at least is arrested more often.

The Background Variable of Having Lived in A Public Housing Project

The background variable of having lived in a public housing project has no effect on significantly differentiating gang members who have or who have not tried to quit the gang.

The Background Variable of Having Committed a Crime in a Public Housing Project

The more hard core gang member is more than twice as likely to report having committed a crime on the property of, or inside an apartment of, a public housing project. By hard core member here, we mean the person who has never attempted to quit the gang. Table 30 shows that among those who have never attempted to quit the gang that 50.4 percent report having committed a crime in a public housing project, compared with 23.4 percent among those who have tried to quit the gang.

Assaulting Teachers: Another Attribute of the Combative Personality Syndrome

We have found this variable to be an important correlate of gang behavior and it appears to be part of the behavioral profile of the combative personality syndrome. It measures whether or not the person has ever assaulted a school teacher. This variable again shows the hardening effect in regard to attempts to quit the gang. Among those who have never tried to quit the gang, the more hard core group, 41.2 percent report having assaulted a school teacher. Among those who have tried to quit the gang, this reduces to 25.1 percent who have assaulted a school teacher.

The Declining Role of Formal Social Control in Terms of The Deterrent Value of Anti-Gun Legislation To Gang Members

Table 30 shows three additional gun-related variables that all tend to show the declining deterrent value of formal social control, more specifically whether harsher anti-gun laws would deter gang members from crimes involving

guns. One of the most fundamental issues to emerge from our research report here is that gang members do think significantly differently than citizens and legislators do, at least in terms of control issues, and personality differences (e.g., values, and beliefs). The gang member belief system is one most compatible with the criminal subculture. Such anti-gun legislation initiatives are shown here to be least effective with the hard core gang member, but much more effective with the less hard core gang member (i.e., the gang member who has attempted to quit the gang).

The issue here is one of harsher sanctions for gang-involved gun crimes. The hardening effect emerges significantly again for all three of these variables.

The first of these variables measures the percentage who agree with the statement "I would never use a gun in a crime if it carried a really long prison sentence". Among those who have never attempted to quit the gang only 44.2 percent agreed with this statement. This rises significantly to 60.1 percent among those who have attempted to quit the gang.

The second of these variables measures the individual deterrent effect of truly harsh anti-gun sanctions --- whether the gang member would be prevented from gun crimes if such offenses had penalties requiring an automatic natural life sentence. Specifically, the question asked "do you think that if judges had to give an automatic natural life sentence for using a gun in any crime that this would really prevent you from ever using a gun in any crime? The results show the consistent hardening effect for gang membership. Among those more hard core gang members who have never attempted to quit the gang, only 35.4 percent indicated they would be prevented from gun-crimes if they face automatic life sentences. However, among the less hard core gang members, those who had attempted to quit the gang, some 63.1 percent indicated that this type of sanction would be effective in preventing them from gun-crimes.

The third of these variables comes from the vignette or scenario question in the survey which measures the deterrent value of "doubling" the length of prison sentences for gang members caught committing gun-crimes. Specifically, the question posed the following scenario: "because people are more likely to be violent in a group that supports violence, do you think it would be fair to require that gang members caught committing crimes with guns should receive double the amount of the ordinary prison sentence?". Among those who have never tried to quit the gang, only 19.8 percent felt this would be fair, compared to 42 percent who felt it would be fair among those gang members who had tried to quit the gang.

TABLE 30

VARIABLES HAVING A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON
DIFFERENTIATING WHETHER GANG MEMBERS
HAVE EVER ATTEMPTED TO QUIT THE GANG

Ever Attempt to Quit Gang?

No Yes

Would you take a \$9.00/hour

job? NO 43 14

YES 210 209

Chi-square = 12.9, $p < .001$

While in school did you

participate in any adult

supervised extracurricular

activities? NO 98 62

YES 157 160

Chi-square = 5.87, $p = .01$

Have you ever served time

in a juvenile correctional

institution? NO 143 144

YES 111 76

Chi-square = 4.13, $p = .04$

Do you have a permanent

tattoo? NO 91 102

YES 164 119

Chi-square = 5.38, p = .02

How many of your close friends
and associates are gang members?

