



2012 Best Practices in Confronting Gang Membership & Crime in Utah

Moisés Próspero, Ph.D.

IE Consulting

Innovate & Excel through Research, Evaluation, & Training

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	iv
<u>Section 1: Introduction to Gangs</u>	1
Uniqueness of Gangs	1
Consequences to Gang Crime & Violence	1
Definitions of Gangs	2
Prevalence Rates of Gang Membership & Gang Crime	3
United States	
Canada	
Mexico	
Central America	
Europe	
Africa	
Asia	
Pacific	
Risk Factors for Gang Membership & Formation	7
Risk Factors for Gang Membership	
Risk Factors for Gang Formation	
Gang Characteristics	9
Structure & Leadership	
Race/Ethnicity & Gender	
Other Characteristics	
Group Processes in Gangs	11
Theories on Gang Membership & Crime	13
Social Disorganization & Cultural Transmission	
Differential Association & Opportunity	
Strain & Control	
Deterrence, Rational Choice, & Social Learning	
Gang Typologies	17
Behavioral Typologies	
Structural Typologies	
<u>Section 2: Gang Control Efforts</u>	21

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

Principles of Effective Program Intervention (The RNR Model)	21
Note on Ineffective Programs	22
Prevention: Gang Specific G.R.E.A.T. Program	23
Prevention: General Crime Mentoring Close Circuit TV Surveillance Improved Street Lighting	24
Intervention: Gang Specific Gang Intervention Through Targeted Outreach	26
Intervention: General Crime Blueprint Model Programs	26
Suppression: Gang Specific The L.A. Plan Civil Gang Injunctions	26
Suppression: General Crime “Hot spot” Problem-Oriented Policing	29
Re-entry: General Crime Intensive Aftercare Program & Targeted Re-entry	30
Comprehensive Multi-Level Approaches: Gang Specific OJJDP Gang Reduction Program Chicago’s Ceasefire Program	31
Comprehensive Multi-Level Approaches: General Crime Kids First Megacommunities	32
Gang Control Goals & Strategies	34
<u>Section 3: Recommendations</u>	37
General Recommendations	37
Specific Recommendations	38

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

Executive Summary

This report reviews the gang literature in search of best practices to confront gang membership and crime. The review includes prevalence of gangs, gang crime, its consequences, etiology of gangs, characteristics of gangs, and gang control efforts. Based on the most recent gang literature, 11 recommendations were developed aimed at individual, group, and community levels for prevention, intervention, suppression, and re-entry services.

Gangs are prevalent around the world but lack of documentation makes it difficult to accurately describe the gang issues at a global level. The US has the best documentation of gangs and gang crime, but other countries are recognizing that gangs are a problem in their region and are beginning to collect data, especially in Europe. The data reveal a common trend around the world: Gang members are significantly more violent than non-gang members. The factors related to gang violence are the presence of firearms, ethnic tensions, and the social norm of using guns during conflict. The cost of gang crime is extremely high, from death and psychological trauma to community fear and significant economic costs.

A serious concern is the alliance between Mexico's drug trafficking organizations (DTO), such as Los Zetas Cartel and La Familia Michoacana, with US gangs, such as the Banditos Outlaw Motorcycle Gang and MS-13. DTOs use motorcycle and street gangs as soldiers in the drug war, for drug delivery into the US, and for smuggling guns and drug earnings into Mexico from the US. DTOs have been reported in every large city in the US, including Utah (Ogden and Salt Lake City). Consumption of drugs, drug money and high powered weapons increases the strength of Mexican DTOs and US gangs. Although suppressing Mexican DTOs is needed, addressing the large consumption of illegal drugs by the US and trafficking US military weapons to Mexican DTOs also need to take priority in order to obtain long-term reduction of gang violence and crime in the US.

The main risk factors for gang membership are impulsivity, negative life events, lack of sense of belonging, antisocial attitudes, delinquent peers, and lack of parental supervision. The risk factors for gang formation are communities that lack appropriate jobs, lack prosocial alternate activities to gang members, lack informal and formal controls but have minority youth segregation and an out-migration of the middle class.

In the US, research has revealed that gangs are poorly organized with unstable leadership, are more ethnically diverse and gendered than originally believed, and that most members leave the gang within a year, usually by maturing out of the lifestyle. All gang members are not alike, with at least two types of gang members identified: core and fringe. Core gang members are more likely to identify strongly with the gang, be more cohesive with their clique, stay longer in the gang, be more resistant to gang control efforts, and be more violent. At the group level, the

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

cohesiveness of cliques within a gang is related to gang violence as these smaller tight groups of gang members are more likely to follow the “code of the streets” and be more likely to violently retaliate when these codes are broken.

Through an extensive validation process that included data across the US collected through gang experts (law enforcement, gang workers, & researchers), a gang typology was created that included five types: traditional, neotraditional, compressed, collective, and specialty gangs. Traditional gangs are large (over 100 members), enduring, and territorial with a wide age range and several internal cliques. Neotraditional gangs are newer territorial gang that appears to be evolving into larger traditional type of gangs. Compressed gangs make up the largest percentage of gangs (39%) and are smaller groups that have a relatively short history. Collective gangs are medium sized groups of adolescents and young adults that have not developed into a form that has any of the characteristics from other gangs. Specialty gangs are smaller groups that are involved in the following types of crimes: drugs, assault, burglary, theft, and robbery.

The review revealed that gang control efforts have not been effective at addressing the issues of gang proliferation and gang crime. There are a few gang control efforts that have attempted to be multi-level and comprehensive and hold some promise for future success (OJJDP GRP and Chicago’s Ceasefire Program). Unfortunately, these approaches largely ignore the prevention and reentry levels in favor of intervention and suppression efforts. A few comprehensive models hold promise in filling the prevention gap: Kids First and Megacommunities. Effective reentry programs, unfortunately, are practically non-existent, which is extremely concerning as offenders who have been incarcerated for long periods of time are at greatest risk (several criminogenic needs) to re-victimize the community. Another area that has largely been ignored by gang control efforts but unique to gangs and related to increased gang violence is the cohesiveness of cliques within the larger gang.

The following recommendations are based on this literature:

1. Implement multi-level comprehensive gang control efforts with goals and strategies (need political and economic support).
2. Use data-driven assessment to identify target populations (need statewide database).
3. Use programs found to be effective with non-gang members (e.g., Blueprint Model Programs).
4. Use “hot spot” problem-oriented policing (POP) in collaboration with community organizations.

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

5. Use improved street lighting with active close circuit TV (CCTV) in identified “at-risk” areas.
6. Use long-term incarceration for extremely high risk violent offenders (NOT with lower risk offenders).
7. Evaluate all gang control efforts (process and outcome).
8. Be proactive with media to raise awareness and educate the public regarding gang issues.
9. Develop gang-specific screening and assessments (e.g., discriminate core v fringe gang members).
10. Develop gang-specific programs (e.g., reduce gang cohesion, reentry services).
11. Develop a systems-level process and outcome evaluation tool (e.g., test fidelity of collaborative efforts, measure community impact).

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

SECTION 1: Introduction to Gangs

The Uniqueness of Gangs

Compared to at-risk youth, gang members are: 20 times more likely to commit a drive-by shooting; 10 times more likely to commit a homicide; eight times more likely to commit robbery; three times more likely to commit assault in public (Huff, 1998). Additionally, gang members are more likely to carry gun to school, possess illegal weapons, & use gun during violent crime (Miller & Decker, 2001; Decker & Curry, 2002). Actual fluctuations in murder & violent crime rates in U.S. cities have been attributed to variations in gang activities. For example, higher homicide rates and violent crimes have been associated with higher gang activities in the following cities: Chicago (Curry, 2000); Cleveland/Denver (Huff, 1998); Los Angeles (Howell & Decker, 1999); Miami (Inciardi & Pottieger, 1991); Milwaukee (Hagedorn, 1994); St. Louis (Miller & Decker, 2001).

Although some researchers and practitioners have suggested that youth who have tendencies towards violent crime are attracted to gangs and therefore become involved in gang violence, research reveals that the gang itself is the factor that increases a person's likelihood of being involved in violent behavior (Krohn & Thornberry, 2008). That is, youth who have low levels of delinquency before joining a gang get involved in more criminal activity while in the gang and significantly reduce offending once they get out of the gang. Again, this evidence strongly suggests that the gang itself, as opposed to individual characteristics, increases violent behavior among gang members. This has led some researchers (e.g., Klein & Maxson, 2006) to posit that group processes in gangs (e.g., gang cliques, gang cohesion) are linked to the increase of violent crime among members.

Consequences to Gang Crime & Violence

Gang crime and violence can have direct and indirect adverse consequences on the individual, familial and community level. Deaths and physical injuries due to firearm use in gang violence are extremely high, as well as severe psychological trauma, such as post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). Additionally, fear of safety among community members can lead to the loss of social control. That is, residents acting as the informal social control (willingness to intervene or call police when youth break the law) in a neighborhood may not intervene for fear of reprisal by gang members. Community fear may also lead to loss of recreation time for residents and possibly loss of a protective factor against youth crime. Economic costs can also be linked to gang crime. Neighborhoods can suffer from an economic decline in property values, as well as the loss of businesses. The cost of crime is extremely high. A recent cost-analysis (Cohen, Piquero, & Jennings, 2010) found that the largest costs to society is from career criminals, ranging between \$2.1 million to \$3.7 million, distantly followed by drug and alcohol abuse at \$700,000 each. These two social issues are prevalent among gangs and cost society much more than child abuse and neglect (\$250,000 to \$285,000), smoking (\$260,000), teen pregnancy (\$120,000-140,000),

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

and other health-related problems, such as diabetes (\$187,000), asthma (\$144,000), and coronary heart disease (\$127,000). Gang crime, specifically gang violence, can have significant negative consequences at a variety of levels in communities (Klein, 1995; Hipp, Tita, & Boggess, 2009; Ralphs, Medina, & Aldridge, 2009; Garvey & McGreevy, 2007).

Definitions of Gangs

Definitions of gangs vary greatly, from using the term “gang” to using other words, such as “informal youth group” or “delinquent peer group.” The National Youth Gang Center (NYGC) defines a gang as “a group of youths or young adults in your jurisdiction that you or other responsible persons in your agency or community are willing to identify as a ‘gang.’” Motorcycle gangs, hate groups, prison gangs, or “exclusively adult gangs” are excluded. A recent review of gang definitions in state legislation by Barrows and Huff (2009) finds that only two states share the same gang definition.

However, the Eurogang programme has concluded that gangs generally present five factors: durability (with respect to the group over time), street-oriented lifestyle (activities are oriented around places open to the public), youthfulness (members tend to be in their teens and early 20s), illegal activity (law-violating, delinquent or criminal behavior), and identity (illegal activities help define the group identity).

There are two general definitions of gang crimes: member-based crime and motive-based crime. Gang member-based crime focuses on the behavior of the individual gang member whereas gang motive-based crime focuses on the motivation of the criminal behavior. Member-based crime is more inclusive in that any behavior by an individual who happens to be a gang member is classified as gang crime. Motive-based crime requires more investigative work to determine if the gang crime was meant to further the interests of the gang. Using different definitions can influence the perceived prevalence (and threat) of gang membership. For example, Maxson and Klien (1990; 1996) found motive-based definitions to reveal half as many gang homicides as member-based definitions. However, there were no real differences between motive-based or member-based gang homicides and therefore Maxson and Klein (1990) propose that there is no reason to select one definition over the other.

In 2009, the Salt Lake City Police Department (SLCPD) redefined gang crime, changing it from a motive-based definition to a member-based definition. The present definition of gang involved crime is as any incident that involved a gang member, whether as a perpetrator or a victim, regardless of the motive.

The SLCPD definition for a gang is:

- A group of three or more persons that form an allegiance to the exclusion of others
- The group has common symbol, banner, color, name, etc.
- The group engages in criminal activity

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

Individuals are documented as gang members by SLCPD Gang Unit if they meet two of the following criteria:

- Self proclamation of gang membership
- Photographs displaying gang involvement (this can be gang writings/graffiti on notebooks, books, walls, personal items, etc)
- Gang-style tattoos
- Gang-style attire
- Gang signs or posturing
- Arrested with other known gang members (this can also be contact with other known gang members)
- Information from a reliable source

The two criteria can be established during a single contact or aggregated over multiple contacts within a reasonable amount of time. If during an investigation or contact, an officer determines that a person involved in an incident reasonably meets two of the above criteria, the report will indicate “Gang Involved.”

Prevalence Rates of Gang Membership & Gang Crime

The presence of arms, ethnic tensions, social norms of gun use, and “street rules” on respect/power are factors related to gang violence across countries (Decker, 2010). Gang-on-gang violence can be instantaneously triggered and escalated by misperceptions seeded in cultural differences regarding the ‘norms’ of respect (Anderson, 1999; Townsend, 2009; White, 2006b). For this reason, victims of gang violence and homicide are usually other gang members.

Although firearms are globally widespread, gun ownership and gun crime are not necessarily related. Some countries in Europe (e.g., Germany) have high percentages of gun ownership but low gun crime, which is in contrast to African, North and South American countries that have high levels of gun use. The most dangerous use of weapons is in Central America, where hi-powered weapons and military grenades are used in conjunction with “traditional” guns by semi-organized gangs (Decker, 2010). As will be shown below, gang membership significantly increases gun crime and homicides across nations, including in public areas (e.g., drive-by shootings, city center fights, and grenade use in public streets).

