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The problems that gang members create within adult correctional facilities continue to receive attention in the literature. Gang members within juvenile institutions have received far less attention from researchers, and misconduct of these juveniles, both serious and non-serious, is relatively unexplored.

This study explored the institutional misconduct of 4,309 male delinquents released from the Texas Youth Commission. Youths younger at commitment, those with a higher TYC risk score, and those youths with emotional problems were found more likely to commit both serious and non-serious institutional misconduct, regardless of gang membership.

This thesis concludes with suggestions for additional research on gang members within juvenile institutions and the relationship of gang membership to institutional misconduct.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Changing Nature of Juvenile Crime and Juvenile Justice

In the 1980s and 1990s, the juvenile justice system embraced in part the so-called “get tough” movement. However, this movement was more partial than complete. For most delinquents, the juvenile justice system still embraces the rehabilitative aims espoused by the original juvenile court and its foundation of parens patriae. For other delinquents, however, particularly serious, violent, and chronic juveniles, the system has become substantially more “adult-like” and punitive (Zimring, 1998). Well-publicized cases of violent juvenile crime helped spur public concerns about the efficacy of the juvenile justice system in dealing with the most violent and chronic of young offenders.

The move toward a tough and punitive juvenile justice system did not occur because of a few sensational and isolated incidents during that time, however. According to the 2006 National Report on Juvenile Offenders and Victims, the number of juveniles arrested for murder from 1987 to 1993 rose 110%, and the overall violent crime index peaked in 1994, rising over 60% from 1988 levels (Snyder and Sickmund, 2006). This rise in the juvenile crime rate and in the number of arrests drove the juvenile justice system to make numerous changes to its operation—changes primarily focused on the most violent and chronic of all juvenile offenders.
Between 1992 and 1997, for example, all but three states passed new laws and modified existing laws to handle serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders in a more punitive manner. Forty-five states made it easier to transfer or waive juveniles to adult court jurisdiction, and thirty-one states expanded sentencing options for certain adjudicated delinquents allowing them to be incarcerated well into young adulthood. One of the popular sentencing options for serious and violent delinquents is blended sentencing, also called determinate or mandatory sentencing laws. In states with blended sentencing provisions, laws were structured to allow certain types of delinquent youth to be sentenced to long terms of confinement in both the juvenile and adult correctional systems. Another feature of the get-tough paradigm are “Once an adult, always an adult” statutes. Used by thirty-four states including Texas, these statutes allow juveniles waived and convicted in adult court to be considered as an adult for all future crimes committed as a juvenile (Snyder & Sickmund, 2006).

During the get-tough movement of the mid-1990s, the crime rate among young offenders consistently dropped. The most current national data available indicates the violent crime index has dropped below the early 1980s crime rate, and the juvenile homicide rate has fallen to a low not seen in three decades. Aggravated assaults and rape arrest rates have followed similar trends.

Despite decreases in the juvenile crime rate, incarceration rates have followed a different pattern. The total number of delinquents held in institutions rose 48% from 1991 to 1999, despite decreases in violent juvenile crime. Although the rate of juvenile incarceration has declined in the last few years,
incarceration rates remain at a high level relative to crime decreases (Snyder & Sickmund, 2006).

Juvenile Correctional Populations

Despite more than a decade of decreasing juvenile crime rates, in 2003 juveniles were still arrested for more than 92,000 Index I violent offenses including but not limited to homicide, robbery, and sexual assault (Snyder & Sickmund, 2006). The same report details that on any given day; nearly 100,000 juveniles are incarcerated in secure facilities in the United States. Thus, while arrests have declined from a peak in the mid-1990s, there are still a large number of juveniles arrested each year for offenses that would justify institutionalization. In 2003, Snyder and Sickmund (2006) found that nearly 33,000 juveniles were incarcerated for Index I violent crimes, including nearly 900 murderers (2.6%), over 7,400 for rape (22.4%), 6,230 for robbery (18.8%), and nearly 7,500 for aggravated assault (23%). In addition, there were over 8,000 juveniles committed to juvenile facilities for simple assault (24%), and over 11,000 for drug and weapons offenses (12.3%).

In Texas, for example, data from the Texas Youth Commission (TYC) for 1996 to 2005 shows that institutional populations remain at a high level despite juvenile crime decreases. The number of state committed juveniles in Texas peaked in 1998 with 3,188 committed youths, and then declined to the current level of 2,614 youths in Texas facilities for 2005 (TYC, 2006). Overall, however, the population in Texas juvenile institutions has grown 39% from 1996 to 2005.
Part of the reason for this growth in population may be that state committed juveniles are remaining within institutions for longer periods of time. The average length of stay has increased nearly 60% (13.1 months to 20.9 months) from 1996-2005 (TYC, 2006). This would seem to indicate either that juveniles in Texas are committing crimes of a more serious nature, or that they are receiving longer sentences in general.

According to the Texas Youth Commission (TYC) in 2005, 33% of the youths in their institutions had committed violent offenses, 1% committed a drug offense, 3% had committed a weapons offense, and 1% were habitual felony offenders, with the balance listed as “general offenders” (TYC Commitment Profile, 2006). Of these youth, 81% were in custody for a current felony conviction, 86% had at least one prior felony adjudication and 49% had at least two prior felony adjudications. The bottom line in Texas is that state committed juveniles represent some of the most problematic delinquents in the state—serious, chronic, and violent—such that institutionalization is the only option. Thus, despite a decreasing crime rate, there are still a number of youth requiring institutionalization.

Not all state committed delinquents are created the same. Indeed, there are subpopulations of these incarcerated youths that import special problems into juvenile correctional environment—problems beyond the garden-variety issues demonstrated by most state committed delinquents. Special youth populations such as drug related juvenile offenders and sex offenders have implications not only for correctional management, but for youth treatment as well. Of particular
concern are gang-related juveniles. In some states, gang members represent a substantial proportion of the incarcerated population. In Texas, for example, roughly 35% of all state committed delinquents are known gang members (TYC, 2006).

Considering the large number of incarcerated youths, and the special problems they bring to the institutional environment, understanding the factors that influence their behavior has far-reaching impacts upon management strategies of juvenile correctional institutions. Juvenile correctional officials must maintain order and keep the peace within their facilities, for the safety of other juveniles and staff is at stake. Doing so also helps to insulate juvenile correctional institutions from the legal ramifications of violence and disorder within their facility. At the most basic level, maintaining order is particularly important in juvenile facilities, because institutions marked by chaos, disorder, and fear cannot effectively accomplish rehabilitation.

Managing the most serious and violent of all juvenile offenders is not an easy task. Juvenile correctional facilities face many obstacles in maintaining a safe and secure environment. Overcrowding is a constant concern and makes the task even more difficult. Indeed, the 2002 Juvenile Residential Census reports that thirty-six percent of all juvenile facilities are at, or over, one hundred percent of capacity (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention [OJJDP], 2002). Facility overcrowding has been linked to a number of institutional problems including inmate misconduct (Bonta & Gendreau, 1990; French & Gendreau, 2006; Gaes, G., 1994), increased tension among inmates.
(Rolland, 1997), and to a myriad of other issues that negatively affect the institutional environment. Yet, this task becomes even more difficult in the presence of specialized correctional populations such as gang members. Notwithstanding the endemic problems of overcrowding, and other important issues, perhaps one of the greatest problems facing the administration of juvenile correctional facilities is the presence of gangs within the walls.

The Problem of Gang Members within Institutions

Gang members, whether in adult or juvenile correctional settings, present numerous problems to prison administrators. Although juvenile correctional institutions arguably hold the most violent and chronic of all juvenile offenders, gang members confound the ability of administrators to effectively operate a sound and secure correctional program. Gang members, unlike their “regular” institutionalized counterparts, are often more violent, chronic, and disruptive both in and out of institutions.

Indeed, gangs and their members have been synonymous with violence from the bandits of ancient Rome (Shaw, 1984), to such modern day super-gangs such as the Crips, Bloods, and Latin Kings (Delaney, 2006). Many inner-city residents cite gangs as the greatest source of crime and neighborhood fear (Da Cruz, 2004; US Department of Education [USDoE], 2006; Zamora, 2000). Media accounts in most major cities depict scenes of gang violence on a regular basis and these are simply not scare tactics. The FBI Supplemental Homicide Reports (SHR) revealed that from 1993 to 2003, 5-7% of all homicides, and 8-
10% of all gun homicides were gang related (Harrell, 2005). The sheer number of gangs is troublesome. In terms of correctional institutions, however, what occurs on the streets will eventually be imported into correctional systems. Indeed, it is impossible to divorce what occurs on the streets from what happens within institutions. One of those occurrences is the presence of gang members.

One 1990 survey revealed that more than seventy-five percent of juvenile institutions had a “gang problem” within their facility (Howell, 1998). Howell also found that two-thirds of inmates within juvenile facilities reported belonging to gangs (Howell, 1998). While this percentage may be inflated, without specific evidence to the contrary it is difficult to refute. Although gangs can and do form solely within the walls of correctional facilities, perhaps the greatest number of juvenile gang members are those that have imported this characteristic into the institutions. This presents a major problem for correctional administrators because when gang members migrate into correctional facilities they do not usually cease their gang-related activities. Rather, many gang members simply resume their criminal activities from the street within the institution—both violent and non-violent activities.

Studies have revealed that gang members produce the bulk of institutional rule violations (Fleisher & Decker, 2001; Fong, 1990; Gaes et al., 2002; Howell, 1998; Knox, 2004). Not surprisingly, research has revealed that as gang membership increases, the level of violence inside institutions increases as well (Gaes et al., 2002; Howell, 1998; Knox, 2004). Many studies have revealed that
gang members commit the majority of rule violations and “crimes” within correctional settings, well above their proportion of the prison populations.

Whether called rule infractions, write-ups, disciplinary tickets, facility violations, or whether they are simply crimes within facility walls, these acts of misconduct offer insights into the adjustment of juvenile offenders to correctional settings. If a facility has a high level of misconduct by its inmates, not only may this be an indication of problems with management, but also this could indicate disruption of the overall goals of rehabilitation for inmates. This is particularly problematic in juvenile institutions, because despite a more punitive move in the treatment of some juvenile offenders, rehabilitation is still a hallmark of juvenile institutional regimes. It is difficult to reach troubled youths in the best of circumstances, adding institutional disruption only makes the effort more difficult. In addition, institutional misconduct often includes violence directed against correctional officers, staff, and other inmates, which is a prime concern to prison administrators. Perhaps more than any other correctional population, gang members bring the greatest potential of misconduct to correctional environments.

**Juvenile Gang Membership and Institutional Misconduct**

Youths have a number of reasons for joining gangs outside of institutions. They may join for social purposes, allowing them to remain with peers and family (especially close family members such as older siblings) who are already members of the gang. Youths also join for protection and safety, and they may join as a way to earn status or respect, or to earn money through drug trafficking
or other crimes (Howell, 1998; Howell & Egley, 2005). These motivations do not disappear once a youth is incarcerated. Gangs provide strength, protection, and status. Crimes and misconduct within institutions can provide drugs or cash for niceties at a commissary, and membership provides a sense of belonging. All of these factors give a young inmate a way to help him endure and survive his stay while incarcerated. Oftentimes, these activities manifest in institutional misconduct.

Institutional misconduct has received attention from researchers, but the focus has been almost exclusively upon adult prison populations. Extant literature reveals just five studies regarding juveniles and institutional misconduct, (Cesaroni & Peterson-Badali, 2005; Gover, Mackenzie & Armstrong, 2000; MacDonald, 1999; Poole & Regoli, 1983; Trulson, 2007), and only two of these studies have used gang membership or affiliation as a predictor of misconduct. Even within adult misconduct literature, there is only one work that specifically examines gang affiliation and institutional misconduct (Gaes et al., 2002).

There have been many studies done on prison and street gangs (Baugh, 1993; Camp, G. and Camp, C. 1985; Decker & Lauritsen, 1996; Fleisher & Decker, 2001; Fong, 1990; Fong, Vogel & Buentello, 1992; National Gang Crime Research Center 2004; Wacquant, 2001), as well as on juvenile gangs in general (Decker, 2003; Delaney, 2006; Esbensen & Huizinga, 1993; Thornberry et al., 1993). Few, however, have focused specifically on the impact of gang membership on institutional misconduct among state incarcerated delinquents.
While the growing number of studies of adult inmate misconduct may inform on the situation for juveniles, it is premature to conclude what explains misconduct for adults automatically qualifies as an explanation for juveniles. Incarcerated juveniles and adults face an entirely different set of circumstances and life experiences.

Adult correctional facilities, for example, rarely mimic the function and rationale of juvenile institutionalization. Adult prisons are viewed and operated as more punitive in nature, while juvenile correctional facilities as a whole are more rehabilitative in nature. Adult prisons also hold a clientele that tends to have lengthier and/or more serious criminal records. At the most basic level, state committed juveniles serve much shorter sentences than incarcerated adults do. In short, while there are similarities, juveniles are not adults and this recognition requires that the juvenile institutional experience be examined separately as it relates specifically to gang membership and institutional misconduct.

*Foundation for this Study*

Current adult misconduct literature has demonstrated that younger inmates, inmates with an extensive prior criminal history, and gang members are more likely to commit both violent and non-violent misconduct while in custody. Of particular interest is the concept that membership in either a prison or street gang increases the likelihood of violent misconduct as juveniles tend to come
from street gangs. However, it is premature to state categorically that what applies to adults will apply to juveniles.

Juvenile studies have suggested a correlation between gang membership and violent misconduct; however, no study has focused exclusively upon juvenile gang members who are placed in secure custodial settings. Only a few studies have examined the impact of gang membership on institutional misconduct, but even then these studies relied on gang membership only on a peripheral level. This study attempts to fill this gap and improve upon available literature on the determinants of misconduct of institutionalized delinquents, and more specifically, gang-related delinquents.

Research Questions for this Study

The gap in the literature on gang membership and institutional misconduct among state committed juveniles provides justification for this study. What is known, however, is that gang membership rarely results in positive outcomes. As a result, this study attempts to evaluate the impact of gang membership on institutional misconduct among a cohort of state committed delinquents. This study is organized by the following research questions:

1. Are there differences in the demographics, delinquent histories, and risk factors between state committed delinquent gang members and state committed delinquent non-gang members?

2. Is there a difference in the frequency of institutional misconduct between state committed delinquent gang members and state committed delinquent non-gang members?

3. Is gang membership among state committed delinquents a significant determinant of serious institutional misconduct?
4. Do the determinants of serious institutional misconduct among state committed delinquents differ for gang members compared to non-gang members?

5. Is gang membership among state committed delinquents a significant determinant of disruptive institutional misconduct?

6. Do the determinants of disruptive institutional misconduct among state committed delinquents differ for gang members compared to non-gang members?

To address the above research questions, Chapter 2 first outlines and discusses extant literature on institutional misconduct among incarcerated juveniles. There is a lack of research on institutional misconduct among juvenile offenders. Despite this small literature base, studies on institutional misconduct among incarcerated juveniles do exist. These studies, in conjunction with studies on misconduct among adult offenders, will help frame and guide the current research.

Chapter 3 presents the methodology utilized for this study, including the population under study and the methods used to obtain the sample and data from the TYC. This thesis involves the secondary analysis of data originally collected and maintained by the TYC. As such, Chapter 3 explores the methods used by TYC to collect the data. The selection of both independent and dependent variables is also discussed in Chapter 3, in addition to variable coding. Finally, reliability and validity of the data is presented.

The findings and analysis are presented in Chapter 4. Bivariate analyses were employed to examine the differences between gang members and non-gang members. Logistic regression is then used to determine the impact of
several variables, including gang membership, on institutional misconduct. Logistic regression is also used to explore the predictors of institutional misconduct among gang and non-gang related youth.

The last chapter presents the implications of the findings of this study. If gang members are more likely to commit acts of violent misconduct, what consequence will this have for administrators of juvenile correctional institutions? What should administrators do with gang members? The answers to these and other questions will be examined. Additionally, Chapter 5 addresses the limitations of this study and present directions for future research.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Gangs have been in existence for centuries. Indeed, individuals involved in criminal activities have often worked together to achieve their goals. Law enforcement officials in the Middle Ages often complained about lawless groups in much the same manner as their modern counterparts do now (Hanawalt & Wallace, 1999; Ruff, 2001). However, gangs that operate as a collective entity within prison walls are a relatively new phenomenon; the official recognition and existence of prison gangs traces back a mere fifty years (Caltabiano, 1981; Camp, G., and Camp, C. 1985; Fleisher & Decker, 2001; Valentine 1995, 2000). And from their earliest existence, gangs within prisons became synonymous with violence (Camp, G., and Camp, C. 1985; Fleisher & Decker, 2001; Valentine 1995, 2000).

