

**GANG INTERVENTIONS IN JAILS:
A NATIONAL ANALYSIS**

Rick Ruddell*

Department of Political Science
California State University, Chico
741 Butte Hall
Chico, CA 95929-455
Phone: (530) 898 6041
Fax: (530) 898 6910
rruddell@csuchico.edu

Scott H. Decker

Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
University of Missouri-St. Louis
8001 Natural Bridge Road
St. Louis MO 63121-4499
Phone: (314) 516 5038
Fax: (314) 516 5048
deckers@msx.umsl.edu

Arlen Egley, Jr.

National Youth Gang Center
P.O. Box 12729
Tallahassee, FL 32317
Phone: (850) 385 0600
Fax: (850) 386 7263
aegley@iir.com

* **Corresponding Author**

**GANG INTERVENTIONS IN JAILS:
A NATIONAL ANALYSIS**

GANG INTERVENTIONS IN JAILS: A NATIONAL ANALYSIS

This national-level study surveyed the perceptions of 134 jail administrators in 39 states about the prevalence of gang members in their facilities. Consistent with previous empirical work, approximately 13 percent of jail populations were thought to be gang-involved, and while there were no regional differences in these estimates, small jails reported having fewer gang-involved inmates. When asked about the problems that these inmates caused in their facilities, respondents reported that gang members were less disruptive than inmates with severe mental illnesses, but more likely to assault other inmates. The use and efficacy of ten programmatic responses to gangs were evaluated, with respondents rating the gathering and dissemination of gang intelligence as the most effective intervention. Implications for practitioners and gang research are outlined.

GANG INTERVENTIONS IN JAILS: A NATIONAL ANALYSIS

Most of our knowledge about gangs in correctional facilities is based on research conducted in state or federal prison systems (Camp & Camp, 1985; Gaes, Wallace, Gilman, Klein-Saffran, & Suppa, 2002; Ralph & Marquart, 1991; Stastny & Tyrnauer, 1983). Typically, these studies have found that the proliferation of gangs and the number of gang members in prison settings have increased substantially since the 1980s (Decker, 2003). Understanding the extent of the gang problem is an important issue for prison administrators because gang-involved inmates contribute to higher rates of prison violence (Camp & Camp, 1985), increase racial tensions within prisons (Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 2002; Ross & Richards, 2002), challenge rehabilitative programming by supporting criminogenic values (Decker, 2003; Fortune, 2003), engage in criminal enterprises within prisons (Ingraham & Wellford, 1987) and contribute to failure in community reintegration if these parolees return to gang activities upon release (Adams & Olson, 2002; Fleisher & Decker, 2001a; Olson, Dooley, & Kane, 2004).

Fischer's (2001: ii) study of Arizona prisons, for instance, reported that "members of certified prison gangs (security threat groups), uncertified prison gangs, and street gangs commit serious disciplinary violations at rates two to three times higher than do non-gang inmates housed in units of the same security level." Thus, by better understanding the scope of the problem, and the efficacy of different types of interventions, jail professionals can work to reduce the influence that gangs have in their facilities. In addition, other stakeholders also need to better understand the extent of this social problem. Esbensen, Winfree, He, and Taylor (2001:122) observe that research about gangs is also important for researchers and theorists, "For researchers, it is important to refine measurement: to assess the validity and reliability of the measures being used. For theorists, it is important to better understand factors associated with

gang membership and associated behaviors, whether testing or constructing theory.” These scholars also acknowledge the importance of information-sharing and collaboration between academics, and policy makers, although we also suggest that jail practitioners ought to be involved in the research process as well as they have intimate knowledge of the success and failure of different interventions within their institutions.

Comparatively little is known about the extent of adult gangs in jails.¹ Increasing our knowledge about gangs and tactics designed to respond specifically to these groups is an important issue given the size of the jail population – approximately 700,000 inmates are housed in local correctional facilities (Harrison & Karberg, 2004). Unlike prisons, jails are intended primarily for inmates awaiting court processes and incarceration for periods of less than one year. Parallel with federal and state prison systems, however, local jails have also experienced dramatic growth over the past two decades (Cunniff, 2002; Harrison & Karberg, 2004; Stephan, 2001). This growth has stretched county budgets (Davis, Applegate, Otto, Surette, & McCarthy, 2004), increased staff turnover (Kerle, 1998), and may contribute to higher rates of inmate violence (Tartaro, 2002). Altogether these changes produce less predictable conditions within America’s jails (Mays & Ruddell, 2004).