United States

Although the study of gangs has been present since early 1900’s (Thrasher, 1927), only since the 1970’s have data been systematically collected (Miller, 1982). Presently, the National Gang Center collects annual data and publishes a variety of gang-related issues, such as demographics and homicides. Research in the 1960’s & 70’s found a large increase in gang homicides, with an increase from 181 in 1967 to 633 in 1980 (Howell, 1999). More recently, data from 2002 to 2006 revealed that

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

there were approximately 7,800 gang homicides in the 100 largest US cities, with an increasing trend from just under 1,400 in 2002 to just under 2,000 in 2006 (Decker, 2010). These gang-homicides accounted for 25% of the total number of homicides. The average gang-related homicide rate was 893 per 100,000 gang members, which is extremely high when compared with the overall US homicide rate of 5.7 per 100,000. Most recent estimates of gang prevalence in the US is 27,000 active gangs, accounting for 788,000 gang members (Egley & O'Donnell, 2009). The number of gangs in a community is highly related to the number of homicides. For example, Robinson and associates (2009) found that, over a nine-year period, a neighborhood with no gangs had 3 homicides per square mile. However, if a neighborhood had between 1 to 10 gangs, the average homicide rate increased to 11 and a neighborhood with 21-30 gangs increased to 42 homicides. These findings reveal the lethality specific to gang violence.

A more recent and urgent concern are Mexican drug trafficking organizations (DTOs). DTOs have been documented in every large city in the US, including Ogden and Salt Lake City, Utah. Mexican DTOs have been increasing their relationship with US street, prison, and motorcycle gangs (National Drug Intelligence Center, 2008). Although not part of the formal DTO structure, US gangs are used as soldiers in the drug war, for drug delivery into the US, and for smuggling guns, drug money, cars and humans into Mexico from the US. Prison gangs are used to assist cartel members that are incarcerated in the US. The use of US gang members is also used to insulate DTO members from detection by US law enforcement. Mexican DTOs alliances with US street gangs raises the threat level for local law enforcement officers in the US as the guns being smuggled are high military grade weapons.

The US gangs that are in alliance with Mexican DTOs include: Banditos (OMC), Mongols (OMC), Vagos (OMC), Barrio Azteca (prison gang), Mexican Mafia (prison gang), Texas Syndicate (prison gang), Bilby Street Crips (street gang), La 18 (street gang), Latin Kings (street gang), MS-13 (street gang), Nortenos (street gang), Sur-13 (street gang), South Family Bloods (street gang), Southside Posse Bloods (street gang), and West Coast Crips (street gang) (Burton & West, 2009).

Although suppressing Mexican DTOs is needed, the US should increase large-level prevention and intervention programs to address the large consumption of illegal drugs by the US. Additionally, the US should focus domestically on reducing smuggling of US military weapons to Mexican DTOs. Consumption of drugs, drug money and high powered weapons increases the strength of Mexican DTOs and US gangs; therefore, multilevel, comprehensive approaches need to be funded, developed, implemented, and evaluated for significant, long-term reduction of gang violence and crime in the US.

Canada

As with the rest of the world, gang violence in Canada does not compare to the US gang problem. However, gangs are present in Canada and a similar pattern of a

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

disproportionate number of homicides are attributed to gangs. There are approximately 7,000 Canadian gang members (Royal Canadian Mountain Police, 2006) and 1 out of every 13 homicides were gang-related (Savoie, 2003).

Mexico

There are no official gang crime statistics in Mexico as the government does not have consistent numbers on gang members. However, what is known is that there is a gang problem in Mexico, with documentation revealing gang violence between several gangs, such as MS-13 and 18th Street (USAIS, 2006). An urgent concern is Mexico's drug trafficking organizations (DTO) that consist of approximately 100,000 members that are divided into several primary cartels, such as Arellano Felix Organization, Beltran Leyva Organization, Los Zetas Cartel, Sinaloa Cartel, Carrillo Fuentes Organization, Gulf Cartel/New Federation, and La Familia Michoacana (Etter, 2011). The Mexican government is critical of the US "war on drugs" because of it does not provide assistance in the efforts to reduce trafficking arms and drug earnings into Mexico or reduce US demands for illicit drugs (Cook, 2007). More than 90% of guns seized in raids and shootings in Mexico can be traced back to the US (Serrano, 2008). O'Neil (2009) estimates that \$25 billion a year is going into Mexico DTOs from US drug money. In other words, the US consumer need for drugs is making the Mexican DTOs rich and powerful, and thereby increasing the strength of US gangs. US is again focusing on suppression efforts against DTOs for much needed, immediate short-term gains but at the cost of ignoring prevention efforts that would address one of the driving forces of this criminal activity: US consumption of illegal drugs.

Central America

Although gangs do exist in Central America, accurate statistics specific to gang crime are difficult to obtain. For example, official figures estimate that 69,000 gang members exist in Central America, while academic statistics estimate 200,000 (UNODC, 2007). Homicide rates in many Latin American countries are greater than US, Canadian, and European countries.

There are generally two main types of gangs in Central America: pandillas and maras. Pandillas came about from groups of Central American youth in conflict with authorities and other youth groups over territory, resources, etc. The pandillas have been known to provide protection in the community from outside threats. Maras, on the other hand, came about from U.S. immigration policies that deported immigrant criminals from Los Angeles (usually gang members) to their country of origin. The maras brought gang criminal behavior to Central America. The most well known maras are the Mara Salvatrucha (MS-13) and Mara Dieciocho. The countries that have the highest levels of gang violence in Central America are believed to be in El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras. One reason these countries have such high gang violence is the introduction of maras.

Similar to other findings around the world, a significant percentage of violence can be attributed to gangs. One study attributes as much as 60% of violence in Central America to gangs (UNODC, 2007). However, the more consistent finding is that gangs commit 10% of all homicides (Weaver & Maddaleno, 1999), which is closer to

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

US statistics. Another similarity between Central America and the US is the accessibility of guns to youth. Central American youth have suffered from civil wars and use gun violence to gain respect (Batista & Burgos, 2008; DeCesare, 2003; Maclure & Sotelo, 2004; Rodgers, 2006; Winton, 2005).

Europe

Gangs have been identified in 16 European countries and 50 cities (Klein, Weeman, & Thornberry, 2006). Although the level of gang crime is less than the U.S., overrepresentation of gang homicides is again seen. For example, one study comparing Denver, Colorado and Bremen, Germany samples found that in both cities, gang members were disproportionately represented in violence, 64% and 44%, respectively. Cross national studies have found that gang members can be as much as four times more violent than non-gang members (Bennett & Holloway, 2004; Bradshaw, 2005; Esbensen & Weeman, 2005; Huizinga & Schuman, 2001). One reason that US gang violence is usually higher than European is the accessibility and use of guns during conflict (gun-violence is more prevalent in the US). However, there are some exceptions: Manchester, UK and Kazan region of Russia both have higher percentages of gang-attributed gun violence than most US cities. For example, between 1997 and 2000, Manchester gangs were involved 80% of homicides that included guns (Bullock & Tilley, 2002).

Africa

Although gangs have been reported in several countries in Africa, including Kenya, Liberia, and Uganda, most violence is attributed to war and coups (Covey, 2003). The exception is in South Africa where prisons and street gangs are connected and gang violence is extremely prevalent (Berg & Kinnes, 2009). For example, there are approximately 137 gangs & 100,000 gang members in the West Cape and 40-60% of violent crimes are attributed to gangs. However, a distinct difference between the US and South African gangs is that the majority of violence is between law enforcement, vigilante groups (e.g., Pagad: People against Gangsterism & Drugs), gangs, and (Dixon & Johns, 2001). That is, community members have banded together to violently confront gangs in their neighborhoods.

Asia

Gangs have been documented in several Asian countries, such as China (Hong Kong), India, Japan, Korea, Pakistan, Philippines, and Taiwan (Covey, 2003). However, little is known about gang crime as most information is journalistic. Additionally, Asian reports commonly combine gangs with organized crime.

Pacific

Australian gangs appear to be similar to those in Europe. Tensions and conflict between different ethnic groups have increased and have contributed to the proliferation of ethnic gangs in larger cities (White, 2006b). However, violence between gangs have not been found to be related to territory or resources, but rather for conflicts that involved women (White, 2006a). There is a concern that youth groups are at extreme risk of developing into gangs that are much more like US

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

gangs. Recommendations are that Australian officials and communities need to address ethnic tensions and marginalization to prevent gang violence from escalating. In New Zealand, the existence of youth gangs have been documented since the 1950's, when they were mostly seen as rebellious teenagers. In the 1960's, gangs became more structured with the influence of the US motorcycle gang, Hell's Angels. During this time, gangs were mostly made up of youth from European background (Pakeha) but in the 1970's, indigenous gangs become more prevalent (e.g., Maori, Samoan, Tongan, etc). Asian and white supremacist gangs gained prominence in the 1990's, which led to an increase inter-gang conflict over territory and the drug market. The public is resistant to the belief that gangs are prevalent around the country, preferring to focus mostly on the region surrounding the largest city, Auckland (Ministry of Social Development, 2006).

Risk Factors for Gang Membership & Formation

Risk Factors for Gang Membership

A systematic review was conducted to identify elements that increase the likelihood of gang membership. Risk factors can be organized into five domains: individual, family, peer, school, and neighborhood (Klein & Maxson, 2006). The more risk factors in each domain a youth has, the more likely to she/he will become involved in gangs.

The review of the **individual** risk factor domain revealed that externalizing behaviors (e.g., impulsivity, hostility), negative life events (e.g., loss of intimate social relationships, school suspension), and delinquent attitudes increased the likelihood of gang membership. Other findings were that self-esteem was not associated with gang membership. The relationship between gang membership and internalizing behaviors (e.g., anxiety, depression), involvement in conventional activities, and attitudes towards the future were found to be inconclusive (6 longitudinal and 13 cross sectional studies).

The review of the **peer** risk factor domain consistently found that having delinquent friends that are socially accepting of a youth that does not have a sense of belonging (i.e., emotionally filling the lack of sense of belonging) significantly increases the likelihood of gang membership. Therefore, it is not simply enough for the individual to have a loss of sense of belonging to join a gang, but delinquent peers also need to fill that void (6 longitudinal & 10 cross-sectional studies).

The review of the **family** risk factor domain found that only the lack of parental supervision is associated with gang membership. The most prominent findings were that gang membership was not associated with family poverty, family structure (e.g., single parent), or attachment. Parenting style and family deviance were found to be inconclusive (6 longitudinal & 13 cross-sectional studies).

Surprisingly, the review of the **school** risk factor domain did not find any risk factors related to increased gang membership. An unsafe school environment was found to not be related to gang membership and commitment to educational goals and

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

academic achievement had inconsistent findings (5 longitudinal & 9 cross-sectional studies).

Similarly, the review of the **neighborhood** risk factor domain did not find any risk factors related to increased gang membership. Criminogenic neighborhood indicators were not found to be related to gang membership, while area crime was found to be inconsistent (3 longitudinal & 6 cross-sectional studies).

In summary, the review of six longitudinal and 14 cross-sectional studies revealed the most consistent risk factors for gang membership were negative life events, external behaviors, delinquent beliefs, peer characteristics, and social acceptance/belonging. The review also found that gang membership was not associated with criminogenic neighborhoods, unsafe schools, family poverty/structure, attachment, or self-esteem.

These findings should be interpreted with caution, as the individual, family and peer domains are the most studied risk factors. Researchers tend to use more rigorous methodology in these three domains than in studies focused on the school and neighborhood level domains.

It should also be noted that although much has been discovered by this review, most of the findings were inconclusive. This review was focused on “individual-level” risk factors for gang membership and not “group-level” risk factors for the onset of gangs in neighborhoods. That is, identifying the factors that increase the likelihood on an individual joining a gang is different than the factors that increase the likelihood of a group of youth becoming a gang. An individual may be impulsive, lack parental supervision, and have antisocial peers but does not have a gang to join because the neighborhood does not have the foundation for gang development, such as ethnic tensions, conflict over resources, “street rules” on respect/power, and misperceptions of cultural norms (Decker, 2010). Therefore, the methodologies implemented in the neighborhood studies were not appropriate to identify group-level risk factors for gang development.

Risk Factors for Gang Formation

Factors that may contribute to the creation of gangs in neighborhoods include the community structure (e.g., city population size, rental stability, economic and social disadvantage) and community process (e.g., informal controls, social relationships). Other community factors that have been related to gang formation are economic/social disadvantage & instability (absence of appropriate jobs, acceptable alternative activities, informal controls), minority segregation (large number of segregated minority youth), out-migration of the middle class, education system failure, lack of informal and formal controls, and poor or absent social relationships (Klein, 1995).