Much of the research on gangs has been devoted to street gangs. This is not surprising, for these groups are far more visible to the public, and their crimes are committed against a population that can demand action be taken by law enforcement and legislators. Alternatively, prison gangs are a relatively hidden population. Because of their hidden nature, they did not become a topic for systematic research until the problems they presented to prisons and prison
administrators had grown severe enough to warrant action—sometimes to the extent that their activities extended beyond the prison walls. Indeed, one report called prison gangs, “…gang researchers’ final frontier…” (Fleisher & Decker, 2001).

While some suggest that there are only five major prison gangs currently in United States prisons (Fleisher & Decker, 2001), other researchers list almost too many to count. For example, the National Alliance Of Gang Investigators Association (NAGIA) identified 26 different gangs in an early study of prison gangs, and over 1,600 gangs with more than 113,000 members in their most recent report for 2005 (NAGIA, 2005). In another study, Camp and Camp (1985) identified over 100 prison gangs, and the National Gang Crime Research Center (2004) listed over 300 different gangs (Camp, G. & Camp, C. 1985, Knox, G. 2004). Despite the lack of consensus about the number of prison gangs, there does appear to be a general consensus of which gangs are considered “major,” and these are typically the gangs that have multiple state representations, have the highest number of members, and tend to be the most violent of all inmate groupings.

The most significant and established prison gangs in the United States are the Aryan Brotherhood (AB), the Mexican Mafia (La EME), Nuestra Familia (NF), The Texas Syndicate (TSE), Bloods / Crips, The Vice Lords, Mara Salvatrucha (MS-13), Latin Kings, and the various Gangster Disciples groups (Camp, G. & Camp, C. 1985; Knox, 1999, 2004; NAGIA, 2005). Yet, there is much variation between these different groupings. For example, the Vice Lords, Gangster
Disciples, and the Latin Kings are more often reported in the Midwestern states of Illinois, Michigan, and Ohio, while the Mexican Mafia and the Texas Syndicate are more often found in the west and south. The Aryan Brotherhood is the one gang that has members in almost all states (Anti-Defamation League [ADL], 1998).

The previous discussion suggests that the emergence of adult prison gangs cannot be ignored in the study of institutionalized juvenile gang members for the simple reason that there are very few studies that have examined this topic. As such, this chapter begins with a focus on the emergence of adult prison gangs. It then examines the definitional problem of defining exactly what a prison gang is. It examines next what is known about juvenile gang membership in correctional facilities. This chapter then explores the models used to explain institutional misconduct, with a special focus on misconduct among gang members within juvenile and adult correctional institutions. The literature on juvenile misconduct is limited, and literature on institutional misconduct attributed to gang members is virtually non-existent. Therefore this chapter examines the literature on adult gang member misconduct to help frame and guide an understanding of institutional misconduct among gang related delinquents.

The Emergence and Expansion of Adult Prison Gangs

Prison gangs were first identified on the West Coast in the 1950s; the Gypsy Jokers in the Walla Walla prison in Washington State in 1950, and the Mexican Mafia (La EME) in 1957 at the Deuel Vocational Institute in California
(Camp, G. and Camp, C. 1985; Fleisher & Decker, 2001). Despite their slow beginnings, by the end of the 1960s different and competing prison gangs had developed across the country in state and federal prison systems.


The BGF was founded upon the political ideology of Marxism and claimed radical revolution as its status. The gang also claimed brotherhood with other radical or militant organizations such as the Black Panther Party, the Symbionese Liberation Army (SLA), and the Black Liberation Army (Boyer, 1985; Fleisher & Decker, 2001; Valentine, 1995, 2000; Walker 2003). The founder—George L. Jackson—was a member of the Black Panther Party, and while he had political goals, he and later leaders of the BGF also moved the gang into criminal enterprises for money, membership recruitment, and control of drug trafficking.
Other dominant black prison gangs include the Vice Lords, Crips, Bloods, Gangster Disciples, and the 415 or Kumi African Nation (Fleisher & Decker, 2001; Florida Department of Corrections, 2001; NAGIA, 2005; Valentine, 1995, 2000; Wacquant, 2001; Walker, 2003).

According to NAGIA, the Vice Lords are now found in 35 states after forming in Chicago in 1969 as a street gang (Camp, G. & Camp, C. 1985; Know Gangs website, 2005; NAGIA, 2005). They are active primarily in the Midwest and Northeast areas of the US, and according to the 2004 National Gang Crime Research Center report, they are the fifth largest gang in US prisons according to documented numbers of members (Knox, 2004).

The Gangster Disciples, (also known as the Black Gangster Disciples), began in the Chicago area in the late 1960s (Camp, G. & Camp, C. 1985; Know Gangs website, 2005; NAGIA, 2005). A Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) press release stated that the gang had 30,000 members in prison and on the streets (DEA, 1997), but more current reports state that they have over 100,000 members in 43 states (NAGIA, 2005), and they are the second largest gang in the country (Knox, 2004).

A relatively new gang is Mara Salvatrucha or MS-13. Originally a street gang from El Salvador called La Mara, the first members appeared in Los Angeles in the 1980s, (Valdez, 2000), under the name of Mara Salvatrucha. After they aligned themselves with the Mexican Mafia, the Mara Salvatrucha changed their name to MS-13$^2$ to reflect that alliance and they have taken the enemies of
EME as their own (Valdez, 2000). As of 2005, the group has spread to over thirty states, Mexico, and Canada, while maintaining ties to the original street gang that spawned it (Valdez, 2000; NAGIA, 2005). Members were originally only from El Salvador, now they include other Central American Hispanics and blacks. MS-13 members have a growing reputation for extreme violence and fearlessness (NAGIA, 2005), and members were responsible for the “execution” of 3 federal officers (Valdez, 2000).

The previous discussion focused on some of the largest prison gangs in the US. Information does exist in a broader view however, on the extent of prison gangs across the nation. The first national survey of prison gangs in 1981 reported 47 gangs in 24 prisons (Caltabiano, 1981). By the mid 1980s, Camp and Camp found 114 gangs in 33 prisons (out of 49 reporting), with a membership of 13,000 (Camp, G. & Camp, C. 1985). By 1992, in a report for the American Correctional Association, Baugh found the numbers had jumped to over 45,000, a 350% increase (Baugh, 1993). A decade later saw the increase of another 250% to nearly 117,000 gang members (NAGIA, 2005). Based on available evidence, both the number of gangs and their members have increased substantially over time. However, one of the major problems in counting the number of adult prison gang members is that it is not known if these figures represent gang members currently incarcerated, or if it includes members that are on the streets. The issue of defining what qualifies for a prison gang is somewhat complicated, and this issue is addressed in a later section. At this
point, it is useful to examine what is known about the organization and structure of prison gangs—however they might be labeled and counted.

**Prison Gang Organization and Structure**

Oftentimes, prison gangs are organized upon racial or ethnic lines; whites join white gangs, blacks join black gangs, and Hispanic or Latinos join Hispanic gangs, though there are a few crossovers (Valentine, 1995). Joe Morgan, the head of the Hispanic Mexican Mafia from 1960 until his death in 1993, was of Hungarian descent, but was raised in the barrios of Los Angeles and spoke Spanish. In this racially polarized environment, different gangs fight with other gangs, and to a lesser extent, prison staff. In their efforts to control the illicit drug trade, gang members use extortion, force, threats, and violence—including homicide (Fong et al., 1992). For example, the Mexican Mafia is allied with the Aryan Brotherhood and Mexikanemi (another Hispanic gang), but is strongly antagonistic to all black gangs and the Nuestra Familia (Valentine, 1995; Walker, 2003).

Adult prison gang members are also organized in a hierarchal and para-military manner, with a leader or council of leaders at the top, followed by lower level members who may carry titles such as lieutenant or captain (Valentine, 1995; Walker, 2003). Most of the gangs have a creed or motto, symbols (often expressed in tattoos or jewelry), and many have a rite of initiation (Fleisher & Decker, 2001; Jackson & McBride, 1992; Valentine, 1995, 2000; Walker, 2003). The most common way into a gang is through a ritual of violence known as
“Blood-in, Blood-out”. This ritual requires a gang hopeful to either kill someone on the gang’s “hit” list, or at the very least, commit an act of violence (Fleisher & Decker, 2001; Fong et al., 1992). This ritual also occurs when a gang member tries to leave the gang; the defection is often met with violence, and can mean a death sentence from fellow gang members (Fong et al., 1992).

**Prison Gang Activities**

The primary activities of larger gangs (besides group identity and protection), is the business of drugs. Different gangs may deal in different types of drugs, but control of all narcotics trafficking is the goal of prison gangs (Jackson & McBride, 1992; NAGIA, 2005; Valentine, 1995; Walker, 2003). According to NAGIA, prison gangs are the main source of illicit drugs in the US, and the Mexican Mafia has imposed a “street tax” on all drug sales in Southern California. Indeed, the head of the Gangster Disciples was convicted of running a 100 million dollar per year drug operation in 35 states—from inside a prison cell (NAGIA, 2005).

Outside of drug related activities, numerous studies have concluded that prison gangs produce the majority institutional rule violations—perhaps a byproduct of their activities (Fleisher & Decker, 2001; Fong, R. 1990; Knox, 2004). Fong et al., 1992) reported that prison gangs were responsible for 50% of prison management problems (Fong, Vogel, & Buentello, 1992). The American Correctional Association (ACA, 1993) revealed that prison gangs were responsible for 20% of violent incidents towards staff and 40% of inmate
assaults. Others have noted similar patterns and seem to support the idea that
gang members are qualitatively different from non-gang members in correctional

A disturbing new trend among prison gangs is their affiliation with
recognized terrorist groups. NAGIA reported that a Colorado facility had inmates
with ties to Al-Qaeda, the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO), and Hamas,
with 18 of the gang member inmates trained as active terrorists (NAGIA, 2005).
Papachristos reported that the Chicago El Rukn gang had joined with Libyan
groups to commit crimes of terror here in the United States (Papachristos, 2005).
He also linked the Latin Kings to FALN3 in the 1990s, and Mara Salvatrucha
(MS-13), who joined forces with Al-Qaeda to smuggle immigrants into the United
States.

Adult prisoners may join gangs once they arrive in prison, and many will
continue the affiliation with that prison gang while on the outside. Any street gang
affiliation will be moved to the sidelines and the prison gang will trump street
status—and may sometimes continue for life even after release from
incarceration.4 The Nuestra Familia and Texas Syndicate gangs, for example,
require their members to contribute a set percentage of any income to the gang
for life (Fong, R. 1990; USDOJ, 2004). A few may cut all ties to the prison gang
once they leave prison, but the “blood-out” ritual deters many from leaving (Fong
et al., 1992), and the inability to get away from fellow members while in prison
deters those from leaving while still incarcerated (Decker & Lauritson, 2002).
Definitional Problems

Part of the problem in conducting research about prison gangs and members is in how they are classified by correctional systems around the country. This is particularly the case for adult prison gangs. For example, a prison gang in one jurisdiction may be considered a street gang in another, and security threat group (STG) in yet another. Lyman (1989) defines a prison gang as:

An organization which operates within the prison system as a self-perpetuating, criminally-orientated entity, consisting of a select group of inmates who have established an organized chain of command and are governed by an established code of conduct (Lyman, M. 1989, pp. 48, emphasis added).

This definition works well for gangs in prisons, but street gangs are harder to define. There is no single definition that all can agree upon (Taylor, Fritsch, & Caeti, 2007). California defines a street gang as:

...any ongoing organization, association, or group of 3 or more persons whether formal or informal...having a common name or common identifying sign or symbol, and whose members individually or collectively engage in or have engaged in a pattern of criminal activity. (California Penal Code § 186.22, emphasis added)

This is a good general description, but does not address several, often key identifiers, such as attire or locality, or how they are classified when these street gang members enter the prison setting. Delaney (2006) expands upon the California description.

...street gang is a group of individuals whose core members interact with one another at a high frequency rate. They possess a group name, generally wear certain types of clothing, can generally be identified by specific colors, are most likely to claim a neighborhood, turf, or marketplace, and often engage in criminal or other delinquent behavior (Delaney, T. 2006, pp. 8, emphasis added).
The STG label is used by the Federal Bureau of Prisons, and by some states to differentiate between different gangs for security purposes. An STG may describe a gang with a lesser risk or fewer members than an official “prison” gang. The STG label encompasses not only the smaller or less well represented gangs, but also such groups such as outlaw motorcycle clubs including the Hell’s Angels or Mongols, white supremacy groups such as the KKK, Christian Identity, White Aryan Resistance (WAR), or Aryan Circle, and the cults or more radical religious groups such as Satanists or the Nation of Islam (ADL, 1998; Knox, 2004; NAGIA, 2005). Some correctional facilities and law enforcement officials even put all gangs under the STG label. In short, the STG label is used in a number of different ways across the nation, in much of the same way as the terms prison and street gang are used.

This labeling disparity (for prison or street gangs and STG’s) occurs for several reasons. At the most basic level, the different labels relate to differences among the various state prisons and their classification procedures. Additionally, some gangs are regional in nature, for example, the Vice Lords and various Gangster Disciples groups are more often found in the Midwestern states of Michigan, Ohio, and Illinois, while the Mexican Mafia, Nuestra Familia, and Texas Syndicate are seen most often in the west and south. A gang new to state or prison authorities may not carry the label of “prison” gang simply because of its recent formation. The bottom line is that one system’s prison gang is another system’s street gang or STG. This creates some issues in terms of correctly
assessing the true number of gangs and gang members in correctional facilities across the nation.

The situation above may mean that if a facility reports that they have 350 gang members within their institution, this number may reflect only what the institution classifies as prison gang members and not members of street gangs or STG’s. For example, the Crips and the Bloods are black gangs that originated on the streets of Los Angeles in the late 1960s or early 1970s (Boyer, 1985; Jackson & McBride, 1992; Valentine, 2000). Sources are divided as to whether they are truly “prison” gangs, or are merely street gangs that have members imported into the prison setting. Indeed, a 1985 study of prison gangs by Camp and Camp fails to mention either gang (Camp, G. & Camp, C. 1985), while other studies consider the two gangs only as street gangs (Jackson & McBride, 1992; Valentine, 1995, 2000). In the Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ), the second largest prison system in the nation, this system does not even recognize either group as an actual prison gang—they are only considered a STG within Texas prisons (TDCJ, 2004).

On the other end of the spectrum, a major study of gangs by the National Gang Crime Research Center (NGCRC) lists Crips and Bloods as the number one and three prison gangs in terms of the number of members currently in prisons throughout the country (Knox, 2004), and the National Alliance of Gang Investigators Association (NAGIA) states that the Bloods and Crips are the most frequently reported presence in US prisons (NAGIA, 2005). Still others report only that the Bloods and Crips gangs are merely a growing problem in US
prisons (Fleisher & Decker, 2001). Regardless of definitional inconsistencies, there is a significant presence of gang members within adult correctional facilities. Some are prison members, some are street gang members, some are STG members, and some may be all of these things.

Adult prison gangs have flourished and they have received increasing amounts of attention from both correctional administrators and researchers. However, there is a virtual lack of research for juvenile gang members in juvenile correctional institutions. Unlike attention paid to adult prison gangs and the issues they create for adult correctional settings, little research attention has been paid to either the presence of gangs in juvenile institutions or the problems that such gang related juveniles create.

Juvenile Gang Membership Behind Bars

Although little is known about juvenile gang membership within juvenile correctional institutions, the literature is not completely absent on this specialized type of incarcerated delinquent. One finding, for example, is that juvenile gang members are often not viewed as “worthy” for adult gang membership until they have progressed through the system and reached some stage of prominence (Jackson & McBride, 1992). For example, on the West Coast, members of the adult prison gangs have no interest in recruiting the juvenile gang member from the streets. However, as the youth makes his way through the juvenile system from the lower level work camps and juvenile hall, to the more secure and “adult-like” youth authority prisons, then the larger prison gangs may become interested
in the youth. Jackson and McBride note that once a youth has “matured” through the juvenile justice system and arrived at the highest levels of detention—prison—only then are the youth recruited into the mainstream prison gangs (Jackson & McBride, 1992). Since a primary goal of all juvenile institutions is the rehabilitation of its residents, it would seem prudent then, if a youth can be kept from gang affiliation within the institution, he may remain amenable to rehabilitation programs aimed at keeping him from returning to prison and “graduating” to the adult prison gangs. The key finding here, however, is that rarely do juvenile and adult prison gangs mix. Juvenile gang members within correctional institutions are a distinct phenomenon and tend to be much different from their adult counterparts—there is little blurring of the boundaries.