None 17 32

1 6 12

2 13 16

3 13 15

4 13 6

5 or more 191 142

Chi-square = 15.0, p = .01

Table 30: Continued

Why did you originally

join the gang?

Protection 9 22

To be with friends 52 63

Was pushed into it 7 20

To make money 62 49

A family member was in the gang 62 36

Combination: money & friends 27 15

Chi-square = 24.1, $p < .001$

If youngsters were exposed to a man

who had once been in a gang and now

was "going straight" making it on

his own, do you think he would be a

powerful influence for youngsters

to also get out of the gang?

NO 92 38

YES 151 182

Chi-square = 24.2, $p < .001$

Have you ever owned an

assault rifle? NO 140 145

YES 111 77

Chi-square = 4.47, $p = .03$

Have you ever used an assault

rifle to commit a crime? NO 148 170

YES 101 52

Chi-square = 15.7, $p < .001$

Which statement best describes you?

Never carried a concealed gun 46 83

Carry a gun all the time 88 36

Carry a gun in some situations 100 89

Carry a gun only when doing a crime 17 9

Chi-square = 33.2, $p < .001$

Have you ever used a sawed-off

shotgun to commit a crime? NO 178 198

YES 72 21

Chi-square = 27.1, $p < .001$

If someone does you wrong, which
is the most likely solution

that you would use?

Call the police 19 57

Use a third part to negotiate 19 16

Ask for apology/restitution 35 44

Retaliate against the person 161 86

Chi-square = 44.0, $p < .001$

Table 30: Continued

For the most part, justice gets
done by the police and the courts.

AGREE 48 73

DISAGREE 196 142

Chi-square = 12.0, $p = .001$

We would have less crime if our
laws were more strict. AGREE 48 69

DISAGREE 199 144

Chi-square = 10.1, p = .001

The legal system is the best way

to handle disputes and settle

conflicts. AGREE 60 104

DISAGREE 182 111

Chi-square = 27.5, p <.001

I would rather die than give up

my loyalty to the gang. AGREE 96 30

DISAGREE 143 180

Chi-square = 37.0, p <.001

It is better to live by the law

of the jungle than the law of

the land. AGREE 171 93

DISAGREE 71 119

Chi-square = 33.3, p <.001

Have you ever fired a gun

at anyone? NO 55 92

YES 183 116

Chi-square = 22.4, $p < .001$

Have you ever fired a gun
at anyone where it involved
a gang fight? NO 54 83

YES 164 100

Chi-square = 18.7, $p < .001$

Have you ever fired a gun
at anyone where it involved
a drug deal? NO 99 116

YES 102 52

Chi-square = 14.7, $p < .001$

Table 30: Continued

Have you ever fired a gun

at anyone where it involved

a police shoot-out? NO 152 151

YES 49 16

Chi-square = 13.7, $p < .001$

If you really needed a fully

automatic "machine gun", how

hard would it be for you

to get one? VERY HARD TO GET 24 48

SOMEWHAT HARD TO GET 78 67

NOT HARD AT ALL 137 96

Chi-square = 14.3, $p = .001$

Have you ever used a gun with

a silencer or sound suppressor?

NO 169 168

YES 71 44

Chi-square = 4.62, $p = .03$

Have you ever possessed or used

any illegal explosives (dynamite,

military explosives, hand

grenades, etc)? NO 156 162

YES 88 50

Chi-square = 8.37, p = .004

If you really needed to get your hands on some illegal explosives (dynamite, military explosives, hand grenades, etc), how hard would it be for you to do so?

VERY HARD 63 88

SOMEWHAT HARD 94 73

NOT HARD AT ALL 86 51

Chi-square = 13.6, p = .001

Have you ever asked someone in the military if they could help you in getting military weapons?

NO 157 169

YES 78 41

Chi-square = 10.5, p = .001

Table 30: Continued

In my childhood troubles I simply
did not have a chance to fully
develop a set of moral beliefs.