Community interventions should include developing local controls, building and sustaining informal & formal social relationships between neighborhood residents &

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

social institutions (e.g., schools, churches, community groups, local political agencies, & public services). Similar to the relationship between gang cohesion and gang crime, social cohesion is also related to general crime and reduction of delinquency is through collective efficacy. Collective efficacy is cohesion in the community, where mutual trust exists among neighbors and elicits mutual expectation that they will intervene to confront crime in their community. This develops into informal social control in the community. Higher collective efficacy between local controls is associated with lower levels of crime/violence. For example, a socially cohesive community can change local norms that encourage criminal behavior, such as replacing the “code of the street” with informal controls that promote prosocial behavior (Anderson, 1999; Bursik & Grasmick, 1993; Sampson, et al., 1997).

Table 1. Risk Factors for Gang Membership & Formation

Risk Factors	Characteristics	Gang Membership or Formation
<i>Individual domain</i>	externalizing behaviors, negative life events and delinquent attitudes	Membership
<i>Peer domain</i>	having delinquent friends that are socially accepting	Membership
<i>Family domain</i>	parental supervision	Membership
<i>School domain</i>	unsafe school environment, commitment to educational goals & academic achievement	Neither
<i>Neighborhood domain</i>	criminogenic neighborhood indicators	Neither
<i>Community Structure</i>	economic/social disadvantage, minority segregation, out-migration of middle class, education failure	Formation
<i>Community Process</i>	formal/informal social controls, social cohesion, collective efficacy	Formation

Gang Characteristics

Structure & Leadership

Much of the information regarding the characteristics of gangs is based on anecdotal evidence or sensationalism. Researchers are starting to uncover the dimensions of gangs and separate myth from reality. One myth is that gangs have a dominant

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

hierarchical structure with rigid rules and strong, stable leaders who are older, more serious criminal offenders. Research has found, however, that the vast majority of gangs are loosely structured, poorly organized and have unstable or shared gang leadership. Similar to leaders from other non-criminal groups, gang leaders tend to have good verbal, organizational, and social skills (Block & Block, 1993; Decker, Bynum, & Weisel, 1998; Decker & Van Winkle, 1996). Stable leadership is difficult to accomplish in gangs as “streets norms” often guide gang behaviors. Additionally, opposition to authority is a common characteristic among gang members, and this creates a barrier to leadership.

Race/Ethnicity & Gender

The ethnic/racial and gender make-up of gangs is debated between youth researchers and law enforcement. Law enforcement reports that gangs are generally made up of 13% White, 31% Black, 47% Latino, and 6% female. On the other hand, youth studies reveal higher percentages for White gang members and females, 25% White, 31% Black, 25% Latino, and 25–33% females. Law enforcement generally theorizes that female gang members are mostly fringe participants and not core gang members. However, youth researchers have found that females are just as likely as males to be core gang members.

A common myth is that different ethnic/racial gangs get involved in different specific types of criminal activities. According to this myth, Black and Latino gangs differ substantially from each other, and both differ from Asian gangs and White gangs (if included in the myth). In reality, ethnic gangs are remarkably similar in attitudes toward gangs, reasons for joining gangs, gang characteristics, illegal activities and victimization rates. Gangs do not generally specialize in certain criminal activities (e.g., violence, drugs). Rather, gangs are usually involved in “cafeteria-style” crime: involvement in all types of criminal behavior. However, the more criminal activity a gang is involved with, the more likely they will be active in gang violence.

Other Characteristics

Approximately 5–10% of youth will join a gang by the age of 17, with most joining when they are between 13 to 15 years old. Gang-involved youth report joining gangs for protection, respect, drugs/money, peers/family in gangs, enjoyment of illegal activities, and to get a sense of belonging. An individual’s sense of belonging can be lost from a variety of sources, including family, schools, religious institutions, and community. The gang provides the basic need to be part of a social group and may lead to greater cohesiveness within the gang clique.

Contrary to popular myth, most gang members stay in a gang for a year or less. Sensationalism promotes the myth of “blood in, blood out,” meaning that if an individual joins a gang, the only way they can get out of the gang is that they must be “jumped-out” (physically assaulted by the gang membership) or through death. The reality is that most gang members simply mature out of the gang, get jobs, become parents, or other mundane reasons that take time away from gang activities. Gang

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

members also leave after experiencing traumatic events that reveals the real-life dangers of gang membership (e.g., death of a friend, physically assaulted). Although gang members may leave in less than a year, there are several adverse effects of such membership that may endure into adulthood, such as economic hardship, family problems, and non-gang criminal involvement (Krohn, Ward, Thornberry, Lizotte, & Chu, 2011). Therefore, prevention efforts on gang desistance should be expanded to stop or significantly reduce the negative effects of gang membership on individuals, families, and communities.

Not all gang members are the same. There are at least two types of gang members: core and fringe. Core gang members are more likely to identify strongly with the gang, be more cohesive with their gang clique, and stay longer in the gang. Fringe gang members are more likely to be the youth that leave the gang within a year because of a lack of identification with the gang and gang activities. Core gang members can make up approximately 25–50% of gangs and have distinct criminogenic characteristics that make them different from fringe members. For example, core members are more likely to have less guilt when breaking the law, believe in physical violence during conflict, have more delinquent friends, and be more impulsive and risk-taking than fringe gang members. Therefore, antisocial attitudes, delinquent peers, and impulsivity are better predictors of core gang membership than demographic factors, such as age, ethnicity/race, family structure, parent's education, or gender. These important distinctions between core and fringe gang members have implications in interventions for gang desistance and crime reduction that will be discussed later (Craig, Vitaro, Gagnon, & Tremblay, 2002; Decker & Lauritsen, 2002; Esbensen, Winfree, He, & Talyor, 2001; Freng & Winfree, 2004; Katz, Webb, & Decker, 2005; Klein, 1995b; Klein & Maxson, 2006; Peterson-Lynsky, Winfree, Esbensen, & Clason, 2000; Thornberry, Huizinga, & Loeber, 2004).

Group Processes in Gangs

One area that has not been researched in-depth is the existence of group processes within a gang. Group processes are believed to be a significant factor as to why youth become much more involved in delinquent and criminal behavior (especially violent acts) when they are in gangs as compared to before or after gang membership. It is believed that group processes will always have a stronger effect on gang behavior than the structural gang typology (Klein & Maxson, 2006).

Group processes include gang leadership, clique formation, cohesiveness, commitment to the gang, conformity, obedience, and de-individuation. The following section will review the literature on gang leadership, clique formation, cohesiveness and commitment to gangs but will not include conformity, obedience, and de-individuation as there are no studies on gangs related to the latter three factors.

As stated earlier, gang leadership is usually not organized, hierarchal, or stable, and therefore has not been found to be highly related to gang crime, which is in contrast

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

to media reports. Because of this, targeting gang leaders through arrest and suppression efforts usually leads to the creation of new leadership in the gangs rather than reduction of long-term gang crime. Strong leadership within a gang may be nearly impossible to attain as autonomy from authority is so prevalent in the attitudes of gang members. An extremely cohesive gang clique will not need a leader to be involved in gang violence, as the “code of the streets” will guide behaviors, such as disrespect and retaliation.

The stronger the cohesiveness among gang members, the more likely the gang will be involved in gang crime and the stronger resistance will be to gang controlling efforts. Gang cohesiveness often occurs in gangs that have cliques (smaller groups of members) existing within the larger gang, and is often based on region or area (Klein & Maxson, 2006). Gang cliques, which consist of approximately 3 to 20 members, are developed and connected through family, social friendships, residential proximity, and criminal orientation. Clique members are also more likely to be core gang members, which is extremely important because core gang members (as opposed to fringe members) are likely to be more violent, have started delinquency at a younger age, and have a lengthier criminal history. Core members are also more likely to identify with and commit more to the gang, which contributes to gang cohesion. A cohesive gang clique is more likely to be involved in retaliation against other gang members and more oppositional to law enforcement. Therefore, gang desistant efforts should be more effective with fringe members as their commitment to the gang or clique is weaker. Fortunately, fringe members make up the majority of gang members. Core gang members will be much more resistant to any gang intervention and control. Interventions with core members should be individually targeted at reducing their gang cohesion, as it is directly related to increased gang crime (Deckeer & Curry, 2000; Fleisher, 1998; Klein, 1971, 1995a; Lien, 2005a; Moore, 1991; Short & Strodbeck, 1965; Vigil, 2002; Yablonsky, 1963).

Although dated, Klein’s (1971) studies with four large African-American gangs in south-central Los Angeles and one traditional Mexican-American gang in East Los Angeles is the best example of how reducing gang cohesiveness can lead to significant reductions in gang crime (known as the cohesion-delinquency hypothesis). The first study was a four-year intervention with four large African-American gangs that included a high percentage of group programming. The study found that as more group programming was implemented, it lead to stronger gang cohesion, which lead to higher delinquency. An additional finding was the presence of conflict between program workers and law enforcement officers throughout the intervention. The second intervention study with a traditional Mexican-American gang used the findings from the first intervention study to address the problems caused by group programming. The intervention first reduced and then totally eliminated all group programming with the gang members. Group meetings were replaced with several individual interventions, such as individual counseling, individual mentoring, individual tutoring, and individual employment assistance. The purpose of replacing group activities with individual ones was to reduce group cohesion between gang

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

members. The study's findings supported the cohesion–delinquency hypothesis. After six months, gang cohesion was significantly reduced and sustained until the end of the intervention at 18 months. This was a significant finding since over half of the gang consisted of family members. Gang recruitment totally stopped after 12 months and led to a reduction in the gang size. Most importantly, gang member offenses were reduced by 35%, mostly found within the first six months. The timeline in the reduction in gang crime is consistent with the largest reduction of gang cohesion. These results were compared with delinquency records from two police stations from the same area (but not part of the intervention). These two precincts reported no significant reductions in crime, thereby supporting that the intervention of reducing gang cohesion was related to reduction of gang crime.

The findings of these two studies support the cohesion–delinquency hypothesis, revealing how reduction of gang cohesion, even among large, traditional gangs with long histories, can help reduce gang crime. Therefore, interventions and policies should avoid increasing gang cohesion. Rival gang conflict, intense group programming and intense suppression efforts have been known to increase gang cohesion, as cliques form and commitment to the gangs increase for “security” against other gangs and law enforcement. Law enforcement suppression activities increase gang cohesion by creating an “us vs. them” mentality. Gang–on–gang violence is an example how cohesion can make negotiations and truce–making extremely difficult because gang members begin to identify primarily with their smaller gang clique and react according to street norms. Truce interventions aimed at lowering gang cohesion should be used to reduce violent gang crime.

Theories on Gang Membership & Crime

Social Disorganization & Cultural Transmission

There are several theories that have been posited to explain criminal behavior, including gang membership and crime. In the early 1900's, a few theorists began to develop some theories to help explain criminal behavior, starting with Thrasher's (1927) theory of social disorganization and further developed by Shaw and McKay's (1931) theory of cultural transmission. The theory of social disorganization states that economic destabilization contributes to social disorganization, which leads to a breakdown of conventional social institutions, such as schools, churches, & families (Thrasher, 1927). These social institutions are then unable to satisfy the needs of the people and slowly lose the ability to control the people's behaviors. Therefore, if family, schools, churches or governments fail to provide for younger populations, youth will form their own groups for social support, such as gangs (Lane & Meeker, 2004; Spergel, 1995). Adding to this, the theory of cultural transmission further suggests that socially disorganized neighborhoods “culturally” transmit criminal traditions from generation to generation the same way that other cultures pass on traditions to younger generations (Shaw & McKay, 1931). Within a disorganized society, criminality is the norm, motivating young people to deviate from traditional, law–abiding norms. This socially disorganized culture is ideal for gang formation,

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

which provides the foundation for youth to deviate from convention and oppose authority. On the other hand, the social institutions in middle class culture continue to control members through prosocial traditions that are transmitted to the younger generations.

Differential Association & Opportunity

Building upon these theories, Sutherland (1937) developed the theory of differential association, followed by Cloward and Ohlin's (1960) theory of differential opportunity. The theory of differential association posits that criminal behavior is present across all classes, but that associating with criminal groups increase chances of antisocial behavior (Sutherland, 1937). Hence, delinquent behavior is likely to occur among youth if they are exposed for prolonged periods of time to criminal attitudes by people they like and respect early in life. On the other hand, the theory of differential opportunity argues that differences between socio-economic classes can create different opportunities for youth to learn how to be prosocial or how to offend (Cloward & Ohlin, 1960). Middle class children have less opportunity to learn how to offend and more opportunities to learn legitimate means to resolve strain in their lives, whereas lower socio-economic classes have more opportunities to learn illegitimate means to resolve stressors and therefore have more access to "criminal schools."

Bringing these four theories together, middle class youth are not exposed to the traditions of criminality and are far less likely to be involved in delinquent behavior as social institutions still have control over their behaviors. In contrast, youth in disorganized lower socio-economic communities have lost the support of social institutions and are more likely to be exposed to "agents of crime" (e.g., gangs) throughout their lives and thereby increasing their opportunities to learn criminal behavior.