The Street Gang Connection

Gang members found in juvenile correctional institutions, unlike many of their adult counterparts, are almost entirely imports from existing street gangs. Rarely if ever do juvenile form their own prison gangs, and such groupings when they exist would be best characterized by groups with very loose associations. Instead, incarcerated juvenile gang member groupings are often street related.

Regardless of their formation and organization, youths have a number of reasons for joining gangs both in and out of institutions. On the street, youths join gangs for social purposes, allowing them to remain with peers and family (especially close family members such as older siblings) who are already members of the gang. Youths also join for protection and safety, and they may
join as a way to earn status or respect, or to earn money through drug trafficking or other crimes (Howell & Egley, Jr., 2005; Taylor et al., 2007). These motivations do not disappear once a youth is incarcerated.

Howell and Egley (2005) noted that the potential involvement of a youth with gangs rested upon a multiplicity of what they termed risk factors; community or neighborhood, family, school, peers, and individual factors (Howell & Egley, Jr., 2005). Community risk includes the availability of drugs, the feelings of safety within the neighborhood, and high crime or arrest rates in the neighborhood (Howell & Egley, 2005). Family factors include abuse, a lack of parental supervision, and a non-intact family group – the one parent household, and sibling or parental involvement in violence or other anti-social behaviors. School factors include feeling unsafe or vulnerable in school, leading to seeking membership for protection (Howell & Egley, 2005). Many of these factors do not apply to adults. Risk factors may have guided an individual to gang membership as a youth, but they have little relationship to an adult who joins the Aryan Brotherhood while in prison. Adults are not in school, and parental influences have long since waned.

This is why gang members found within juvenile institutions are almost solely street imports. There is no evidence to date (that we are aware of) of juveniles forming “prison” gangs analogous to the Mexican Mafia, Texas Syndicate or the Aryan Brotherhood within juvenile institutions. The only prison gang with correlations to juvenile prisons is the Nazi Low Riders. This group originally formed in the 1970s in the youth facilities of the California Youth
Authority, and carries the same white supremacy philosophy as the Aryan
Brotherhood (ADL, 1998, Valentine, 2000; Walker, 2003). Yet today, the Nazi
Low Riders are primarily an adult based prison gang despite its juvenile
beginnings.

*From Street Gang to Prison Gang*

A juvenile street gang member that is sent to prison may not find other
members (or enough members) of his street gang to associate with. Therefore,
his choice is limited to going it alone, or joining a grouping within the facility that
will provide the same benefits that his street gang gave him. Most evidence
shows that juveniles will join with other members of their own street gang, or a
gang closely associated with their own. Gangs provide strength, protection, and
status through the sheer numbers of members. Crimes committed within the
institution such as assaults, drug dealing, or gambling can provide drugs or cash
for little niceties at a commissary, and membership provides the same sense of
belonging received from a street gang. All of these factors give a young inmate a
way to help him endure and survive his stay in prison.

Juveniles follow a different path to gang membership than adults.
Juveniles tend to join their first gang while on the streets (Delaney, 2006;
Jackson & McBride, 1992; Valentine, 1995; Howell, Moore, & Egley Jr., 2002;
Peterson, 2004; Taylor et al., 2007; Zatz & Portillos, 2004). Many of the youth
gangs have a similar rite of initiation to adults, although typically less violent.
However, once the youth reaches a juvenile correctional institution, the street
gang affiliation will not be left at the door. The youth will continue to assert his street gang affiliation while in the institution—even if he joins a different group while incarcerated. Once the youth returns to the free world, he will return to his old street gang, with the added respect shown to him as a “veteran” of prison. Should the youth return to prison, the cycle is repeated (Valentine, 1995, 2000).

Reasons to join prison gangs also differ from adult to juvenile. The primary reason for an adult to join a gang in prison is pure survival (Jackson & McBride, 1992; Valentine, 2000). An adult can go it alone, but this is a risky undertaking. Jorge Renaud, an inmate in a Texas prison, wrote a narrative account of gangs and violence in prison.

Violence has always been a part of prison. Every man was tested when he came to the joint (prison). There were always a certain percentage of men who would not fight...and those men were ‘turned out’ or raped...with most of the trade being controlled by the building tenders or gangs (Renaud, J. 2002, pp. 127, emphasis added).

Juveniles may join a street gang for protection, but it appears more likely that they join for other reasons; their family may have other members in the gang (Zatz & Portillos, 2004), the gang gives a sense of belonging, power, or control, and the gang may provide some income through criminal activities (Tompkins, 2004). Snyder and Sickmund (2006) reported that in one study of gang membership, 545 said they followed another family member or peer into the gang, nearly 20% claimed protection as the reason, and 15% joined for fun or excitement (Snyder & Sickmund, 2006). They also noted that younger individuals were more likely to join for protection.
Once a juvenile gang member reaches an institution, one issue becomes problematic – identifying him or her as a gang member. The most usual method is one of self-admission by the youth (Schram & Gaines, 2005; Griffin & Hepburn, 2006; Sheldon, Tracy, & Brown, 2001). In Texas, 35% of all youths admitted to secure facilities claimed gang membership (Texas Youth Commission Offender Fact Sheet, 2006). Self-reporting carries risks of both over and under-reporting. Youths (especially younger offenders) may claim membership that they do not have in order to receive the benefits of status, protection, or belonging provided by such membership. Conversely, membership may be self-denied by a youth to avoid the scrutiny or loss of privileges by correctional officials. However, the problems of identifying a street versus prison versus STG member found in adult gang populations are not an issue for juvenile gang members. A youth is either a gang member or he is not, and the membership is almost always the street gang that the youth associated with prior to his incarceration.

It is widely accepted that juvenile gang members are responsible for a disproportionate amount of crime on the street, both violent and non-violent (Delaney, 2006; NAGIA, 2005; Sheldon, Tracy, & Brown, 2001; Snyder & Sickmund, 2006; Taylor et al., 2007). For example, Snyder and Sickmund (2006) note that in a study of Denver youth, gang members comprised 14% of the sample but committed 80% of the serious or violent crimes (Snyder & Sickmund, 2006). Further, they noted that in another study in Rochester, gang members comprised just 30% of the sample, but committed 69% of the violent offenses, 70% of the drug sales, and 68% of the property offenses. Given this premise, it
seems unlikely that gang members will miraculously cease their activities when they transition from freedom to incarceration. Unfortunately, there has been no study to date that has investigated the behavior of juvenile gang members while incarcerated. What we do know about gang members in prison is primarily found in adult studies.

Gang Members and Institutional Misconduct

Studies on the misconduct of inmates are not a new topic. The first seminal works were done in 1940 (Clemmer), 1958 (Sykes), and in 1962 (Irwin and Cressey), and the topic continues to be of interest in current literature. More recent research on the determinants of prisoner misconduct have studied the impact of race on institutional misconduct (Harer & Steffensmeier, 1996; Hemmens, & Marquart, 1999), offense and length of sentence (Cunningham et al., 2005; Sorenson, Wrinkle & Gutierrez, 1998), facility security level (Camp, S. & Gaes, 2005), gender (Cao, Zhao & Van Dine, 1997), drug use (Jiang, 2005), anger levels of prisoners (Mills & Kroner, 2003), and gang membership (Gaes, Wallace, Gilman, Klein-Saffran, & Suppa, 2002; Griffin & Hepburn, 2006; Ruddell, Decker, & Egley, Jr., 2006).

Still other studies have concentrated upon the more general samples of both male and female inmate behavior (Collie & Polaschek, 2003; Gover, MacKenzie & Armstrong, 2000; Hochstetler & DeLisi, 2005; Islam-Zwart & Vik, 2004; Jiang & Fisher-Giorlando, 2002; Kellar & Wang, 2005; Loucks, 2005; MacDonald, 1999; Paterline & Peterson, 1999; Wooldridge, Griffin & Pratt, 2001;
Wright, 1991). However, most studies have examined misconduct among adult offenders—very few studies have concentrated specifically on juvenile misconduct.

In the last twenty plus years, there have been only five studies that have examined the nature and extent of misconduct in facilities for state committed delinquents (Cesaroni & Peterson-Badali, 2005; Gover, MacKenzie, & Armstrong, 2000; MacDonald, 1999; Poole & Regoli, 1983; Trulson, 2007). Outside of these works, there have only been two studies focused on gang membership and juvenile misconduct specifically (Peterson, 2000; Schram & Gaines, 2005). The first study by Peterson (2000) was an exploratory examination of female gang members in a correctional setting, and the sample contained both female juveniles and young women (Peterson, 2000). Schram & Gaines (2005) examined the differences between gang members and non-gang members that participated in a probation treatment program designed to intervene with youth at risk for new criminal behavior or further delinquent activity (Schram & Gaines, 2005). None of the juveniles were incarcerated at the time of the study and Trulson (2007) and MacDonald (1999) only included gang membership as a variable within their studies (MacDonald, 1999; Trulson, 2007). No study has focused specifically on the institutional misconduct among juvenile gang members, and this presents a gap in the literature.

Theoretical Models of Institutional Misconduct

Research on institutional misconduct in correctional settings has been
generally guided by two competing models; importation, deprivation, or some combination of the two (Camp & Gaes, 2005; Cao, Zhao & Van Dine, 1997; Cesaroni & Peterson-Badali, 2005; Clemmer, 1940; Gover, MacKenzie, & Armstrong, 2000; Griffin & Hepburn, 2006; Harer & Steffensmeier, 1996; Irwin & Cressey, 1962; Jiang, 2005; Kellar & Wang, 2005; MacDonald, 1999; Poole & Regoli, 1983; Sorenson, Wrinkle & Gutierrez, 1998; Sykes, 1958; Trulson, 2007; Wooldridge, Griffin & Pratt, 2001; Wright, 1991), while others have included situational models (Jiang & Fisher-Giorlando, 2002; Steinke, 1991), integrated models (Hochstetler & DeLisi, 2005), and a self-conception model (Paterline & Peterson, 1999).

**Deprivation Model**

The deprivation model is based upon Donald Clemmer’s (1940) process of “prisonization” as described in his classic work, *The Prison Community*, and supported by Gresham Sykes in his seminal work, *The Society of Captives* in 1958. The major assumption of the deprivation model is that prison behavior is largely the product of a prisoner’s response to the “abnormal” prison environment and the pains of imprisonment (Sykes, 1958). According to Poole and Regoli, inmate misconduct under the deprivation model constitutes:

…the normal reaction of normal people to abnormal conditions. Coercive, brutal, and dehumanizing prison conditions may force inmates into predatory behavior in order to cope with the pains of imprisonment…*regardless of the characteristics of inmates* (Poole, E. & Regoli, R. 1983, pp. 215, emphasis added).
Certain aspects of prison life exert a negative pressure on inmates to go against the institutional regime and violate rules (MacDonald, 1999). Factors such as arbitrary rule enforcement by guards, staff-to-inmate ratios, facility overcrowding, the length of the sentence or the time already served in incarceration, security level of the institution, and the orientation of the institution (e.g. custodial or treatment) may impact the probability of institutional misconduct (Trulson, 2007). The deprivation model may not fit well as an explanation of misconduct for incarcerated juveniles because they do not spend as much time behind bars as do adults. According to the OJJDP, for example, only 13% of all sentenced offenders are still in custody after one year (Snyder & Sickmund, 2006). This is a considerably shorter period of time than adult inmates spend incarcerated on average. In addition, juvenile correctional facilities are not viewed as coercive as adult correctional facilities, thus the pains of imprisonment are probably less applicable to state committed delinquents.

Importation Model

In contrast, the major assumption of the importation model is that prison behavior is largely determined by the past experiences and characteristics that inmates bring into prison (Irwin & Cressey, 1962). Thus, the prison environment has less to do with an inmate’s behavior, rather it is the inmate’s traits, experiences, and lifestyle in the free world that are simply imported into the prison where the inmate resumes his deviant lifestyle. According to Poole and Regoli:
violence in prison is the logical and predictable result of the commitment of a collection of individuals whose life histories have been characterized by disregard for law, order, and social convention, in addition to a concurrent propensity for aggression....regardless of the institutional setting (Poole, E. & Regoli, R. 1983, pp. 215, emphasis added).

Therefore, variables that led to criminal behavior on the outside are the same variables that lead to institutional infractions on the inside according to the importation model (Irwin & Cressey, 1962; Sorenson, Wrinkle, & Gutierrez, 1998). These variables include, but are not limited to, individual, criminal, and social history related variables such as conviction history, arrest history, history of violent behavior, substance abuse, parental and/or sibling criminality, educational level, personality style, gang membership on the outside, age or its correlates (e.g. age at first prison admission), and race (Cao, Zhao, & Van Dine, 1997; Harer, & Steffensmeier, 1996).

Other Models of Misconduct

Integrated models assume that both imported characteristics and the response of inmates to the prison environment interact to produce the response of misconduct by the inmate (Hochstetler & DeLisi, 2005). Still others prefer the situational model. This model assumes that institutional misconduct is based upon situational factors such as time of the year, climate, and other situational based factors (Jiang, & Fisher-Giorlando, 2002; Steinke, 1991). Therefore, regardless of the deprivation of an inmate, or the pre-prison experiences, the situational model assumes that institutional misconduct is largely the result of certain situational events that converge to result in a rule infraction (Trulson,
The self-conception model looks at how an inmate feels about himself and his situation. The model assumes that how an inmate feels about being in prison, how he is socialized within the inmate culture, and how much control he feels that he has over his world will produce the results of misconduct (Paterline & Peterson, 1999).

Each of the different models has found support in the literature, with the stronger support in the importation camp (Cao, Zhao, & Van Dine, 1997; Harer & Steffensmeier, 1996; Gaes et al., 2002; Griffin & Hepburn, 2006), or in a combined model of both importation and deprivation variables (Gover, MacKenzie & Armstrong, 2000; Paterline & Peterson, 1999; Wooldridge, Griffin & Pratt, 2001). Indeed, a meta-analysis of 39 previous misconduct studies found that both deprivation and importation variables had similar predictive ability in measuring an inmate’s adjustment to prison (Gendreau, Goggin & Law, 1997). In the following section, literature discussing gang membership within the original importation or deprivation models, and the combined or integrated models will be reviewed for both adults and juveniles. An examination of adult misconduct literature is presented first, and is warranted, because of the lack of systematic research on institutional misconduct among state committed juveniles. Indeed, a review of adult misconduct studies serves to frame and guide the present study in terms of what is known about the determinants of misconduct, and specifically, the influence of gang membership.
Adult Misconduct Literature

Several studies have found that younger inmates and those with a significant prior criminal history have a greater propensity for misconduct (Cunningham et al., 2005; Harer & Steffensmeier, 1996; Wooldredge, Griffin & Pratt, 2001). Cunningham examined 2,500 male inmates at a Missouri facility over an 11 year time period. The inmates were serving sentences ranging from 2 years to a death sentence. Using official records of misconduct from 1991 to 2002, Cunningham found that the most influential predictor of violence was the age of the inmate; an inmate younger than age 21 was 3 times more likely to commit acts of violence (Cunningham et al., 2005). Harer & Steffensmeier examined racial differences for violent misconduct using data from 58 male federal institutions. The data included all recorded acts of misconduct for male inmates over an 18 month period from July 1, 1988 to December 31, 1989. They found that younger inmates and inmates with prior criminal history were significantly more likely to engage in acts of violent misconduct. Gang membership was not a significant predictor of institutional violence, however; Harer & Steffensmeier used gang membership as a deprivation variable, stating that gang presence within the institution was correlated with violence initiated by gang members, and incidents of drug dealing by gangs (Harer & Steffensmeier, 1996). They also offer the suggestion that violence by gang members is controlled by gang leadership, and this may lead to less violence, thus explaining the lack of predictability for gang membership and violence (Harer & Steffensmeier, 1996).
In another study, Sorenson and colleagues studied 336 male inmates with sentences for murder at the Missouri Department of Corrections from 1978 to 1987. Sorenson and colleagues revealed that younger inmates had a higher likelihood of committing institutional misconduct as measured in this study (Sorenson et al., 1998). However, in a study of 186 male inmates at a prison in the Deep South, Jiang and colleagues found that age or gang membership was not a significant predictor of violent misconduct when examined as an importation variable (Jiang & Fisher-Giorlando, 2002).

