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ABSTRACT

This thesis begins by reviewing the existing literature on the definitions of gangs and distinguishes the differences between street gangs and prison gangs. Several hypotheses are formed from the literature that will address why people join gangs and why gangs exist. For many gang members, membership fulfills the need of belonging and often fills the void of a family unit. Gangs can provide a sense of protection, birthright, and excitement. For others peer pressure or financial gain can cause someone to gravitate to gangs.

Street gangs and prison gangs exist for similar reasons, but the reasons for joining them vary drastically. There is no uniform definition of gang and gang behavior. Because of this, there is a bias and a strong possibility that official data or purposive samples of gang members have resulted in a misrepresentation of not only gang membership, but gang behavior.

There are also differences in the literature concerning the methods for studying gangs and describing gang behavior. Research shows that prison gangs exist for many reasons, but mostly for profit and for protection. Even though a prison is a controlled environment, these kinds of illegal activities continue to thrive and exist.
The research also revealed many different opinions concerning why inmates join prison gangs and the power and control the gangs have in prison.

This research examines the attitudes and perceptions among parolees, and police officers on why inmates join prison gangs, how powerful they are, and their power and control in prison. The data for this study was obtained from a self administered researcher questionnaire from parolees, recently released inmates, and police officers, with many years of experience with dealing with parolees. The questionnaire consists of statements about the participant's opinions or perceptions about prison gangs. The participant are asked to what extent you agree or disagree with the statement. The data examined revealed a significant difference in the attitudes and perceptions among the two groups.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to examine the etiology, power, and control prison gangs have on inmates. The research revealed the following issues: inmates who seek protection and profit in prison; inmates who are segregated in prison based on race and origin; and inmates subjected to robbery, assaults, murder, and the threat of being raped. As a result of these issues, inmates are more likely to join a prison gang for protection. It is hypothesized from the research literature that prison inmates join gangs because the prison system environment is conducive to prison gangs.

Prison gang research reveals that inmates join prison gangs because of adaptation to prison life, danger of being robbed, assaulted, raped or murdered (Parry, 1999), for profit and protection (Knox, 2000), and because internal conditions stimulate various kinds of behavior (Irwin & Cressey, 1962). This research revealed why inmates join a gang and how they exist in a controlled prison environment. To examine this issue the researcher investigated three important hypotheses: the perceptions of why prison gangs exist; the perceptions of how powerful prison gangs are; and the perceptions of who controls prisons.
It is estimated that the number of gang members incarcerated in California prisons have increased by two to four times due to new laws imposing tougher sentences for drug and other gang related crimes (Parry, 1999). The exact number of gang members in California prisons is unknown because of the inmates' loyalty to the gang culture, and the fear of reporting gang affiliation. Furthermore, one cannot assume the affiliation of gang members. However, it is estimated that there are over 37,713 gang members incarcerated in California prisons (National Gang Crime Research Center, 1997).

This thesis reviews the existing literature on prison gangs, inmate population, prison subculture, prisonization, the methods for studying, describing, regulating gang behavior, and the problems with studying gangs. The literature revealed that prison gangs are grouped according to race, ethnicity, and gang membership. Gangs have become a strong influence on the youths in our society and have established dangerous and deadly trends (National Gang Crime Research Center, 1997).

Several hypotheses are formed from the literature, and have addressed why people join gangs, and why gangs exist. For example, gangs fulfill the need to belong (Zatz & Portillos, 2000). Some gang members are “at risk” teenagers
who gravitate to gangs for a variety of reasons. Gangs are seen as a means of protection, birthright, and excitement. Sometimes peer pressure or financial gain can cause one to gravitate to gangs. These gangs will often replace the family unit in importance. They offer pseudosocieties that have their own rules and morals. These rules and morals tend to be criminal and anti-social in nature (Knox, 1998).

Gangs develop their own style of dress, language, method of communication (i.e. graffiti), and code of conduct. It is this code of conduct that maintains power and control within the gang (Decker & Barrik, 1996). In essence it represents a secret society. It is because of this secret society that there is limited research and a misunderstanding of gangs.

Before answering these questions, one must obtain current and accurate data that are without bias and are truly representative of gang membership and gang behavior. These data are inaccurately being obtained because of the lack of a clear uniform definition of gang and gang behavior.

Because gangs are secret societies, researchers have not been able to accurately define a gang. The data obtained are substantially distorted because of a lack of a common means for studying and describing gang behavior (Hagedorn, 1994a&b). This lack of a common definition has
resulted in a biased representation of not only gang membership, but also gang behavior. To study why a person becomes a member of a gang, researchers must be able to obtain empirical statistical information.

Definitions of a Gang

Buentello, Harland, and Knox (1993) define a gang as a group of three or more persons who have a common identifying sign, symbol or name, and whose members individually or collectively engage in or have engaged in a pattern of criminal activity creating an atmosphere of fear and intimidation within the community.

Decker (1996) defines a gang as a group of individuals, usually three or more, who come together for criminal and anti-social behavior. Valentine (1995) simply states that a gang is any group gathered together on a continual basis to commit illegal activity. Klein and Maxson (1989) defined a gang as a group involved in illegal activity.

The California Penal Code (See Appendix A) defines "criminal street gang" as any ongoing organization, association, or group of three or more persons, whether formal or informal, having as one of its primary activities the commission of one or more of the criminal acts, 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 gang activity (California Penal Code, Section 186.22, 2002).

The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (See Appendix B) defines a gang as any ongoing formal or informal organization, association or group of three or more persons which has a common name or identifying sign or symbol whose members and/or associates, individually or collectively, engage or have engaged, on behalf of that organization, association or group, in two or more acts which include, planning, organizing, threatening, financing, soliciting, or committing unlawful acts or acts of misconduct classified as serious (California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation Regulations, Title 15, Section 3378, 2002a).

The California prison system has identified five criteria for gang membership: (1) when an individual admits being a member in a gang, (2) when a reliable informant identifies an individual as a gang member, (3) when an informant of previously untested reliability identifies an individual as a gang member and it is corroborated by independent information, (4) when an individual resides in or frequents a particular gang’s area or affects their style of dress, use of hand signs, symbols, or tattoos, or
maintains ongoing relationships with known gang members, and where the law enforcement officer documents reasonable suspicion that the individual is involved in gang related activity or enterprise, and (5) when an individual has been arrested in the company of identified gang members for offenses which are consistent with usual gang activity (California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, 2003).

The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation defines a member of a gang, associate, or dropout of a gang (prison gang or disruptive group) as an inmate/parolee that has been identified as a gang member or associate, or as having safety concerns is supported by at least three independent sources. A member is an inmate/parolee who has been accepted into membership by a gang, which also requires at least three (3) independent source items of documentation indicative of actual membership. An associate is defined as an inmate/parolee who is involved periodically or regularly with members or associates of a gang. This identification requires at least three (3) independent source items of documentation indicative of association with validated gang members or associates (California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, 2002b).
Literature Hypotheses

The literature examines the California criminal justice prison system concerning prison gangs. It explores some of the reasons why inmates join prison gangs such as "prisonization" (Clemmer et al., 1971); adaptation to prison life (Knox, 1998); profit and protection (Knox, 2000); and for controlling prison rackets (Benaquisto & Freed, 1996).

"Prisonization" is defined as a process that describes the socialization that draws the inmate away from the values and norms of society (Clemmer et al., 1971). For inmates to survive in prison, they must learn to adapt quickly to prison life (Knox, 1998).

Prison gangs were formed for self-protection and later they became involved with the control of drugs and favors inside and outside of the prisons (Landre, et al., 1997). Prison gangs seek control of prison rackets, just as organized crime groups. Simply stated, prison gangs exist mainly for two reasons: for protection and for profit (Knox, 2000). Inmates who seek protection and profit in prison have to join a gang to survive.

Prison gang membership is based primarily on race and/or area of origin (Valentine, 1995). Prison administrators have segregated the gangs and placed Mexican Mafia inmates in San Quentin and Folsom prisons, and La
Nuestra Familia in Soledad and Tracy prisons. Inmates are asked their gang affiliation and then are sent to the prison dominated by their gang (Parry, 1999). In order to survive the dangers in prison, the inmate must act like a convict, and have some type of affiliation with a gang.

**Research Hypotheses**

The study examined the differences of perceptions, attitudes, and opinions among parolees (recently released inmates), and senior police officers concerning the following six hypotheses:

1. Perceptions of why prison gangs exist vary among parolees.
2. Perceptions of why prison gangs exist vary among police officers.
3. Perceptions of how powerful prison gangs are, vary among parolees.
4. Perceptions of how powerful prison gangs are, vary among police officers.
5. Perceptions of who controls prisons vary among parolees.
6. Perceptions of who controls prisons vary among police officers.

The responses examined among parolees, and police officers concerning why gangs exist in prison and how
powerful they are, should reveal that the groups have similar perception of why inmates join prison gangs.

The responses examined concerning who controls the prison should reveal that the groups have a significant difference in perceptions. It is proposed that the parolees will have the perception that they are powerful because of the fear other inmates have for them, and the police officers will have the perception that the prison staff are in control because they have the ability and power to restrain inmates.

Assumptions

This research study was created based upon certain assumptions.

• Participation in the research was voluntary, without the promise of any special rewards from the police, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, or researcher as the result of their participation.

• Participants will be able to read English or Spanish and understand the items on the questionnaire.

• Participants will answer the questionnaires completely and honestly.

• The measures used in the study are appropriate for both groups.
Limitations

This thesis adds to the understanding of the etiology, power, and control of prison gangs, however, certain limitations to the study exist.

• The data were collected using self-report questionnaires in a cross-sectional design which only assess parolees’ and police officers’ perceptions of the independent and dependent variables at one point in time.

• The use of a cross-sectional, correlational design limits assertions of causality between the independent and dependent variables.

• Just using individual reports to measure both the independent variables and dependent variables results in shared method variance (which can inflate the relationship between the independent and dependent variables).

• This study collapses various ethnic groups into one group which does not take into account intra-group differences.

• This sample from parolees is limited to the Los Angeles area, and the sample from police officers is nation wide, which can limit parolee generalizability.
Summary of the Following Chapters

In order to determine the etiology, power, and control Prison gangs have on inmates I will review literature previously published that reveals why inmates join prison gangs. In Chapter III, I will discuss the procedures, sample, and measurements taken in conducting this study. In Chapter IV, I will present the results of the analyses performed. Lastly in Chapter V, I will discuss the findings of the study and the implications of the power and control that prison gangs have on inmates, the prison system, law enforcement, and society.
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Gang-like activity has always been a part of U.S. history. Immigrants came to the U.S. in search of a better life. Their main objective was to survive, and many did not. The first street gangs were actually young children who had been abandoned or had lost their parents. These children banded together for socialization purposes and for protection. These children were often of the same race or ethnic background. It was also the norm for them to be of low social-economic status (Knox, 1998).

In the 19th century, criminal gangs began to form. This was a result of a growing population, bad economy, and an increase in job competition. Records show that Irish immigrants formed the first known American criminal gangs in an area of New York City known as “The Five Points.” They were known to dress in a specific way and used monikers or nicknames (Knox, 1998).

Edward Coleman was the first recognized gang leader for a gang called the “Forty Thieves.” He formed the gang in 1826. Their adversaries were the Bowery. The two sets battled often and were so intense that the army had to be called in to stop them (Knox, 1998).
Before the Civil War, New York City's government was so corrupt, that gangs plundered stores and businesses as well as private homes without fear of the police. After the war, in 1865, New York records indicated a presence of Jewish, Italian, African American and Irish gangs. As the population of immigrants grew, so grew gang membership. Almost every criminal of note made New York its headquarters (Decker & Barrik, 1996).

Chinese gangs appeared in California during the mid 1800s. Philadelphia reported gangs as early as 1840. In 1870, Philadelphia became home to over 100 street gangs. During this time murder became a test of toughness. Drugs became a part of the scene. By the end of the 19th century, gangs started using clothing to distinguish themselves from others (Knox, 1998).