AGREE 138 96

DISAGREE 95 103

Chi-square = 5.21, p = .02

It is usually a mistake to trust
a white person. AGREE 105 48

DISAGREE 131 156

Chi-square = 21.1, p <.001

There are many white people
who are not prejudiced. AGREE 154 164

DISAGREE 83 44

Chi-square = 10.4, $p = .001$

Gang members really do not fear
going to jail or prison. AGREE 131 92

DISAGREE 107 117

Chi-square = 5.40, $p = .02$

It is better to have a feud
than to forget when you
have been wronged. AGREE 123 78

DISAGREE 110 131

Chi-square = 10.6, $p = .001$

A verbal insult to one's self
is best settled by violence or
the threat of violence. AGREE 135 78

DISAGREE 99 130

Chi-square = 17.9, $p < .001$

A verbal insult to one's gang
group, organization, or nation
is best settled by violence or

the threat of violence. AGREE 122 84

DISAGREE 113 117

Chi-square = 4.45, p = .03

Some persons go out of their way
to steal guns. Other persons steal
guns only when the opportunity arises.

Which best describes you?

Go out of my way to steal guns 34 21

Steal guns when I come across them 87 51

I have never stolen a gun 107 130

Chi-square = 13.1, p = .001

Table 30: Continued

Have you ever worn a bullet-proof
vest during a crime? NO 172 165

YES 63 37

Chi-square = 4.43, p = .03

Have you ever committed a crime
on the property of or inside an

apartment of a public housing

project? NO 116 158

YES 118 47

Chi-square = 35.2, $p < .001$

Have you ever assaulted a

school teacher? NO 137 155

YES 96 52

Chi-square = 12.6, $p < .001$

I would never use a gun in a

crime if it carried a really

long prison sentence. AGREE 103 121

DISAGREE 130 80

Chi-square = 11.0, $p = .001$

Do you think that if judges had

to give an automatic natural life

prison sentence for using a gun

in any crime that this would

really prevent you from ever

using a gun in any crime? NO 149 74

YES 82 127

Chi-square = 32.9, $p < .001$

Because persons are more likely
to be violent in a group that
supports violence, do you think
it would be fair to require that
gang members caught committing
crimes with guns should receive
double the amount of the
ordinary prison sentence?

IT'S FAIR 45 82

IT'S UNFAIR 182 113

Chi-square = 24.6, $p < .001$

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN "PEOPLES" AND "FOLKS"

By both forced choice questions asking the gang member to indicate whether his/her gang was "peoples" or "folks" and a content analysis of the specific gang identifier provided by the respondents in providing the exact name of their gang, it was possible to create two categories for analysis here. This is simply the difference in gang alliances: people and folks. The "peoples" are also referred to as "brothers" among African-American gang members. We will not confuse the matter any further by discussing how "Brothers of the Struggle" are actually a disciple gang, and thus are "folks". However, some self-reported gangs could be easily coded. Peoples in this sample includes Four Corner Hustlers, Black P. Stone Nation, Latin Kings, and Vice Lords. Folks in this sample includes Black Disciples, Gangster Disciples, Maniac Latin Disciples, Maniac Gangster Disciples, and Simon City Royals.

The analysis undertaken here to investigate any differences between peoples and folks therefore uses a selected sample of gang members. This is true because this type of classification "peoples versus folks" is insufficient analytically to encompass the complete gang spectrum. Aryan Brotherhood gang members, for example, are neither peoples or folks. Other gangs like the AB's exist that defy such simple classification. In the sample obtained from the probationers and the midnight basketball program, however, it was specifically ascertained if the respondent was "people" or "folks" as an added variable to the survey instrument. This was necessary, to cite one example, because a gang like the "Popes" in Chicago are "Peoples" on the southside and "Folks" on the northside! In short, what is measured here is gang alliance, whether the gang member rides under the "five pointed star" (Peoples or brothers) or the "six pointed star" (Folks). Thus, this distinction does not include lower level groups who are not a part of this alliance and it does not include more sophisticated organizations like the Aryan Brotherhood and certain motorcycle gangs who by the nature of their white supremacist ideology tend to fall outside of such a classification.