In a study specifically examining gang membership and violent misconduct, Griffin and Hepburn examined a sample of 2,158 male inmates at a southwestern prison during their first three years of incarceration and analyzed the record of disciplinary infractions for each inmate (Griffin & Hepburn, 2006). Independent variables included the inmate’s age at entry to the prison, race, sentenced for a violent or non-violent offense, length of sentence, prior incarceration, security level of the inmate, and gang affiliation. The dependant variable, violent misconduct, was based upon official records of disciplinary infractions for each inmate. These infractions were coded into: Assault, fighting, threats, weapons, or any major violent misconduct was used as a summary measure (Griffin & Hepburn, 2006).

Griffin and colleagues revealed that younger inmates had a significantly higher likelihood of committing violent misconduct. In addition, gang membership also had a positive association with violent misconduct for all of the dependant measures (assault, fighting, threats, and weapons). Consequently, gang
membership had a positive correlation to the summary measure of any violent misconduct (Griffin & Hepburn, 2006). Further, they explored both street and prison gang membership and violence, finding no statistical significance between the two groups. Prison gang membership produced the highest likelihood of weapons violations, fighting, assaults, and any other violent misconduct, whereas street gang members had the highest level of threats, and was second highest in likelihood for all other categories. This finding suggests that researchers may be able to combine street and prison gang members into a single group of gang affiliates for study of the impact of gang membership on misconduct (Griffin & Hepburn, 2006). However, as the authors note, this study is limited by the inclusion of inmates serving only a 3 year or longer sentence. Short-term sentenced inmates were not included in the study, and the behavior of inmates past the 3 year time frame was not examined, so it is not known if violent misconduct is correlated to inmates serving longer or shorter sentences.

In a 2004 survey of 418 jail administrators in all 50 states, Ruddell (2006) asked administrators about experiences with “special needs” inmates, including gang members. One-hundred thirty-four administrators in 39 states responded for a response rate of approximately 32%. Ruddell found that the jails had roughly 13% gang members within the general population, and then compared gang members to other special needs populations such as inmates with severe mental problems, repeat offenders, and inmates with a sentence longer than one year. He found that gang members were significantly more likely to be disruptive (a summary index including suicidal inmates, is likely to self-harm, victimization,
assaults on inmates or staff, escape or attempts, and other criminal conduct) than any other special population except for inmates with mental problems (Ruddell, Decker & Egley, Jr., 2006). In the individual categories, gang members were significantly more likely to assault staff, or assault other inmates than any other group of special needs inmates.

Gaes et al. conducted the first comprehensive multivariate analysis of gang membership on prison misconduct in 2002 (Gaes et al., 2002). Gaes used data from the Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP), limiting the sample to male inmates in all non-contract BOP institutions in March, 1997. A total of 82,504 male inmates comprised the sample, and 7,445 (9%) were considered gang members. Misconduct data came from the same prisons, and were from the time period of one year following the reference date (Gaes et al., 2002).

Dependant variables included two measures of violence. The first consisted of more violent misconduct such as homicide, attempted homicide, aggravated and simple assault, fire setting, weapon possession, rioting, taking of hostages, threats, and extortion. The second measure of misconduct included numerous lesser forms of misconduct such as drugs, theft, gambling, being in unauthorized areas and an “other” category used as a catchall for any other misconduct not included in other categories (Gaes et al., 2002).

Independent variables included; history of violent, drug, sexual, property, or other misconduct, and a summary history of any misconduct. Background variables included the security level of the inmate, citizenship, age, time served, race, and a security custody score determined by the BOP. This score is a
continuous scale used by the BOP to classify inmates—the higher the score, the more likely an inmate is expected to be involved in violence (Gaes et al., 2002). Gang variables included the gang to which an inmate was affiliated, the length of time the inmate was affiliated with the gang in months, a measure of an inmate’s embeddedness within the gang by using the title given to the inmate by the BOP classification (member, suspect, associate, organized crime, and non-affiliated) and a multi-gang affiliation variable. For members of multiple gangs, the primary gang would be used (Gaes et al., 2002).

Gaes and colleagues found that membership in any type of gang organization (prison gang, street gang, STG, organized crime groups, or even drug cartels) increased the likelihood of both violent and non-violent misconduct. The amount of time spent in the gang decreased the levels of violent misconduct, and having a membership in more than one gang was not significant (Gaes et al., 2002). Gaes and colleagues also noted that the passage of time within a gang and a consequent decrease in violence might be related to several factors. The inmate may simply become less likely to commit violent misconduct, the inmate may have become a leader within the gang and no longer participates actively in such behaviors, or lastly, that the higher levels of scrutiny given to gang members in prison helps lower the ability to commit violence (Gaes et al., 2002). In addition, they noted that the hardcore members were more likely to commit misconduct than were the more peripheral members such as associates, but even these associate members were still more likely to commit violent
misconduct than were unaffiliated inmates even when other background characteristics were taken into consideration.

Adult Research Summary

With the exception of the Jiang and Fisher-Giorlando study, these previous studies have shown that the factors of younger age, previous and/or extensive prior criminal history, and most important for our study, gang membership, are useful in predicting misconduct (both violent and non-violent) in correctional facilities. Additionally, both the Griffin study and the study by Gaes and colleagues found more specifically that gang membership increases the likelihood of violent misconduct regardless of the type of gang—prison or street. As juveniles are more street gang related than are adults, this finding has the implication that juvenile gang members may have similar violent behaviors while incarcerated as do adult gang members.

Juvenile Misconduct Literature

It is not known precisely why the presence of gangs or gang membership in juvenile institutions has not been studied, but there are several potential explanations. At the most basic level, even adult prison gangs were not studied until just recently, and this was largely the result of gangs creating massive problems for prison administrators. The first major studies of adult prison gangs began in the early 1980s, nearly 30 years after such gangs had first been identified. Second, adult gangs typically export their activities such as drug
trafficking outside the prison walls, and there seems to be little evidence that juveniles have done the same. Third, adult gang members have very high levels of violence, not only directed at each other, but at correctional staff as well. This type of behavior will garner attention quite rapidly. While juveniles can be violent, they do not seem to have the same levels of violence perpetrated by adults. Fourth, juveniles are not in prison for the long periods of time that adults are. The average sentence length for youths is a year or less, so there is less opportunity to form the highly organized structure found in the larger adult prison gangs (Snyder & Sickmund, 2006). In addition, there are simply less youths available within institutions to form large prison-based gangs. There are over 2 million adults in prison, while there are less than 100,000 juveniles in custody (Snyder & Sickmund, 2006). Finally, juveniles are a population that requires special handling, whether on the streets or in an institution. Gaining parental permission and being granted access for research to institutionalized youth is far more difficult than with adults. Despite these numerous reasons for the lack of research on gang members and institutional misconduct, there have been a few research efforts that have examined this issue.

In one of the first systematic studies, Poole and Regoli (1983) examined the determinants of institutional misconduct among 461 male juveniles from 4 different institutions in the South. They utilized a combination of interviews, observations, analysis of official documents and mailed questionnaires, and obtained a response rate of 81%. Importation variables included age, race, attitudes of aggression, and previous acts of violence. Deprivation variables
included the inmate adopting the “inmate code”, the orientation of the institution, and the amount of time served (Poole, & Regoli, 1983). They found that inmates with a history of aggressive behavior were more likely to commit violent acts, as were those inmates confined to more custodial institutions rather than a treatment orientated facility (Poole & Regoli, 1983).

Gover et al. (2000) examined 3,986 juveniles incarcerated in 48 different institutions across the United States. Twenty-two of the facilities were training camps and detention facilities, and the remainder (26) were boot camp facilities. The vast majority of the inmates were male (96%). Utilizing a self-report survey given to inmates and interviews with administrators between April 1997 and August 1998, Gover and colleagues revealed that younger inmates and those with a history of familial criminal behavior (including gang membership) were more likely to have problems adjusting to the correctional setting as measured by anxiety levels (Gover, MacKenzie, & Armstrong, 2000). While this study did not examine institutional misconduct or gang membership, it did examine state committed delinquents.

In studies using gang membership as an importation variable, support was found for the hypothesis that membership increased the potential for violent misconduct. MacDonald (1999) sampled two cohorts from the California Youth Authority (CYA) for the years 1981-82, and 1986-87 that were randomly selected from all of the 16 CYA facilities, thus limiting selection bias when a sample is limited to a single facility (MacDonald, 1999). Importation variables included the length of criminal history, number of previous arrests, family criminality, previous
offense types, drug history, and prior gang involvement (MacDonald, 1999). Deprivation variables included the level of institutional security, and the ratio of staff to inmates. The dependent variable was officially recorded institutional violations (MacDonald, 1999), and these were divided into two measures; assaults on either inmates or staff, and drug use. MacDonald found that inmates with significant gang histories were more likely to commit violent acts, as were inmates with a history of violence in general (MacDonald, 1999). In fact, he noted that gang membership increased the odds of a new violent act by nearly 30%. For those with a history of prior violence, the odds of a new violent act increased by about 20%.

MacDonald's findings seem to mesh with the most recent research on institutional misconduct conducted by Trulson. Trulson explored institutional misconduct among nearly 5,000 state committed inmates from a large southern juvenile correctional system (Trulson, 2007). The sample included 4,684 state incarcerated juveniles during the entire time of their incarceration. Males comprised 92% (4,309) of the sample, and females accounted for 8% (375). The independent variables included demographic (age and sex), delinquent history (such as age at first referral to the system, at commitment, and at release, length of sentence, criminal history, degree of offense, gang membership, and previous violence towards the inmates’ family), and risk factor variables. The latter included social issues such as familial gang membership, level of education, family structure, if the inmate was abused, abandoned, or neglected, or had mental health issues (Trulson, 2007). Dependant variables included two
measures of institutional misconduct; institutional danger and institutional
disruption. Institutional danger included assaults on staff or inmates and the
possession of a weapon. Institutional disruption was used as a general measure
of misconduct; whether an inmate disobeyed the directions of staff members
(Trulson, 2007).

Trulson (2007) found that younger inmates, juveniles with a more
extensive and/or serious criminal histories, and gang members were more likely
to commit violent misconduct such as assaults on staff, assaults on other
inmates, and possession of a weapon than did juveniles without such
characteristics (Trulson, 2007). However, while age and criminal history
remained significant in predicting a less serious form of institutional misconduct,
gang membership was not (described as failing to obey directives of staff).
Trulson concluded that “…while the determinants of misconduct for juveniles and
adults may differ, the results…seem to support the idea that what leads to
misconduct for adults are similar for juveniles…” (Trulson, 2007).

These juvenile studies, along with adult studies, suggest that both current
and previous gang membership are more likely to produce institutional
misconduct by juveniles, particularly violent misconduct. However, without
specific empirical evidence for juvenile offenders beyond the few studies above,
it cannot be conclusively determined that what impacts the misconduct for adults
automatically applies to juveniles. In addition, previous studies on
institutionalized juveniles and misconduct have focused only peripherally on the
role of gang membership. Even then, such studies are few and far between.
This study represents the first of its kind to focus specifically on the determinants of institutional misconduct among institutionalized gang members.

Summary

What is fairly well known is that gangs are present across the institutional spectrum; jails, prisons and juvenile facilities all report the presence of gang members (Sheldon, Tracy, & Brown, 2001; Howell, 1998; Egley, Jr., & Ritz, 2006). A 1990 survey of youth facilities reported that 75% of institutions had gang problems (Sheldon, Tracy, & Brown, 2001), and Howell (1998) found that over two-thirds of inmates in juvenile institutions were gang members (Howell, 1998).

According to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), there are over 96,000 incarcerated juveniles in the United States (OJJDP, 1993). Using Howell’s figure of two-thirds as gang members equals over 64,000 juvenile gang members behind bars. Given the problems of using self-reporting to gain accurate identification of members, this number of juvenile gang members incarcerated is perhaps inflated. However, even if the true number is closer to only 10% of the incarcerated juvenile population, that still equals nearly 10,000 gang members in our juvenile institutions.

The bottom line is that we simply do not know how many incarcerated juveniles are gang members because research is scant on this subject. Whatever the numbers, there is considerable evidence in the literature regarding the problems that gang members represent to prison management.
Gangs are present in both adult and juvenile correctional settings, and there is some proof that gang membership is a factor in adult institutional misconduct. Despite the limited studies on juvenile misconduct, some research shows that gang membership is an important determinant of institutional violations. In fact, the only two juvenile studies focused on misconduct demonstrated that gang membership is a significant determinant of institutional misconduct. At the least, gang membership has some significance to understanding the institutional experience of incarcerated delinquents. However, there have been no studies to date to test this hypothesis specifically. Therefore, this study attempts to fill this gap in the literature by asking: What is the impact of gang membership among state committed delinquents? Chapter 3 outlines how this question will be answered.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Current adult misconduct literature has demonstrated that younger inmates, inmates with an extensive prior criminal history, and gang members are more likely to commit both violent and non-violent misconduct while in custody. Of particular interest is the concept that membership in either a prison or street gang increases the likelihood of violent misconduct as juveniles tend to come from street gangs. However, it is premature to state categorically that what applies to adults will apply to juveniles.

Juvenile studies have suggested a correlation between gang membership and violent misconduct; however, no study has focused exclusively upon juvenile gang members who are placed in secure custodial settings. Only a few studies have examined the impact of gang membership on institutional misconduct, but even then these studies relied on gang membership only on a peripheral level. This study attempts to fill this gap and improve upon available literature on the determinants of misconduct of institutionalized delinquents, and more specifically, gang-related delinquents.

To determine the impact of gang membership on institutional misconduct, several research questions are examined in this study. The first two research
questions examine the background characteristics of the entire sample, the
differences between gang and non-gang members, including the frequency of
involvement in officially recorded institutional misconduct. These questions
include:

- Are there differences between state committed delinquent gang
  members and state committed non-gang members in terms of
demographics, delinquent history, and risk factors?

- Are there differences in the frequency of institutional misconduct
  between state committed delinquent gang members and non-gang
  members?

Questions 3 and 4 then examine the factors that predict serious
institutional misconduct, and whether gang membership specifically is a
significant determinant of this type of misconduct. These questions include:

- Is gang membership a significant predictor of serious institutional
  misconduct?

- Do the determinants of serious institutional misconduct differ for gang
  members compared to non-gang members?

Questions 5 and 6 are similar to questions 3 and 4. The only difference is
that these questions examine the determinants of disruptive, but not serious,
institutional misconduct among gang and non-gang related state committed
delinquents. These questions include:

- Is gang membership among state committed delinquents a significant
determinant of disruptive institutional misconduct?

- Do the determinants of disruptive institutional misconduct among state
  committed delinquents differ for gang members as compared to non-
gang members?

In short, this study examines whether gang membership matters when it comes
to both serious and non-serious but disruptive institutional misconduct.
The first section of this methodology chapter analyzes the source of data for this study, sample selection procedures, and criteria, and the final sample obtained for this thesis. It then examines the methods of data collection utilized by the Texas Youth Commission (TYC), along with a presentation and discussion of the independent and dependant variables. Next is a discussion of the reliability and validity of the data, along with the limitations associated with the data. Finally, the chapter presents the analytical techniques and analysis plan.

Data and Methods

Data Source

The Texas Youth Commission (TYC) is the state's juvenile corrections agency, providing for the care, custody, and rehabilitation of Texas' most serious juvenile offenders. One of the largest juvenile correctional systems in the nation, TYC operates 13 secure institutions and 9 residential programs. Delinquents committed to the TYC begin their stay at the Marlin Orientation Assessment Unit, which is the statewide intake unit for all state committed delinquents. At Marlin, state commitments are evaluated prior to a permanent placement in either a secure unit or one of the residential programs, although roughly 80% of youth are committed to secure state school facilities. This evaluation includes a number of different areas, including medical, dental, psychological, and delinquent history.