In the early 1900’s, Mexican-Americans established the barrios (neighborhoods) in Los Angeles. Hispanic gangs are typically concerned with self-respect and integrity of their neighborhood. Traditionally, Hispanics settled in small communities in the East Los Angeles area. They took great pride in their barrio (neighborhood) and banded together to protect it from hostile outside forces (Landre, Miller, & Porter, 1997).
The U.S. economy worsened and the population grew at a very rapid pace. The gap between rich and poor widened. All across the nation gangs appeared where poor, hopeless people lived. The dawning of the 20th century also brought about widespread use of firearms. There were over 1300 gangs in Chicago and more than 25,000 members. Gang warfare in Chicago was widespread and gang fights took place along and crossed ethnic, cultural, and racial neighborhoods (Zatz & Portillos, 2000).

Immigration of Mexicans into California grew quickly. Over two million legal immigrants flooded into the state in search of the American dream. Although these people worked to assimilate into society, the second generation had a small number of youth who refused to fit in. These gang members wore fancy and distinctive clothing called "Zoot" suits, also known as "Pachucos." Los Angeles during WWII was a military town and the "Pachucos" had to compete with sailors for the local woman. The sailors resented that the "Zoot" suiters were not going off to war as they were. This caused serious problems and led to the "Zuit Suit Riots." Some of the gangs that originated during this period still exist in Los Angeles (Klein & Maxson, 1989).

Between 1941 and 1945 over half a million Puerto Ricans arrived in the United States and settled in New York City.
The African American populations migrated from the south to northern cities. Due in part to this influx, post WWII spawned the greatest era of youth gangs in American gang history (Decker & Barrik, 1996).

During the 1950s gang-fighting rose to an all time high in large cities across the country. Gang members were usually in their teens. The way a member dressed, walked and talked was very important as a means of identification. Usually gangs fought over girls, respect, or turf. Turf could be anything from a few blocks, to an entire neighborhood (Knox, 1998).

The 1960's saw a decline in gang activity. America's attention shifted to Vietnam, the Civil Rights Movement, and drugs. Politically motivated organizations such as The Black Panthers, and The Black Muslims gained national prominence during this time (Knox, 1998).

Zatz and Portillos (2000) found that Phoenix gangs were mostly barrio gangs and were not centered on drug sales. Their neighborhoods consisted of multigenerational gang members, with several members of the extended family belonging to the same gang in each generation. Black, White, and Asian gangs formed mainly for protection from other gangs. Some black gangs have evolved into an enterprising street network focused on the sale of
narcotics. The Crips and Bloods are both notorious black gangs that continue to exist today (Valentine, 1995).

By the early 1970s gangs were making headlines again. Violence was on the rise and gang membership was growing. The potential for violence was great because gangs now had access to weapons that gangs before this time never had. Prior to this era gangs resolved conflict with fists, clubs, chains, and knives. Gangs also made their headquarters in private places instead of public ones. They were becoming more legally and politically sophisticated. Gangs started to use minors to commit their crimes, because minors would receive shorter sentences for committing crimes. This also helped the young gang members to enhance their reputation (Valentine, 1995).

As inner-city areas became overcrowded, a gang’s territory often was as small as a single corner or block. Guns decided arguments quickly and gang wars were often fought like never ending guerilla warfare. This included sniping from rooftops and quick shots from a drive-by or even a walk-up (Zatz & Portillos, 2000).

This decade brought new forms of violence enhanced by graphic media. Advancements in communication and the emergence of dysfunctional families in the suburbs, combined to form the “New Affluent Gangster” a youth with an
education, money and mobility, access to almost any information needed to create havoc, via the Internet (Klein & Maxson, 1989). Recently, the world has seen the rise of what may possibly be the next wave of criminality, homegrown cells of terrorists.

Today gangs, and gang activity, continue to be a challenge for our society. Some researchers believe there is a youth violence epidemic, one of unprecedented proportions (Curry, 2000). Unfortunately this comes to no surprise to those whom believe that a non-traditional dysfunctional family unit is the primal cause of youth violence. Today, we face the largest number of ruptured or broken homes ever in America. It is the youth that come from these poor family environments that are most likely to become gang members (Hunt, 1993).

However, the groups that traditionally come to mind when one thinks of gangs are the Crips and Bloods from California. The origins of these gangs can be traced back to the late 60’s. Their gang culture is so ingrained on the west coast that their heritage can be traced back to three and even four generations (Klein & Maxson, 1989).

Oftentimes, young peripheral or associate gang members get their first exposure to the gang culture through various aspects of the media--news shows, movies, videos, and even
through the music of various artists. Some music and movies tend to glamorize the gang lifestyle (Knox, 1998).

The society we live in makes alternative lifestyles very appealing. Many kids who gravitate to gangs do so out of a need to belong to something prestigious, and for the power that is gained from being in a gang (Valentine, 1995). The need for attention and the desire to obtain material goods are fast becoming the motivations driving youngsters to these groups (Hagedorn, 1994b).

Prison gangs are nothing new to the California criminal justice prison system. Prison gangs have been in existence since the beginning of our correctional system. They are very powerful and have tremendous authority over the inmates. Prison gangs range from racially hostile cliques of schoolmates to friends from the same neighborhood, from biker club members to street gang members, or tough convicts from large organized groups (Knox, 1998). Their influence reaches from inside prison walls of America's most secured lockup facilities and onto Main Street in the United States with impunity (Benaquisto & Freed, 1996). Researchers contend that prison gangs are reflective of a larger criminal subculture. Irwin and Cressey (1962) believe that internal conditions stimulate inmate behavior of various kinds and that inmates bring a culture into the prisons with
them. Gangs are not indigenous but imported from criminal gangs outside prison walls.

Knox (2000) argues that prison gangs exist mainly for two reasons: for protection and for profit. Resources for prisoners are limited, particularly contraband items such as drugs, money, sex, weapons, and other items which inmates would not normally have access to in the prison environment.

Irwin (1980) argues that prison gangs emerged when money and contraband from outside the prison became abundant, and the convict ideal shifted towards toughness and rapaciousness: "racketeers" replaced merchants and politicians. Racketeers operated in groups and rob as well as sold to other prisoners. Prisoners that operated outside the protection of the gangs were subjected to extortion, robbery, and assault. However, the gang ensures that these contraband items are available to wanting inmates, and charge a price. It is this supply and demand that makes these prison gangs successful (National Gang Crime Research Center, 1997).

During the late 1960's and early 1970's the prison system experienced an increase in violent prison gangs. Research has revealed that prisoner violence is the principal indicator of disorder and mismanagement (Irwin, 1988). Dilulio's (1987) research revealed that the quality
of prison life depends far more on management practices than any other single variable. Dilulio insists that the best prisons are organized along bureaucratic, even paramilitary lines, and operated strictly "by the book."

Gangs are now widespread in most prison systems. The gangs seek control of prison rackets, just as organized crime groups do in the wider society (Benaquisto & Freed, 1996). Prison gang membership is based primarily on race and/or area of origin. They strictly follow formalized rules and procedures. If violated, the gang member is severely punished. Prison gangs were originally formed for self-protection and later they became involved with the control of drugs and favors inside and outside of the prisons (Landre, Miller & Porter, 1997).

Gangs and gang members are under-reported and over-represented by researchers. The media coverage of crime news, and exploited by politicians for their own election. Because of this, some research has revealed that gang members were more involved in criminal activity than non-gang members (Hagedorn, 1994a). While other studies revealed that gang members were not as involved in criminal activity as expected (Esbensen & Huizinga, 1993).

This research examines the differences in the definition of a gang, street gangs and prison gangs, and the
reasons why some seek gang membership. The research also addresses several questions as to why gang members join gangs. Do gang members graduate from gangbanging? Is gang crime more organized or is it "freelance" criminal activity? Does one become a gang member for protection?

Curry (2000) identified distinct differences in the way Los Angeles and Chicago Police identify gang-related crimes. Los Angeles identified gang members and then identified any crime that involved a gang member as a gang related offense. In Chicago, crimes were first identified as gang-related, and then offenders in gang-related crimes were identified as gang members. For someone to be identified as a gang member in Chicago, the person had to be identified as an offender in a gang related offense.

Gangs generally have a leader or group of leaders who issue orders and reap the fruits of the gang's activities. A gang may also wear their "colors" (i.e., wear certain types of clothing representing their gang), tattoos, brands, or likewise imprint their gang's name, logo, or other identifying marks on their bodies. Gangs also adopt certain types of hairstyles and communicate through the use of hand signals and graffiti on walls, streets, school work, and school property (Knox, 1998). It is not illegal to be in a gang and indeed many adults are currently involved in gang
type activities. However, many gangs of today, especially youthful gangs, break the law to provide funding for gang activities or to further the gang's reputation on the street.

Gangs may identify with a large city gang or remain locally turf oriented. Development of local intelligence as well as pro-active events is a mandatory part of dealing with this problem. Schools must develop lines of communication with law enforcement officials in order to track and prevent gang growth and violence effectively (Klein & Maxson, 1989).

There are many disagreements as to the exact definition of a gang. Once researchers have identified and agreed upon a definition of a gang, they must attempt to develop common understandings of why a person joins a gang.

Differences between Street and Prison Gangs

The major difference between street gangs and prison gangs are their motivations for violence. The street gang usually commits a violent act to terrorize its enemies; murder is generally of secondary importance. The prison gang uses murder as a specific act of revenge; the terror created by killing is secondary (Buentello, Hartland, & Knox, 1993). There are many reasons why gangs are formed, but a common
ground seems to be for protection and profit (Lane & Meeker, 2000). According to Welte, Wieczorek, and Zhang (1999), gang members are more likely to commit crime and be involved in drug use and trafficking than non-gang members. Groups that may have started out as a delinquent band of neighborhood toughs have now turned into a violent drug gang. Some of whom retain a gang identity for enforcement, collection, or other reasons (Zatz & Portillos, 2000).

Most gang members crave power, or “juice” as it is known in gang slang. Several years ago, a pecking order within a gang may have been established by flying fists. Now it is settled by flying lead (Landre, Miller, & Porter, 1997). Joining a group known to have a reputation, good or bad, gives a kid looking for a purpose something to belong to (Valentine, 1995).

Gang members also claim to enjoy the respect or fear others exhibit around them. Then they say, the money begins flowing, and with that comes all of the things associated with material wealth. This serves as a motivator to those who are usually adolescents that see wealth as beyond their reach. The criminal unfortunately views it as only being attainable with the criminal activity associated with being involved in a gang (Lane & Meeker, 2000).

Sociologists Decker and Barrik (1996), as well as gang
members, have isolated the following reasons for joining a street gang: identity; recognition; belonging; discipline; love; and money. Additionally, many kids are intimidated into gangs to avoid continued harassment. Gangs provide their members and family members with protection from other gangs as well as any other perceived threats.

To some teenagers, joining a gang is exciting because of their instant tough reputation, not only on the streets but inside the prison. Gang members are known to be both feared and respected by their enemies. Others join to protect themselves from a new subculture or from those who prey on them because they seem weaker, because they do not understand the culture, and tend to be more vulnerable.

Zatz and Portillos (2000) found that teenagers join a gang because it gave them a sense of community; a place where they belonged.

Welte, Wieczorek, and Zhang’s (1999) article examined three theoretical models of why youths join gangs. These models were derived from Hirschi (1969) and Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) theoretical perspectives.

The first one is a selection or kind of person model, assumes that delinquent youths seek out gangs. Gang members are more likely to engage in delinquency than non-gang members because they were already delinquent before they
joined gangs.

The second model is called social facilitation or kind of group model. This model posits that gang affiliation is a major cause of delinquency. The gang is a criminogenic peer group that provides group pressure and drives youths to delinquency.

The third model is the enhancement model that mixes the first two models. Gang members were already delinquent and gang affiliation enhanced delinquency.

**Criminal Activity**

There is a very predominate commonality among prison gangs and street gangs is criminal activity. So much in fact that prison gang’s tax (i.e., require street gangs to pay money) to sell narcotics on the streets in certain neighborhoods. Law enforcement officials have confiscated official gang rules and codes of conduct that restrict the sales of narcotics by gangs in certain neighborhoods.