The analysis begins by examining only those who had ever joined a gang. It was possible to test over 100 different variables in comparing "people" and "folks". It is often said that a statistical fishing expedition like this, that if we have 100 variables or 100 tests we are making, then by chance alone we might get about five that come out significant. Our results were not very different. There were only six variables on which peoples differed from folks at the .05 probability level using a Chi-square test.

Peoples and folks are basically not any different at all. Only six of the variables from the over 100 variables in the entire survey instrument showed significant differences by whether the gang member was "peoples" or "folks".

One difference was that a lower percentage of peoples (20.2%) indicated they had never held a full-time job than that compared with folks. Among gang members who were folks, some 35.7 percent reported they had never held a full-time job.

Another difference was that a higher percentage of the folks gang members reported that their gang was racially mixed (i.e., has black, white, and Hispanic members). Some 70.4 percent of the folks compared to 59.7 percent of the peoples reported that their gang was racially mixed.

The related difference had to do with whether the gang members are equal. In the peoples 57.5 percent indicated the members were equal, compared to 71.8 percent for the folks.

One difference in the level of violence potential did emerge here: whether the gang members reported they had been involved in a police shootout. Some 12.2 percent of the peoples and 23 percent of the folks reported they had been involved in a police shootout. Another difference emerged in asking the gang member whether a natural life sentence

would deter them from committing a gun crime. Some 59.8 percent of the peoples and 42.5 percent of the folks indicated they would be deterred from committing a gun crime if they had to face a natural life sentence.

Finally, the sixth variable that was the last to be significant in the over 100 variables tested, was that of whether the gang members believed it would be fair to give a gang member a double-length prison sentence for crimes involving gang violence. Some 35.6 percent of the peoples believed it would be fair, compared to 19.4 percent for the folks.

These findings about what significant differences exist between peoples and folks are easy to summarize here. Folks are more integrated and treat members more equally, but more folks members had never held a full-time job. Folks reported engaging in more police shootouts, would be less deterred from a gun crime even if they faced a natural life sentence, and were less likely to consider it fair to double the prison sentences for violent crimes committed by gang members. That's it. In no other background, risk factor, attitudinal or behavior variable did the peoples or folks differ significantly. Thus, in 95+% of the variables tested there was no difference between peoples and folks.

We are aware of one other test between Peoples and Folks, using 51 Latin Kings and 57 Two-Sixers, which showed many significant differences with the general trend being the Latin Kings were a higher risk group. This work by Spergel, et al, is different methodologically than our own, and ours does not go down to the level of individual gangs in the analysis presented here. But their work does provide what seems to be substantial evidence that individual gangs can be profiled for comparative threat analysis --- in terms of the extent of criminal backgrounds, self-reported violence and crime, etc.

TESTING DIFFERENTIAL ACCESS THEORY

Previously used to explain terrorism and the potential for insurrection and revolution and civil disturbances, differential access theory posits that when an individual perceives a collective inability to resolve issues of justice that extralegal measures are adopted instead (Nieburg, 1970). More specifically:

"Differential access focuses on disparities in political influence and power as the most influential factors. The less access to a remedy for its grievances a group has, the more violent it tends to become in demanding such access" (Nieburg, 1970: p. 40).

In the context of armed gang violence the survey data collected for this research allows examining some implications of this theory.

Civil court is the forum for handling many grievances, but do gang members actually take advantage of this type of law suit as a remedy for perceived "wrongs"? Or is the preferred conflict resolution strategy one of retaliation? To what extent do gang members actually have confidence that justice gets done by the police and the courts? Do gang members even believe that the legal system is the best way to handle disputes and to settle conflicts? Or, alternatively, do gang members live by another "code of justice" altogether? Do gang members differ significantly from non-gang members in voting behavior? Do gang members recognize there are many effective ways other than violence that are available to settle grievances? These are questions directly assessed by the present research and overall tend to measure important implications of differential access theory.