State commitments that end up at TYC are considered the most chronically delinquent or have committed the more serious or violent offenses among all delinquents offenders in Texas. Indeed, in 2005, one-third of TYC
arrivals had committed violent crimes, nearly 40% were considered high risk offenders, and approximately 35% were admitted gang members. For the same year, the average length of time a youth remained at TYC was approximately 23 months; however, those youths sentenced for the most serious crimes such as homicide may begin their sentence at TYC, and then may be transferred to the adult prison system to finish the sentence.

Given the strong presence of youths with more violent criminal histories and those claiming gang ties, the juvenile population housed at TYC is well-suited for this study. TYC was approached by the author for the use of their archived data and permission was granted for the data to be utilized in this study. Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was sought and granted under Application Number 06-268 on August 3, 2006.

**Sample**

This study examines the institutional misconduct of 4,309 male state delinquents released from the TYC. The sample is comprised of two different cohorts; the first cohort includes all male youth released from TYC from their first incarceration in 1997-1998, and the second cohort includes all male youth released from their first incarceration in 2003-2004. These two cohorts were merged for the final sample.

In terms of race, Hispanics accounted for 42.5% (1,832) of the sample, Caucasians for 22.3% (963), blacks for 34.1% (1,469), and the 45 remaining youth (1%), were coded as “other.” Nearly 80% (3,439) of the youths were
committed for a felony offense, with 870 (20.2%) committed for misdemeanor offenses. Over 81% (3,517) have one or two previous felony adjudications, 223 (5.2%) have three or more adjudications, and 13.2% (569) have no prior felony adjudications. Over 30% (1,307) are considered violent offenders, about 3% (125) are considered chronic serious offenders, and about 67% (2,877) are classified as non-violent offenders. Nearly 48% (1,840) of the youth claims to be a member of a gang. The overwhelming majority (3,935 or 91%) of the youths have only a 9th grade education or less, with only 37 youths (0.9%) completing high school.

Data and Variables

Data Collection Procedures in TYC

All data in this study was provided by the Texas Youth Commission. The TYC collects individual data on the characteristics of inmates, their delinquent histories and other data at the Marlin facility for all state committed juveniles upon arrival into TYC. All state committed juveniles remain at the Marlin intake facility for approximately 6 to 8 weeks, and then they are transferred to different facilities around the state to complete their sentence. After a youth is transferred to a different facility, this data collection and evaluation process will continue throughout the entire period of incarceration.

The data compiled by TYC both at intake and during incarceration come from many different sources including, but not limited to; state and county level official records, on-site diagnostic procedures at intake, observations from
professional and correctional staff from both the Marlin facility and from the facility the youth was transferred to, self-reported information from the juvenile, or a combination of these sources.

For example, official records are used by TYC to assemble a criminal history such as arrests, convictions, and dispositions prior to commitment at TYC. Information on social and familial variables, such as whether the family members of the juvenile are gang-related, are collected through a combination of self-reports taken at the intake facility. Other information is obtained through official records, such as level of education and if the parents of the youth are divorced. Medical, psychological, and other diagnostic information such as educational testing, are also collected on-site at the Marlin facility through testing done by psychologists, sociologists, and other correctional professionals. This collection of information is ongoing throughout the juvenile’s incarceration. The bottom line is that the TYC has made available a rich source of data for this study.

Data on the official institutional misconduct of state committed delinquents is collected at each of the juvenile facilities around the state. Institutional misconduct forms are standardized across all facilities in the state, with all facilities maintaining records for those delinquents housed at that location. These misconduct forms, called incident reports, include the type and location of the misconduct, and whether a hearing was held to determine the outcome of the misconduct such as a transfer to another facility or a change in housing or security status. When completed, the form is forwarded to a state data
coordinator for coding and entry into a statewide database. Violations are separated into three categories; the most serious are category one, lesser violations are category two, and the last category is “other.” Category one rule violations include offenses such as assaulting staff members or other juveniles during his or her incarceration, the possession of a weapon, escape, and extortion. Category two includes offenses such as gambling, and possession of contraband other than a weapon. The last category is for special occurrences not amounting to a rule violation such as a change in housing, or injuries requiring treatment or hospitalization.

**Independent Variables**

There are three sets of independent variables used in the analyses: demographic variables, delinquent history variables, and risk factor variables. (For complete coding of variables, see Table 1, pp. 65).

The only demographic variable is race. Delinquent history variables include five continuous and five categorical variables. The continuous variables include age at first formal referral to the juvenile system, age at state commitment, age at release from incarceration, the length of incarceration in days, and number of previous felony adjudications. The categorical variables include a weighted risk score completed by the TYC, whether the juvenile was on probation at the time of commitment, the degree of commitment offense (felony or misdemeanor), whether the youth was previously violent towards his family, and whether the youth was a gang member.
Risk factor variables include 19 continuous and categorical variables. The two continuous variables are the number of previous out of home placements (such as foster care or a youth shelter, but not including incarceration), and the education level of the youth (highest grade completed). The categorical variables include the gang affiliation of the youth's family members, the presence of divorce in the youth's family, whether the youth lived in poverty, whether the youth was confirmed to have been physically, emotionally, or sexually abused, or has been physically neglected, whether the youth was abandoned, whether the youth needed specialized treatment (emotionally disturbed, sex offender, or capital offender), whether the youth received treatment for these special needs, and whether the youth showed suicidal tendencies, or was mentally challenged or mentally ill.

With the single exception of Trulson (2007), this study greatly expands the number of independent variables used in previous research to examine the determinants of misconduct. Additionally, this study uses data from every facility in the state of Texas, and has a very large sample size relative to almost all other juvenile or adult misconduct studies. Further, this study includes data from the entire period of incarceration rather than a cross-section of time, and includes a measurement of two types of misconduct; serious and non-serious, which is consistent with previous literature on both adults and juveniles. Finally, this data is far more recent than any other juvenile (or adult) misconduct study except for the research done by Trulson (2007).
Dependent Variables

The TYC collects data on over 50 different types of “incidents” that a youth may commit within a facility. These incidents range from the most serious such as assaulting staff or another inmate and participating in a riot, to less serious offenses such as thefts, vandalism, and gambling, and down to the least serious offenses such as the misuse of mail or phone privileges. These offenses are recorded on an official “Incident Report.” This report describes the inmate, offense, and such tangibles as the time, date, and the location of the occurrence. Once completed, incident reports from all juvenile facilities across the state are maintained in a central location by the TYC.

Of all offenses described by the TYC Incident Report, two dichotomous measures of institutional misconduct were selected for this study. The first is a measure of “institutional violence” and is a composite measure composed of whether the youth assaulted staff, assaulted another youth, or possessed a weapon while incarcerated. The second outcome measure is “institutional disruption.” This is a general measure of misconduct compiled by TYC, and is a measurement of whether a youth fails to comply with written requests from TYC staff members. Examples of institutional disruption include such offenses as failing to keep a living area clean, failing to follow instructions by staff, or failing to abide by facility dress codes. After two or more attempts by staff to gain compliance with a certain request, the youth receives an incident report for failure to comply with a reasonable written request.
In general, youth involved in institutional violence have received the highest level of rule violations in the TYC. Youths that have committed institutional disruption have been involved in less serious, but disruptive incidents by failing to follow institutional rules and instructions of staff.

Table 1

*Independent Variables and Coding*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographic Variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1=Non-white; 0=White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delinquent History Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at first formal referral to juvenile system</td>
<td>Continuous Coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at state commitment</td>
<td>Continuous Coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at release from incarceration</td>
<td>Continuous Coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of incarceration in days</td>
<td>Continuous Coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous felony adjudications</td>
<td>Continuous Coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Gang Member</td>
<td>1=yes; 0=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Score</td>
<td>1=high risk; 0=low risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Probation at time of commitment</td>
<td>1=yes; 0=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of commitment offense</td>
<td>1=felony; 0=misdemeanor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous violence towards family members</td>
<td>1=yes; 0=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk Factor Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of previous out of home placements</td>
<td>Continuous Coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family members gang related</td>
<td>1=yes; 0=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents divorced</td>
<td>1=yes; 0=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family in poverty</td>
<td>1=yes; 0=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of physical abuse</td>
<td>1=yes; 0=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of sexual abuse</td>
<td>1=yes; 0=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of emotional abuse</td>
<td>1=yes; 0=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of physical neglect</td>
<td>1=yes; 0=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of abandonment</td>
<td>1=yes; 0=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for emotional disturbance treatment</td>
<td>1=yes; 0=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for sex offender treatment</td>
<td>1=yes; 0=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for capital offender treatment</td>
<td>1=yes; 0=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received emotional disturbance treatment</td>
<td>1=yes; 0=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received sex offender treatment</td>
<td>1=yes; 0=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received capital offender treatment</td>
<td>1=yes; 0=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any suicidal tendencies</td>
<td>1=yes; 0=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth mentally challenged</td>
<td>1=yes; 0=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth mentally ill</td>
<td>1=yes; 0=no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reliability and Validity

The validity of this study was strengthened by the use of the very large sample size, and that the sample came from every facility in the state, thereby limiting selection bias when a sample is limited to a single facility. With the exception of Trulson (2007) and Gaes et al. (2002), no misconduct study, adult or juvenile, has a sample of this size. The use of all youth released for the particular year from every correctional facility in the state (1997-98 and 2003-04) provided a comprehensive probability sample. Every male youth released after their first incarceration from the Texas juvenile justice system was included, thus eliminating a non-random selection process. In addition, the incident report data collected by TYC is recorded on a form utilized by every facility in the state, thereby assisting in avoiding validity threats due to instrumentation changes. Finally, this thesis fills a large gap in the study of institutional misconduct as it is the first study ever to concentrate upon gang membership as a determinant of juvenile institutional misconduct and institutional disruption.

Limitations

There are limitations with all research, and this study is no exception. The sample included juveniles only from the state of Texas, so caution should be used in generalizing the results to other states. Further, this study only examined juveniles following their first incarceration. Subsequent incarcerations may produce different patterns of behavior but this data was not available. Additionally, the use of only two time periods, (or the specific years 1997-98 and 2003-04), may have produced incomplete results. It is not known if samples from
different or additional time periods would have produced different outcomes. Further, misconduct listed on the incident report forms is subject to the discretion of the correctional officers completing the reports. Different officers may code very similar conduct as two different offenses. Another limitation may be in the total number of reported gang members. As already stated, TYC uses self-admission to determine if a youth is a gang member, and self-reporting has well known problems of both under and over-reporting.

As a final point, despite the large number of variables used, other variables that may help explain misconduct may still be missing. In addition, the variables that were used could have been more specific beyond the dichotomous indicators of yes and no. The use of interval level data could provide additional detail, particularly with respect to intensity or levels of the measurement, thus allowing for different analytical techniques. Unfortunately, as this data was collected by the TYC for their own internal purposes and not for research, it must be accepted with its flaws.

Yet despite these flaws, the data in-hand is an improvement over existing literature. Indeed, the few juvenile misconduct studies in the literature were written over twenty years ago or used data more than twenty years old. In addition, the data for this study includes a number of variables not collected in previous literature. Although there are limitations with the data and its collection, the bottom line is that this study will both add to and expand on existing literature on institutional misconduct, and will add the specific focus of institutional misconduct and gang related juveniles.
Data Analysis Plan

The analysis will proceed in two stages. The first stage of the analysis is a
descriptive look at the demographic, criminal history, and risk factor variables for
the full sample of state committed juveniles (Table 2). The descriptive analysis
then examines the level and extent of misconduct attributed to the full sample of
state delinquents (Table 3). In each descriptive analysis, the first column
represents data for the full sample, the second column examines only gang
members, the third column examines only non-gang members, and the fourth
column compares gang members to non-gang members. The goal of the
descriptive analysis is to paint a clear picture of the state delinquents in this study
in terms of their backgrounds, and then to compare gang members to non-gang
members.

Following the descriptive analysis, logistic regression is used to examine
the influence of the independent variables on the two outcome measures of
institutional violence and institutional disruption. Logistic regression is the
appropriate statistical technique in this instance because the dependent variables
are dichotomous in nature. The logistic regression analysis proceeds as follows:

1. Logistic regression model predicting institutional violence for the full
   sample, then only for gang members, and then for non-gang members
   only (Table 4).

2. Logistic regression model predicting institutional disruption for the full
   sample, then only for gang members, and then for non-gang members
   only (Table 5).

The following chapter will present the findings and interpretation of the
analysis results. The chapter will begin with the background characteristics of the
entire sample and the frequency of recorded misconduct, including any
differences between gang members and non-gang members. Next will be a discussion of findings from the two different logistic models. The first will assess if gang membership is a significant predictor of violent misconduct (institutional violence). The second model will assess if gang membership is a significant predictor of non-violent misconduct (institutional disruption).
CHAPTER 4
ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Introduction

Previous research has revealed that gang membership may be an important influence on the institutional behavior of adult prison inmates. Although there is not a wealth of adult literature specifically on the influence of gang membership, the most sophisticated study thus far reveals that gang membership matters in the context of institutional misconduct (Gaes et al., 2002). Importantly, however, the institutional experience between adult prison inmates and state incarcerated juvenile offenders differs in a number of ways. At the most basic level, there are substantial differences between adult prison inmates and state committed delinquents in the type, degree, history, and correctional contexts in which they are situated. As a result, the influence of gang membership on institutional misconduct as found in the adult literature may not hold true for incarcerated delinquents. The bottom line, however, is that we do not know.

The only study to date which examined the nexus of gang membership and misconduct among state committed delinquents revealed that those juveniles with "a prior history with gangs" were significantly more likely to be involved in violent institutional misconduct than were those without a history of
gang involvement (MacDonald, 1999). This is an important study, yet it was written almost 10 years ago and used data on a sample of state committed delinquents incarcerated in the mid-1980s. Additionally, this study did not specifically examine the impact of current gang membership, but rather, only whether individuals had a “prior history” of gang involvement—no information was given as to the intensity or timing of such involvement. Moreover, the most recent study, which examined gang involvement and misconduct among institutionalized delinquents, was conducted by Trulson (2007), yet this author did not focus specifically on gang membership either. Rather, this study examined the impact of “gang influence” on institutional misconduct—a composite measure of whether the delinquent was a known gang member and/or had family members who were gang related. Although Trulson (2007) found that gang influence had a significant positive impact on violent misconduct, the question still remains on the relative impact of gang membership alone on institutional misconduct.

Consistent with the research questions, this chapter first examines demographics, delinquent histories, and risk factors among a sample of state committed male delinquents incarcerated and released from the Texas Youth Commission (TYC). It examines any differences between gang members and non-gang members on the aforementioned factors. Included with the descriptive analysis is an examination of the frequency of misconduct among gang members and non-gang members, including the participation of each respective group in institutional violence and institutional disruption.
Logistic regression analysis is then used to determine the relative impact of the demographic, delinquent history, and risk factor variables on the two dependent variables of institutional violence and institutional disruption. It proceeds by examining the predictors of violence and disruption for the full sample of state delinquents, with special attention to the influence of gang membership. It then examines the predictors of violence and disruption for the sample of gang members and then for non-gang members. The bottom line goal of the analysis is whether gang membership is a significant determinant of two forms of institutional misconduct. A secondary goal is to determine whether the predictors of misconduct for gang members are different for non-gang members.

Analytical Techniques and Assumptions

The descriptive analysis examines the background characteristics and participation in institutional misconduct of the full sample of state delinquents, and then for gang members and non-gang members separately. In each descriptive analysis, independent sample t-tests are used to examine whether significant differences exist between the samples of gang members versus non-gang members on the independent variables. Normally, independent t-tests may only be used to examine the mean differences between two groups on metric or continuous variables (Kenny, 1987). For examining the differences between two groups among categorical or non-metric variables, the appropriate test is the Mann-Whitney U for two independent samples (Kenny, 1987). In each descriptive analysis, differences among the samples of gang members and non-gang members were done by using independent sample t-tests, and
corresponding t-values and significance levels are reported. Although the
independent t-test is normally inappropriate with non-metric variables as
mentioned, Mann-Whitney U tests produced the exact results and thus the more
familiar t-value was used in the tables.

Logistic regression is the appropriate multivariate test to examine the
influence of gang membership and other independent variables on institutional
misconduct. Logistic regression is used when the dependent variable is
dichotomous (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). In this study, the dependent variables
of institutional violence and institutional disruption were coded to indicate
whether state delinquents were involved or not in these two categories at least
one time during their incarceration. Logistic regression also allows for the
inclusion of independent variables that are either metric and/or categorical.
Since a large number of variables in this study are dichotomous, logistic
regression is an appropriate analytical technique (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001).