Hagedorn (1994a) reviewed and debated that some gang members sold drugs "freelance," while other gangs were more organized in trafficking drugs. Hagedorn identified four different gangs selling drugs in distinct Milwaukee neighborhoods: Hustletown, Posse Park, La Parcela, and Citywide Drug Gang. The Hustletown gang area is located in the inner city and its racial makeup is African-American.
Posse Park gang area is next to downtown and its racial makeup is African-American. La Parcela gang area is located next to downtown and its racial makeup is Latino (mostly Puerto Rican.) Citywide Drug gang area is located in the inner city and its racial makeup is African-American. All of these gangs were identified drug gangs.

Esbensen and Huizinga (1993) research, known as the Denver Youth Survey, examined the prevalence and demographic composition of gangs, the degree to which gang members are involved in illegal activities, and the temporal relationship between criminal offending and gang membership. The results of this study revealed that most gang members are primarily males, but also found reason to believe that females are more involved in gangs than generally acknowledge or realized. Welte, Wieczorek, and Zhang (1999) research validated that this belief and found that female membership represented as much as 20% to 46% of the gang, and furthermore found that gang membership appeared to be associated with age and race.

The Denver Youth Survey (DYS) revealed that 27% of the gang members were 18 years old, 31% were 16 years old, 36% were 14 years old, and 7% were 12 years old. Most of the members sample revealed that they join a gang when they were in their teens. The DYS revealed that the majority of gang
members were from minority races, 85% to 94% of the gang members were African-American or Hispanic.

This research revealed that gang members were more involved in drug sales and drug use than non-gang members. Drug sales for male gang members were 29%, for non-gang members 3%, for female gang members 18%, and female non-gang members 1%. Drug use for male gang members was 52%, for non-gang members 13%, for female gang members 69%, and female non-gang members 13%. The offense types studied were street crimes, drug sales, serious assaults, minor assaults, alcohol use, and drug use. Drug sales and use were significantly less when compared to other offenses. Of the gang members surveyed, 30% of the male gang members and 18% of the female gang members indicated that they were involved in drug sales. The DYS revealed that the stability of gang membership was short term, 67% were members in only one year, 24% belonged for two years, 6% belonged for three years, and only 3% belonged for all four years. The gangs involved in this research were not drug gangs but existed primarily for protection (Hagedorn, 1994a).

Hagedorn (1994b) conducted two interview studies of Milwaukee’s gangs for the Milwaukee Urban Research Center. In this research he reviewed four typologies of a male adult gang member: (1) those few who had gone legit, or had
matured out of the gang; (2) homeboys, a majority of both African-American and Latino adult gang members, who alternately worked conventional jobs and took various roles in drug sales; (3) dope fiends, who were addicted to cocaine and participated in the dope business as a way to maintain access to the drug; and (4) new jacks, who regarded the dope game as a career.

Of the 236 Milwaukee male gang members interviewed, only 12 or 5.1% matured out. Of these, 2 were African-American, and 1 was Latino. Significantly over 30.5% worked part or full time, 47.9% admitted to selling drugs, mostly cocaine and marijuana, 6.8% were deceased, and 18.4% of the respondents never sold drugs.

Most of the gang members that sold drugs admitted selling to fill the employment void. Not all gangs are drug gangs, but Hagedorn (1994a) found that most gang drug sales in Milwaukee were neighborhood-based, and loosely organized operations. The complexity of gang drug organization varied inversely to the degree that drug sales were centered on neighborhood as a market.

Hagedorn's (1994b) research points out that gang drug organization is probably not simply a matter of rational choice by career criminals but rather environmental conditions that may exercise considerable influence on
complexity of drug organization. The Milwaukee gang drug organization varied mainly based on the profitability of drug sales and the stability of the market. In neighborhoods where sales went only to low-income buyers, there was little or no drug organization. But as sales to affluent Whites and outsiders increased, more efficient drug-selling structures were created (Hagedorn, 1994a).

Gang Culture

Incarcerated young gang members have become exposed to and indoctrinated into the world of real life “gangbangers” who are truly the hardest of the hard-core. When they come out and go back to the streets these “bangers” go with more knowledge than could have been gained on the streets. While they are in prison, many gain rank or “juice” within their gang because they went to the “joint.” Even though most adolescents are good kids, as long as society continues in the direction in which we are currently drifting, all kids must be considered at risk (Thornberry et al, 1993).

Knox (1998) identified three criteria for gang membership, labeled the “Three R’s” of gang culture: reputation, respect, and retaliation. A gang members’ reputation or “rep” is of critical concern to “gangbangers” (i.e., gang members). A “rep” extends not only to each individual, but to the gang as a whole. In some groups,
status or rank, is gained within the gang by having the most "juice" based largely on one's reputation. While being "juiced" is very important, the manner by which the gang member gains the "juice" is just as important.

Many gang members embellish their past gang activities in an attempt to impress their conversation partner. Gang members freely admit crimes and embellish their stories to enhance their feeling of power.

In many gangs, to become a member, a person must be "jumped in" by members of the gang. This entails being "beaten down" as a person walks in between members of the gang. This can continue for a few minutes or until the leader calls for it to end. Afterwards, all gang members hug one another to further the "G" thing. This action is meant to bond the members together as a family. Frequently, young gang members, whether hardcore or associate, will talk of fellowship and the feeling of sharing and belonging as their reason for joining a gang.

Respect is something everyone wants and some gang members carry their desire for it to the extreme. Respect is sought for not only the individual, but also for one's set or gang, family, territory, and various other things, real or perceived in the mind of the "gangbanger" (Hagedorn, 1994a).
Some gangs require, by written or spoken regulation, that the gang member must always show disrespect to rival gang members. This is referred to in gang slang as “dis.” If a gang member witnesses a fellow member failing to “dis” a rival gang through hand signs, graffiti, or a simple “mad dog” or stare-down, they can issue a “violation” to their fellow posse member and he or she can actually be “beaten down” by his or her own gang as punishment. After “dis” has been issued, if it is witnessed, the third “R” will become evident (Hagedorn, 1994b).

Retaliation or revenge in gang culture is very important. No challenge goes unanswered. Many times, drive-by shootings and other acts of violence follow an event perceived as “dis.” A common occurrence is a confrontation between a gang set and single rival “gangbanger.” Outnumbered, he or she departs the area and returns with his “homeboys or homegirls” to complete the confrontation to keep his or her reputation intact. This may occur immediately or follow a delay for planning and obtaining the necessary equipment to complete the retaliatory strike. It must also be understood that many acts of violence are the result of bad drug deals or infringement on drug territory or females (Knox, 1998).

Some question the authenticity of gang rivalry in
shootings and other acts of violence. However, if a group of individuals are together committing either random or pre-planned violence, are they a gang? If the gang aspect is learned, many crimes can be solved through the use of accurate intelligence gathering techniques by law enforcement agencies dealing with this problem. In gangbanging, "today's witness is either tomorrow's suspect or the next day's victim" (Knox, 1998).

**Prison Subculture and Prisonization**

Inmates soon become subject to certain influences of prison life. Valentine (1975) discusses the toughness necessary for gang members' survival. He states "toughness means, first, being able to take care of oneself in the prison world, where people will attack others with little or no provocation." Second, it means "having the guts to take from the weak." Inmates in prison are subject to robbery, assaults, murder, and the threat of being raped.

Today the "respected public" prison figure, the convict, stands ready to kill to protect himself, maintains strong loyalties to some small group of other convicts invariably of their own race, and will rob or attack weak independents or their enemies (Parry, 1999). The inmate openly and stubbornly opposes the administration, even if this results in harsh punishment (Hunt & Riegel, 1993).
Clemmer et al (1971) coined the term “prisonization,” which describes the socialization that draws the inmate away from the values and norms of society. This occurs when a prisoner begins to take on the folkways, values, customs, and general culture of the penitentiary.

Every person who enters the prison system undergoes prisonization to some extent. Inmates soon learn, and know the meanings of prison slang. Inmates learn to adapt quickly to prison life. They learn new ways to pass time, such as how to gamble or new styles of gambling. Some may, for the first time in their lives, engage in homosexual behavior. The inmate is extremely assertive of his masculine sexuality, even though he may occasionally make use of the prison homosexuals (Clemmer et al, 1971).

Prisoners immediately begin to accept an inferior role, the development of new habits of eating, dressing, working, sleeping, and the adoption of prison language. They begin to take on the conception that nothing is owed to the environment for supplying everyday needs, and the desire for a good prison job (Clemmer et al, 1971).

Clemmer, Radzinowicz, and Wolfgang (1971), identified five influential factors that determine assimilation or prisonization. The first process of prisonization concerns the inmate’s status. The inmate is at once an anonymous
figure in a subordinate group. Secondly, the extent of relationships which an inmate has with persons outside the walls. Third, whether an inmate becomes affiliated in prison gangs. Fourth, the type of work an inmate does in prison, the inmate’s cellhouse, and relationships with cellmates. The inmate not only expects to be taken care of, but also begins to identify with and learns to coexist with other inmates. Fifth, whether the inmate accepts the dogmas or codes of the prison culture. These influences depend on one's susceptibility to a culture, primarily on the types of relationships he had before imprisonment or personality characteristics.

Irwin (1980) identified that prisoners restrict their interaction to small friendship groups and other small units (gangs, for example) formed with members of their own race. Other than race, inmates restrict their socialization to these five characteristics: (1) criminal orientation, (2) shared preprison experiences (i.e., such as coming from the same neighborhood or having been in other prisons together), (3) shared prison interests, and (4) forced proximity in cell assignment or work.

Prison Gangs

There are six major prison gangs in the California prison system. The Aryan Brotherhood, Nazi Low Riders,
Mexican Mafia, La Nuestra Familia, Texas Syndicate, and Black Guerrilla Family. All of these gangs originated in the California prison system. In 1995, the Bureau of Prisons listed these gangs as the most organized, having the most potential for violence, and most influential for disrupting institutional operations. Gangs have typically been categorized along racial and cultural categories such as white, black, Asian, and Hispanic (Marquart & Sorensen, 1997).

White Gangs

White gangs exist mainly to promote and act on racist beliefs. For the most part they are concerned with committing hate crimes and trace their origins in this country to the Ku Klux Klan. The most violent of these white supremacy groups operating today is the Skinheads, who have formed alliances with older hate groups like the prison gang Aryan Brotherhood (Valentine, 1995).

The Aryan Brotherhood started in San Quentin Prison in the early 1960's. This particular gang only admits members who align themselves ideologically with white supremacists. Even though they are white supremacists, they are known to associate with Mexicans and blacks. They formed an alliance with the Mexican Mafia for the necessity of protection and control of narcotics (Buentello et al., 1993).
The Aryan Brotherhood commanded the attention of established prison gang groups because of their willful and sporadic use of violence. They flexed their powerful influences in pursuit of gaining some respect for the Caucasian inmates in California’s prison system. The Aryan Brotherhood, once known as the Bluebirds or Diamond Tooth, have gained more prominence in the prison system over the past few years. The majority of Aryan Brotherhood members still in California prisons are located in the Secured Housing Unit at Pelican Bay State Prison in Crescent City (Knox, 2000).

The Nazi Low Riders is perhaps the fastest growing prison gang in California. This group is becoming a force to be reckoned within California prisons. Their power is so influential that it extends beyond the prison walls to communities in San Bernardino, Los Angeles, and Orange County (Parry, 1999). Primarily involved in the lucrative methamphetamine trade, they are known as a violent and ruthless group inside and outside of prison. They were formed in the California Youth Authority institution in Chino, California and have surpassed the violence and membership level of the Aryan Brotherhood (California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, 2003).
Hispanic Gangs

Hispanic gangs are typically concerned with self-respect and integrity of their neighborhood. Traditionally, Hispanics settled in small communities in the Los Angeles area. They took great pride in their barrio (i.e., neighborhood) and banded together to protect it from hostile outside forces (Landre et al., 1997).

In 1967, Hispanic gangs began to emerge and take control of San Quentin Prison. They consisted of a tightly knit clique of Chicanos, who had known each other on the streets of Los Angeles and other prisons. From the onset of the formation of their gang they took control of the drug trade by forcefully take drugs away from prisoners. The clique gained a reputation for toughness and the label of "the Mexican Mafia" (Valentine, 1995).