The analysis here involves pooling all of the social context samples to make comparisons between gang members

and non-gang members on these selected issues. Table 31 below provides the results of this inquiry.

Gang members are not gun shy when it comes to civil suits, in fact they are significantly more likely to use this type of remedy than are non-gang members. This evidence is antithetical to that expected from differential access theory, and to a large extent by the viewpoints of gang members themselves --- that is, their noticeable lack of confidence in getting justice through the legal system. The larger issue here is that the social preference of gang members for retaliation exceeds that of other options for conflict resolution. There was no significant difference between gang members and non-gang members in terms of being legally registered voters. Thus, it is not so much they are excluded from any participatory system as much as they may exclude themselves by adopting beliefs such as those favoring the law of the jungle over as being preferable to living by the law of the land. Violence is part and parcel of gang life. The lack of access for resolving grievances is not a consistent explanation for gang violence.

TABLE 31

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED VARIABLES
BY HAVING EVER JOINED A GANG
USING THE COMBINED SAMPLE WHICH INCLUDES
SAMPLES FROM JAIL, SCHOOL, PROBATION, AND RECREATION

EVER JOIN A GANG?

NO YES

***** *****

% Who have sued

in court? 13.2 17.8 p = .02

% Who Prefer

Retaliation 24.7 55.9 p < .001

% Who believe justice
gets done by the
police and courts 39.7 26.7 p < .001

% Who Believe the Legal
System is best way
to handle disputes
and settle conflicts 46.9 35.4 p < .001

% Who believe they cannot
expect justice through
the legal system 54.8 61.3 p = .03

% Who Believe in the
Law of the Jungle 37.6 58.0 p < .001

% Who believe there are
many effective ways
other than violence
to settle grievances 85.5 73.7 p < .001

% Who are registered voters 37.5 42.1 p = .11 (n.s.)

VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose here is to provide a brief summary of major findings, and state some conclusions of our research based on this study, and to also provide some recommendations regarding future research.

SUMMARY

The primary mission of this project was to investigate gangs and guns. The research reported here used survey data from 1,206 respondents in four different social contexts: the county jail context, the urban public high school context, a suburban probation program, and a community-based recreation/service program located in the inner city. Our data included 505 persons who had joined a gang. The type of gang joined are for the most part brand name formalized gangs originating in Chicago. Our data also includes 891 inmates from eight different county jails in the midwestern area of the United States. Oversampling of a urban public high school and a community-based social service program serving youths in the inner city allowed us to generate matched-pair designs as well, where we could compare gang members to their identical demographic non-gang member counterparts. Finally, a sample of gang members from a suburban probation program was the fourth social context for analyzing the relationship between gangs and guns.

The research findings reported here have many implications for understanding the relationship between gangs and guns. Beyond this, the findings have much import by comparison to official results reported by the U.S. Department of Justice funded research on the scope and extent of the gang problem behind bars generally, and to understanding firearms acquisition and usage patterns among gang members specifically. Following this we will present conclusions relevant to putting into perspective the entire matter of a national assessment about the gang problem in corrections.

The Ripple Effect in Gang Problems. The jail inmate portion of our research showed that the same Chicago-based gangs can be found far from the urban area in which they originally came from. However, there is a consistent pattern in many variables regarding the intensity of the gang problem, which means that the further one moves away from the urban central area a drop off does occur in the intensity of the gang problem. This is also associated with differences in gang density as well.

Gangs and Guns. Our research here includes 505 respondents who have joined a gang. There exists substantial evidence from the research reported here that gang members as a risk group do in fact pose a more serious problem than do non-gang members generally, and even in the offender population specifically, when it comes to the myriad of issues about firearms. Among some of the other major findings that bear repeating here are the following:

*** Evidence does emerge here showing that gang members have more access to guns and are more likely to use them.

*** The types of gangs studied here include some of the more formal structures, such that these gangs often do maintain a "treasury", and use that treasury money to purchase firearms.