The benefit of using logistic regression beyond the reason that it is
inclusive of the variables in this study is that this test is resistant to the restrictive
assumptions of an ordinary least squares (OLS) regression (Bachman &
Paternoster, 2004; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Indeed, one of the major
assumptions of logistic regression is that the independent variables do not have
to be linear and normally distributed (Bachman & Paternoster, 2004; Tabachnick
& Fidell, 2001). Although linearity and normality among independent variables
may increase the logistic model’s power to detect significance, it is not necessary
as in OLS (Bachman & Paternoster, 2004; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Another
major assumption of logistic regression is that there are a substantial number of cases to variables, roughly a ratio of 30 cases for each variable. Since this study involves over 4,000 state delinquents, and roughly 30 variables, the cases to variable ratio meets this assumption (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). A final assumption of logistic regression is that the independent variables not be correlated highly with each other (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Correlations among the independent variables were inspected, and this produced only a few high correlations. In these instances, highly correlated variables were deleted from the analysis. For example, the correlation between the TYC’s risk score and the variable indicating the number of prior felony adjudications were highly correlated. Because the TYC’s composite risk score is derived in part based on the number of prior felony adjudications, risk score was used in its place in the logistic regression. In other instances, some variables were moderately correlated with each other, but were included separately in the equations for their practical value. For example, someone who was physically abused might correlate highly with sexual abuse, but examining the influence of these variables individually is important on a practical basis.

We now turn to the descriptive analysis examining the backgrounds and frequency of institutional misconduct among the state committed delinquents in this study.

Descriptive Statistical Analysis

*Individual, Delinquent History, and Risk Factors*

Table 2 examines the individual, delinquent history and risk factors for the
state committed delinquents in this study. Proportions (PP) and standard deviations are included for categorical variables, and means (M) and standard deviations are included for continuous variables. The first analysis is for the entire sample of state committed delinquents, the second analysis examines only gang members, the next analyzes only non-gang members, and the last is a comparison of gang members to non-gang members.

Analyses in Table 2 reveal that the overwhelming majority of the sample is non-white (78%) and about half (43%) are admitted gang members. The youths under study were about 13 years of age at their first formal referral to the juvenile justice system, were committed to the state at about age 16, and were just over 17 at the time of their release from the juvenile correctional system. The average length of time spent incarcerated was about 488 days or about 16 months. The large standard deviation in terms of the length of incarceration suggests that there was much variation among the sample of state delinquents in terms of days incarcerated. A more accurate picture of the length of incarceration is perhaps the median number of days. Analysis not shown in tabular form revealed that the median number of days incarcerated was roughly 369 days or about one year.

Concerning other aspects of their delinquent histories, nearly 70% were on probation at their time of commitment, and 80% were committed for a felony offense. On average, these state delinquents had over one felony commitment prior to their current commitment offense. The TYC also completes a weighted risk assessment or risk classification score comprised of delinquent and behavioral history indicators including but not limited to; the number of felony
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Full Sample (N=4,309)</th>
<th>Gang (n=1,840)</th>
<th>Non-Gang (n=2,469)</th>
<th>Gang/Non-Gang Comparisons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PP/M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>PP/M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (1=non-white)</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known gang member (1=yes)</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age first formal referral</td>
<td>12.98</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>12.88</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at state commitment</td>
<td>15.98</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>15.95</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at release from incarceration</td>
<td>17.32</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of incarceration (days)</td>
<td>487.48</td>
<td>343.93</td>
<td>475.98</td>
<td>306.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony adjudications prior to state commitment</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk score (1=high risk)</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On probation at commitment (1=yes)</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of commitment offense (1=felony)</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent towards family (1=yes)</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family members gang related (1=yes)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of previous out-of-home placements</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest grade completed</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents divorced if married (1=yes)</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family in poverty (1=yes)</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of physical abuse (1=yes)</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of sexual abuse (1=yes)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of emotional abuse (1=yes)</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned (1=yes)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of physical neglect (1=yes)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for emotional disturbance treatment (1=yes)</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for sex offender treatment (1=yes)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for capital offender treatment (1=yes)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received emotional disturbance treatment (1=yes)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received sex offender treatment (1=yes)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received capital offender treatment (1=yes)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth mentally challenged (1=yes)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth mentally ill (1=yes)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any suicidal tendencies (1=yes)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Categorical variables were dichotomized and indicate proportion with 1 as coding score under the PP/M column. For example, Race (1=non-white) at PP/M .78 means 78% of the 4,309 full sample is non-white. Values are rounded to the nearest one hundredth of a percent and using actual proportions to obtain N may be slightly off because of rounding. * p < .05; "ns" means not significant.
referrals, the number of prior placements, the number of prior felony adjudications, and the age the juvenile is first formally referred to the juvenile justice system. According to this indicator, 72% of the state delinquents were considered high risks. Further analyses show that the average youth had less than one prior out of home placement, most had only an 8th grade education, 30% had been violent towards their family in the past, and 14% had family members that were gang related.

A large majority (71%) of the youth lived in poverty, and over 30% had parents who were divorced. Over 20% had documented evidence of emotional abuse, with lower percentages for sexual abuse (8%), physical abuse (17%), physical neglect (9%), and 13% had been abandoned by their family. Concomitant with these measures of abuse and neglect, nearly 40% of the youth demonstrated a need for emotional disturbance treatment, but only 8% demonstrated a need for either sex offender or capital offender treatment. As a result, 9% actually received emotional disturbance treatment, none received capital offender treatment, and just 2% received sex offender treatment. Finally, few of the youth were considered suicidal (5%), 7% were considered mentally ill, and 8% were considered mentally challenged.

**Comparison of Gang Members and Non-Gang Members**

A number of statistically significant differences were found between gang members and non-gang members. Gang members were significantly younger at all of the age measures; at their first formal referral (12.88 versus 13.06), their
age at commitment (15.95 versus 16.01), and age at release (17.25 versus 17.37). Demographically, more gang members were non-white (88% versus 70%). Other significant delinquent history variables were that while more non-gang members were committed for felony offenses (82% versus 77%), gang members had a greater history of being violent towards their families (31% versus 27%).

Among risk factor variables, several significant differences appeared. Gang members had a far greater number of gang related family members (26% versus only 5%). This makes empirical sense, most literature is in agreement that having family members in a gang increases the chances that a youth will join a gang (Howell, 1998; Snyder & Sickmund, 2006). Gang members had a lower level of education (8.06 versus 8.15) than non-gang members, and more members came from a family living in poverty (76% versus 67%). Abuse and neglect variables only showed one significant difference, with gang members having a lower level of sexual abuse than did non-gang members (6% versus 9%).

Gang members also showed less of a need for emotional disturbance treatment than did non-gang members (35% versus 38%), and a much lesser need for sex offender treatment (4% versus 10%). Not surprisingly, more non-gang members received emotional disturbance or sex offender treatment (11% versus 6%, and 3% versus 1%, respectively). Finally, fewer gang members were considered to be mentally ill (6% versus 8%).
Overall, the descriptive comparisons show in general that gang members tend to be younger in all levels of measurement, were more likely to have been violent towards their family and to have other family members in a gang. Members also appear to have less emotional or sex offender issues, leading to a lesser need for any specialized treatment. This finding may relate to the fact that fewer gang members had been sexually abused.

Research Question 1 - The answer to this question is yes, there are demonstrably different demographics, delinquent histories, and risk factors for gang members than for non-gang members. As noted in the above paragraph, gang members tend to be younger, more violent towards their family, have fewer cases of sexual abuse, and have less emotional problems.

Institutional Misconduct of State Committed Delinquents

Table 3 shows the total number of incidents committed by the sample of youth during their entire incarceration, and the breakdown between violent incidents (Institutional Violence), and the disruptive incidents (Institutional Disruption). The first column is for the entire sample of youth, the second is only for gang members, the next is only non-gang members, and the last is a comparison of gang members to non-gang members.
Table 3

Institutional Misconduct of State Committed Delinquents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Sample (N=4,309)</th>
<th>Gang (n=1,840)</th>
<th>Non-Gang (n=2,469)</th>
<th>Gang/Non-Gang Comparisons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PP/M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>PP/M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total incidents during incarceration</td>
<td>52.67</td>
<td>100.36</td>
<td>52.24</td>
<td>95.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional violence (1=yes)</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional disruption (1=yes)</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Categorical variables were dichotomized and indicate proportion with 1 as coding score under the PP/M column. For example, institutional violence 0.58 means that 58% of the full sample was involved in at least one staff assault, inmate assault, and/or found in possession of a weapon while incarcerated. Values are rounded to the nearest one hundredth of a percent and using actual proportions to obtain N/n may be slightly off due to rounding. ***p < .001.

An examination of Table 3 reveals that state committed delinquents were involved in about 53 incidents each during the course of their incarceration. What is not shown in tabular form is that the full sample committed a total of 226,934 separate offenses during their incarceration. This total includes all incidents committed by the state delinquents, including incidents not specifically examined in the logistic regression models used in this study. It should also be noted that a youth could have multiple incidents of the same nature and/or occur multiple different incidents during the same offense. For example, a youth that assaults another inmate with a knife may be charged with both the assault and the possession of a weapon.

Noting these considerations, the very large standard deviation suggests that there is much variation within the average number of incidents. For example, not shown in Table 3 is that the median number of incidents for the entire sample was 16, with a mode of zero. Six hundred and two youth had no incidents of any kind, while the three youth with the highest number of incidents averaged over
1,000 incidents each. Therefore, the average number of incidents can be very misleading, and taking out the influence of these outliers by examining the median suggests the actual number of incidents was much lower than the average.

Of the full sample of 4,309 state delinquents, 58% were considered to be violent within the institution by having assaulted a staff member, assaulted another youth, and/or had been found in possession of a weapon during their incarceration on at least one occasion. Thirty-nine percent were considered disruptive to the institution by failing to comply with a reasonable written request by a staff member on at least one occasion. So the bottom line is that well over one-half of the state committed delinquents were considered institutionally violent, while less than one-half were considered institutionally disruptive.

Comparison of Gang Members and Non-Gang Members

Table 3 also includes a comparison of gang members and non-gang members. In the terms of the number of incidents committed in toto, gang members and non-gang members were not significantly different. However, significantly more gang members were considered to be institutionally violent (60% versus 57%), and institutional disruptions (41% versus 38%). So it would seem that while both gang members and non-members commit a roughly equal number of offenses overall, gang members commit higher numbers of both violent and disruptive offenses than do non-gang members. While statistical significance was demonstrated when comparing gang and non-gang members,
on a practical level, the levels of violence and disruptions appear to be almost indistinguishable.

Research Question 2 – The answer is yes, there are significant differences in the frequency of institutional misconduct between state committed delinquent gang members and non-gang members. Gang members commit more institutionally violent and institutionally disruptive offenses than do non-gang members. On a practical level, however, the differences are quite small.

Multivariate Analysis

Each of the logistic regression tables includes three different analyses. The three models in Table 4 analyze the determinants for the dependant variable institutional violence; first for the entire sample, then for gang members only, and then for non-gang members only. The three models for Table 5 examine the determinants for the dependant variable institutional disruption first for the full sample, then for gang members only, and then for non-gang members.

Institutional Violence

Table 4 presents the analysis of the determinants of institutional violence—a composite measure of assaulting staff, assaulting another youth, and/or being found in possession of a weapon while incarcerated. The analysis of the full sample of state delinquents in Table 4 shows 15 significant demographic, delinquent history, and risk factor variables impacting institutional violence\(^5\).
Non-white juveniles, those on probation at the time of commitment, those considered high risks by TYC, those youth who had a higher number of previous out of home placements, and those youth that displayed a need for emotional disturbance treatment were found to be more likely to be involved in misconduct indicating institutional violence. Older youths, those with more education, youths not committed for a felony offense, those youth not requiring or receiving sex offender or capital offender treatment, those whose parents were not divorced, were significantly less likely to be considered institutionally violent. In addition, the delinquents of the 1997-1998 cohort were significantly less likely to be considered institutionally violent. In this full sample model, the length of incarceration, while significant, had no impact either way on the odds of institutional violence misconduct.

An examination of the significant predictors of institutional violent misconduct provided some interesting findings that were not expected based upon the limited previous research on juveniles, or on the larger body of research on adult misconduct, while other findings were consistent with previous research.

Consistent with previous juvenile and adult misconduct research, non-white juveniles were more likely to engage in misconduct (Cao, Zhao, & Van Dine, 1997; Harer & Steffensmeier, 1996; Sorenson, Wrinkle, & Gutierrez, 1998), as were younger delinquents (Cunningham et al., 2005; Gover et al., 2000; Harer & Steffensmeier, 1996; Sorenson et al., 1998; Wooldredge, Griffin, & Pratt, 2001), those with less education (Cao, Zhao, & Van Dine, 1997), those with previous histories of violence (Gover et al., 2000; MacDonald, 1999; Poole &
Table 4

Logistic Regression Model Predicting Institutional Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Full Sample (N=4,309)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Gang (n=1,840)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Gang (n=2,469)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( B )</td>
<td>( SE(B) )</td>
<td>( Exp(B) )</td>
<td>( B )</td>
<td>( SE(B) )</td>
<td>( Exp(B) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race as non-white</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.32*</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 1997/1998</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.52*</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known gang member</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at first formal referral to juv. system</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.68*</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.61*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at state commitment</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Incarceration (days)</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.71*</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.79*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk score</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.31*</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On probation at state commitment</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of commitment offense</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.83*</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.76*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent towards family</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family members gang related</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of previous out of home placement</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.11*</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest grade completed</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents divorced</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.86*</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family in poverty</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of physical abuse</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of sexual abuse</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.81*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of emotional abuse</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of physical neglect</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for emotional disturb. treatment</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.52*</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for sex offender treatment</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.58*</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for capital offender treatment</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.70*</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received emotional disturb. treatment</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received sex offender treatment</td>
<td>-1.61</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received capital offender treatment</td>
<td>-3.21</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
<td>-5.24</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth mentally challenged</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth mentally ill</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicidal tendencies</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>163.36*</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>501.98*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2/df \) = 888.20/29, 452.68/28, 478.39/28

\( p \) = <.001, <.001, <.001

Nagelkerke R\(^2\) = 0.25, 0.30, 0.24

Cox & Snell R\(^2\) = 0.19, 0.22, 0.18

Note: \( p < .05 \)
Regoli, 1984), and those with a more serious delinquent or criminal history (Harer & Steffensmeier, 1996). These findings from the full sample suggest that many of the determinants for misconduct are similar for both adults and juveniles. However, two of the findings require some additional discussion.

First, gang membership or familial gang influences were not significant for the full sample, and this is inconsistent with almost every previous juvenile or adult misconduct study (Gaes et al., 2002; Griffin & Hepburn, 2006; MacDonald, 1999; Ruddell, Decker, & Egley, Jr., 2006; Trulson, 2007). However, our results do support the finding of Jiang and Fisher-Giorlando, (2002) in their study. Our sample had a very large percentage of gang members (43%), and this is greater than most previous adult or juvenile studies, yet there were still more non-gang members than gang members. Indeed, as the descriptive analysis revealed, non-gang members were only slightly less involved in misconduct than gang members were, and had comparable levels of all misconduct as measured by frequency. In addition, the gang members in this study had been committed for less felony type offenses than had the non-gang members, so this also may explain why this particular set of gang members were less likely to commit institutional violence. This group of gang members may simply be less violent altogether. As such, it was perhaps expected that gang membership might not be a significant predictor of institutional violence.

While the findings go against some previous research, it must be noted that this research is different from previous studies. First, most previous literature is adult based and cannot be directly applied to juvenile offenders. But,
this finding does go against the two findings in the juvenile studies examined previously. Most importantly, however, this study examined current gang membership, not the impact of “gang influence” (Trulson, 2007) or those “with a prior history with gangs” (MacDonald, 1999). The failure to find gang membership a significant predictor is not an indictment against this study. In reality, this is only the third study examining the influence of gang membership on institutional misconduct among juveniles, and the only study with gang membership as the central focus. As such, the findings do seem to call for further research with variable specification of gang membership consistent with this study.