The Mexican Mafia promotes ethnic solidarity among Hispanics and controls gambling, extortion, and the drug trade within the prison system (Knox, 1998). They are known for their viciousness and murders as a form of inter-gang intimidation. It is one of the most disruptive prison groups within the federal prison system (Landre et al., 1997).

The Hispanics from Texas and small towns in California who were in conflict with Los Angeles Chicanos united and
formed a counter group known as "La Nuestra Familia" (Landre et al., 1997). The Nuestra Familia, archenemies of the Mexican Mafia, is perhaps the most highly regimented of all prison gangs. The group began in the sixties in California prisons as protection for Northern Hispanic inmates against the Mexican Mafia (Buentello et al., 1996).

The conflict between the Mexican Mafia and Nuestra Familia is cultural in nature. The Nuestra Familia believes very strongly that they, as a group, mirror the culture and mores of the Mexican heritage. They see the Mexican Mafia as false-sophisticated "city slickers" that have abandoned their birthright in pursuit of a twisted version of the "American Dream" (Landre et al., 1997).

La Nuestra Familia associate with the Black Guerrilla Family and the Texas Syndicate for protection because they are bitter enemies with the Mexican Mafia and the Aryan Brotherhood. Wars between the Nuestra Familia and Mexican Mafia are legendary. Both groups have lost members to the ongoing rift. La Nuestra Familia members identify with the Norteño gang culture (Northern California) and have adopted the numerical identifier 14 and the alphabetical letter N. The dividing line between the Northern and Southern gang culture is around the Bakersfield area of California (Landre et al, 1997).
The conflict between the two gangs increased and spread to other prisons. Because of the frequency of attacks among these two gangs, prison administrators attempted to segregate the gangs. In attempting this, two prisons were designated for each individual gang: San Quentin and Folsom for the Mexican Mafia, and Soledad and Tracy for La Nuestra Familia. When Hispanic gang members enter the California prison system, they are asked their gang affiliation and then they are sent to the designated prison dominated by their gang. The segregation of these gangs has made both gangs strong and powerful (Parry, 1999).

Black Gangs

Black gangs formed mainly for protection from other gangs. They have evolved into an enterprising street network focused on the sale of narcotics. The Crips and Bloods are both well-known black gangs, but the prominent black prison gang is the Black Guerrilla Family (Valentine, 1995).

The Black Guerrilla Family was established by a former Black Panther, George Jackson, in 1966, at San Quentin (Landre et al., 1997). They were formed as a Marxist/Leninist revolutionary organization with goals of overthrowing the United States Government and abolishing racism. Their goal is to consolidate all black communities
in order to promote revolution and bolster the weakness of the Black Panther Party, as well as protection against the more aggressive Mexican prison gangs (Valentine, 1995).

The Black Guerrilla Family draws most of its members from all black street gangs, including both Crips and Bloods. They maintain close ties with street gangs to enhance the flow of narcotics and in some cases have been known to provide protection for drug dealers rather than deal drugs themselves (Landre et al., 1997).

The Texas Syndicate was formed at Folsom Prison in the 1970s (Valentine, 1995,). Most of its membership is in the Texas prison system. The Texas Syndicate was organized for protection from the Aryan Brotherhood and Mexican Mafia. The gang primarily concentrates on drug trafficking and in selling protection in prison (Lane et al., 2000).

Other Prison Gangs

In addition to the traditional prison gangs, there are many other lesser known, but just as dangerous, prison gangs. They are known as “Supreme White Pride,” “Aryan Circle,” “Rollin 60s,” “Border Brothers” or “Los Mojados” (the wetbacks), and “Sinaloan Cowboys” (Valentine, 1995). These gangs frequently align themselves with other gangs who may have similar cultural or criminal beliefs. In some instances, prison and street gangs have been known to have
truces with rival gangs strictly for the purpose of facilitating their criminal activities (i.e., the supply and distribution of narcotics) (Hunt & Riegel, 1993).

Life in prison may be very dangerous. To survive in the convict's world, one must act like a convict, and have some type of affiliation with and the protection of a powerful racial clique or gang. Prison officials do not adequately discourage prison gangs. Officials know these gangs exist, but they cannot seem to control them or change the prison subculture. Some researchers believe that prison officials tolerate their existence because it helps to maintain the status quo (Dilulio, 1987).

Prison Population

The strength of prison gang lies in their numbers as well as their level of violence (Usee, Camp, & Dugan, 1995). With close to two million people now incarcerated in the United States, it is certain that there will be those inmates and inmate gangs who will strive to control their little corner of the prison, ensuring a steady stream of new recruits and a re-inventing of existing prison gangs (Carlson, Hess, & Orthmann, 1999).

The number of gang members incarcerated in California prisons is estimated to have increased between 1985 and 1992 due to dozens of new laws imposing tougher sentences for
drugs and other gang related crimes (Parry, 1999). As of March 4, 2006, the total number of males were 156,316, and females were 11,111, a total of 167,427 prisoners incarcerated in California prisons California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, 2006). Four years earlier, in December 2002, there were 148,153 incarcerated prisoners, an increase of over 1.8 percent (California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, 2003). The actual number of male California prison gang members is unknown, but it is estimated that they make up more than 2.5 percent of the prison population, which is approximately 41,856 gang members (National Gang Crime Research Center, 1997).
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

In order to analyze the variance among parolees and police officers, and to determine the nominal association, directional and symmetric measures, the asymptotic standard errors, and their maximum possible variations, the researcher ran a Cramer's V coefficient statistical analyses to determine the strength of association for each variable (Dantzker, Lurigio, Seng, & Sinacore, 1997).

The opinions and perceptions obtained from the survey should validate the many reasons why gangs exist as stated in the literature review. The survey was designed to reflect the findings from previous research that gangs exist because of race and social groups (Irwin, 1980); internal conditions (Irwin and Cressey, 1962); peer pressure (Decker and Barrik, 1996); fulfill void of a family unit (Knox, 1998); financial gain (Knox, 2000); for protection (Parry, 1999); fulfills the need of belonging, birthright, and excitement (Zatz and Portillo, 2000).

Rates and Trends Analysis

The differences of opinions was analyzed from the surveys of the parolees and police officers on why inmates
join gangs, how powerful they are, and their power and control in prison. The comparisons will be analyzed in terms of averages from each of the statements. The means for significance from each group and conduct a Cramer's V test (Dantzker et al., 1997) will be computed to determine a statistical difference between the groups. The values of the standard deviations and the number of cases in each group will be computed.

**Procedures**

The researcher contacted administrators at a school for police managers in Quantico, Virginia, and at a local municipal police department in southeast Los Angeles to solicit participation in the research project. After securing permission from the administrators, the researcher contacted 250 parolees, and 250 police managers to participate in the study.

Each participant was administered a consent form, with the survey on the reverse side, and a copy of the debriefing statement (see Appendices C, D, E, F, H, G and I). The only identifying instrument is the color of the paper identifying each of the groups. Parolees were given a white colored paper questionnaire and research consent form. Police officers were given a blue colored paper questionnaire and research consent form.
The anticipated response rate from participants is expected to be approximately 60% due to schedule conflicts and their unwillingness to be interviewed (National Gang Crime Research Center, 1997).

After the surveys are collected, they were taken back to the researcher's office for data coding. The samples were stratified according to group membership. The raw data was then entered into a Microsoft Excel work book. Next, the data was entered into a data file in SPSS 13.0 for Windows operating system.

**Pilot Study**

A pre-questionnaire was administered to a Lieutenant Correctional Officer employed with the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation at a northern California prison, a Parole Officer employed with California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, at a southern California parole office, and a parolee currently incarcerated in a southern California prison, to test the measurements, cross validation, and the construct of the survey.

The results of the pretest indicated that the closed ended questionnaire was an efficient means to measure the degrees of differences among perceptions of the survey groups, and it revealed that there was a need differentiate and have separate research consent forms for the parolees.
and police officers.

The pilot study was conducted for the following reasons: (a) to ensure that subjects responded in accord with instructions, (b) to assess the appropriateness of procedures (c) to determine the time needed to complete the questionnaire, (d) to uncover and decide how to handle unanticipated questions from the participants, and (e) to assess the clarity of wording of the self-report instrument. Revisions were made to the formatting of the questionnaire in response to the pilot study data. Also, minor revisions to the spelling and grammar were made. The time to take the survey ranged from 15 to 20 minutes.

Sample Description

The researcher contacted and distributed 500 surveys, 250 surveys to each group of parolees and police officers. The research setting for parolees is at an undisclosed southern California municipal police department jail, and from police managers attending the FBI National Academy in Quantico, Virginia.

The municipal police department jail is responsible for the processing an average of 1,200 parolees a year. The police department between the years of 2001 and 2005 has processed 6,417 parolees (see Appendix J). The parolees are inmates released from California prisons on parole residing
in southern California. The parolees surveyed are representative from some of the 32 state prisons in California (i.e., Pelican Bay, Folsom, San Quentin, Ironwood, Calipatria, Chino, and Chuckawalla Valley.)

The FBI National Academy is a professional 10 week course of study for United States and international law enforcement leaders designed to improve the administration of justice in police departments and agencies and to raise law enforcement standards, knowledge, and cooperation worldwide. This program is limited to highly-qualified leaders in law enforcement agencies, and provides a challenging curriculum of leadership skills and specialized training. The academy’s purpose is to support, promote, and enhance the personal and professional development of law enforcement leaders by preparing them for complex, dynamic, and contemporary challenges through innovative techniques, facilitating excellence in education and research, and forging partnerships throughout the world.

Measures

This study uses a closed ended questionnaire items to assess participants’ attitudes and perceptions on why inmates join prison gangs, how powerful they are, and their power and control in prison. The questionnaire gave the participants the following response choices: 1 = agree, 2 =
neither, 3 = disagree to fifteen statements. The variables in the study were assessed using the responses from the questionnaire. The questionnaire was designed by the researcher to measure the responses from participants. Each participant was asked to mark an "X" in the box indicating whether they agree, neither, or disagree with a statement.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESULTS

This chapter will present the results of all the analyses performed. All analyses were conducted using SPSS 13.0 for Windows. Table 1 compares police officers and parolees by presenting all the percentage of participants answering disagree, neutral, and agree to each attitude and perception of prison gangs.

Response Rates

The data analyses were conducted using 276 responses from 500 participants, 122 responses from Parolees and 154 responses from Police Officers. The total response rate for parolees was 49% compared to 62% for police officers. As expected and previously cited in the literature review, the parolee response rate was low due to schedule conflicts and unwillingness to participate in the study (National Gang Crime Research Center, 1997). One possible reason may be that the interviewed parolees were incarcerated in jail pending arraignment in court and were more than likely be returning to prison for violating their parole agreement. Those parolees who did participate, volunteered, and spoke with the researcher openly and at length about their gang
life experiences.

Percentages of Why Gangs Exist

Table 1 shows the percentage of parolees and police officers who answered agree, neutral, and disagree to each attitude and perception regarding prison gangs. The percentages of responses from parolees and police officers were examined to compare both groups response rate.

In comparing the percentages for why gangs exist, the majority of both groups agreed with statements 1, 2, 5, 8, and the majority of both groups disagreed with statements 14 and 15.

- Statement (1): inmates join a prison gang because of their color or race: 74.3% of both groups agreed with this statement, parolees = 64.8% and police officers = 81.8%.

- Statement (2): inmates are forced to join prison gangs by other inmates, 62.7% of both groups agreed with this statement (parolees 39.3% and police officers 81.2%).

- Statement (5): inmates join a prison gang because they need protection, 77.9% of both groups agreed with this statement (parolees 59.8% and police officers 92.2%).

- Statement (8): inmates join prison gangs because they fear violence, 76.8% of both groups agreed with this statement (parolees 77% and police officers 76.6%).
• Statement (14): the prison staff does nothing to prevent gangs from existing in prison, 52.5% of both groups disagreed with this statement (parolees 58.2% and police officers 48.1%).