There is support for the theories above, as gangs are more likely to exist in areas that are socially disorganized, with lower socio-economic status and large percentage of poverty (Chettleburgh, 2007; Howell & Decker, 1999; Howell, Egle, & Gleason, 2002; Spergal, 1994). Gang membership has been found to be related with having delinquent peers (Amato & Cornell, 2003; Esbensen & Weerman, 2005) and criminal or gang member family members (Kakar, 2005; Sharp et. al., 2006). Several researchers have criticized these theories, however, arguing that these theorists create the picture of humans as at the complete mercy of their communities and possessing no choice in behavior (Emler & Reicher, 1995). Youth from the same families have been found to have variability in gang membership, with some siblings joining gangs and others not, which some argue reveal personal disorganization (Emler & Reicher, 1995). Macro-level criticisms have been raised as well, arguing that these theories promote classist and racist views on gang membership and crime by focusing on lower socio-economic communities with high percentages of racial/ethnic minorities and ignoring criminal behavior in White upper and middle class societies, specifically White gangs (Bursik & Grasmick, 1995; Caulfield, 1991; Sanday,

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

1990; Spergel, 1995). A concern is if gang membership is defined by low socio-economic and ethnic/minority status, then research will focus on poor ethnic minorities and thereby limit our knowledge of gang membership and crime to only those groups.

Strain, Control & Social Learning Theories

Strain theory (Merton, 1938) advances the idea that people are given universal goals by society. The problem arises when society allows a limited number of people to achieve goals and places barriers to others in the community, thereby creating groups with privileged opportunities for achievement. This unequal opportunity to achieve socially accepted and prized goals leads to a strain between the set goals and the ability to actually achieve the goals among the less-privileged. Working class youth experience strain from inadequate socialization (e.g., failed education, lack of community resources) that prevents them from attaining social status, which then leads to the development of “status frustration.” Status frustration creates an environment in which youth form a subculture (i.e., gangs) motivated by attitudes against middle class ideals. The subculture’s new values are dominated by antisocial behavior meant to give them status in society (Cohen, 1955).

Unlike strain theory that focuses on why offenders offend, control theory (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990) poses the question, “Why do conformists not offend?” Control theory contends that people naturally offend because it provides the quickest and simplest way to short term gains. Children need to learn how to be prosocial through the socialization process, where formal sanctions (e.g., schools, juvenile justice) are reinforced by informal sanctions (e.g., parents, neighbors). But, social norms need to be internalized, not simply imposed on children. Therefore, the development of social bonds between the child and other prosocial significant others is extremely important (Fagan & Meares, 2008; Hirchi, 1969). The child is committed to protect relationships with significant others, cares about reactions by significant others, abstains from immediate gratification by practicing self-control, and eventually internalizes the social norms carried by significant others. Social bonds prevent offending from a very young age and the breakdown of these social bonds allows the child to act freely to the social norms. Essential to building social bonds is adequate child rearing, which includes consistent monitoring of a child’s behavior and identifying and disciplining deviant behavior. Inadequate child rearing comes from parents who may not be willing or able to provide care and supervision, and may lead to a child’s low self-control and delinquent behaviors. Although some control theorists support harsh punitive sanctions, Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) recommend that parental disappointment of the child’s behavior is a much more effective way of promoting prosocial behavior than corporal punishment.

There is both support for and critique of strain and control theories. Stressed youth have been found to use gang membership to address anger, frustration and build up esteem (Eitle et al., 2004; Klemp-North, 2007; Spergel, 1995). At the same time, other research has revealed that self-esteem may rise due to “successful” criminal

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

acts (Dukes, et al., 1997). Strain theory also does not explain why most youth from lower socio-economic class communities who experience strain do not offend and generally live a life without crime (Goldstein, 1991; Webser et al., 2006). Additionally, gang members actually do not have attitudes against middle class values, but rather have professional goals that are part of legitimate social norms, such as wanting to be teachers and nurses (Klein, 1995; Sikes, 1997). Supporting control theory, research has found that gang members are more likely to come from homes with family disorganization, poor parental skills, or lack of parental role models (Eitle et al., 2004; Hill et al., 1999; Klemp-North, 2007; Thornberry, 2003). On the other hand, parental attachment, supervision, and family disorganization have been found to have weak relationships with gang membership (Hill et al., 1999; LeBlanc & Lanctot, 1998). Harsh physical punishment by authoritarian parents may actually lead to greater delinquency and aggression towards others (Klein, 1995; Wells & Rankin, 1988). Additionally, gang members have been known to participate in their own social controls like providing groceries for poor families, transportation, and security to communities (Patillo, 1998; Venkatesh, 1997). There is also evidence that gang members stay connected to the informal social norms even while they are involved with delinquent behavior. This allows for gang members to re-connect with informal social controls (e.g., parenthood, employment, military service, or marriage) that elicits gang desistance and stops offending (Moloney, Mackenzie, Hunt, & Joe-Laidler, 2009; Sampson & Laub, 2001).

Deterrence, Rational Choice, & Social Learning Theories

Deterrence theory posits that if the public knows the consequences of criminal and delinquent behavior, most people will not become involved in such behavior. Three factors need to be present in order for deterrence theory to be effective at preventing crime: individual needs to know the law, the punishment for violating the law, and that the punishment will be certain (Robertson, 1989). Most law enforcement policies are based on deterrence theory. A major criticism of the basing policies and practices on deterrence theory is that the criminal justice system is too complex to allow these three factors to be fully implemented.

Rational Choice theory generally states (Siegel, 1992) that an individual will rationally chose to break the law when he or she evaluates and decides that the benefits of the offense (e.g., value gained, need for that value) outweigh the risk/costs of the offense (e.g., getting caught, severity of punishment). Therefore, the offender is viewed as a “reasoning criminal” (Cornish & Clark, 1986). For example, a gang member would rationally chose to publicly assault a stranger who stared at him if he believes that he can “win the fight”, will not be caught by the police for the assault, will punish the stranger “disrespect”, will gain respect by fellow gang members, and if he highly values that “street cred.” There are four groupings of crime prevention techniques that are based on Rational Choice theory: Increasing perceived efforts (e.g., steering locks/parking lot barriers), increasing perceived risks (e.g., lighting/cameras), reducing anticipated rewards (e.g., ink merchandise tags/graffiti cleaning), and removing excuses (e.g., roadside speedometers/ignition interlocks). Although the is

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

some support for these techniques (Clark, et. al., 1998), a main criticism of Rational Choice theory is that it promotes a “fortress society” to prevent crime and yet, even in situations where human behavior is controlled at the extreme, such as prisons, criminal behavior persists. An additional critique is that the theory does not address macro level societal conditions, such as poverty.

Social learning theory of criminal and deviant behavior (Akers, 1997) uses social learning processes to explain how youth learn antisocial behaviors. Youth delinquency increases when family, peers, or other close members are involved in criminal behavior, the youth imitates these criminal role models, adopts these antisocial attitudes and then receives more rewards than punishment for criminal behavior (Akers, 1998). These four factors increase the likelihood that the youth will internalize criminal attitudes and behaviors to achieve goals (e.g., believe that violence gets you respect).

Gang Typologies

Behavioral Typologies

Theorists have tried to classify types of gangs, with behavioral typologies being the most popular. Behavioral typologies focus on the supposed dominant behaviors of different types of gangs. Gangs have been broken into turf gangs, fighting gangs, drug dealing gangs, predatory gangs, social/party gangs, and delinquent gangs (Huff, 1989; Fagan, 1989; Miller, 1980, Taylor, 1990). Several problems arise from categorizing gangs in behavioral typologies. First, the behavioral typologies were largely based on the specialty of researchers/professionals, which is an outcome from the lack of coordinated, multi-site research. For example, Taylor (1990) focused on drugs and gangs and found that drug gangs evolved from scavenger gangs to territory gangs, and finally to cooperative gangs. Second, individuals and gangs are involved in different types of delinquent behavior. That is, gang crime is versatile, not specialized, which is contrary to behavioral typologies. As such, youthful offenders and gangs mostly participate in “cafeteria-style offending,” involved in theft, vandalism, burglary, robbery, drug use and selling, weapons, assault, etc.

Structural typologies

Structural typologies do not focus on behaviors but rather on social characteristics of the gangs, such as race/ethnicity, size, and organizational types/levels (leadership & roles). Klein and Maxson (2006) have proposed a structural typology that categorized gangs into five types. The structural typology was initially started by using the 1992 gang proliferation & migration survey that was administered in 792 cities. A stratified sample of 60 cities (small, medium, & large jurisdictions) was selected between the years of 1985–1992, 1971–1984, and prior to 1971. Fifty-nine gang experts (law enforcement and researchers) responded stating that they would be willing to be interviewed for the development of the structural gang typology. The gang experts were asked to describe the one gang that they had most knowledge and experience working with. Based on these descriptions, six dimensions (sub-groups, size, age

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

range, durations, territorial, and crime versatility) were used in the analysis and five types of gangs emerged: traditional, neotraditional, compressed, collective, and specialty gangs.

A validation phase was then implemented with different data sets. First, a survey was completed by police gang experts from 201 cities. Second, the five gang types were presented to 887 Illinois police agencies (Scott, 2000). Third, data from the National Youth Gang Center (2000b) that represented 265 nationally represented police jurisdictions were used to validate the typology. Lastly, European gang review was used to test the typology (Klein, 1996; Patrick, 1973; Weitekamp, 2001). The results from the analyses generally supported structural typology, with only 5% of alternative gangs not fitting the five types of gangs. It should be noted that the five type gang typology is meant to describe street gangs and not prison gangs, motorcycle gangs, terrorist groups or organized crime groups. The analyses also revealed more details about the types of gangs.

Traditional gangs (11% of all gangs) are large (over 100 members), enduring, and territorial, with a wide age range and several internal cliques based on age or area. Neotraditional gangs (24%) are newer gangs that look to be on their way to becoming traditional in time. This type of gang is beginning to subgroup, may or may not have territory, and its size is evolving into larger traditional type of gangs. Compressed gangs (the most prevalent at 39%) are smaller groups (less than 50 members) that have a relatively short history, and therefore there is less certainty about subgroupings or territoriality. These newly formed gangs may grow and develop into the more traditional form of gangs, or may stay as a less complex group. Collective gangs (9%) are medium sized groups (over 50 members) of adolescents and young adults that have not developed into a form that has any of the characteristics from other gangs. Specialty gangs (17%) are smaller groups (less than 50 members) that are not generally involved in “cafeteria-style” crime but rather focus on a specific type of crime. Specialty gangs are particularly involved in one or more of the following types of crimes: drugs, assault, burglary, theft, and robbery. The extent that a specialty gang is territorial will depend largely on the type of crime.

Gang structure is not always stable. Groups may modify into different structures, disband, or remain in the same typology. To investigate gang transformations over time, structural typologies were re-analyzed four years after the initial data collection that was used to form the typologies. Four years later, 19% of the gangs were inactive or had disbanded and 39% of active gangs had transformed into another typology. Of the 42% of gangs that remained same structural form, 50% of traditional, 62% of compressed, 13% of neotraditional, 13% of collective, and 33% of specialty gangs remained in the same typology. As can be seen, gang typologies are not stable over time, with compressed being the most likely to remain in the same form. Traditional were the next most structurally stable, yet nearly 50 percent become neotraditional, compressed or collective. Neotraditional and collective gangs were the most unstable. Neotraditional gangs had a significant percentage (39%) transforming into traditional

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

gangs, while 87% of collective gangs transformed into one of the other four types of gang typologies. Surprisingly, nearly half of specialty gangs did not exist four years later, with 23% becoming traditional gangs.

Table 2. Structural Typology: Five Types of Gangs

Type	Sub-groups	Size	Age range	Duration	Territorial	Crime Versatility
Traditional (11%)	Yes	Large (>100)	Wide (20-30 yrs)	Long (>20 yrs)	Yes	Yes
Neo traditional (24%)	Yes	Med-Large (>50)	No pattern	Short (<10 yrs)	Yes	Yes
Compressed (39%)	No	Small (<50)	Narrow (<10 yrs)	Short (<10 yrs)	No pattern	Yes
Collective (9%)	No	Med-Large (>50)	Med-Wide (>10 yrs)	Medium (10-15 yrs)	No pattern	Yes
Specialty (17%)	No	Small (<50)	Narrow (<10 yrs)	Short (<10 yrs)	Yes	No

Prevention and intervention efforts should be used with traditional and neotraditional gangs, especially if persistent life-skills counseling from positive role models/mentors and employment opportunities are included. Suppression efforts on traditional and neotraditional gangs, especially targeting leaders, may increase gang cohesion and thereby, decrease gang control efforts. Additionally, gang leaders can easily be replaced. If suppression is used with these types of gangs, however, intervention efforts should be implemented immediately after the operation in an attempt to take advantage of the “vacuum” of leadership and perhaps be able to convince some gang members to leave the gang or at least be less committed to the gang.

Collective gangs are quite transformable and therefore may become either more structured as traditional or perhaps become non-existent. Intense interventions on this group of gang members may allow for gang desistance from many of its members, especially if given practical alternatives to gang life.

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

Compressed gangs are the most stable gang type. It may be their similarity in age and being small in size creates strong gang identification and cohesion. Therefore, reducing group cohesion should be the focus of law enforcement operations and community services. Working with individual gang members, separate from each other may prove useful with compressed gangs.

Suppression efforts with specialty gangs, especially those that specialize in drugs, can be quite effective because specialty gangs are more likely to have hierarchical leadership with structured processes for their business. Suppression efforts will likely disrupt the market territory, especially if targeting the gang as a group, such as drug busts, stings, and civil abatement.