It is plausible that some of the problems in the day-to-day operations that jails confront are a result of expanding gang populations. As a result, an important first step is to examine the extent of the problem. Wells, Minor, Angel, Carter, and Cox (2002) surveyed jail administrators and found that approximately 16 percent of all jail inmates were members of security threat groups (STG) while 13 percent of prison inmates were STG members. There are a number of reasons why jail populations have rates of gang involvement that closely correspond with prison systems. First, while jail populations tend to be more heterogeneous than prisons (a wide variety

of persons from different demographic and socioeconomic backgrounds are admitted), this diversity is a function of the short-term nature of jail incarceration. Most inmates are held for a day or two until they make bail, but serious or persistent offenders, such as gang members, may have more difficulty securing release, and may wait months or even years for the conclusion of their trials. James (2004: 4) found that 11.3 percent of jail inmates were held more than six months, while an additional 6.5 percent were held more than one year.

A second reason why rates of gang membership in jails parallel prison rates is that jails act as an entry point for prisons. Virtually everyone who is admitted to prison will first spend time in jails, either awaiting court dates, or pending their transfer to prison. Approximately ten percent of all jail inmates have already been sentenced to a term within the state prison system, but overcrowding keeps these inmates in city or county facilities awaiting transfer (Harrison & Karberg, 2004). Finally, jails hold persons sentenced to periods of incarceration up to one year. While early scholarly work reported that jail inmates were primarily members of the underclass held on relatively minor offenses (Goldfarb, 1975; Irwin, 1985) current research indicates that offenders in many urban jails are held on more serious crimes. In fact, Rainville and Reaves (2003:33) found that nearly 75 percent of all persons sentenced to jail incarceration were felony offenders.

Organizational characteristics of jails might also contribute to gang membership. Jails hold a diverse mix of short- and long-term inmates, which can contribute to unpredictability. While prison populations are fairly stable over periods of years, the population in a jail unit may change completely in a single week. Jails with high levels of population turnover are less predictable for jail officers and inmates alike (Richards, 2003). The short term nature of jail confinement relative to prisons also makes classification and programming more challenging.

Wright and Goring (1989: II) observed that “prisoners come in directly from the street as unknown quantities, often with alcohol, drug or psychiatric problems.”

While the unpredictability of jail incarceration is bearable for a few days, it may contribute to gang-affiliation as months stretch into a year, or longer. As Ross and Richards (2002: 133) remark, “in some prisons you absolutely need to affiliate with a group that will protect you. The loners, the people without social skills or friends, are vulnerable to being physically attacked or preyed upon.” Lhotsky (2000: 213) describes the pressures to join a gang in a large urban jail, “everything here is gang politics and you have to be involved, one way or another....and you better participate or you’re gonna get beat bloody.” Consequently, the characteristics of an individual jail or the types of inmates incarcerated within a facility (both the demographic and offense-related characteristics) may also contribute to gang membership (Santos, 2004).

Despite the problems that gang-affiliated inmates cause, there is some evidence to suggest that jails have been slow to adopt gang intervention programs – especially compared with state prison systems (see Wells, et al., 2002). Moreover, there has been very little empirical attention devoted to the issue. This national-level study examines the prevalence of gang members in jails, based on information about the methods that jails use to classify gang-involvement, perceptions about the types of problems that gang-affiliated inmates cause, and the efficacy of strategies intended to reduce the harm that gangs create in jails.

INTERVENTIONS WITH INCARERATED GANG MEMBERS

Jail officers and administrators have developed a number of gang intervention strategies over the past few decades. The types and methods of intervention are based on the prevalence of gang-affiliated populations within a jail, the levels of inmate involvement in gangs, resources

available to the jail, and the location of the facility. Gangs have been observed to exhibit considerable diversity across the United States in terms of organization and structure (Klein & Maxson, 1996) and criminal involvement (Howell, Egley, & Gleason, 2002). Correctional settings are not immune to this variation. A county jail located in rural Texas, for instance, is likely to have an entirely different gang problem – and response – than a state prison that draws its population from Los Angeles or Chicago.

Previous empirical work has reported that there are regional as well as urban-rural differences in the type of gang problem that a jurisdiction is likely to encounter (Egley, Howell, & Major, 2004; Weisheit & Wells, 2004). Demographic and offense-related characteristics of the gang population, for instance, may influence the involvement of gang members in disruptive activities within an institution. Younger gang members, as well as those sentenced on violent offenses, have a higher likelihood of involvement of gang members in disciplinary infractions (Fischer, 2001). Moreover, some prison gangs were established generations ago, and the types of problems that teenaged “wannabe” gang members from small rural gangs cause are fundamentally different than members of the Aryan Brotherhood or Mexican Mafia – as these established gangs have long-established networks that transcend the jail or prison.

Decker (2003:58) outlined a number of tactics that correctional facilities have used to control gangs including:

Use of inmate informants, the use of segregation units for prison gang members, the isolation of prison gang leaders, the lockdown of entire institutions, the vigorous prosecution of criminal acts committed by prison gang members, the interruption of

prison gang members' internal and external communications, and the case-by-case examination of prison gang offenses.