• Statement (15): gang intervention programs in prison have helped to prevent inmates from joining a prison gang, 37.3% of both groups disagreed with this statement (parolees 31.1% and police officers 42.2%).

Percentages of How Powerful Gangs Are

In comparing the percentages for how powerful gangs are, the majority of both groups agreed with statements 3, 4, 7, 9, and 13.

• Statement (3): inmates fear violating gang rules more than prison rules, 89.5% of both groups agreed with this statement (parolees 83.6% and police officers 94.2%).

• Statement (4): prison gangs control the prison more than the staff, 61.6% of both groups agreed with this statement (parolees 45.9% and police officers 74%).

• Statement (7): gangs are a problem for the people running the prison, 83.7% of both groups agreed with this statement (parolees 72.1% and police officers 92.9%).

• Statement (9): inmates fear prison gang members more
than prison staff, 88% of both groups agreed with this statement (parolees 82% and police officers 92.9%).

- Statement (13): Punishment from the prison gang is feared more than from the prison staff, 85.9% of both groups agreed with this statement (parolees 80.3% and police officers 90.3%).

Percentages of Who Controls Prisons

In comparing the percentages for who controls prisons, the majority of both groups agreed with statements 6, 10, 11, and 12.

- Statement (6): prison gangs make a lot of money in prison, 68.8% of both groups agreed with this statement (parolees 83.6% and police officers 57.1%).

- Statement (10): prison gangs are responsible for most of the violence in prison, 81.9% of both groups agreed with this statement (parolees 74.6% and police officers 87.7%).

- Statement (11): gang members control the drug sales in prison, 84.1% of both groups agreed with this statement (parolees 82.8% and police officers 85.1%).

- Statement (12): gambling is controlled by prison gang members, 82.2% of both groups agreed with this statement (parolees 84.4% and police officers 80.5%).
Cramer’s V Results of Why Prison Gangs Exist

The Cramer’s V statistical analyses were conducted to examine whether police officers and parolees significantly differed in their attitudes and perceptions of why prison gangs exist. The results of Cramer’s V are shown in Table 1.

• Statement 1: parolees, in comparison to police officers, reported significantly lower belief that inmates join a prison gang due to color or race ($V = .255, p<.001$). Although the relationship is statistically significant, the relationship is weak to moderate.

• Statement 2: parolees, in comparison to police officers, reported significantly lower belief that inmates are forced to join a prison gang by other inmates ($V = .569, p<.001$). The relationship of this statement is moderate to strong.

• Statement 5: parolees, in comparison to police officers, reported significantly lower belief that inmates join a prison gang because they need protection ($V = .450, p<.001$). The relationship of this statement is moderate.

• Statement 8: parolees, in comparison to police officers, reported a significantly nominal association
between the belief that inmates join prison gangs due to fear of violence ($V = .187, p<.01$). Although the relationship is statistically significant, the relationship is weak.

- Statement 14: parolees, in comparison to police officers, both groups disagreed with the belief that prison staff does nothing to prevent gangs from existing in prison ($V = .145$). The data is not significant, did approach significance.

- Statement 15: parolees, in comparison to police officers, reported significantly higher belief that gang intervention programs have helped to prevent inmates from joining a prison gang ($V = .355, p<.001$). The relationship of this statement is moderate.

Cramer’s $V$ Results of How Powerful Prison Gangs Are

- Statement 3: parolees, in comparison to police officers, reported significantly lower belief that inmates fear violating gang rules more than the staff ($V = .231, p<.01$). Although the relationship is statistically significant, the relationship is weak.

- Statement 4: parolees, in comparison to police officers, reported significantly lower belief that prison gangs control the prison more than the staff ($V
The relationship of this statement is moderate.

• Statement 7: parolees, in comparison to police officers, reported significantly lower belief that gangs are a problem for the people running the prison (V = .327, p<.001). The relationship of this statement is weak to moderate.

• Statement 9: parolees, in comparison to police officers, reported significantly lower belief that inmates fear gang members more than the prison staff (V = .234, p<.01). Although the relationship is statistically significant, the relationship is weak.

• Statement 13: parolees, in comparison to police officers, reported significantly lower belief that punishment from the prison gang is feared more than the punishment from the prison staff (V = .256, p<.001). The relationship of this statement is weak to moderate.

Cramer’s V Results of Who Controls Prisons

• Statement 6: parolees, in comparison to police officers, reported significantly higher belief that prison gangs make a lot of money in prison (V = .395, p<.001). The relationship of this statement is moderate.

• Statement 10: parolees, in comparison to police
officers, reported significantly lower belief that gangs are responsible for most of the violence in prison ($V = .353, p<.001$). The relationship of this statement is moderate.

- Statement 11: parolees, in comparison to police officers, reported significantly lower belief that gangs control the drug sales in prison ($V = .293, p<.001$). The relationship of this statement is weak to moderate.

- Statement 12 parolees, in comparison to police officers, reported significantly lower belief that gambling in prison is controlled by gangs ($V = .330, p<.001$). The relationship of this statement is weak to moderate.
Table 1. Cramer’s V Comparison of Each Attitude and Perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>WHY</th>
<th>Parolee</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Inmates join a gang because of their color or race.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inmates are forced to join prison gangs more than inmates.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Inmates Join a prison gang because they need protection.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Inmates join prison gangs because they fear violence.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The prison staff does nothing to prevent gangs from existing in prison.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Gang intervention programs in prison have helped to prevent inmates from joining a prison gang.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inmates fear violating gang rules more than prison rules.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Prison Gangs control the prison more than staff.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Gangs are a problem for the people running the prison.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Inmates fear prison gang members more than the prison staff.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Punishment from the prison gang is feared more than from the prison staff.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Prison gangs make a lot of money in prison.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Prison gangs are responsible for most of the violence in prison.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Gang members control the drug sales in prison.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Gambling is controlled by prison gang members.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.01

**p<.001
Language Comparison of Why Prison Gangs Exist

The Cramer's V statistical analyses were conducted to examine the differences among Spanish speaking only and English speaking parolees. Both groups significantly differed in their attitudes and perceptions of prison gangs. The results of Cramer's V tests are shown in Table 2.

- **Statement 1**: Spanish speaking parolees, and English speaking parolees agreed that inmates join a prison gang due to color or race ($V = .119$). No significant difference was found in the relationship between both groups.

- **Statement 2**: Spanish speaking parolees, in comparison to English speaking parolees, reported significantly higher belief that inmates are forced to join a prison gang by other inmates ($V = .616, p < .001$). The relationship of this statement is moderate to strong.

- **Statement 5**: Spanish speaking parolees, in comparison to English speaking parolees, reported significant difference in their belief that inmates join a prison gang because they need protection ($V = .427, p < .001$). The relationship of this statement is moderate.

- **Statement 8**: Both Spanish speaking parolees, and English speaking parolees agreed that inmates join prison gangs due to fear of violence ($V = .061$). No
significant difference was found in the relationship between both groups.

- Statement 14: Spanish speaking parolees, in comparison to English speaking parolees, reported significant difference in their belief that the prison staff does nothing to prevent gangs from existing in prison ($V = .205, p<.01$). Although the relationship is statistically significant, the relationship is weak.

- Statement 15: Spanish speaking parolees, in comparison to English speaking parolees, reported slightly higher belief that gang intervention programs have helped to prevent inmates from joining a prison gang ($V = .194, p<.01$). Although the relationship is statistically significant, the relationship is weak.

**Language Comparison of How Powerful Prison Gangs Are**

- Statement 3: Both Spanish speaking parolees, and English speaking parolees agreed that inmates fear violating gang rules more than prison rules ($V = .010$). No significant difference was found in the relationship between both groups.

- Statement 4: Spanish speaking parolees, in comparison to English speaking parolees, reported significantly lower belief that prison gangs control the prison more
than the staff \((V = .471, p<.001)\). The relationship of this statement is moderate.

- Statement 7: Spanish speaking parolees, in comparison to English speaking parolees, reported a significant belief that gangs are a problem for the people running the prison \((V = .220, p<.01)\). Although the relationship is statistically significant, the relationship is weak.

- Statement 9: Both Spanish speaking parolees, and English speaking parolees agreed that inmates fear gang members more than the prison staff \((V = .018)\). No significant difference was found in the relationship between both groups.

- Statement 13: Both Spanish speaking parolees, and English speaking parolees agreed that punishment from the prison gang is feared more than the punishment from the prison staff \((V = .017)\). No significant difference was found in the relationship between both groups.

**Language Comparison of Who Controls Prisons**

- Statement 6: Spanish speaking parolees, in comparison to English speaking parolees, had a significance difference in their belief that prison gangs make a lot of money in prison \((V = .294 p<.001)\). The relationship of this statement is weak to moderate.
• Statement 10: Both Spanish speaking parolees, and English speaking parolees agreed that gangs are responsible for most of the violence in prison (V = .107). No significant difference was found in the relationship between both groups.

• Statement 11: Spanish speaking parolees, in comparison to English speaking parolees, reported significantly higher belief that gangs control the drug sales in prison (V = .156, p<.01). Although the relationship is statistically significant, the relationship is weak.

• Statement 12: Spanish speaking parolees, in comparison to English speaking parolees, reported significantly higher belief that gambling is controlled by prison gangs (V = .173, p<.01). Although the relationship is statistically significant, the relationship is weak.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>WHY</th>
<th>Spanish Parolee</th>
<th>Spanish Officer</th>
<th>English Parolee</th>
<th>English Officer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Inmates join a gang because of their color or race.</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>Disagree 15 25.4 34 15.7 49 17.8</td>
<td>Neutral 6 10.2 16 7.4 22 8.0</td>
<td>Agree 38 64.4 167 77.0 205 74.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inmates are forced to join prison gangs by other inmates.</td>
<td>.616**</td>
<td>Disagree 49 83.1 32 14.7 81 29.3</td>
<td>Neutral 2 3.4 20 9.2 22 8.0</td>
<td>Agree 8 13.6 165 76.0 173 62.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Inmates join a prison gang because they need protection.</td>
<td>.427**</td>
<td>Disagree 10 50.8 22 10.1 52 18.8</td>
<td>Neutral 1 1.7 8 3.7 9 3.3</td>
<td>Agree 28 47.5 107 86.2 215 77.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Inmates join prison gangs because they fear violence.</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>Disagree 10 16.9 37 17.1 47 17.0</td>
<td>Neutral 2 3.4 15 6.9 17 6.2</td>
<td>Agree 47 79.7 165 76.0 212 76.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The prison staff does nothing to prevent gangs from existing in prison.</td>
<td>.205*</td>
<td>Disagree 42 71.2 103 47.5 145 52.5</td>
<td>Neutral 7 11.9 37 13.8 37 13.4</td>
<td>Agree 10 16.9 94 38.7 94 34.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Gang intervention programs in prison have helped to prevent inmates from joining a prison gang.</td>
<td>.194*</td>
<td>Disagree 16 27.1 87 40.1 103 37.3</td>
<td>Neutral 17 28.8 80 36.9 97 35.1</td>
<td>Agree 26 44.1 50 23.0 76 27.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inmates fear violating gang rules more than prison rules.</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>Disagree 4 6.8 16 7.4 20 7.2</td>
<td>Neutral 2 3.4 7 3.2 9 3.3</td>
<td>Agree 53 89.8 194 89.4 247 89.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Prison Gangs control the prison more than the staff.</td>
<td>.471**</td>
<td>Disagree 63 51.6 16 10.4 79 28.6</td>
<td>Neutral 3 2.5 24 15.6 27 9.8</td>
<td>Agree 56 45.9 114 74.0 170 61.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Gangs are a problem for the people running the prison.</td>
<td>.220*</td>
<td>Disagree 16 27.1 20 9.2 36 13.0</td>
<td>Neutral 1 1.7 8 3.7 9 3.3</td>
<td>Agree 42 71.2 189 87.1 231 83.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Inmates fear prison gang members more than the prison staff.</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>Disagree 5 8.5 20 9.2 25 9.1</td>
<td>Neutral 2 3.4 6 2.8 8 2.9</td>
<td>Agree 52 88.1 191 88.0 243 86.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Punishment from the prison gang is feared more than from the prison staff.</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>Disagree 5 8.5 17 7.8 22 8.0</td>
<td>Neutral 4 6.8 13 6.7 17 6.2</td>
<td>Agree 50 84.7 187 86.2 237 85.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Prison gangs make a lot of money in prison.</td>
<td>.294**</td>
<td>Disagree 1 1.7 29 13.4 30 10.9</td>
<td>Neutral 2 3.4 54 24.9 56 20.3</td>
<td>Agree 56 94.9 134 61.8 190 68.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Prison gangs are responsible for most of the violence in prison.</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>Disagree 7 11.9 24 11.1 31 11.2</td>
<td>Neutral 1 1.7 18 8.3 19 6.9</td>
<td>Agree 51 86.4 175 80.6 226 81.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Gang members control the drug sales in prison.</td>
<td>.156*</td>
<td>Disagree 1 1.7 20 9.2 21 7.6</td>
<td>Neutral 2 3.4 21 9.7 23 8.3</td>
<td>Agree 56 94.9 176 81.1 232 84.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Gambling is controlled by prison gang members.</td>
<td>.173*</td>
<td>Disagree 1 1.7 19 8.8 20 7.2</td>
<td>Neutral 2 3.4 27 12.4 29 10.5</td>
<td>Agree 56 94.9 171 78.8 227 82.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.01

**p<.001
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine the etiology, power, and control Prison gangs have on inmates. The study addressed the following issues: inmates who seek protection and profit in prison; inmates who are segregated in prison based on race and origin; inmates seek protection from robbery, assaults, murder, and the threat of being raped, and that inmates control the sales of drugs and gambling in prison. As a result of these issues, inmates are more likely to join a prison gang for protection. It was hypothesized that prison inmates join gangs because the prison system environment is conducive to prison gangs. The study revealed that parolees and police officers have the same perceptions that the prison system is controlled by prison gangs.