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

SECTION 2: Gang Control Efforts

Principles of Effective Program Intervention (The RNR Model)

One of the most empirically supported rehabilitation approaches in reducing criminal and delinquent behavior is the risk management perspective, exemplified in the Risk, Need, Responsivity model (RNR: Andrews & Bonta, 2003). This method is primarily focused on detecting and managing risk of re-offense for the purpose of future crime reduction in the individual offender. RNR proposes that organizations and programming that serve offenders should follow three principles: 1) identify the risk level of the offender and match appropriate treatment dosage; 2) target intervention efforts to the criminogenic factors, the needs of the individual; and 3) properly match the delivery of interventions to the characteristics of the offender. The specifics the RNR model are described in more depth below.

The Risk Principle requires an assessment to identify the risk level of the offender (i.e., high risk vs. low risk) in order to provide the correct dosage of programming. High and low risk offenders should be separated and receive separate services. Mixing high and low risk offenders will likely increase recidivism of low risk offenders, as they may learn antisocial behaviors from high risk offenders. Intense treatment should be provided to high risk offenders (at least 200 hours of cognitive-behavioral interventions) to reduce future recidivism. Intense treatment should not be given to low risk offenders, as this may disrupt their prosocial networks, family support, and employment (all protective factors), and thereby increase the likelihood of recidivism (Bourbon & Armstrong, 2006). For example, one study examined treatment to high and low risk offenders (Bonta et. al., 2000). The recidivism rate for high risk offenders who were not given any treatment was 51.1%, but was significantly lower for those high risk offenders who did receive treatment (31.6%). The recidivism rate for the group of low risk offenders without treatment was at 14.5%, but was significantly **higher** if they received intense treatment (32.2%). This was approximately the same as high risk offenders' recidivism rates! In other words, treatment reduced recidivism rates of high risk offenders by 19.5% but increased recidivism rates for low risk offender by 17.8%.

The Need Principle states that the dynamic risk factors associated with re-offense, criminogenic needs, should be identified and targeted during treatment. There are eight criminogenic needs that have been found to be associated with recidivism and should be the focus of interventions with offenders: 1) history of antisocial behaviors (adult crime and childhood delinquency); 2) antisocial personality symptoms (hostility, impulsivity); 3) antisocial cognition (antisocial attitudes, beliefs, and values); 4) antisocial peers (delinquent friends); 5) family & marital history (childhood maltreatment and adult conflict); 6) work and school (performance and satisfaction);

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

7) recreation (recreation is criminal behavior); and 8) substance abuse. The first four needs (antisocial attitudes, behaviors, peers, and personality) are the best predictors of future re-offense.

The Responsivity Principle is concerned with how the offender will respond to the intervention. Therefore, interventions should take into account various offender characteristics, such as the ethnic/racial background, sex, and socio-economic class. The therapeutic alliance between the offender and the worker is extremely important in this principle. Because of this, professionals should focus on building client rapport, using motivational interviewing techniques and understanding stages of change. RNR recommends that qualified, well-trained staff use cognitive-behavioral approaches (focusing on offenders practicing prosocial behaviors) with manual-based curriculums, and to deliver the treatment with integrity (process evaluations required). Cognitive-behavioral approaches are especially recommended because these can be done in any setting, are easy to train staff, are relatively cheap to deliver, have several curricula available, and multiple studies have revealed the effectiveness of this approach (e.g., 25%–50% reduction in recidivism).

RNR has been criticized for focusing too much on risk of individuals and not enough on protective factors. Addressing the criminogenic needs of the individual is necessary but not sufficient to create true effective change that leads to prosocial attitudes and behavior. RNR does not take into account the “human goods.” Focusing simply on not re-offending lowers the bar too much for offenders. Rather, offenders want to live good, fulfilling lives, not just a life free of crime. Another criticism is that RNR does not take seriously building the therapeutic alliance, as it focuses only on the risk of the individual rather than helping the client view themselves as a person with capabilities to achieve their own goals. Lastly, RNR is too focused on the individual and ignores the social and cultural systems that influence offender behavior (Ward, Collie, & Bourke, 2009). A new model has been recently created to compliment RNR by addressing the critiques, the Good Lives Model (GLM: Ward & Gannon, 2006). GLM views offenders as human beings that are similar to non-offenders in their wants and needs. The two core therapeutic goals of GLM are to promote the human goods and reduce risk. Presently, research is being conducted to test the GLM model.

Note on Ineffective Programs

Although popular, many programs have been found to be ineffective in reducing juvenile delinquency and adult crime, or actually increase antisocial behavior. Examples of these are: shock probation (scared straight), boot camps, gun buybacks, peer counseling, summer jobs for at-risk youth, neighborhood watches, didactic education (DARE), home detention with electronic monitoring, and programs that are not faithful to the original model program guidelines/curriculum (Center for the Study & Prevention of Violence, 2011).

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

Prevention: Gang Specific

G.R.E.A.T. Program

The Gang Resistant Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) program was developed to prevent gang membership. G.R.E.A.T. was based on Drug Awareness, Resistance, and Education (D.A.R.E.), which is a primary prevention program for drug use. Both G.R.E.A.T. and D.A.R.E. are delivered by uniformed law enforcement officers to students in schools. There was immediate concern that G.R.E.A.T. was based on a program (D.A.R.E.) that has been shown to not be effective. Past evaluations of D.A.R.E. have shown little to no effects, or actually less effect than comparable programs (Clayton, Cattarello, & Johnstone, 1996; Rosenbaum & Hanson, 1998). For example, a meta-analysis from the Research Triangle Institute (RTI) found that D.A.R.E. participants either showed no short term effects on drug use or that comparable prevention programs often had better outcomes (Ennett, Tobler, Ringwalt, & Flewelling, 1994).

The objectives of the G.R.E.A.T. program are to reduce gang activity and to educate youth about the consequences of gang involvement. An evaluation of G.R.E.A.T. was conducted (Esbensen, Osgood, Taylor, Peterson, & Freng, 2001), and found that the program curriculum lacked gang specific information in the content, even though it was based on social control and social learning theories. As described earlier in this report, gang membership and crime are different from general delinquency, and therefore should be addressed differently. The G.R.E.A.T. program, however, views gang members as just more serious delinquent offenders. The fidelity of the G.R.E.A.T. implementation revealed that the officers/teachers were well trained and implemented the program faithfully. The longitudinal design study included a four year follow up of 22 schools (3,500 students) in New Mexico, Nebraska, Arizona, Oregon, and Pennsylvania. The evaluators presented the findings in a positive light, reporting that “G.R.E.A.T. program participants expressed more pro-social attitudes after program completion than did those students who had not been exposed to the G.R.E.A.T. curriculum” (Esbensen et al., 2001: 108). Yet, further review of the tables ((Esbensen et al., 2001: 103, Table 3) reveals that G.R.E.A.T. students were more likely to have long-term prosocial change in only 4 of 24 **attitudes**, which should be considered as a minimal and practically weak effect. Additionally, other measures of gang membership, drug abuse, and delinquent behaviors were not statistically significant revealing that there were no differences in gang and general delinquency **behaviors** between G.R.E.A.T. & non- G.R.E.A.T. students. The failure of the multimillion dollar G.R.E.A.T. national program to prevent behavioral change in gang membership and delinquency has been attributed to several factors, including: using the D.A.R.E. program as its basis; using didactic lessons; using general life skills to address gang membership; lack of gang-specific content; not using empirical knowledge about gangs; and not targeting youth who are higher risk of gang membership (Klein & Maxson, 2006).

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

Additionally, the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence produces a Blueprint for Violence Prevention Matrix that has evaluations by 12 organizations, such as the Department of Education, Safe Schools; Communities that Care; National Institutes of Drug Abuse (NIDA); Surgeon General's Report; Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). Only one of the the Blueprint Matrix organizations (OJJDP) scored G.R.E.A.T. as effective.

The critique of Esbensen et al.'s (2001) G.R.E.A.T. evaluation has been positively received and the program has undergone significant changes to the curriculum and format. Another multi-site, four year evaluation of the updated G.R.E.A.T. program is in progress.

Prevention: General Crime

Mentoring

Mentoring programs have been used as an approach to prevent delinquent behaviors. Mentoring can be defined as an interaction between two individuals for an extended time where the mentor has higher knowledge, experience, and power than the mentee (recipient), and the mentee has the opportunity to imitate the mentor. The mentorship process should elicit a relationship between the mentor and mentee in which the mentee perceives the mentor as a positive role model and will therefore internalize prosocial attitudes and behaviors. The mentor-mentee relationship can be a professional-youth, parent-child, teacher-student, etc. Mentorship uses social learning and social control theories, but is also based on relationship building where the mentee does not want to disappoint the mentor and thus controls impulsive antisocial behaviors and displays prosocial behaviors that will elicit positive reinforcement (e.g., rewards) by the mentor (rather than punishment).

A meta-analysis was recently conducted on mentorship programs (Tolan, et al., 2008), and the results showed decreased delinquency, improved academics, reduced drug use, and reduced aggression. Differences between types of mentorship programs were found. Professional development of the mentor, the motivation of mentor, and emotional support for the mentee were found to be the most important components of mentoring programs. An example of an effective mentorship program is Big Brothers Big Sisters (BBBS). According to the Blueprint Matrix (2009) produced by the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence, six of the 12 evaluating organizations scored BBBS as effective or exemplary.

Close Circuit TV Surveillance (CCTV)

The purpose of Close Circuit TV Surveillance (CCTV) is to prevent personal and property crime while enhancing or taking the place of personal security. There are generally two types of CCTV monitoring: active and passive. Active monitoring is when the operator monitors in real time (by law enforcement or security) and passive monitoring is when officers review tape recordings at later time.

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

A meta-analysis was conducted that included 41 studies in the US and Europe (Welsh & Farrington, 2008). CCTVs were placed in city and town centers, public housing, public transportation, and car parks. The average follow-up on outcomes was 12 months. Results of CCTV's relationship with all crime in city and town centers showed 50% of locations with crime reduction, but also 25% with an increase in crime and 25% with no change in crime. Therefore, CCTV did not have a significant effect on crime reduction. Results of CCTV on all crime in public housing showed 30% of locations with crime reduction, 20% with increased crime, and 40% with no effect. Again, CCTV had no significant effect on crime reduction. For public transportation, there was again no significant effect of CCTV on all crime (50% of locations showing crime reduction, 25% an increase in crime, and 25% no effect). In all three of these settings, CCTV was related to higher reporting of crime to police. CCTV was found to be significantly related to reduction of all crime in parking lots, with 80% of locations showing crime reduction and 20% an increase in crime.

In review, CCTV is most effective in reducing vehicle crimes in parking lots, but it should be implemented with active monitoring and used with other interventions, such as patrolling security and improved lighting (see below).

Improved Street Lighting

Improved Street Lighting (ISL) is meant for the prevention of crime but also for pedestrian and traffic safety. ISL prevents crime by increasing surveillance of potential offenders. Offenders are more visible at night with ISL and lighted areas at night are more likely to bring in more citizens to public areas, thereby increasing surveillance. ISL can also be viewed as a community investment (day & night), increasing community cohesion and leading to informal social control.

A meta-analysis investigating the effect of ISL on crime was recently conducted that reviewed 32 studies (13 experimental studies and 19 non-experimental studies) in the US and UK (Welsh & Farrington, 2008). Results showed that ISL had significant effect on crime reduction, both in the US (22% reduction ISL vs. no ISL) and the UK (38% reduction ISL vs. no ISL). Surprisingly, reduction was found only in daylight crime and not nighttime crime. This finding supports the idea that ISL increases community investment/cohesion and informal social control. ISL is an effective and fairly inexpensive method to reduce crime, especially when used with other interventions, such as patrolling security and CCTV.

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

Intervention: Gang-Specific

GITTO

Gang Intervention Through Targeted Outreach (GITTO) is the Boy's & Girl Club of America's approach to gangs. GITTO has four components: community mobilization, recruitment, promoting positive development, and case management. An evaluation of GITTO was conducted in 1997. Three Clubs were included (104 "gang" youth) in the evaluation, but only 66 GITTO youth were surveyed 12 months later (along with 45 youth in a comparison group). Results showed that, among GITTO youth, 21% participated weekly and 35% found "activities interesting." GITTO youth were found to be less likely to skip school. There were no differences, however, between GITTO youth and the comparison group in gang membership (join, stay, or leave).

Intervention: General Crime

Blueprint Model Programs

There are a variety of programs that have been found to be effective at reducing delinquent behavior. One great resource for effective non-gang specific program is the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence (CSPV) at the University of Colorado at Boulder. CSPV has developed a Blueprints for Violence Prevention Matrix that identifies effective drug and violence prevention programs. The Matrix presently has over 900 programs. CSPV also has a list of 11 model programs that have met the most rigorous standards. The CSPV website will have a brief summary of the program, its background and research, program costs, a video describing the program, and contact information.

The model programs are: Midwestern Prevention Project; Big Brothers Big Sisters of America; Functional Family Therapy; Life Skills Training; Multisystemic Therapy; Nurse-Family Partnerships; Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care; Olweus Bullying Prevention Program; Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies; The Incredible Years: Parent, Teacher, and Child Training Series. The Matrix also include promising programs, who have not achieved the status of model programs but have been found to be moving in "the right direction."