Another possible explanation for the lack of significance concerning gang membership may relate to how this variable is determined by the juvenile correctional system. Unlike the more sophisticated and detailed classification characteristic of adult prison classification systems, the measure in this study are primarily based on self-reports from youth, with perhaps little objective verification by institutional staff members. It may be the case that many of the “reported” gang members were not actual gang members and thus “false positives” in some regard. This is not unfathomable given the well known problems with self-reporting. It might also be the case that some non-gang members were actually gang-related. Each explanation may be likely and could have impacted the analysis. At the most basic level, it may be that the gang members included in our sample are simply less likely to engage in violent behaviors, or there may be some other factors at work masking the influence of
gang membership. As it is, however, gang members were not significantly more likely to be involved in institutional violence.

The other important finding in this study is that cohort membership appears to matter. Youth from the earlier cohort (97-98) were significantly less likely to be considered institutionally violent. This finding suggests that youth may be becoming more violent over time in terms of their institutional misconduct as suggested by MacDonald (1999). An alternative speculation is that the state of Texas is committing more serious delinquent youth now than they have in the past.

Research Question 3 – The answer is no, gang membership is not a significant predictor of institutional violence.

Comparison of Gang Members and Non-Gang Members

Table 3 also includes models for both gang members and non-gang members. For gang members, the results of the analysis are similar to the full sample results with a few exceptions. For gang members, those whose parents were divorced had no impact upon institutional violence, race had no impact, and the need for or receipt of sex offender treatments had no significance in terms of explaining institutional violence. However, one variable not significant for the full sample did have an impact upon the model predicting institutional violence for gang members; those with documented histories of sexual abuse were more likely to be considered institutionally violent. In fact, sexual abuse was the only abuse/neglect variable that had any significance for either gang members or non-
members. However, the findings for non-gang members differ (albeit minimally) from the full sample and from gang members in several categories.

For example, non-gang members are more likely to be non-white, and the parents of the youth are more likely to be divorced. Non-gang members who demonstrated a need for or received sex offender treatment were more likely to commit institutional violence than were gang members. And while sexual abuse was significant, it was in the opposite direction. Non-gang members with documented histories of sexual abuse were less likely to commit institutional violence.

Perhaps the most important findings outside the full sample analysis come from a comparison of all models. Remarkable consistency was found for a variety of important variables. Younger inmates, those with a higher risk score, those on probation at the time of commitment, and those demonstrating a need for emotional disturbance treatment had impact on the likelihood of committing institutional violent misconduct—regardless of whether gang members or non-gang members were being examined. Of these four variables, the risk score showed the strongest impact; that youth with a higher risk score were very likely to engage in violent misconduct. What this suggests is that the juvenile correctional system has an adequate instrument to predict who will become most likely to be institutionally violent, and this is independent of gang membership.

Research Question 4 – The answer is yes and no. Although some differences were found concerning the determinants of institutional violence among gang and non-gang members, the overall comparison of models suggests
that the strongest determinants of serious institutional misconduct are similar for
gang members and non-gang members.

Institutional Disruption

The analysis in Table 5 examines the variables associated with institutional disruption—failing to obey the written requests of a staff member. This variable measures much less serious behavior than the variables that comprise institutional violence, but the failure to follow institutional directives may have the potential to have a significant disorderly effect upon the correctional environment. In other words, a youth that disobeys directives may eventually “graduate” to a more serious offense. For example, a youth that continually ignores or disobeys staff orders may incite other youth to begin the practice as well. In addition, once a youth grows comfortable committing this smaller offense he may attempt more serious behaviors such as gambling or theft.

The full sample analysis revealed 13 significant variables. In general, youths who were younger at the time of commitment, considered high risks by the juvenile correctional system, were on probation at the time of commitment, and were previously violent towards their family, those who had a higher number of out of home placements, all of the treatment variables, and those with less education were significantly more likely to commit acts of institutional disruption.

In addition, in a complete reversal of the prediction of institutional violence, those from the earlier cohort (1997-1998) were more likely to commit acts of institutional disruption. In fact, this finding was the strongest predictor
### Table 5

**Logistic Regression Model Predicting Institutional Disruption**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Full Sample (N=4,309)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE(B)</td>
<td>Exp(B)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE(B)</td>
<td>Exp(B)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE(B)</td>
<td>Exp(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race as non-white</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 1997/1998</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>4.01*</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>4.03*</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>3.97*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known gang member</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at first formal referral to juvenile system</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at state commitment</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.81*</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.77*</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.84*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Incarceration (days)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk score</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.62*</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.40*</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.79*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On probation at state commitment</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.33*</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.46*</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of commitment offense</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent towards family</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.22*</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family members gang related</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of previous out of home place</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.07*</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.13*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest grade completed</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.93*</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents divorced</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family in poverty</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of physical abuse</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of sexual abuse</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of emotional abuse</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of physical neglect</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for emotional disturbance treatment</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.67*</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.43*</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.83*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for sex offender treatment</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.63*</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for capital offender treatment</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.44*</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.42*</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received emotional disturbance treatment</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.74*</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received sex offender treatment</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>-1.92</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received capital offender treatment</td>
<td>-3.55</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
<td>-4.43</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
<td>-2.92</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth mentally challenged</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth mentally ill</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicidal tendencies</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X²/df</th>
<th>1161.30/29</th>
<th>472.53/28</th>
<th>713.74/28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagelkerke R²</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox &amp; Snell R²</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: p<.05*
variable across the entire model for institutional disruption. One potential explanation may be that the juveniles incarcerated at that time were less serious offenders as a whole. And as a result, correctional officers may have been able to devote more of their time and efforts into handling these less serious behaviors. Then as committed juveniles became more violent, officers may have had to shift their focus from the relatively minor disruptive offenses to managing these more serious offenders.

Two other variables—risk score and the need for emotional disturbance treatment—were also strong predictors across the entire model for institutional disruption. It would seem then for any misconduct, whether institutional violence or institutional disruption, TYC staff has an accurate measure in their risk score assessment of those youth that have a higher probability to commit disruptive acts. Those youth needing treatment for emotional problems was also significant across both the disruption model and the violence model. This presents perhaps a notice to administrators that identification of these youth should be a priority so the proper interventions and/or treatment may be instituted.

Lastly, although the length of incarceration was significant, it had no impact either way on the odds of institutional disruption. In addition, race, gang membership, family gang influences, and all of the abuse and neglect variables failed to predict institutional disruption.

Research Question 5 – The answer is no, gang membership is not a significant predictor of institutional disruption.
Comparison of Gang Members and Non-Gang Members

As with institutional violence, the predictors of institutional disruption for gang members were similar to the full sample. Younger inmates, those considered a high risk by the juvenile correctional system, on probation at the time of commitment, and those with a greater number of out of home placements were more likely to be considered institutionally disruptive. However, of the treatment variables, only the emotional disturbance or capital offenders proved to be significant. In particular, those who received the treatment for capital offenders showed a marked decrease in the likelihood of disruption. However, race, educational level, familial gang influences, violence towards family, and all of the abuse and neglect variables failed to be significant predictors of institutional disruptions for gang members.

Non-gang members differed from both the full sample and from gang members in several categories. Two major differences were that the variables of being on probation at the time of commitment, or those with a high number of previous out of home placements failed to predict institutional disruption for non-gang members. However, unlike gang members, non-gang members with a lower level of education, and those not receiving sex offender treatments were more likely to be considered institutionally disruptive.

As with previous comparisons, although some differences were found among gang and non-gang members in the prediction of institutional disruption, there was much consistency found among the strongest predictors. The strongest and most consistent predictors between the two groups were age at
state commitment, risk score, and those with a need for emotional disturbance treatment. The bottom line is that the most consistent predictors for either gang or non-gang members is that those younger at their state commitment, those classified as high risks by the juvenile correctional system, and those with emotional disturbance treatment needs had significantly higher odds of being involved in institutional disruption—independent of whether the sample was gang or non-gang members.

Research Question 6 – The answer is yes and no. Some predictors of institutional disruption were different for gang members than for non-gang members. However, the strongest and most consistent predictors in the model suggest that what predicts institutional disruption for gang members was the same as that for non-gang members.

Comparison of Institutional Violence and Institutional Disruption Models

There are five findings in comparing the analyses of institutional violence and institutional disruption that bear additional scrutiny. First, the variables of a younger age at first commitment, the demonstration of a need for emotional disturbance treatment, and the TYC risk score remained significant for both regression models. This finding suggests several things. One, TYC staff might be able to concentrate efforts and attention upon those youth who fit the model—the younger new arrivals, and those whose psychological testing shows emotional problems. By concentrating efforts on those youths most at risk for either violent or disruptive misconduct, more serious behaviors might be prevented. Secondly,
the consistency of the risk score assessment implies that juvenile correctional administrators have an accurate instrument to predict which delinquents have a higher potential for either violent or disruptive misconduct. And once again, administrators may concentrate their efforts upon these youths with higher risk scores to keep problem behaviors from ever starting, or at the very least, keep the behaviors from escalating.

Thirdly, the cohort direction not only changed from the model predicting institutional violence, the cohort variable was one of the stronger predictors for institutional disruption. For the institutional violence model, the later cohort (2003-2004) was more likely to commit violent institutional misconduct, but for the institutional disruption model, the earlier cohort (1997-1998) was more likely to commit disruptive misconduct. Trulson (2007) found a similar result in his study. He offers the explanation that over the intervening years, correctional officers have had to deal with an increasing level of violence from delinquents, and this increase may have led to lesser attention being given to less serious offenses (Trulson, 2007). So the more disruptive 1997-1998 cohort may be a reflection of the ability of correctional officers to expend more effort to manage disruptive offenses in that earlier time period. Another potential explanation is a change in correctional officer attitudes. As the committed youth have become more violent, officers may be more dedicated to managing the more violent offenses that may directly impact their safety, rather that concentrating upon “mere” disobedience that is not seen to be as much of a threat.
Further, and most important for this study, is that gang membership is not a significant predictor for either violent or disruptive institutional misconduct. As already explained, this finding is not consistent with previous adult or juvenile misconduct studies with the exception of one (Jiang & Fisher-Giorlando, 2002). Although we can only speculate, a potential explanation may be that perhaps the TYC is more successful at identifying and controlling their gang population within juvenile facilities. Another explanation may be that the gang population within Texas juvenile facilities differs in some ways, such as they may be less violent in general, they may be more successful in concealing their offenses from correctional personnel, or differ in some other way as yet unknown. It may be that the juveniles in Texas facilities are simply more violent overall, or that the non-gang members in our study were more violent than is usually found. This latter point does mesh with our finding that the non-gang members were more likely to have been committed for a felony offense than the gang members were.

Moreover, since our data did not indicate the specific charge against the youth, it is not known if many of the gang members were committed for lesser offenses than were the non-members. For example, a youth convicted of aggravated robbery and another convicted of burglary will both show a conviction for a felony offense, but the differences between these two offenses are large. So even within felony convictions, there is a large discrepancy with the degree of violence used. If our gang member population contained a large number of youth convicted of these lesser felony offenses, it may mean that the degree of offense
needs a more precise degree of measurement than just felony and misdemeanor.

Finally, differences in institutional violent and disruptive misconduct outcomes may be the result of several other factors. There may be differences in how incidents are reported across (or even within) different institutions and across different time frames, and these variations may have impacted the findings. Further, correctional officers are different people, with different skills and abilities. It might be that different officers have greater skills in preventing or managing misconduct.

Conclusions

As a final note, although not all variance was explained (for either model), R values for the violence models were moderately high, ranging from 18% of explained variances for non-gang members (Cox & Snell $R^2$), to thirty percent of variances explained for gang members (Nagelkerke $R^2$). The levels of explained variance were even higher and slightly more consistent for the disruption models, ranging from 23% explained for gang members (Cox & Snell $R^2$), to 34% of variance explained for non-gang members (Nagelkerke $R^2$).

The following chapter will first summarize and discuss the findings, and then present the limitations for the study—both with the data, and with the study as a whole. The next section will explore options and present suggestions for further research of this topic. The final section will present the conclusions along
with a discussion of the implications of the results for use in juvenile institutional policy.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary of Findings

This study examined the determinants of institutional misconduct among over 4,000 male state committed delinquents incarcerated and released from the Texas Youth Commission (TYC). More specifically, the impact of gang membership was examined as a potential determinant of institutional misconduct. Although research concerning the determinants of adult inmate misconduct continues to grow, there remains a large gap in the literature examining the determinants of misconduct of state committed juveniles, and none that have specifically focused on gang membership. For this study, a number of significant predictors were found for both serious misconduct (institutional violence), and non-serious misconduct (institutional disruption).

For institutional violence, the significant predictors were; those juveniles in the later cohort (2003-2004), non-white juveniles, those younger at state commitment, those with more extensive delinquent histories such as being on probation at the time of state commitment, having a history of violence towards their families, having a higher number of previous felony adjudications, and a greater number of previous out of home placements, and finally those juveniles that had emotional problems were significantly more likely to commit institutional violations consistent with being considered institutionally violent—those who
assaulted correctional staff, assaulted other inmates, and/or those who possessed a weapon in the facility. However, gang membership failed to be a significant predictor of institutional violence, which was inconsistent with previous research other than the study by Jiang and Fisher-Giorlando (2002).

The findings for institutional disruption had some similarities to institutional violence and some differences. The significant predictors included; younger inmates, those who had formal contact with the juvenile system at an younger age, those with more extensive delinquent histories such as being on probation at the time of state commitment, having a history of violence towards their families, having a higher number of previous felony adjudications, and a greater number of previous out of home placements, along with the youth with emotional problems, and those with less education were more likely to commit institutional violations consistent with being institutionally disruptive. The cohort with the greater likelihood of committing disruptive acts however, was the earlier one (1997-1998), a reversal from institutional violence. And as with institutional violence, gang membership failed to be a significant predictor of disruptive misconduct. Some of these findings require additional examination.

First, remarkable consistency was maintained across both the violence and disruption models for three of the strongest predictors—the age at first commitment, the TYC risk score, and those youth demonstrating emotional problems, regardless of gang membership. These findings suggest that juvenile institutions should perhaps concentrate intervention strategies upon youths that fit the model such as their younger delinquents in state custody for the first time,
and youth of any age that appears to have emotional issues. In terms of the risk score, as already noted, TYC appears to have an accurate method in which officials may identify those youth who are far more likely to create problems within the institution—whether violent or disruptive. At the most basic level, this finding provides some validation for the technique TYC uses to assess the risk level of the delinquents committed to its facilities.

Secondly, the change in cohort direction between the violence and disruption models was not expected, but it is instructive. This finding, also noted by Trulson (2007) in his study of institutional misconduct, supports the work by MacDonald (1999) that youth may be becoming more violent than in previous years.

Thirdly, and most importantly for this study, was the lack of support for gang membership as a predictor of any misconduct, serious or non-serious. Given the strong support for gang membership and misconduct found in adult misconduct literature, and moderate support in the more limited juvenile literature, this result was surprising, to say the least. However, as discussed below and in the previous chapter, there are several potential explanations for the apparent dichotomy.

*Explanation of the Findings*

The finding that misconduct is more likely to come from youths who are younger in age when they first come into contact with the juvenile justice system is not surprising on two fronts. One, this finding is in agreement with most
previous misconduct research for either adults or juveniles (Cunningham et al., 2005; Gover et al., 1997; Harer & Steffensmeier, 1996; Sorenson et al., 1998; Trulson, 2007; Wooldredge, Griffin & Pratt, 2001), and two, it fits well within general literature on the patterns of delinquency. Taylor et al., (2007) notes:

> Of key importance is the fact that early child delinquents are two to three times more likely to become serious, violent, and chronic offenders than first time adolescent offenders who become delinquent in their teens. (Taylor, Fritsch, & Caeti, 2007, pp. 150).

So if an early start in delinquent behavior is a factor in becoming a more serious offender at a later date, it makes empirical sense that delinquents that come into contact with the justice system at an earlier point in their lives are also more likely to become the more serious offender while in that system.

On the other hand, the finding that gang membership was not a predictor for any type of misconduct was noteworthy. Again, while we can only speculate, there are several potential explanations, including definitional issues with gang members and with gang research.

Adult prison systems lack a system-wide cohesive method for the classification of gang members within their facilities. This creates numerous problems for counting the number of gang members within each prison, yet even so, their methods are more comprehensive and more accurate than the method of self-reporting used by the TYC and other state juvenile correctional systems. The problems with self-admission are well known so it is unnecessary to repeat them. However, this method of identifying TYC gang members may have produced inaccurate numbers—indeed, the percentage of gang members reported in our sample was extremely high (43%) both for the TYC, who normally
reports the gang population at about 35% (TYC Commitment Profile, 2006), and for gang members in prison nationally (figures range from 10 to 15% of prison populations). So the figure of 43% must be viewed with some concern as to its accuracy.