Discussion

The study revealed a significant difference in the perceptions, attitudes, and opinions among parolees and police officers concerning why prison gangs exist; how powerful prison gangs are; and who controls the prison.

There is a perception from both parolees and police
officers that inmates join prison gang because of their color or race; that inmates are forced to join a prison gang by other inmates; that inmates fear violating gang rules more than the staff; that prison gangs control the prison more than the staff; that inmates join a prison gang because they need protection; that prison gangs make a lot of money in prison; that gangs are a problem for the people running the prison; that inmates join prison gangs due to fear of violence; that inmates fear gang members more than the prison staff; that gangs are responsible for most of the violence in prison; that gangs control the drug sales in prison; that gambling in prison is controlled by gangs; and that punishment from the prison gang is feared more than the punishment from the prison staff.

Parolee and police officers had similar perceptions that prison staff does prevent gangs from existing in prison; and that intervention programs have helped to prevent inmates from joining a prison gang.

Implications

It is very important to know that prison gangs are powerful in prison. If the prison system wants to control prison gangs, then they must know what the prison gang controls. In order to make the prison gang less powerful, the prison system needs to take away their power. The
prison gang is a corporate monopoly on drug sales, gambling, prostitution, extortion, and murder. As with most enterprises, money is power. Take away their money you take away their power.

Only recently has law enforcement taken action to stem the flow of organized crime in prison. Law enforcement targeted the criminal activities of the White Aryan Resistance, the Aryan Brotherhood (AB), a California based prison gang. Law enforcement is targeting prison gangs and other terrorist gangs utilizing the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO).

The Mexican Mafia, the Nazi Low Riders, the Wah Ching and Los Angeles' 18th Street gang are among the groups that have been hit with RICO prosecutions. The law contains tough penalties. Twenty-three of those charged will be eligible for the death penalty if convicted. Among them are Barry Byron Mills, 54, of Santa Rosa, and Tyler Davis Bingham, 55, of Sacramento, both members of a three-man commission that allegedly controls Aryan Brotherhood activities throughout the federal prison system. Mills, currently housed at a maximum security prison in Florence, Colorado, is accused of personally committing one of 16 murders cited in the indictment. Bingham, also in custody at the Florence penitentiary, was accused of ordering
murders and assaults on Aryan Brotherhood opponents.

A separate troika controls Aryan Brotherhood activities in the California prison system, according to the indictment. Many members are being held at Pelican Bay Prison in Northern California, designed for the most troublesome inmates in the state corrections system. Despite efforts to segregate and control them, Aryan Brotherhood members at Pelican Bay have engaged in a lethal struggle for power. At least six murders have occurred since 1996. Charged in the indictment unsealed Thursday are three Pelican Bay inmates who reputedly make all important decisions affecting Aryan Brotherhood actions in the state penal system: Richard Lloyd Terflinger, 55, and David Allen Chance, 45, both of Los Angeles, and John William Stinson, 48, of Long Beach. All three are eligible for the death penalty if convicted. The investigation that led to the indictments was headed by agents from the federal Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms with assistance from the state Department of Corrections and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. In addition to the 23 defendants who face death penalty trials, the remaining 17 could receive life terms without the possibility of parole if convicted (Rosenzweig, 2002).
On October 18, 2002, a federal grand jury in Los Angeles has indicted 40 reputed members and associates of the Aryan Brotherhood on racketeering charges that include allegations of a string of murders and violent attacks designed to expand the power of the white racist prison gang. Thirty defendants are already in prisons around the country on unrelated charges. Eight were arrested Thursday and two were listed as fugitives. Law enforcement officers executed search warrants on prison cells, homes and offices in California, New York, Louisiana, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Georgia, Colorado, Massachusetts, Florida, Washington, Nebraska and Connecticut. The indictments grew out of a six-year investigation into the workings of the gang, which was founded at San Quentin state prison in 1964 and has since spread to penitentiaries across the nation (Rosenzweig, 2002, October 18).

Policy Suggestions

The literature reviewed revealed a need for a uniform definition of gang and description of gang behavior. Because there is not a common definition of a gang, research may be substantially distorted because of a lack of a common means for studying, describing, and regulating gang behavior. The response rate of this study revealed that parolees and gang members are unwilling to participate in
the study, therefore official data or purposive samples of gang members could result in a biased representation of not only gang membership, but gang behavior.

The results of this study validated the hypotheses that there is a significant difference in the attitudes and perceptions of why inmates join prison gangs and the power and control gang inmates have in prison. The study revealed that gang intervention or "rehabilitation" programs according to parolees, may deter inmates from joining prison gangs, and may rehabilitate inmates.

The results also revealed a stronger belief among Spanish speaking parolees versus English speaking parolees in the attitudes and perceptions of why inmates join prison gangs and the power and control gang inmates have in prison. A possible reason for this is the translation and wording of the researcher questionnaire from English into Spanish. There are some English words that do not translate precisely into Spanish, therefore giving the Spanish speaking parolee a statement that is better understood in their own language.

Future research should pay more attention to organizational theory and the neighborhood context of prison gang activities and organization. Instead of improving economics, poverty, literacy, and health care programs, we have adopted a more dispositional attributional position,
inflicting penal harm and increasing the scale of punishment to deter further criminal behavior. Current crime policies are reactive to crime by focusing on offenders after the onset of their criminal careers with policies of punishment, deterrence, imprisonment, and incapacitation (mandatory imprisonment, habitual offender statutes, and "three-strike" selective incapacitation). These punitive policies have no evident effect on recidivism or deterrence of crime. We must all make the effort to gain back the traditional family values that instill maturity, responsibility, and a sense of self-worth through prison anti-gang intervention programs.

Prison gang intervention programs should focus on decreasing the influence of gangs, on individual gang member behavior, and more importantly on the conditions that foster prison gang development.

A better understanding of these differences of perceptions should be useful in designing programs to deter prison gang involvement, and developing alternative approaches when dealing with prison gang inmates.
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CALIFORNIA PENAL CODE, SECTION 186.22
APPENDIX A

CALIFORNIA PENAL CODE, SECTION 186.22

(a) Any person who actively participates in any criminal street gang with knowledge that its members engage in or have engaged in a pattern of criminal gang activity, and who willfully promotes, furthers, or assists in any felonious criminal conduct by members of that gang, shall be punished by imprisonment in a county jail for a period not to exceed one year, or by imprisonment in the state prison for 16 months, or two or three years.

(b)(1) Except as provided in paragraphs (4) and (5), any person who is convicted of a felony committed for the benefit of, at the direction of, or in association with any criminal street gang, with the specific intent to promote, further, or assist in any criminal conduct by gang members, shall, upon conviction of that felony, in addition and consecutive to the punishment prescribed for the felony or attempted felony of which he or she has been convicted, be punished as follows:

(A) Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), the person shall be punished by an additional term of two, three, or four years at the court's discretion.

(B) If the felony is a serious felony, as defined in subdivision (c) of Section 1192.7, the person shall be punished by an additional term of five years.

(C) If the felony is a violent felony, as defined in subdivision (c) of Section 667.5, the person shall be punished by an additional term of 10 years.

(2) If the underlying felony described in paragraph (1) is committed on the grounds of, or within 1,000 feet of, a public or private elementary, vocational, junior high, or high school, during hours in which the facility is open for classes or school-related programs or when minors are using the facility that fact shall be a circumstance in aggravation of the crime in imposing a term under paragraph (1).

(3) The court shall order the imposition of the middle term of the sentence enhancement, unless there are circumstances in aggravation or mitigation. The court shall state the reasons for its choice of sentencing enhancements on the record at the time of the sentencing.

(4) Any person who is convicted of a felony enumerated in this paragraph committed for the benefit of, at the direction of, or in association with any criminal street gang, with the specific intent to promote, further, or assist in any criminal conduct by gang members, shall,
upon conviction of that felony, be sentenced to an indeterminate term of life imprisonment with a minimum term of the indeterminate sentence calculated as the greater of:

(A) The term determined by the court pursuant to Section 1170 for the underlying conviction, including any enhancement applicable under Chapter 4.5 (commencing with Section 1170) of Title 7 of Part 2, or any period prescribed by Section 3046, if the felony is any of the offenses enumerated in subparagraphs (B) or (C) of this paragraph.

(B) Imprisonment in the state prison for 15 years, if the felony is a home invasion robbery, in violation of subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) of Section 213; carjacking, as defined in Section 215; a felony violation of Section 246; or a violation of Section 12022.55.

(C) Imprisonment in the state prison for seven years, if the felony is extortion, as defined in Section 519; or threats to victims and witnesses, as defined in Section 136.1.

(5) Except as provided in paragraph (4), any person who violates this subdivision in the commission of a felony punishable by imprisonment in the state prison for life, shall not be paroled until a minimum of 15 calendar years have been served.

(c) If the court grants probation or suspends the execution of sentence imposed upon the defendant for a violation of subdivision (a), or in cases involving a true finding of the enhancement enumerated in subdivision (b), the court shall require that the defendant serve a minimum of 180 days in a county jail as a condition thereof.