A major barrier in implementing these model and promising programs is cost. Although some of the programs have moderate costs (The Incredible Years: \$1,300-\$4,500 for entire program), other programs can be extremely expensive (Multisystemic Therapy: \$4,500 per youth). Although the programs may be cost-beneficial in the long-run, the short term costs of training and implementation keeps many of these programs out of the reach of many communities in need.

Suppression: Gang Specific

The L.A. Plan

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

The L.A. Plan was an uncoordinated collection of suppression efforts to confront the rising gang-related homicide rate in the 1980's (351 gang-related homicides in 1980). Many gang control efforts were put in place, but six activities were at its core: Community Youth Gang Services (CYGS); Operation Safe Streets (OSS)/Community Resources against Street Hoodlums (CRASH); Operation Hammer; Operation Hardcore; Correctional Gang Caseloads; and an Interagency Task Force.

CYGS was a youth outreach program, but only in theory. Youth workers were not allowed to build relationships with specific gangs but rather were used as community surveillance.

OSS is a law enforcement gang unit from L.A. Sheriff's Department (LASD) that emphasized becoming knowledgeable about gang members and their neighborhoods. Similarly, CRASH is a L.A. Police Department (LAPD) gang unit but focuses strictly on suppression, with officers patrolling the neighborhoods in uniform and marked cars.

Operation Hammer was a LAPD suppression effort that used area sweeps to harass gang members. In a much publicized sweep of south-central L.A. by 1,000 LAPD officers, the police arrested 1,435 people. However, 1,350 were released without charges (only 2% were charged with a felony) and approximately half were not even gang members.

Operation Hardcore is a special prosecution unit in the district attorney's office that used vertical prosecution to focus on convicting gang leaders and serious gang offenders (almost entirely on gang-related homicides). One evaluation found a high conviction rate of its target population (Dahmann, 1982), but no evaluation has been conducted to test its deterrence effect on other gang members (e.g., gang desistance, gang crime reduction, etc.).

Correctional Gang Caseloads is a method of intense surveillance efforts of gang members by special gang units in the L.A. Probation Department and the California Youth Authority. Officers did not work to reintegrate offenders to the community (e.g., employment opportunities, drug treatment, etc.), but rather focused on "catching" violators and sending back to courts or incarceration.

The Interagency Task Force was brought together to increase collaborative efforts by justice system institutions. Rather than bringing together resources for long-term outcomes, meetings were mostly used to share information on wanted suspects. Observations of this task force, however, led to the creation of the comprehensive gang approach, the Spergel Model.

Unfortunately, as is common in many gang control efforts, the L.A. Plan and its components described above were not evaluated. There are, however, some statistics that provide some insight into its ineffectiveness. After 15 years of the L.A. Plan suppression effort, 8,000 gang-related homicides were recorded. In 1995, there

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

were over 800 gang-related homicides, significantly higher than the 1983 rate of 351 gang-related deaths in L.A. County. The L.A. Plan is an example of how suppression efforts alone cannot address the issues of gang membership and crime.

Civil Gang Injunctions

One gang control effort aimed at the group and community level is the use of a civil gang injunction, which is a court order from a civil judge prohibiting identified members of a particular gang from engaging in specified activities, such as associating with one another, making gang hand signs, signaling drug sales, and being in public after an established curfew. The gang is sued as a public nuisance and any violation of the injunctions can elicit large fines and short-term incarceration. There are some concerns regarding the use of gang injunctions, specifically on issues of due process and basic rights violations.

Gang injunctions are based on deterrence, social psychological, and social disorganization theories. Crime is deterred through sure, swift, and severe sanctions, and if gang members are being closely watched, they will be more likely to get caught/sanctioned (deterrence theory). Additionally, by targeting individual gang members and leaders, gang injunction can break up gang identity, norms, and cohesion (social psychological theory). Lastly, by reducing the immediate threat of gangs, community fear is reduced, eliciting community engagement and the development of social networks that can act as informal social controls, build social capital and have long-term effects on crime reduction (social disorganization theory).

Most of the evidence supporting the effectiveness of gang injunctions has been anecdotal. Initial studies investigating gang injunctions' effect on crime have had mixed results. One study found no effect of gang injunctions (Maxson & Allen, 1997), while another found an increase in violent crime (ACLU, 1997). On the other hand, two more recent studies found some positive effects of gang injunctions. A study that included 14 gang injunctions between 1993–1998 found a 5–10% reduction in assaults with no increased crime in adjoining areas (Grogger, 2002). There were no reductions in property crime. Another study investigating the effects of gang injunctions on crime in five neighborhoods found that six months after the injunction was put in place, there was less gang presence and intimidation and less community fear confronting gang members and crime. Even so, there were no changes in victimization, community cohesion, informal social control, calls to the police, or trust in the police. These latter findings may be attributed to the fact that there was no direct community involvement during the gang injunction (Maxson, Hennigan, & Sloane, 2005), which is commonly seen in this type of suppression effort.

Gang injunctions appear to show some short-term success in the reduction of violent crime. The methods by which gang injunctions have been implemented, however, leave out a vital portion of its objectives, which is to promote social cohesion that will lead to informal controls and long-term crime reduction. A better method of implementing gang injunctions would be to make them more comprehensive and

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

include intense community interventions (e.g., local business initiatives, parent/family groups, community schools, etc.). Gang injunctions may provide enough time and feelings of safety to allow for community involvement. Collective efficacy (mutually trusting relationships between community and law enforcement) can lead to social capital and informal social controls in the community to complement formal controls by law enforcement, thus promoting a greater likelihood of achieving long-term crime reduction.

Suppression: General Crime

“Hot Spot” Problem-Oriented Policing

Over half of all crimes are committed at a few criminogenic areas within a community (Pierce, et al., 1988; Sherman et al., 1989; Weisburd et al., 1992). This clustering of crime in small geographic areas is called “hot spots.” “Hot Spots” policing (HSP) is a crime control policy that replaces traditional interventions that focused on individual factors. HSP uses “place-oriented” strategies that are based on environmental criminology, where offenders, targets (property/victims), opportunities, time, and space come together to increase the likelihood of criminal activity. Therefore, the role of place in crime is important, such as facilities (e.g., bars, apartments, abandoned buildings), site features (e.g., no guardians, valuables in sight, easy access), and target selection (e.g., acceptable risk of criminal behavior for future gain). For example, an abandoned home (facility) next to freeway (site features) is an ideal place for drug buyers and sellers (target selection low risk and high gain).

HSP focuses law enforcement efforts to monitor “hot spots” through directed patrols, proactive arrests, and problem-oriented policing (POP: use of community members, business owners, etc.). The concept behind HSP is that by reducing crime in the “hot spots,” overall crime should also decrease. A critique of HSP is that the strategy results in displacement of crime (criminals move to places not protected by police) rather than crime reduction.

A systematic review (Braga 2007) of HSP was conducted that included nine studies (five experimental and four quasi-experimental). The locations were five large cities in the US and one in Australia (Minneapolis, Jersey City, St. Louis, Kansas City, Houston, and Beeneleigh). Intervention periods were 29 weeks to 24 months using problem-orientated policing (POP), directed patrol programs, police crackdowns, and raids.

The systemic review found crime reductions in seven of nine studies. An example of successful HSP was in the Jersey City POP that focused on “violent places.” As compared to the control places, 10 out of the 11 targeted places had reduced crime (e.g., fights, property, drugs). Another successful example was the Kansas City Gun Project, where the targeted places had a 65% increase in guns seized and a 49% decrease in gun crime, while the control places had a 15% increase in guns seized and a 4% increase in gun crime. An example of unsuccessful “hot spot” policing was Minneapolis RECAP, where no significant differences were found in crime reduction

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

between targeted and control places. Lack of success was attributed to the assignment of the highest crime areas to targeted places (vs. lower crime areas to the control place) and that RECAP officers were assigned too many cases.

The systematic review also investigated issues of displacement and diffusion effects. Five studies examined whether HSP displaced crime to adjacent places and/or diffused benefits unintentionally to adjacent places. The results were mixed. For example, the Houston Targeted Beat (POP) found no displacement of crime in adjacent places, though there was a diffusion of benefits in three adjacent places (lower crime). On the other hand, Jersey City DMAP (a drug control intervention) had six new drug hot spots within two blocks adjacent to the target place (two adjacent places had no displacement of crime). Additionally, there was no diffusion of benefits in three adjacent areas.

“Hot Spots” policing is a promising method at decreasing criminal behavior in targeted areas, with some displacement of crime and diffusion of benefits. The use of problem-orientated policing (POP), such as the Houston Targeted Beat POP and the Jersey City POP, and proper assignment of cases to officers appears to increase the likelihood of successful crime reduction.

Re-entry: General Crime

Reentry services are meant to reintegrate residential or incarcerated offenders back into the community. Services should begin before the offender is back into the community and continue while they are in the community. Incarcerated offenders may be the most at-risk of all offenders, as their social network and support has been cut off, their skills may be significantly lacking for employment opportunities, antisocial attitudes and behaviors may have further developed while incarcerated with antisocial offenders, and the negative perceptions of being incarcerated by society may be extremely hard barrier to overcome.

Various reentry programs have been used to address the needs of offenders returning into the community (e.g., Philadelphia Intensive Probation Aftercare, Juvenile Aftercare in Maryland Drug Treatment; Skillman Intensive Aftercare in Detroit & Pittsburgh; Michigan Nokomis Challenge Program). Evaluation findings from these programs showed no significant improvement, along with significant implementation and collaborative problems.

Intensive Aftercare Program & Targeted Reentry

Recently, two experimental evaluations were conducted with programs that had many of the components believed to address the needs of offenders integrating back into the community. The first was an experimental design evaluation of a 5-year, multi-site program (Colorado, Nevada, New Jersey, Virginia). The Intensive Aftercare Program (IAP) was based on strain, social control, and social learning theories and consisted of risk assessment, individualized case planning, intense surveillance,

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

enhanced services, incentives/graduated sanctions, and collaboration between the justice system and community organizations. The results of the evaluation showed no significant differences in recidivism between IAP and non-IAP participants (Wlebush, et al., 2005). The second experimental evaluation combined the IAP program with the Targeted Reentry (TR) program developed by the Boys & Girls Club of America (BGCA). TR provided positive youth development programming to offenders during and after incarceration. The results of this program also reveal no significant differences in recidivism between TR and control participants (Barton, Jarjoura, & Rosay, 2008).

Comprehensive Multi-Level Approaches: Gang Specific

OJJDP Gang Reduction Program (GRP)

The Office on Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) Gang Reduction Program (GRP) is a comprehensive, multi-pronged approach (Spergel, 2007). GRP includes prevention, intervention, suppression, and reentry in its goals but is primarily an intervention model. It brings together community stakeholders, working collaboratively through a steering committee to achieve mutually agreed goals that are based on a comprehensive community gang assessment. The assessment should identify family, peer, school, and community needs, as well as identify resources/ services to meet those needs. The steering committee, which is made up of representatives of stakeholders, identifies a target population/geographic area. A local GRP coordinator develops and maintains collaborative relationships and helps the program stay faithful to the model. Outreach workers may also be included and they are the “eyes and ears” in the community, especially focusing on the target population/area. There may also be an intervention team and a lead agency that can perform crisis interventions. Past evaluations of GRP found several problems with simply implementing the program, as coordinating several organizations proved to be an overwhelming task.

A multi-site, longitudinal evaluation of the GRP was conducted in the following locations: Los Angeles, CA (Boyle Heights); Milwaukee, WI (Metcalf Park); Miami, FL (North Miami); and Richmond, VA (Southside). Intervention targeted small areas (2–5 square miles) and all had comparison groups that did not receive the GRP intervention.

The general findings of the latest evaluation showed that all four sites successfully implemented GRP, which was a major accomplishment. Only three sites, however, implemented sustainable GRP, with one location terminating GRP once the grant funding was over. Successful implementation was related to strong leadership, strategic planning, and technical assistance by OJJDP.

The results for crime reduction attributed to GRP varied significantly. In Los Angeles, there were reductions in serious, violent gang crime and calls for reported shots fired. Additional outcomes were that “hot spots” were reduced or moved to adjacent areas.

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

On the other hand, there were no reductions in vandalism or overall gang crime. In Miami, there was no comparison city for data on gang crime, and therefore this is a significant limitation. The only positive result was that there was a reduction in intensity of several “hot spots.” No reductions in serious crime were found. Richmond results showed a reduction in serious violent crime and “hot spots” intensity. On the other hand, there was also a significant increase in drug crime. The Milwaukee results were the most disappointing – no reduction in gang crimes were found, and the GRP ended when funding stopped. Milwaukee did report major problems keeping a program director, which reveals the importance of this position in carrying out program objectives.