*** The types of gangs studied here allowed a comparison between the "Peoples" and "Folks". Of the over 100 variables analyzed only six were significant. For the most part on almost all issues they are basically identical in their views, experiences, and behaviors. Their difference is not socially, psychological, or behaviorally based, it is a difference in what appears to be symbolism alone.

*** Gang members can be further analyzed in terms of the gang risk continuum. This was done in this report, basically creating a threat analysis where group zero included persons who had never joined a gang and had no gang friends, where group one included persons who had never joined a gang but did have one or more close friends and associates who were gang members (some often call this the "wannabe", or "gang associate"), where group two included persons who had joined a gang but were not currently a gang member, and where group three (the highest level of gang risk) were active gang members. This further demonstrated that the higher one climbs the gang integration ladder, the higher the risk of violent behavior and related predispositions regarding firearms.

*** Gang members do profile consistently in some regards across social contexts in terms of firearms acquisition and firearms use. The gang member was revealed in this study to not only have greater access to civilian firearms, but also to military weapons, fully automatic weapons, explosive devices, and body armor. The gang member generally is more likely to fire a weapon in a police shoot out as well.

*** Much of this behavior seems tied to a predisposition in a cluster of values and beliefs shown to be associated

with gang life: a rejection and repudiation of the "legal system", a preference for "retaliation" over other alternative recourses of action for resolving conflicts, and a mixed up value system generally where the individual gang member also is one more likely to not accept moral responsibility for his behavior. This cluster of attitudes, beliefs, and background behavior that is significantly associated with gang membership has been called the combative personality syndrome, because it is one that is dependent on conflict.

Assessing the Gang Problem in Corrections. Our research on 891 inmates as the unit of analysis reveals a much higher level of gang density (the proportion of gang members within the inmate population) than claimed by recent federal research. It appears the national assessment of gangs in corrections (ACA, 1993) is seriously flawed. We conclude that in an area of such great interest and concern to scholars and practitioners alike, we must re-double our efforts to identify the scope of gang membership in corrections. Accurate and reliable information is necessary if effective policy and programs are to be formulated and implemented to combat a problem that threatens the security and tranquility of our prisons and jails.

The ACA report suffered from an aggregation problem in its unit of analysis and concluded that only six percent of American prison inmates were gang members. The most elementary math here would refute this claim. Our research findings provide, we believe, strong evidence showing that the gang density rate is probably much higher than that estimated in the NIJ-funded research on the gang problem in corrections. Such enormous underestimates appear to exist in that ACA report to cause us as researchers to conclude the ACA report was little more than misinformation in regards to gang density.

Comparing Gang Members and Non-Gang Members. Our findings here included situations where we could use a matched-pair design. Generally, across social contexts studied here (eight jails, a high school sample, a probation program sample, a community recreation program) the gang member has a relatively consistent profile. This always includes greater criminal justice experience (arrests, convictions, juvenile correctional experience), early violence (assault teachers), early trouble (firing a gun and carrying a gun at an early age, being expelled or suspended from school for disciplinary problems, etc), and a host of attitudinal and behavioral factors described throughout this report.

The Hardening Effect and The Combative Personality Syndrome. A closer look at 505 gang members shows differences not only comparing gang members to non-gang members, but that there are important gradients within the gang member population. This is particularly true in regard to the gang risk level, for example comparing gang members who have never attempted to quit their gang with those who have tried to quit the gang. For lack of a better explanation at this point, we have called this progression effect the hardening process where the further one goes up the gang membership level, that is the higher the commitment to the gang, the harder the gang member becomes in terms of a risk of violence. This also appears to be associated with consistent patterns of beliefs and values among gang members.

CONCLUSIONS

Our primary mission was to examine issues about firearms access and usage among gang members. Our research benefited from data on 505 gang members from four different social contexts. We also had a useful and meaningful

comparison group of non-gang members for purposes of analysis.