(d) Any person who is convicted of a public offense punishable as a felony or a misdemeanor, which is committed for the benefit of, at the direction of or in association with, any criminal street gang with the specific intent to promote, further, or assist in any criminal conduct by gang members, shall be punished by imprisonment in the county jail not to exceed one year, or by imprisonment in the state prison for one, two, or three years, provided that any person sentenced to imprisonment in the county jail shall be imprisoned for a period not to exceed one year, but not less than 180 days, and shall not be eligible for release upon completion of sentence, parole, or any other basis, until he or she has served 180 days. If the court grants probation or suspends the execution of sentence imposed upon the defendant, it shall require as a condition thereof that the defendant serve 180 days in a county jail.
(e) As used in this chapter, "pattern of criminal
gang activity" means the commission of, attempted commission
of, conspiracy to commit, or solicitation of, sustained
juvenile petition for, or conviction of two or more of the
following offenses, provided at least one of these offenses
occurred after the effective date of this chapter and the
last of those offenses occurred within three years after a
prior offense, and the offenses were committed on separate
occasions, or by two or more persons:
(1) Assault with a deadly weapon or by means of force
likely to produce great bodily injury, as defined in Section
245.
(2) Robbery, as defined in Chapter 4 (commencing with
Section 211) of Title 8 of Part 1.
(3) Unlawful homicide or manslaughter, as defined in
Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 187) of Title 8 of Part
1.
(4) The sale, possession for sale, transportation,
manufacture, offer for sale, or offer to manufacture
controlled substances as defined in Sections 11054, 11055,
(5) Shooting at an inhabited dwelling or occupied motor
vehicle, as defined in Section 246.
(6) Discharging or permitting the discharge of a firearm
from a motor vehicle, as defined in subdivisions (a) and (b)
of Section 12034.
(7) Arson, as defined in Chapter 1 (commencing with
Section 450) of Title 13.
(8) The intimidation of witnesses and victims, as defined
in Section 136.1.
(9) Grand theft, as defined in subdivision (a) or (c) of
Section 487.
(10) Grand theft of any firearm, vehicle, trailer, or
vessel.
(11) Burglary, as defined in Section 459.
(12) Rape, as defined in Section 261.
(13) Looting, as defined in Section 463.
(14) Money laundering, as defined in Section 186.10.
(15) Kidnapping, as defined in Section 207.
(16) Mayhem, as defined in Section 203.
(17) Aggravated mayhem, as defined in Section 205.
(18) Torture, as defined in Section 206.
(19) Felony extortion, as defined in Sections 518 and 520.
(20) Felony vandalism, as defined in paragraph (1) of
subdivision (b) of Section 594.
(21) Carjacking, as defined in Section 215.
(22) The sale, delivery, or transfer of a firearm, as
defined in Section 12072.
(23) Possession of a pistol, revolver, or other firearm capable of being concealed upon the person in violation of paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) of Section 12101.

(24) Threats to commit crimes resulting in death or great bodily injury, as defined in Section 422.

(25) Theft and unlawful taking or driving of a vehicle, as defined in Section 10851 of the Vehicle Code.

(f) As used in this chapter, "criminal street gang" means any ongoing organization, association, or group of three or more persons, whether formal or informal, having as one of its primary activities the commission of one or more of the criminal acts enumerated in paragraphs (1) to (25), inclusive, of subdivision (e), 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 gang activity.

(g) Notwithstanding any other law, the court may strike the additional punishment for the enhancements provided in this section or refuse to impose the minimum jail sentence for misdemeanors in an unusual case where the interests of justice would best be served, if the court specifies on the record and enters into the minutes the circumstances indicating that the interests of justice would best be served by that disposition.

(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for each person committed to the Youth Authority for a conviction pursuant to subdivision (a) or (b) of this section, the offense shall be deemed one for which the state shall pay the rate of 100 percent of the per capita institutional cost of the Department of Youth Authority, pursuant to Section 912.5 of the Welfare and Institutions Code.

(i) In order to secure a conviction, or sustain a juvenile petition, pursuant to subdivision (a), it is not necessary for the prosecution to prove that the person devotes all, or a substantial part of his or her time or efforts to the criminal street gang, nor is it necessary to prove that the person is a member of the criminal street gang. Active participation in the criminal street gang is all that is required.
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TITLE 15, SECTION 3378 CRITICAL CASE INFORMATION

(a) Any information regarding an inmate/parolee which is or may be critical to the safety of persons inside or outside an institution shall be documented as required below on a CDCR Form 812 (Rev. 8/01), Notice of Critical Case Information—Safety of Persons (Nonconfidential Enemies); a CDCR Form 812-A (Rev. 9/92), Notice of Critical Information—Prison Gang Identification; CDCR Form 812-B (9/92), Notice of Critical Information—Disruptive Group Identification; and CDCR Form 812-C (Rev. 8/01), Notice of Critical Information—Confidential Enemies. The CDCR Forms 812, 812-A, 812-B, and 812-C and all documents referred to on the forms shall be filed in the central file of each identified inmate/parolee. Any confidential material affecting the critical case factors of an inmate/parolee shall conform to the provisions of section 3321. Entries on these forms shall not be a substitute for detailed documentation required elsewhere in the central file.

(b) A CDCR Form 812, and when applicable a CDCR Form 812-C, shall be completed for each newly committed or returned inmate/parolee.

(1) The CDCR Forms 812 and 812-C shall be updated as any critical information becomes known and is documented in the inmate/parolee's central file. The forms shall also be reviewed and updated at the time of any change in the inmate/parolee's status or placement.

(2) Any inmate/parolee who claims enemies shall provide sufficient information to positively identify the claimed enemy. Any inmate/parolee identified as an enemy shall be interviewed unless such interview would jeopardize an investigation or endanger any person. The results of the interview or investigation which supports, verifies or disproves the information shall be documented on a CDCR Form 128-B, General Chrono.

(3) Notations on the CDCR Forms 812 and 812-C, or absence thereof, shall not be the sole basis for a staff decision or action which may affect the safety of any person.

(c) Gang involvement allegations shall be investigated by a gang coordinator/investigator or their designee.

(1) CDCR Form 812-A or B shall be completed if an inmate/parolee has been verified as a member, associate, or dropout of a gang (prison gang or disruptive group) as defined in section 3000, or has safety concerns relating to gangs.
Information entered onto the CDCR Form 812-A or B shall be reviewed and verified by the gang coordinator/investigator to ensure that the identification of an inmate/parolee as a gang member or associate, or as having safety concerns is supported by at least three independent source items in the inmate/parolee's central file. The independent source items must contain factual information or, if from a confidential source, meet the test of reliability established in section 3321. The verification of an inmate/parolee identified as a gang dropout shall require a formal debriefing conducted or supervised by a gang coordinator/investigator.

(3) A member is an inmate/parolee who has been accepted into membership by a gang. This identification requires at least three (3) independent source items of documentation indicative of actual membership.

(4) An associate is an inmate/parolee who is involved periodically or regularly with members or associates of a gang. This identification requires at least three (3) independent source items of documentation indicative of association with validated gang members or associates.

(5) A dropout is an inmate/parolee who was either a gang member or associate and has discontinued gang affiliation. This identification requires the inmate/parolee to successfully complete the debriefing process.

(6) The verification of an inmate/parolee's gang identification shall be validated or rejected by the assistant director, law enforcement and investigations unit (LEIU), or a designee. The validation and/or rejection of evidence relied upon shall be documented on a CDCR Form 128-B2, Gang Validation/Rejection Review, and forwarded to the facility or parole region of origin for placement in the inmate/parolee's central file. Upon receipt of the CDCR Form 128-B2, the Classification and Parole Representative or Parole Administrator I, or their designee, shall clearly note in some permanent manner upon the face of every document whether or not the item met validation requirements.

(7) The CDCR Forms 812-A and 812-B shall be reviewed by a classification committee at each annual hearing and upon any review for transfer consideration. This shall be documented on a CDCR Form 128-G, Classification Chrono. Questionable gang identifications, notations, or new information shall be referred to the gang coordinator/investigator for investigation.

(8) The determination of a gang identification shall reference each independent source item in the
inmate/parolee's central file. The sources shall be based on the following criteria:

(A) Self admission.
(B) Tattoos and symbols. Body markings, hand signs, distinctive clothing, graffiti, etc., which have been identified by gang coordinators/investigators as being used by and distinctive to specific gang.
(C) Written material. Any material or documents evidencing gang affiliation such as the membership or enemy lists, constitutions, organizational structures, codes, training material, etc., of specific gangs.
(D) Photographs. Individual or group photographs with gang connotations such as those, which include insignia, symbols, or validated gang affiliates.
(E) Staff information. Documentation of staff's visual or audible observations which reasonably indicate gang affiliation.
(F) Other agencies. Information evidencing gang affiliation provided by other agencies. Verbal information from another agency shall be documented by the staff person who receives such information, citing the source and validity of the information.
(G) Association. Information related to the inmate/parolee's association with validated gang affiliates.
(H) Informants. Documentation of information evidencing gang affiliation from an informant shall indicate the date of the information, whether the information is confidential or non-confidential, and an evaluation of the informant's reliability. Confidential material shall also meet the requirements established in section 3321.
(I) Offenses. Where the circumstances of an offense evidence gang affiliation such as where the offense is between rival gangs, the victim is a verified gang affiliate, or the inmate/parolee's crime partner is a verified gang affiliate.
(J) Legal documents. Probation officer's report or court transcripts evidencing gang affiliation.
(K) Visitors. Visits from persons who are documented as gang "runners" or community affiliates, or members of an organization which associates with a gang.
(L) Communications. Documentation of telephone conversations, mail, notes, or other communication, including coded messages evidencing gang affiliation.
(M) Debriefing reports. Documentation resulting from the debriefing required by (c)(2), above.

(d) An inmate housed in the general population as a gang member or associate may be considered for review for inactive status when the inmate has not been identified as having been involved in gang activity for a minimum of two (2) years. Verification of an inmate’s inactive status shall be approved or rejected by the LEIU assistant director or a designee. The approval or rejection shall be forwarded for placement in the inmate’s central file. The Institution Classification Committee shall review and consider this determination at the next hearing and upon review for transfer consideration.

(e) An inmate housed in a security housing unit (SHU) as a gang member or associate may be considered for review of inactive status by the Departmental Review Board when the inmate has not been identified as having been involved in gang activity for a minimum of six (6) years. Verification of an inmate’s inactive status shall be approved or rejected by the assistant director, LEIU, or a designee. The approval or rejection shall be forwarded for placement in the inmate’s central file.

(f)(1) A gang member or associate, who is categorized as inactive and released from a SHU, may be removed from the general population or any other placement based upon one reliable source item identifying the inmate as an active gang member or associate. The source item must identify the inmate as a gang member or associate based on information developed after his or her release from SHU. The source item need not be confidential, but must meet the test of reliability established at section 3321.

(f)(2) The procedures relating to the initial validation or rejection of gang members or associates as described in this section shall be followed when reviewing the present status of an inactive gang member or associate. Verification of an inmate’s active status shall be approved or rejected by the assistant director, LIEU, or a designee. This determination shall be forwarded for placement in the inmate’s central file.

(f)(3) A classification committee is authorized to return an inmate to a SHU based upon the restoration of the inmate’s gang status and a determination that the inmate’s present placement endangers institutional security or presents a threat to the safety or others. As provided at section 3341.5, placement in a SHU requires approval by a classification staff representative.
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My name is William H. Richert, I am a Graduate student at California State University, San Bernardino, and I am conducting research for my thesis on the attitudes and perceptions among prison inmates, custody officers, and correctional staff of why inmates join prison gangs, how powerful they are, and their power and control in prison. You may receive the results of this study upon completion on December 31, 2006 by contacting my supervising faculty member, Pamela J. Schram, Ph.D., California State University San Bernardino, 5500 University Parkway, San Bernardino, CA 92407-2397, phone number (909) 880-5255. This information will be collected from a self administered survey. The survey will take you about 30 minutes to complete. The survey is statements about your opinions or perceptions of prison gangs. Mark an "X" in the box indicating whether you agree or disagree with the statement. After completing the survey give it back to me or mail it in the stamped self addressed envelope.

This location and you will NOT be identified. Your participation in this study is strictly voluntary, without the promise of any special rewards from me or parole staff as the result of your participation. Your refusal to participate will NOT result in any consequences through the Department of Corrections, or will not be used against you in any law enforcement actions. You have the right to withdraw your participation and data from this study at any time without penalty. Your parole status, conditions of your parole, parole officer assignment will not change or be effected, and will not be used in any law enforcement actions against you.

The potential risks are that some participants may personally experience feelings of embarrassment or intrusiveness during responding to the survey. The potential benefits to be gained by the individual participants is through a better understanding of the stereotype attitudes, if any, among the various groups within the institution concerning their perceptions of prison gang members. With such an understanding, information could be gained to help in training correctional officers and program staff as well as gaining knowledge of the experiences of prison inmates. This research may also reveal to prison officials that the current prison environment is conclusive to prison gangs, and because of this prison culture inmates are sometimes coerced into
joining a prison gang.