Chicago’s Ceasefire Program

Chicago’s Ceasefire Program (CCP) is a comprehensive, multi-level approach that aims to change community norms about violence, provides alternatives to conflict, and raises awareness of the risk of violence among high risk youth (Skogan, Hernett, Bump, & Dubois, 2008). CCP used public education campaigns, community outreach and mobilization, and “violence interrupters” (who intervene in gang-related conflicts). An evaluation of eight sites that implemented CCP revealed declines in gang member homicides in two Ceasefire sites, reduction in retaliatory gang homicides in four sites, less gang involvement in homicides in three sites, and decrease in size and intensity of “shooting hot spots,” as compared to comparison areas. It is unknown why there were differences in findings between CCP sites, with some having positive effects and other sites no effect. This may have to do with the fidelity of implementation across sites.

Comprehensive Multi-Level Approaches: General Crime

Kids First

A prevention/early intervention model, Kids First, has been proposed by Kirp (2011) to address many of the social problems that exist in our communities. Most of the ideas include examples of programs that already exist and have been shown to be effective in addressing many of the social ills present in the community. Kids First proposes five ideas: 1) Parenting Education, 2) Early Education for Children, 3) Community Schools, 4) Mentoring for Youth, and 5) the Nest Egg.

The aim for the first idea, Parenting Education, is to provide new parents strong support, starting when the girl/woman first becomes aware that she is pregnant. Parent education during pregnancy and during the first few years of the child’s life can have a preventative effect in several areas, such as mental/physical health, education, and prosocial behavior. Examples of this idea are Nurse-Family Partnership, Incredible Years, and Triple P.

The second idea, Early Education for Children, provides high-quality early education for children. The staff should be educated, preferably in child development, and the

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

curriculum should be targeted at learning, not just “glamorized babysitting.” Examples of this idea are Educare and Los Angeles Universal Preschool (LAUP).

The third idea, Community Schools, links schools and communities to improve what both have to offer to children. Schools are already located within neighborhoods and therefore can become hubs for several community activities and services, such as tutoring, music lessons, and athletics. In this model, schools no longer close at 3pm, but rather stay open late, allowing for the community to come together, building mutual trust between neighborhood members, and creating community cohesion and social efficacy. Examples of this idea are Harlem Children’s Zone and Children’s Aid Society.

The fourth idea, Mentoring for Youth, provides mentors to youth who need a stable, caring adult in their lives. Proper training for mentors aimed at high-quality, one-on-one relationship building with youth, mutual commitment, prosocial role models, and providing a sense of belonging. Examples of this idea are Big Brothers Big Sisters (lower risk children/youth) and Friends of the Children (higher risk children/youth).

The fifth idea, the Nest Egg, is a method of providing children a financial “nest egg” that will help pay for college or to begin a career. This idea is a multi-level approach that teaches parents how to save funds for their children, creates programs that help contribute to families that are saving for their children, and promotes policies that can help families accomplish the nest egg. Examples of this idea are Universal Child Development Account and Asset-Based Approach.

Megacommunities

Megacommunities (Gerencser, Napolitano, & Van Lee, 2006) are the joining together of the non-profit sector, corporations, and government institutions (three sector intersection), as well as other interested parties around an issue of mutual importance. The participants are interdependent of each other, following a set of agreed upon principles to achieve their common goal(s). Megacommunities are a gathering place for organizations (not individuals) that understand that solutions for large problems require multi-organizational systems. Megacommunities have been used in small neighborhoods as well as globally.

For example, a large chain of retailers were planning to open stores in Harlem in 2001. Small businesses agreed that they had to become more competitive as a group and became the Harlem Small Business Initiative. The Harlem Small Business Initiative then brought together several groups, politicians, Chambers of Commerce, university departments, consultants, etc. This megacommunity developed mutual goals and worked interdependently on tasks assigned for each organization, all done without a figurehead leader. A 22 month program was implemented focusing on 10 local businesses. MBA students worked as volunteer accountants and managers teaching business methods while the students became involved in hands-on training on running a business. Although some large retailers did get into the neighborhood,

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

such as Starbucks, many local businesses doubled their revenues in less than two years. The neighborhood also benefited from the megacommunity as services improved, job opportunities increased, and the tax base of the community was enhanced. Other examples include prevention of the spread of HIV/AIDS in India, rain forest conservation, and energy availability and environmental quality in Italy.

Megacommunities have not been used in addressing crime and delinquency. However, the model can be easily adapted to solving gang issues. Many of the gang control collaborations run similarly to megacommunities but have not included the business sector. Working without a figurehead leader may be a challenge at first for the institutions who are used to having strict hierarchical leadership. In spite of this, being guided by mutually agreed upon principles and driven by an overwhelming social issue (i.e., gang crime), all parties should come to understand that the interdependence is a benefit for all of the megacommunity (Gerencser, Napolitano, & Van Lee, 2006).

Gang Control Goals & Strategies

The following gang control strategies are based on three considerations that will provide 32 categorizations to help guide the interventions. The first consideration is the gang control strategy: prevention, intervention, suppression, or reentry. The second consideration is the focus of the gang control effort: target (Target what group? e.g., young boys), group process (What group process? e.g., cliques), gang structure (What gang typology? e.g., traditional), and community context (What community structure/process? e.g., urban with ethnic tensions). Finally, the third consideration is whether the gang control effort will target individual gang members, the gang as a group, or the . The more categories the gang control efforts cover, the more comprehensive the strategies will be and the more likely the community will achieve the goals of long-term, gang crime reduction. The decision on what strategy to use should be based on data, not on anecdotal evidence. Understanding the type of gang, the level of gang cohesion, and the community dynamics is vital to developing an appropriate strategy to confront the gang issue in the targeted area/population. Additionally, the complexity of these strategies will require intense collaboration between government agencies and community organizations in order to achieve the goals. This type of long-term collaboration is rarely seen and requires strong leadership by a highly qualified coordinator and coordinating agency. Below is an example of selecting the goals and strategies for a gang control effort.

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

Table 3. Gang Control Goals & Strategies (Individual Level &/or Group Level)

Strategy	Targeting	Group Process	Gang Structures	Community Context
Prevention	Age, Sex, Ethnicity	Leadership Cliques Cohesiveness	Traditional Compressed Specialty	Structural/ Process Rural/ Urban Cmty dynamics
Intervention	Age, Sex, Ethnicity	Leadership Cliques Cohesiveness	Traditional Compressed Specialty	Structural/ Process Rural/ Urban Cmty dynamics
Suppression	Age, Sex, Ethnicity	Leadership Cliques Cohesiveness	Traditional Compressed Specialty	Structural/ Process Rural/ Urban Cmty dynamics
Re-entry	Age, Sex, Ethnicity	Leadership Cliques Cohesiveness	Traditional Compressed Specialty	Structural/ Process Rural/ Urban Cmty dynamics

Example of Selecting Gang Control Goals and Strategies:

Based on data from a community assessment (e.g., data from law enforcement, public schools, community organizations, etc.), the gang control collaborative team decides to use an intense intervention strategy to compliment a suppression operation targeted at Latino males (focus of suppression on adult core gang leadership and intervention on younger fringe members). The effort will attempt to reduce the cohesiveness of small cliques of a traditional Latino gang and another neotraditional Latino gang. The two gangs are in an urban community where ethnic tensions exist between the Latino community and law enforcement, who are mostly White police officers. Additionally, conflict has arisen between the two gangs and fear of gang retaliation by the traditional gang on the neotraditional gang will increase gang identity and cohesion in both gangs that could lead to extreme violence.

Goals for the gang control effort are: 1) Individual-Level Goals are to encourage gang desistance or crime reduction (violence, theft, violence, etc.); 2) Group-Level Goals are gang dissolution or reduction (neotraditional gangs), reduce inter-gang violence (between two gangs), reduce clique cohesion (traditional gangs) and improve community efficacy and develop informal local controls.

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

Strategies to achieve goals are: 1) Individual-Level Strategies are to provide intensive interventions with fringe male youth to desist gang involvement and crime reduction by focusing on their antisocial attitudes/behaviors and trauma (suppression will be used on core adult leadership to allow time for intervention and community cohesion to develop); 2) Group-Level Strategies are to facilitate a truce between the two gangs and provide alternatives to gang lifestyle (preferably activities that separates gang members from each other); and 3) Community-Level Strategies are to begin community mobilization (e.g., parents, school officials, law enforcement, community agencies, faith-based organizations) focused on a common goals of improving ethnic tensions and reduction of gang membership and crime (community sub-goals involve improving educational achievement, increasing employment opportunities, and developing prosocial recreation, all of which are meant to provide youth alternatives to gangs, as well as to address ethnic discrimination).

This example highlights the complexity of comprehensive, multi-level gang control efforts. The given goals and strategies will require extensive collaboration between several community institutions, and yet many gaps still exist, such as strategies for preventing youth from joining gangs or strategies for increasing employment/ childcare services for parents of gang youth or at-risk youth. The degree of gang problems, community resources, and social efficacy will determine the comprehensiveness of the gang control effort. Many of the resources, however, are already in place in communities but are not coordinated towards a common goal. Political will and strong leadership will be required to bring together the various groups needed to assess the community strengths/needs, develop goals and strategies, implement the plan, evaluate the gang control effort, and be willing to make changes according to the evaluation’s findings.

Table 4. Example of Gang Control Goals & Strategies (Individual Level & Group Level)

Strategy	Targeting	Group Process	Gang Structures	Community Context
Prevention				
Intervention	Youth Latino Males Desistance	Fringe Members Small Cliques	Traditional	Ethnic tensions LE & community Unemployment No youth activities
Suppression	Adult Latino Males Crime reduction	Core Members Leadership Gang Cohesion	Traditional Neotraditional	Ethnic tensions LE & community Gang rivalry

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

Strategy	Targeting	Group Process	Gang Structures	Community Context
Re-entry				

SECTION 3: Recommendations

General Recommendations

The cost of crime is extremely high, from death of family and community members, to the psychological individual effects of PTSD or community fear. The largest economic cost to society is from career criminals, ranging between \$2.1 million to \$3.7 million (Cohen, Piquero, & Jennings, 2010).

Unfortunately, past gang control efforts have not been effective at addressing the issues of gang proliferation and gang crime. Although law enforcement and community programs have attempted to achieve prevention, intervention, suppression, and reentry goals, most attempts are usually narrowly focused (e.g., suppression only) on individual change (e.g., individual's attitudes towards gangs) rather than comprehensive (prevention, intervention, suppression, and reentry) and multi-level (individual, group, and community change). One area that has largely been ignored by gang control efforts but unique to gangs and increased gang violence is the cohesiveness of cliques within the larger gang.

At the individual level, evidence-based gang programs and policies should focus on gang membership (prevent youth from joining gangs), gang desistance (encourage gang-involved youth to leave gangs), crime desistance (stop all criminal behavior), and crime reduction (reduce criminal behavior during gang membership). The last goal, crime reduction, may be controversial as it does not require gang members to leave the gang but rather to reduce the level of harm caused to the community (harm reduction model), such as "over-looking" graffiti to focus on the elimination of violence. This may be a goal for youth involved with intergenerational gangs, where leaving a gang is highly unlikely.

At the group level, efforts should be targeted at reducing gang-on-gang violence, preventing gang retaliation, decreasing gang size, or disbanding the gang. Strategies at this level are aimed at reducing the group cohesiveness of the gang clique.

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

At the community level, the effort should focus on developing collective efficacy in the community so that socially cohesive neighborhoods can allow formal (e.g., law enforcement, public schools) and informal (e.g., parents, spiritual leaders) controls to work collaboratively and prevent the creation of gangs (gang formation) or reduce gang size and gang crime where gangs already exist.

There are a few gang control efforts that have attempted to be multi-level and comprehensive (e.g., OJJDP GRP and Chicago's Ceasefire Program), but these approaches largely ignore the prevention and reentry levels in favor of intervention and suppression efforts, as evident in their outcomes on violent crime but not on other delinquent crimes, gang membership, or gang formation. A few comprehensive models from the fields of education and business hold promise in filling this primary prevention and early intervention gap (e.g., Kids First and Megacommunities). Effective reentry programs, unfortunately, are practically non-existent, which is extremely concerning as offenders who have been incarcerated for long periods of time are at greatest risk (several criminogenic needs) to re-victimize the community and possibly become the next antisocial role models for our youth.

The following specific recommendations will require economic investment from the government, businesses and the community. Although implementing multi-level comprehensive models require more funds, costs can be reduced by coordinating the services and organizations already present in the target area. Effective interventions can be cost-beneficial and therefore evaluations are vital to ensure fidelity of programming and appropriate use of financial resources.

Specific Recommendations

1. Implement multi-level comprehensive gang control efforts with goals and strategies.

Trisector coalitions (government, non-profit and business sectors) should be brought together to implement multi-level, comprehensive gang control approaches and address mutually agreed upon over-arching goals. Goals should include at least two levels (individual, group, community) and more than one strategy (prevention, intervention, suppression, reentry).

Municipalities and communities should consider implementing OJJDP Gang Reduction Program or Chicago's Ceasefire as intervention and suppression strategies. Interventions should ensure that clique cohesion within the gang is reduced.

OJJDP GRP and Chicago's Ceasefire attempt to address that issue by using a multi-level, comprehensive approach. These approaches bring together as many community stakeholders to the table as possible to identify problems and resources

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

in the community. Specialty/problem-solving courts (e.g., juvenile drug courts) may work well in conjunction with these larger programs, especially with higher risk offenders.