Basically, we must conclude that gang members do pose a formidable threat in terms of crime and specifically violent crime. Our findings appear to suggest the problem may be worse than has been previously estimated regarding illegal firearms use. The nature of this threat is amply demonstrated by comparisons of gang members with their demographic counterparts who are not gang members. The evidence strengthens when examine firearms and violence issues along the gang risk continuum, that is comparing threat levels zero through three, corresponding to: (0) Level 0 - Not A Gang Member With No Gang Friends, (1) Level 1 - Not A Gang Member Yet But Has Gang Friends, a basically "at risk" person, (2) Level 2 - the Inactive Gang member, and (3) the active gang member.

Further, the researchers suspect this is not a social problem that can be solved by any quick-fix small-scale solutions. Any effort to seriously disarm the modern American gang will be required to be national in scope and far reaching in its programs for prevention and intervention.

From this and other national gang research, we have no reason to believe that the problems facing Americans today in this study of the midwest are not also facing citizens in many areas of the United States.

Many elected officials and policy makers have opted over the recent years to deny the gang problem as their primary social policy response. Some have even tried to work with gang leaders, as if it were a problem that could be placated or as if gangs could be coopted. We cannot in this report estimate the exact nature of the arsenal that gangs have today, but we can surmise it is not going to be as easy to disarm these criminally active gang members as it is to make it illegal for other citizens to own certain types of firearms. At a time in American history where supply sources for the civilian population are being controlled by recent federal legislation regarding certain restrictions on firearms (e.g., assault rifles), we find the gang members are not likely to be at all affected by this kind of legislation. Their sources have never been legal sources, their sources have for the most part been in the underground market for firearms and other illegal items and products. The price of such illegal firearms in the underground economy will certainly rise, but simply declaring such items illegal for future purchase is not likely to result in any expected decrease in gang firearm-related violence.

What we have seen in recent years is a dramatic explosive of gang activity, a virtual proliferation of gangs across the entire United States. Now that we can demonstrate firearms usage patterns and firearms access for gang members, we must conclude that the denial syndrome will necessarily have to give way to acknowledgement of the problem. Our research does not allow us to estimate what the threshold is for elected officials to finally address this problem. We do not know how many Americans must be killed by random or intended gang violence before this problem is understood as a serious national problem affecting all Americans.

What we do know is that some of our other research is now confirmed. Military personnel have been known from our previous research to experience situations where gang members try to acquire military weapons or explosives. We know from the present research that the gang members readily admit to these attempts to acquire military weapons from military personnel. These attempts appear to be substantial, enough so that we must wonder, after 1,000 attempts, how many military personnel --- perhaps themselves economically distressed fitting the profile of someone who has to frequent the pawn shop, and who might therefore be receptive to a gang member seeking to compromise them --- would it take to finally allow a gang member to succeed in such attempts? This shall have to be the subject of one of our future research projects.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Expanding a project such as that reported here in order to focus on the individually identified gang would be a very valuable contribution. Future research, in order to do this, would have to be much larger than that undertaken here. It is possible to profile individual gangs by threat analysis. For example, weapons access, acquisition, and usage patterns, level of violence threat (i.e., police shoot-outs), and related variables of interest. But research on a larger scale would have to be done to ensure specific gang identity sample development. The ideal design would ensure at least 100 members of each gang identity.

We must alert the criminological community and the public that at this point in time we still do not have a valid national assessment of the problem of gangs in corrections. We would urge that serious professional research be undertaken on this issue. That research report that was produced by funding from the National Institute of Justice enjoys no support from the analysis here.

In studies involving future surveys where the gang member is the unit of analysis the following recommendations are made for extending our theoretical knowledge about the gang problem. One unique aspect about gang life is the hypothesized condition where white kids may be attracted to the kicks and thrills or excitement that gang membership is perceived to represent. These are "floaters", which is to say that for them the social network and culture of the gang is an open-system: they can readily enter and exit and re-enter, floating in and out of the gang as if it were any other voluntary association (Boys Scouts, YMCA, etc) or organization. Thus, in the case of gang floaters, the youth has some genuine home life and alternative social setting to return to when exiting from gang life. Floaters are similar to those who may go "slumming", to use a social interaction lay concept to describe this social structural condition allowing the person to have a place to "go back to" when they have had their fill of gang life. For floaters gang membership can be situational in nature. This hypothesis deserves to be explored further in future research.