Yet another potential explanation is that the TYC is more successful in controlling their gang population and that is why gang membership failed to predict any form of misconduct in this thesis. Many facilities place additional scrutiny and control measures into place with potentially “problematic” inmates, such as gang members, as a way of keeping problems from developing in the first place. The inmates may be housed differently or may have recreational or vocational procedures changed to reduce or eliminate the issues that gang members create. Therefore, gang members may have fewer opportunities to commit offenses in this more restrictive environment. TYC may simply be doing a better job of handling these potential problems with gang members. While this is only speculation, it is plausible.

The gang population inside Texas youth facilities may differ from in other facilities. They may be more (or less) violent overall, they may be better at hiding their activities from correctional officials, or it may be that non-gang members in Texas facilities are more violent than is usually the case. In particular, this latter point may have some substantiation from our descriptive analysis. Indeed, we found that non-gang members were more likely to have been committed for a felony offense (82% versus 77%), and had more prior felony adjudications (1.26 priors versus 1.22 priors), than did gang members. While the numbers were not
significant, it does provide some evidence that our non-gang members may have been somewhat more violent as a group as measured by both current and previous offenses. At the least, while there were differences found between gang and non-gang members, a focus on the most important predictors suggests that TYC non-gang members are not that much different on a practical level than gang members where it counts—age at first formal referral, degree of commitment offense, and the TYC risk score.

Further, our data did not indicate the actual charge against the youths in our sample, and there are profound discrepancies between different felony offenses. For example, aggravated rape and auto theft are both felony offenses and would be coded the same in our sample. However, there is a great difference in the amount of violence used by offenders for these two crimes. It may be that the gang members in the sample were committed for these lower class felonies than were the non-gang members. This explanation seems to call for a more precise degree of measurement in the degree of offense rather than just the dividing line of misdemeanor and felony. A better measure might be further dividing felonies into crimes against persons and property crimes. (This could be done with misdemeanors as well). Finally, the measurement of gang membership in gang research studies has some minor definitional issues as well.

Studies have used different methods of measuring gang membership, making direct comparisons of results difficult. For example, MacDonald (1999) used “a prior history with gangs”, and Trulson (2007) used “gang influence” as variables. Both of these are substantially different from our variable gang
membership. A youth could have prior history and at the same time have no current membership, leading to two different coding results for our study. A youth that did not claim current gang membership would have been coded “no” by the TYC, and hence, for this study. Trulson used a composite for his predictor of gang influence, including membership in a gang, and whether a family member was in a gang. Had this combination been used as the predictor variable, this would have increased the gang member group by 113, or 6%, and of course, decreased the non-gang group by the same amount. Again, while we can only speculate, but that level of reduction in the number of the non-gang members might well have directly impacted the results.

So the bottom line is that this study was different not only from the most recent studies on the relationship of gang membership and misconduct, but also from more general juvenile misconduct studies. This study examined the very specific variable of current gang membership, and so it offers a view of incarcerated gang related juveniles not presented in any previous research.

Limitations

There are several limitations to this study that if resolved could have improved the research. First, this study utilized data from only one state, thus limiting generalizability to other juvenile populations in other states. A national sample or melding samples from several states may provide a greater understanding of institutional misconduct. At the same time, however, this study did use data collected from every secure juvenile institution in the state under
study. This level of breadth has not been matched in previous juvenile research and by only one adult study which was based on the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

Second, the number and/or type of variables used to define misconduct could have been expanded in this study. It is possible that gang membership might have emerged as a significant predictor of different and/or varied types of misconduct. It should be noted, however, that the misconduct variables in this study were consistent or comparable to those used in previous misconduct research. In some ways this was an unavoidable limitation, since this study was constrained by that data provided by the juvenile correctional system. Indeed, data collected by any criminal and juvenile justice agency is usually for their purposes and not specifically for research, it must be accepted as given. However, future research may focus upon including more variables provided they are available.

Future research might also aim for more precise variable measures. For example, the failure of gang membership was somewhat surprising considering previous research, and the lack of significance may relate to how the variables are initially constructed as juveniles enter the juvenile correctional system. While variables such as age at first commitment or the length of incarceration are reasonably clear and unambiguous from a methodological standpoint, gang affiliation is not because it is often based upon self-reporting and/or the subjective decisions by a number of correctional staff. The problems with self-reporting and staff decision-making are well documented, but those problems may have nonetheless impacted the findings in the study.
We also lacked comparative data on the experience of state incarcerated female delinquents. One of the major issues contributing to this limitation is that compared to males, females do not constitute a large number of commitments to this state in any given year thus is would have required analyzing releases from numerous time periods beyond the two cohort time periods in this study. However, a focus on female state delinquents is important as evidenced by the increasing rate of arrests for female offenders, and related, their increased presence in state juvenile facilities. As with the findings for gang versus non-gang members, it could very well be that the determinants of misconduct for females differs markedly from males.

Finally, the data collected for the earlier cohort (1997-1998) is almost a decade old. Aged data may not provide the best indicators of current juvenile (or adult) populations. More recent data would have provided a better picture of the patterns of misconduct in our juvenile facilities. In some ways, however, the use of the older cohort served an important purpose in this study in that cohort indicator was used as a control variable in the logistic regression analyses. The findings that the earlier cohort was predicted to be less violent but more disruptive may speak to changes in the youth that are being incarcerated in juvenile facilities over time. It suggests that those from the earlier cohort were less serious offenders than the later cohort examined in this thesis. This is a contention supported by previous research. At the most basic level, however, the use of old data does not invalidate the findings of this study, but rather, provides another avenue for future research beyond those suggested below.
Yet despite these limitations, and perhaps others that were not mentioned, this study not only fills a gap within current juvenile misconduct literature, it also is the first research ever done that directly focused upon the impact of gang membership and institutional misconduct among state committed delinquents. As such, this study should not be viewed as the end all conclusion concerning misconduct. This study should rather be viewed as a smaller part of a body of research that still needs much attention and development.

Suggestions for Future Research

Our findings in this study seem to indicate that the determinants for juvenile institutional misconduct parallels adult misconduct with the exception of gang membership. This is certainly a claim that needs further research, however. Additionally, future research needs to be conducted on state committed delinquents in other states to confirm or refute the findings. The question to be asked is whether these findings generalize to other states whose correctional systems hold state committed delinquents. To be sure, there is considerable variation both within and between states not only in the types of juvenile institutions but also state confined juveniles. Future research would benefit from a multi-state comparison. At the least, such a study would allow an examination of the question as to whether juvenile gang members in other states are different from those in the state of Texas, and whether or not their experiences while incarcerated are different as well concerning institutional misconduct.
An additional avenue of future research might be in the determinant of age. The finding in this study that the likelihood of misconduct decreases as inmates get older is in agreement with most adult misconduct literature. However, this presents an interesting dichotomy: Why are older institutionalized youth less likely to be involved in misconduct, but young adult inmates more likely to be involved in misconduct? These older institutionalized youth may only be a year or two removed in age from the younger adult inmates. So why is it that youth increases the likelihood of misconduct in either adult or juvenile institutions? Future research might determine if the determinant really is age, or some other factor to explain this interesting paradox.

Finally, future research should examine the impact of differences in facility reporting practices on misconduct. Potential differences in reporting and/or resolution of incidents both between facilities and within facilities and staff are an endemic problem for any research where the data is derived from the sometimes subjective decisions made by correctional staff. Most of the time this problem cannot be resolved, for as already noted, data collected by agencies or facilities is not for researchers in the first place, the data must be used as given. Thus, future research could benefit by not only conducting quantitative analyses on misconduct, but also enrich these analyses with qualitative detail that has to date not been provided in any study on misconduct. A qualitative focus, including surveys and observations, could provide a more detailed understanding of the explanations of misconduct once the determinants are uncovered.
Conclusions

Juvenile correctional systems carry the immense responsibility of rehabilitating the most problematic youth in society. Not only is this task made more difficult by the fact that the delinquents that reach state commitment are considered the most violent, serious, and chronic offenders in the state, but these institutions must effect changes to a youth’s behavior in a relatively short period of time, despite the fact that the misbehaviors took years to develop. Further, even if behaviors and attitudes are changed, these changes must endure even when the youth returns to the same environment that produced the delinquent behavior in the first place.

However, this study did reveal that some of the factors that produce misconduct can be identified, and even more importantly, what is identified can be realistically managed, whether through intervention policies, or through prevention strategies. The major point is that once a problem is identified (i.e. the youth more likely to commit misconduct) then perhaps the outcome of misbehavior can be changed or eliminated altogether.

The bottom line is that the strongest and most consistent predictors of institutional violence and institutional disruption for either gang members or non-gang members are the younger delinquents, those classified as a high risk by TYC, and those delinquents with emotional problems. While there were some differences between gang members and non-gang members, the differences were minor.
In general, with the exception of gang membership, the findings in this study seem to indicate that many of the determinants of institutional misconduct for juveniles are similar to adult misconduct research. However, this study needs to be replicated both in the state of Texas and in other states, to confirm or refute the findings. It would be dangerous to simply take the findings of this thesis and apply them to all situations, and simply assume what leads to misconduct for adults automatically apply to juveniles. Lastly, additional research would seem to be necessary to gain more understanding of the relationship between gang membership and juvenile misconduct.

Policy Implications

The findings most important to juvenile correctional facility administrators are those relating to emotionally disturbed youth, those with high risk scores, and the younger delinquents. These variables were all consistent predictors of both serious and disruptive behaviors on the part of incarcerated youth, and these types of youth are readily identifiable by correctional staff, particularly at the Marlin Intake Assessment facility. Staff members at an intake or other receiving facility should take particular note of any youth that demonstrates any emotional stressors, whether revealed through formal testing, or by observations of medical and correctional staff.

Once a youth is identified as emotionally disturbed (or perhaps even those just emotionally stressed), then they could be more closely monitored and/or evaluated. For example, disturbed youth could be diverted to different or more
intense treatment programs, and if necessary, these youth can be moved to a facility better equipped to handle the problem. In addition, it is incumbent upon legislators (of any state, not just Texas), to make sure that any institution that is entrusted to care for these delinquents has sufficient resources and budgeting to meet the needs of these troubled youths. It simply makes no sense to identify a problem such as the potential to commit violent acts, and then deny the very treatment that may eliminate the problem due to a lack of resources. Any juvenile system that lacks enough funding to care for its residents at whatever level the youth require is not only failing at the primary goal of rehabilitation, it may compound the problem by pushing rehabilitation out of reach.

Further, staff members should pay particular attention to their younger new arrivals. These younger delinquents may be acting out in order to “prove” themselves in front of older youth, it may be that the younger ones are being victimized by older inmates, or it may be related to heightened levels of fear or anxiety (Gover et al., 2000). It may be of benefit for institutions to keep the younger delinquents strictly segregated from older youth, at least until the new arrivals have a chance to settle into their new environment.

Also, since the original risk score is achieved through evaluation at the Marlin facility, those youth labeled as high risk could be placed perhaps in a more secure or restrictive environment, or under tighter scrutiny. In addition, since delinquent youth are more prone to act in groups, the number of high risk youth at a single facility could be limited to help forestall this eventuality. The main point
of the risk score is to provide TYC staff with a method to manage potential risk, so it makes sense to utilize the assessment in every relevant manner.

Additionally, in reference to the central focus of this thesis, the finding that gang membership was not a predictor of institutional misconduct, should not be viewed by juvenile institutions as a reason to either ignore or diminish their scrutiny of gang members, or change their management practices regarding gang members. As already discussed at length, there are many different possible explanations for our findings, not the least of which is that the TYC is simply doing an excellent job of managing their gang population.

Finally, in reference to the greater potential for institutional violence, both disturbed and high risk youth may need to be more closely monitored for access to any type of potential weaponry; the ability of inmates to concoct weapons out of ordinary (and unrestricted) items is well documented, but worth repeating. In addition, correctional staff members need to be reminded of the greater risk of assault from these youth, and the contact of at risk youth with other youths may need closer supervision from staff for this same reason. This may help reduce not only fights between high risk youth, but may also forestall a more criminally sophisticated high risk youth from taking advantage of, or exploiting, a weaker youth.

As a final note, just as the juvenile justice system is returning more strongly to some of its original goals of rehabilitative justice (Taylor et al., 2007), it may make sense for correctional officials to do the same. Even though violent behavior is the primary concern for facilities—as well it should be—the secondary
concern might be prevention of violent behavior by a return to control and management of these more “minor” disruptive behaviors.
ENDNOTES

1 Some may suggest that the decreasing juvenile crime rate may be due to the increased level of juvenile incarceration. More violent juveniles in prison may well equal less juveniles on the street doing crime and drive down the crime rate. However, the answer to this proposal is outside the scope of this thesis.

2 The Mexican Mafia uses the number 13 to denote the Southern California region where the gang was formed; it also is part of the Los Angeles area code of 213. The letter M is the thirteenth letter of the alphabet, and the name “La EME” is the Spanish pronunciation of the letter M. Mara Salvatrucha added the 13 to their name to show their support and alliance with the Mexican Mafia.

3 The Fuerzas Armadas de Liberación Nacional (Armed Forces of National Liberation, FALN) was a Puerto Rican clandestine terrorist group that advocated complete independence for Puerto Rico. FALN was responsible for more than 120 bomb attacks on US targets between 1974 and 1983.

4 An exception is the Bloods and Crips gangs. These gang members will often retain their affiliation with their street gang, but any inter-gang rivalry between competing sects will be pushed aside. In other words, 2 Crips gangs that are rivals on the street will associate while in prison. Gang members are fully aware of the caveat of strength in numbers, and this philosophy allows them to eliminate street rivalries to pursue common goals in prison.

5 The 15th significant variable is the constant for all three models, and this is not discussed in the text.

6 Further, if we had used the combination of gang membership and family gang members as the predictor variable, this would have significantly decreased our numbers in the gang member group. A frequency cross-tabulation of known gang members with those having a family member in a gang resulted in a total of 477. This is only about 26% of our total original sample of gang members (1840). Again, this large of a reduction in our total number of gang members may well have impacted our results.

7 Most states have some sort of intake or receiving facility such as the Marlin Intake Center for Texas juveniles, so this point would apply to most juvenile correctional systems.
Indeed, the author of this study, while working as a deputy in a large southern California jail, learned of a successful homicide of an inmate, using an inmate manufactured shotgun made out of paper maché.
APPENDIX

VARIABLES AND CODING FOR LOGISTIC REGRESSION MODELS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1=Non-White; 0=White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>1=1997/1998 Cohort I; 0=2003/2004 Cohort II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at First Formal Referral to Juvenile System</td>
<td>Continuous Coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at State Commitment</td>
<td>Continuous Coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at Release from Incarceration</td>
<td>Dropped from analysis in favor of length of incarceration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Incarceration</td>
<td>Continuous Coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Score</td>
<td>1=High Risk; 0=Low Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Probation at State Commitment</td>
<td>1=Yes; 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Felony Adjudications Prior to State Commitment</td>
<td>Dropped from analysis in favor of risk score, which contains the component of prior felony adjudications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Commitment Offense</td>
<td>1=Felony; 0=Misdemeanor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Members Gang Related</td>
<td>1=Yes; 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Towards Family</td>
<td>1=Yes; 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Previous Out of Home Placements</td>
<td>Continuous Coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Grade Completed</td>
<td>Continuous Coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents Divorced</td>
<td>1=Yes; 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family in Poverty</td>
<td>1=Yes; 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Physical Abuse</td>
<td>1=Yes; 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Sexual Abuse</td>
<td>1=Yes; 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Emotional Abuse</td>
<td>1=Yes; 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned</td>
<td>1=Yes; 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Physical Neglect</td>
<td>1=Yes; 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Emotional Disturbance Treatment</td>
<td>1=Yes; 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Sex Offender Treatment</td>
<td>1=Yes; 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Capital Offender Treatment</td>
<td>1=Yes; 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Emotional Disturbance Treatment</td>
<td>1=Yes; 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Sex Offender Treatment</td>
<td>1=Yes; 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Capital Offender Treatment</td>
<td>1=Yes; 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Mentally Challenged</td>
<td>1=Yes; 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Mentally Ill</td>
<td>1=Yes; 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicidal Tendencies</td>
<td>1=Yes; 0=No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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