A limitation of OJJDP GRP and Chicago's Ceasefire is the focus more on intervention and suppression without prevention and early intervention. Kids First offers a great evidence-based model to address this gap, providing services that begin during pregnancy and ending with independent living. This model uses many of the programs that may already exist in the community but provides a method for bringing the resources together.

The three GRPs implemented in Ogden (CROSS), Salt Lake City (Salt Lake City Gang Reduction Program), and Provo (Provo Gang Project) should continue their programs. These programs have been implemented with fidelity, which is a great accomplishment. CROSS and Provo Gang Project have gone through process evaluations, which should improve program fidelity, quality of services, and eventual outcomes. It is recommended that the Salt Lake City Gang Reduction Program implement periodic process evaluations to ensure fidelity to the chosen intervention curriculum. Other regions in the state should also consider implementing a similar model in their communities, especially those identified by the companion Gang Assessment report (e.g., SHARP survey of youth, perception surveys of the public and professionals) as potentially having, or at risk of having, a gang issue, such as Washington, and Cache counties.

Gang control efforts should also focus on group and community level interventions, not only individuals. Most gang control efforts have focused on individual gang members and ignored group and community level interventions. Although it is important to work with individual gang members (or at-risk individuals), it is a slow process that can quickly use up large amount of resources with small benefits. Focusing on the gang as a group (e.g., to make changes to reduce community violence or to take part in a prosocial community need) or the community (e.g., to reduce ethnic tensions and increase mutual trust between law enforcement and community members) will lead to greater, long-lasting benefits.

Another systems-level intervention is Megacommunities, which would include the business sector and thereby bring in economic and political power of corporations. Additionally, building a stronger non-profit coalition to develop a stronger, more unified voice would be extremely beneficial. Non-profit organizations and government institutions (e.g., courts, law enforcement) are often found to be in conflict, and eventually non-profits are dropped from the program, either voluntarily or by force. Megacommunities provides a unified voice for the trisector intersection (government, non-profit, business) during collaborative approaches to community issues. The Megacommunity model should be used to ensure that community level factors of gang formation (e.g., unemployment, ethnic tensions) are also addressed,

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

in addition to individual gang membership (e.g., lack of belonging, antisocial attitudes).

A systems-level prevention/early intervention effort (e.g., Kids First or Megacommunities) should be implemented in communities that are at risk for the emergence of gangs, or to complement the other system-level interventions that are more focused on intervention (e.g., OJJDP GRP). For example, a rural community may want to bring together small businesses, schools, and faith-based organizations as a community collaborative (similar to the Megacommunities model) to address a concern about an increase (perceived or real) in juvenile delinquency, and possibly an emergence of gangs. On the other hand, an urban community may have an intervention program in place but is also worried about their youth becoming involved in gangs and future delinquency. The community may implement Kids First, beginning with community schools in the area of most concern. Either of these two examples can serve as pilot project that can be generalized to other similar communities, if found effective.

2. Use data-driven assessment to identify target populations.

A community-wide assessment should be conducted to identify the prevalence or risk of gang membership and crime, and the resources available to address gang issues. The data collected from the assessment (e.g., gang structure, “hot spots,” types of gangs and crime, presence of ethnic tensions, governmental/social services) should be used for planning gang control effort goals and strategies, rather than only using professional knowledge or anecdotal information. A statewide gang database would facilitate achieving this goal, rather from the piece-meal data approach that is used in most assessments.

The structural gang typology (traditional, neotraditional, compressed, collective, and specialty) should be used to identify gang types in the targeted community and appropriate interventions should be used accordingly (for details, please see section under Gang Typologies).

3. Use programs found to be effective with non-gang members.

Since effective programs specifically aimed at gang membership and crime do not exist (or have not been rigorously evaluated), some researchers have recommended programs that have been found to reduce youth violence and delinquency among non-gang members should be used with gang members until innovative gang-specific programs are developed, evaluated and deemed effective. Therefore, gang interventions should select one or more of the 11 of the model programs in the Blueprint Matrix from the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence (CSPV).

One of the model programs, the Incredible Years, focuses on Training for Parents and should be considered as a primary prevention effort, as research has not only found it

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

to improve parenting skills at home (e.g., strategies to handle misbehavior) and at school (e.g., supporting teachers to achieve academic goals), but has also found it to improve the relationship between parents (e.g., communication & problem-solving skills between adults). The parents begin to role model to children how to address conflict non-violently and creates a more nurturing, safer environment to grow up in. The Incredible Years Training for Parents focuses on the parents and not the children and yet has been found to be more effective than the program that solely focuses on children.

If the G.R.E.A.T. program is to be implemented, it should be the most updated version with the gang-specific content and format changes, and it should be rigorously evaluated to test effectiveness.

4. Use “hot spot” problem-orientated policing (POP) in collaboration with community organizations.

“Hot spots” policing has been found to be effective at decreasing criminal behavior in targeted areas, with minimal displacement of crime and some diffusion of benefits into adjacent areas. The use of problem-orientated policing (POP), such as the Houston Targeted Beat POP and the Jersey City POP, and proper assignment of cases to officers is believed to increase the likelihood of successful “hot spot” policing. Additionally, community interventions should be included in these operations in order to address any dismantling of community cohesion as a result of suppression efforts.

Law enforcement and local community organizations should work together during gang control efforts, whether it is prevention or suppression. Using the strengths of both groups will cover for the gaps of the other and therefore be more likely to increase effective interventions. Specifically, law enforcement “hot spot” suppression efforts with problem-oriented policing should be conducted in close collaboration with intense interventions from community organizations. This provides a continuum of services, with suppression efforts providing quick, short-term reduction in gang violence allowing for slower, more long-term reduction in general crime through intense interventions in the targeted community (e.g., alternatives to gangs, employment, drug treatment).

5. Use improved street lighting with active close circuit TV (CCTV) in identified at-risk areas.

Improved street lighting is an effective and fairly inexpensive method to reduce crime, including during the daylight hours. Improved street lighting may be seen as an investment by the community and therefore increase informal social controls in the neighborhood. In targeted areas where crime is prevalent, active close circuit TV (CCTV) should be used in conjunction with improved street lighting.

6. Use long-term incarceration for extremely high risk violent offenders.

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

Incarceration can provide a sense of safety and can actually be cost-beneficial with the appropriate offender. Incarcerating extremely high risk offenders (i.e., those who offend over 12 times a year or identified by assessment like LSI-R) is the only time that there is a cost-benefit to incarceration (\$2.80:1 return on investment; McDougall, et al., 2009). Intense reentry programming should be provided during incarceration to prepare offender for the community once released. This policy should be narrowed, however, to focus on those who are at an extremely high risk of causing harm to the community, as incarceration of offenders in general is likely to have no effect or actually increase recidivism (Dejong, 1997; Smith, Gendrea & Goggin, 2002; Próspero & Tanana, 2009; Spohn & Holleran, 2002; von Hirsh, Bottoms, Burney, & Wikstrom, 1999). Several of these studies have found that the longer an offender is incarcerated, the more likely they are to re-victimize our community neighbors and property. Extensive incarceration policies with offenders who are not extremely high risk may actually give a false sense of security because of the higher likelihood of re-victimization once they go back to the community, which then decreases the safety of our communities in the long-term. Extensive incarceration of lower risk offenders is NOT a cost-beneficial gang control approach.

7. Evaluate all gang control efforts.

Although it has been found that treatment is more likely than incarceration to decrease recidivism (Sung, 2003) and be cost-beneficial (McDougall, et al., 2009), not all treatment is equally effective. Programs should follow the principles of effective intervention (Risk, Need, Responsivity Model; Evidence-Based Sentencing). Outcomes are dependent on how well the program follows these principles. Therefore, the fidelity of program implementation needs to be assessed via process evaluations. Outcome and process evaluations should be part of every gang-control effort to ensure that the program is being properly implemented, staff are properly trained, that funds are used efficiently, and that offenders are actually improving and not “getting worse.”

Many popular programs have been found to be ineffective in reducing delinquent and criminal behavior (or even found to increase antisocial behavior). Therefore, it is recommended that the following programs not be used to address gang problems: shock probation (scared straight), boot camps, gun buybacks, peer counseling, didactic education (e.g., D.A.R.E.), programs focused on increasing self-esteem, and programs that are not willing to be evaluated (process and outcome evaluation).

8. Be proactive with media to raise awareness and educate the public regarding gang issues.

Be proactive with media to help increase awareness of gang issues and to educate community members on preventative methods to reduce gang membership. Increasing awareness and education on gangs includes knowledge of risk and

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

protective factors related to gang membership, formation, and crime. Included in this effort should be addressing myths about gangs, such as revealing that gang members are not only made up of ethnic/racial minorities and males, but can also be White (White supremacist or non-racial gangs) and female (core and fringe membership). Focusing only on ethnic minorities increases prejudicial perceptions of an ethnic group, furthering ethnic tensions, while ignoring gang issues in the dominant culture. Additionally, this makes it difficult for female or White gang members to access the benefits of services.

9. Develop gang-specific screening and assessments.

Gang members are not just higher-level delinquent offenders. There is something unique about a gang that increases the likelihood of members being involved in serious crime, especially violence and homicide. Additionally, not all gang members are the same – some are core gang members while others are fringe gang members, and still others may be in an unclassified, unknown group. Just like high risk offenders should not be mixed with low risk offenders during programming, core gang members should not be mixed with fringe gang members (or at-risk youth).

Unfortunately, gang-specific screening tools and assessment instruments do not presently exist to identify risk of gang membership (i.e., join a gang), type of gang member (i.e., discriminate core v. fringe), and risk of gang crime (i.e., involvement in violent crime). It is recommended that a gang-specific screening and assessment be identified or developed in order to match the appropriate intervention to the needs of the gang offender. Presently, two screening/assessment tools (GSRA: Dixon & Prospero, 2011; GREF: Sloane, 2011) are being tested and validated to fill this void.

Larger and more complicated community-level assessments should also be developed to identify a community's level of risk for gang formation. The assessment should be able to measure a neighborhood's structure (e.g., population size, rental stability, economic & social disadvantage) and process (e.g., informal controls, social relationships) to identify the level of risk of new gangs forming in the area. This community-level assessment would allow for the implementation of prevention and early intervention gang control efforts in neighborhoods where risk factors for gang formation are present but gangs still do not exist.

10. Develop gang-specific programs.

Group cohesion is an extremely important factor because of its relationship to gang crime; as gang cohesiveness increases, so does gang crime. Therefore, gang programs and law enforcement operations should avoid activities that might increase gang cohesiveness. Long-term, intensive programming or suppression efforts are likely to increase the gang's and gang member's oppositional culture to authority, gang identification, and gang cohesion, and thereby make it much more difficult to reduce gang membership and gang crime (and possibly increasing membership and

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

crime). It is recommended that program workers, law enforcement officers, researchers, and others should work collaboratively to develop, implement, and evaluate an intervention aimed at reducing gang cohesion.

One specific technique may be working with core gang members individually, rather than in groups. Core gang members have the highest clique cohesion and therefore, group work may significantly increase the bonding among gang members. Individual work may provide the environment to reduce clique cohesion and allow the worker to target the core gang member's criminogenic needs without the interference of group dynamics that are uniquely present in gangs. Similarly, law enforcement officers should interact individually with core gang members (as opposed to the group of gang members or in front of a group of gang members) to avoid increasing gang cohesion.

A significant gap in gang control efforts is reentry services for gang members who have been incarcerated. As one of the most at-risk for re-offending, incarcerated gang members re-entering our neighborhoods need intensive, community-wide services, starting with providing basic needs (e.g., housing) and treatment (e.g., mental illness, substance abuse), but also teaching skills that can provide opportunities for long-term employment and prosocial relationships.

Lastly, a word of caution on using former gang members in gang interventions. Although there are advantages to using former gang members (e.g., have "street cred," establish rapport, access to gang intelligence), there are also several concerns. To build rapport with gang members, former gang members may discuss experiences of their gang life and unintentionally glorifying gang attitudes and activities. Additionally, former gang members and law enforcement may have antagonistic relations, making collaboration difficult to accomplish (e.g., not sharing each other's gang intelligence). A final concern is that it is unfair to place former gang members into anti-gang roles. For several years, ex-gang members have been involved in a lifestyle that promotes antisocial attitudes and behaviors, and when they leave a gang, there are many issues that need to be addressed at a personal, familial and social level. For former gang members to be suddenly exposed to the gang culture as gang interventionists and given the huge responsibility to change attitudes and behaviors that they are still working on themselves can be too high a burden to carry. Former gang members working as program workers have been known to "fall off the wagon" and resume involvement in gang activities (Klein, 2011). Therefore, care should be taken when former gang members are used in gang control efforts.

11. Develop a systems-level process and outcome evaluation tool

A systems-level process evaluation should be identified or developed that will assess the best practices associated to all parties involved in the system (e.g., providers, courts, probation, law enforcement, schools, etc.). Additionally, the process evaluation should assess the collaborative process (e.g., communication, shared data/

Utah Gang Research & Best Practices Report

resources, time, etc.). Although this is quite an endeavor, it is vital that we understand how the system influences individual behavior (prosocial and antisocial outcomes) and its community impact.