We would recommend replicating and extending this research project to a national level. Anyone interested in assisting in such a project should contact us at the National Gang Crime Research Center.

REFERENCES

American Correctional Association

1993 Gangs in Correctional Facilities: A National

Assessment. James A. Gondles, Executive Director; John J. Greene, II, Director Division of Training

and Contracts; Gwyn S. Ingley, Adult Projects Director; Dennis G. Baugh, Project Director; Robert B. Levinson, Ph. D., Research Assistant; Anna Nunan, Editor; Mary Beth Mason, Desktop Publisher.

Callahan, Charles M. and Frederick P. Rivara

1992 "Urban High School Youth and Handguns: A School-based Survey", Journal of the American Medical Association, June 10.

Camp, George and Camille Graham Camp

1985 Prison Gangs: Their Extent, Nature, and Impact on

Prisons. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Justice.

Goldstein, Arnold P. and Barry Glick

1994 The Prosocial Gang: Implementing Aggression Replacement Training. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers.

Jankowski, Martin Sanchez

1991 Islands in the Streets. Berkeley, CA: University of California at Berkeley Press.

Jensen, Eric L.

1994 "An Interview With James F. Short, Jr.", Journal of Gang Research, Volume 2, Number 2 (in press).

Knox, George W.

1993 An Introduction to Gangs. 2nd edition. Buchanan,MI: Vande Vere Publishing, Ltd.

1994 An Introduction to Gangs. 3rd Edition. Wyndom Hall Publishing Company, Bristol, Indiana.

Knox, George W.; David L. Laske; and Edward D. Tromanhauser

1992 Schools Under Siege. Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hunt Publishing Company.

Knox, George W., et al

1993 Preliminary Results of the 1993 Prison Warden Survey. National Gang Crime Research Center, November, 1993.

Lane, Michael

1989 "Inmate Gangs", Corrections Today (51)(4)(July):

98-99, 126-128.

Morris, Robert E., MD; Edward A. Harrison, M.M.; George W. Knox, Ph.D.; Edward D. Tromanhauser, Ph.D.;
Damon K. Marquis, M.A.; and Lydia L. Watts, B.S.W.

1994 "Health Risk Behavior of Delinquent Adolescents", Journal of Adolescent Health (in press).

National Institute of Justice

1993 Street Gangs: Current Knowledge and Strategies. August.

Nieburg, H.L.

1970 Political Violence: The Behavioral Process. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Sanchez-Jankowski, Martin

1991 Islands in the Street. Berkeley, CA: University of California at Berkeley Press.

Sanders, William B.

1994 Gangbangs and Drive-bys: Grounded Culture and Juvenile Gang Violence. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

Shaw, Marvin E. and Jack M. Wright

1967 Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes.

New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Sheley, Joseph F. and James D. Wright

1993 Gun Acquisition and Possession in Selected Juvenile Samples. U.S. Dept. of Justice, NIJ, Research in Brief, December.

Short, James F., Jr. and Fred L. Strodbeck

1965 Group Process and Gang Delinquency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sleeman, Lt. Col. W.H.

1849 Report on Budhuk alia Bagree Decoits and other Gang Robbers by Hereditary Profession and on the Measures Adopted by the Government of India for their Suppression.

Calcutta, J.C. Sherriff, Bengal Military Orphan Press.

Thrasher, Frederick Milton

1926 The Gang: A Study of 1,313 Gangs in Chicago. Department of Sociology, University of Chicago, Ph.D.

Dissertation.

Watt, N. and B.A. Maher

1958 "Prisoners' Attitudes Toward Home and the Judicial System", Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, (49): 327-330.

Wright, James D. and Peter H. Rossi

1986 Armed and Considered Dangerous: A Survey of Felons and Their Firearms. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

[Click here to return to the HOMEPAGE of the
NGCRC:](#)