This research is approved by the Institutional Review
Board at California State University, San Bernardino. If
you have any questions about the results of this study,
please contact Pamela J. Schram, Ph.D., California State
University San Bernardino, 5500 University Parkway, San
Bernardino, CA 92407-2397, phone number (909) 880-5255.
APPENDIX D

RESEARCH CONSENT
APPENDIX D

RESEARCH CONSENT

My name is William H. Richert, I am a Graduate student at California State University, San Bernardino, and I am conducting research for my thesis on the attitudes and perceptions among prison inmates, custody officers, and correctional staff of why inmates join prison gangs, how powerful they are, and their power and control in prison. You may receive the results of this study upon completion on December 31, 2006 by contacting my supervising faculty member, Pamela J. Schram, Ph.D., California State University San Bernardino, 5500 University Parkway, San Bernardino, CA 92407-2397, phone number (909) 880-5255. This information will be collected from a self administered survey. The survey will take you about 30 minutes to complete. The survey is statements about your opinions or perceptions of prison gangs. Mark an "X" in the box indicating whether you agree or disagree with the statement. After completing the survey give it back to me (room 613) or place it in the envelope in front of room 213.

This location and you will NOT be identified. Your participation in this study is strictly voluntary, without the promise of any special rewards from me or parole staff as the result of your participation. Your refusal to participate will NOT result in any consequences, or will not be used against you. You have the right to withdraw your participation and data from this study at any time without penalty.

The potential risks are that some participants may personally experience feelings of embarrassment or intrusiveness during responding to the survey. The potential benefits to be gained by the individual participants is through a better understanding of the stereotype attitudes, if any, among the various groups within the institution concerning their perceptions of prison gang members. With such an understanding, information could be gained to help in training correctional officers and program staff as well as gaining knowledge of the experiences of prison inmates. This research may also reveal to prison officials that the current prison environment is conclusive to prison gangs, and because of this prison culture inmates are sometimes coerced into joining a prison gang.

This research is approved by the Institutional Review Board at California State University, San Bernardino. If you have any questions about the results of this study,
please contact Pamela J. Schram, Ph.D., California State University San Bernardino, 5500 University Parkway, San Bernardino, CA 92407-2397, phone number (909) 880-5255.
THANKS
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RESEARCHER QUESTIONNAIRE

There are 15 statements in this questionnaire. They are statements about your opinions or perception about prison gangs. Indicate an “X” in the box to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

A = Agree
N = Neither
D = Disagree

1. Inmates join a prison gang because of their color or race.
2. Inmates are forced to join prison gangs by other inmates.
3. Inmates fear violating gang rules more than prison rules.
4. Prison gangs control the prison more than the staff.
5. Inmates join a prison gang because they need protection.
6. Prison gangs make a lot of money in prison.
7. Gangs are a problem for the people running the prison.
8. Inmates join prison gangs because they fear violence.
9. Inmates fear prison gang members more than the prison staff.
10. Prison gangs are responsible for most of the violence in prison.
11. Gang members control the drug sales in prison.
12. Gambling is controlled by prison gang members.
13. Punishment from the prison gang is feared more than from the prison staff.
14. The prison staff does nothing to prevent gangs from existing in prison.
15. Gang intervention programs in prison have helped to prevent inmates from joining a prison gang.
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RESEARCH CONSENT

William H. Richert, un estudiante de la Universidad del Estado de California, San Bernardino, está conduciendo una investigación sobre las actitudes y percepciones entre prisioneros, oficiales de custodia, y el personal de la prisión de porque los prisioneros se unen a las pandillas de prisión, que poderosos son, y la magnitud de poder y control que tienen en prisión. Usted puede recibir los resultados de esta investigación al completarse en Diciembre 31, 2005 contactando a Pamela J. Schram, Ph.D., California State University San Bernardino, 5500 University Parkway, San Bernardino, CA 92407-2397, phone number (909) 880-5255. Los datos serán coleccionados por un cuestionario de investigación administrado por cada participante. El cuestionario tomará aproximadamente 30 minutos para completar. El cuestionario contiene declaraciones sobre su opinión o percepciones de las pandillas de prisión. Hay que marcar con una “X” en la caja si está de acuerdo o desacuerdo con la declaración. Después de completar el cuestionario regreselo por correo al investigador.

El local y su identidad NO será identificada. Su participación en este estudio es estrictamente voluntaria, y sin las promesa de ningún tipo de recompensa de parte del investigador o del personal de la prisión. Negarse a participar NO resultara en ningún tipo de consecuencia de parte de el Departamento de Corrección ni se tomará alguna acción legal en su contra. Usted tiene el derecho de retirar su participación y sus datos de este estudio en cualquier momento y sin ningun castigo y no será usado contra usted en una acción legal.

Los riesgos potenciales son que el participante puede sentir sentimientos de vergüenza o intrusión mientras contesta el cuestionario. Los beneficios para cada participante es un mejor entendimiento de los estereotipas de actitudes, si algunos, entre varios grupos dentro de la institucion referente a las percepciones de los pandilleros en la prisión. Con tal entendimiento, informacion puede ser obtenida para ayudar a entrenar a los oficiales de correccion y a el personal y tambien beneficiar del conocimiento de las experiencias de los prisioneros. Esta investigación tambien revelara a los oficiales de la prision que el ambiente de las prisiones es concluyente a las pandillas, y por esa razon la cultura en las prisiones a veces coacciona a los prisioneros a afiliarse con los pandillas.
Esta investigación es aprobada por el Institutional Review Board en la Universidad de California, San Bernardino. Si tiene alguna pregunta sobre los derechos de los participantes, por favor de contactar Pamela J. Schram, Ph.D., California State University San Bernardino, 5500 University Parkway, San Bernardino, CA 92407-2397, phone number (909) 880-5255.
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RESEARCHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Hay 15 declaraciones en este cuestionario. Son declaraciones sobre su opinión o percepción acerca de las pandillas en prisión. Por favor de indicar con una "X" en la caja hasta que punto está de acuerdo o en desacuerdo con las siguientes declaraciones:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Los presos se unen al las pandillas por su color o raza.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Los presos son forzados a unirse a las pandillas por otros presos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Los presos temen violar las reglas de la pandilla más que las reglas de la prisión.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Las pandillas de prisión controlan la prisión más que el personal de la prisión.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Los presos se unen a las pandillas de prisión porque necesitan protección.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Las pandillas de prisión hacen mucho dinero en la prisión.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Las pandillas son un problema para las personas manteniendo la prisión.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Los presos se unen a las pandillas de prisión porque temen violencia.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Los presos temen a los pandilleros de la prisión más que a el personal de la prisión.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Los presos son responsables por la mayor parte de la violencia en la prisión.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Los pandilleros controlan la venta de drogas en la prisión.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Las apuestas y los juegos son controlados por los pandilleros.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Los castigos de los pandilleros son más temidos que los del personal de la prisión.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. El personal de la prisión no hace nada para evitar que existan las pandillas en la prisión.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Los programas de intervención de pandillas en la prisión han ayudado a prevenir que los presos se unan a las pandillas en la prisión.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The study you have just completed was designed to investigate the differences of inmate and staff perceptions about why inmates join prison gangs, how powerful they are, and their power and control in prison.

The study examined six different perceptions of: (1) Perceptions of why prison gangs exist vary among parolees; (2) Perceptions of why prison gangs exist vary among police officers; (3) Perceptions of how powerful prison gangs are, vary among parolees; (4) Perceptions of how powerful prison gangs are, vary among police officers; (5) Perceptions of who controls prisons vary among parolees; and (6) Perceptions of who controls prisons vary among police officers.

Thank you for your participation and for not discussing the contents of the survey statements with other participants. If you have any questions or if you would like to obtain a copy of the results of this study, please contact Pamela J. Schram, Ph.D., California State University San Bernardino, 5500 University Parkway, San Bernardino, CA 92407-2397, phone number (909) 880-5255, after December 31, 2005.
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INTERROGATORIO DE LA DECLARACION

El estudio que usted acaba de terminar fue diseñado para investigar las diferencias de las opiniones del interno y del personal sobre porqué los internos ensamblan a cuadrillas de la prisión, cómo es de gran alcance son, y su energía y control en la prisión.

El estudio examinó seis diversas opiniones: (1) Las opiniones de porqué existen las cuadrillas de la prisión varían entre parolees; (2) Las opiniones de porqué existen las cuadrillas de la prisión varían entre oficiales de policía; (3) Las opiniones de cómo son las cuadrillas de gran alcance de la prisión, varían entre parolees; (4) Las opiniones de cómo son las cuadrillas de gran alcance de la prisión, varían entre oficiales de policía; (5) Las opiniones de quiénes controlan prisiones varían entre parolees; y (6) opiniones quiénes controlan de prisiones varían entre oficiales de policía.

Gracias por su participación y por no discutir el contenido de las declaraciones del examen con otros participantes. Si usted tiene cualquiera pregunta o si usted quisiera obtener una copia de los resultados de este estudio, entre en contacto con por favor a Pamela J. Schram, p.H.D., Universidad de estado de California San Bernardino, Parkway de 5500 universidades, San Bernardino, CA 92407-2397, teléfono número (909) 880-5255, después del 31 de Diciembre de 2005.
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### ANNUAL CRIME STATISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Hom</th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Robb</th>
<th>Aalt</th>
<th>Burg.</th>
<th>Larc.</th>
<th>GTA.</th>
<th>Ars</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>P.Arr</th>
<th>A.Arr</th>
<th>J.Arr</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>CFS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976 &amp; Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>3143</td>
<td>2063</td>
<td>2850</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>6479</td>
<td>29641</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>1102</td>
<td>1228</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>3451</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>2651</td>
<td>1608</td>
<td>6179</td>
<td>28251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>1469</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>4061</td>
<td>2489</td>
<td>3042</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>7361</td>
<td>29510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>1306</td>
<td>1601</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>4239</td>
<td>2469</td>
<td>3410</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>7773</td>
<td>27805</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>1185</td>
<td>1564</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>4057</td>
<td>2490</td>
<td>3301</td>
<td>1325</td>
<td>7116</td>
<td>26726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>1453</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>3917</td>
<td>2710</td>
<td>3448</td>
<td>1407</td>
<td>7565</td>
<td>28457</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>3296</td>
<td>2454</td>
<td>3390</td>
<td>1271</td>
<td>7115</td>
<td>28658</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>1183</td>
<td>1432</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4192</td>
<td>2639</td>
<td>3359</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>7499</td>
<td>28635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>1236</td>
<td>1522</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4853</td>
<td>2610</td>
<td>3459</td>
<td>1247</td>
<td>7316</td>
<td>30147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>1108</td>
<td>1199</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4256</td>
<td>2461</td>
<td>3007</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>6429</td>
<td>36074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>1097</td>
<td>1283</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4473</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>2704</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>5888</td>
<td>35699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>1043</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>1357</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5155</td>
<td>2121</td>
<td>2469</td>
<td>1172</td>
<td>5782</td>
<td>41028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>1444</td>
<td>1464</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5288</td>
<td>2092</td>
<td>2890</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>6097</td>
<td>41577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>1101</td>
<td>1363</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5516</td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>2618</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>5508</td>
<td>41941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>1265</td>
<td>1579</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5331</td>
<td>2149</td>
<td>2518</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>5742</td>
<td>46584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>1327</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5015</td>
<td>2195</td>
<td>2476</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>5421</td>
<td>44854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>1252</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4633</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2469</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>5328</td>
<td>42097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4212</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>2410</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>5159</td>
<td>41382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3857</td>
<td>1785</td>
<td>2365</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>5040</td>
<td>39813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>1068</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3558</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>2253</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>4602</td>
<td>38499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3231</td>
<td>1346</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>3873</td>
<td>36783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3550</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>1727</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>3228</td>
<td>40318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>1082</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3823</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>1606</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>2934</td>
<td>40294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>1278</td>
<td>1431</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4239</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>2131</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>3284</td>
<td>41743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>1346</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4074</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>2327</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>4348</td>
<td>45157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td>1289</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3765</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>2426</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>4767</td>
<td>43750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Column Headings from Left to Right:**
- Homicide, Rape, Robbery, Assault, Burglary, Larceny (theft), Grand Theft Auto (GTA), Arson, Total, Joint One Crimes, Female Arrests, Male Arrests, Juvenile Arrests, Total Arrests, Crime Data Service Arrest Data begins collection in 1991.
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