The types of interventions that a jail or prison develops are likely to depend on a number of organizational characteristics, such as the size of the facility, the internal and external resources that the institution can draw upon, as well as the nature of the gang problem. Decker (2003) notes that the efficacy of the approaches outlined above have typically not been evaluated – a common limitation of many criminal justice interventions (Sherman, Gottfredson, MacKenzie, Eck, Reuter, & Bushway, 1997).

Wells et al. (2002: 14) solicited information about the effectiveness of different interventions to control security threat groups in their survey of correctional administrators, and reported that 76 percent of prisons had established such interventions, compared to only 44 percent of jails. Prisons also deployed a greater range of gang interventions. Wells and his colleagues also found that many jails reported supervising inmates through a central monitoring unit, although this is a common characteristic in direct-supervision facilities. Contrasted to prisons, these researchers found that jails were more likely to use segregation and protective custody. Respondents from prisons, however, reported that they relied upon monitoring inmate communication, collecting information from searches, and compilation of this intelligence.

A number of “containment” strategies have been used to control gangs in correctional facilities. Long-term isolation or the transfer of gang leaders, for instance, have the goal of reducing a leader’s ability to recruit or influence other members – and this tactic has been successfully used in some jails (Decker, 2003). Another approach, which has been used extensively in the federal prison system, is bus or “diesel” therapy. Inmates perceived to be

disruptive, including gang members, are transferred from facility-to-facility, for periods of months (Knox & Tromanhauser, 1991; see Richards, 2002: 134 for a discussion). Yet, such transfers are beyond the ability or resources of a single county jail.

Jail interventions also include information collection from informants as well as intelligence gathered by law enforcement agents or correctional officers (Norris, 2001). Intelligence gathering may include the development of gang profile reports, classification of inmate affiliation, and information about gang involvement in offenses – either internal or external to the jail (Nadel, 1997). In some cases, aggressive prosecution of unsolved cases, or current criminal activity (such as the sale or distribution of narcotics) may result in additional prison terms for the gang-involved inmate and their associates.

Containment approaches vary by jurisdiction. The Texas Department of Criminal Justice, for example, attempted to consolidate all hard-core gang members in several designated prisons, which reduced their ability to influence or recruit others (United States Department of Justice, 1992). A similar approach was undertaken in Arizona prison systems, and Fischer (2001: ii) reported that isolating (or incapacitating) these inmates resulted in declines of “rates of assault, drug violations, threats, fighting.....by over 50%.” Further, Rivera, Cowles, and Dorman (2003) outlined how one state sent all non-affiliated inmates to “gang free” prisons, a strategy that has also been used in Illinois (Olson et al., 2004). Ultimately this approach attempts to reduce the influence of gangs and provide a safer environment (which in turn, may reduce the likelihood of non-affiliated inmates joining gangs to increase their feelings of safety).

DATA AND METHODS

In June 2004, 418 surveys were sent to jails throughout the nation, soliciting information from jail administrators about their experiences with “special needs” jail populations, including

persons with mental illness, gang members, repeat jail offenders, and long-term jail inmates. With the exception of six states that had integrated state jail systems, all states were included in the sample. A random sample of jails was completed choosing facilities listed in the American Jail Association's (2003) *Who's Who in American Jails*. The exception to the random selection was an over-sampling of large jails. Harrison and Karberg (2004) found that the largest 50 jails (mostly located in urban areas) held approximately 30 percent of all jail inmates, so all jails with a rated capacity over 1500 inmates were surveyed.

In order to enhance the response rate, each facility was contacted by phone, and survey team members spoke with administrators and encouraged their participation. Survey instruments were either mailed or faxed to the administrators, although in some cases the surveys were directed to mental health professionals or classification officers at the request of the official that was contacted. Responses to faxed surveys were somewhat better than those that were mailed, and tended to be promptly returned. The survey instrument solicited responses from jail administrators about their experiences with gang members, including asking how gang affiliation or membership was defined, estimating the prevalence of these populations within their jail, and strategies that worked, or that were not effective in responding to gangs. Although most respondents returned the survey within two or three weeks, we continued to receive responses to the survey for several months afterwards. Altogether, 134 surveys from 39 states were returned: a response rate of approximately 32 percent.

[Insert Table 1. About Here]

There were several limitations with the survey results: Jails in the Northeastern states, for example, were under-represented in the surveys that were returned, as were returns from small jails. This under-representation rests on the sampling strategy used in this study.

Integrated jail-prison systems in Alaska, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Rhode Island, and Vermont were not sent surveys. Fewer surveys were also sent to smaller institutions, and the smallest jail that returned a survey had 28 beds, so approximately 15 percent of all small American jails are not represented in the study. Over ten percent of the sample were smaller jails, but the responses from these facilities were disappointing. Of one group of 25 facilities of 35 beds or less, for instance, only one was returned. It is plausible that larger jails are more likely to have classification experts, administrators, and mental health specialists who have more time to respond to such requests for information. It is equally likely that such jurisdictions see few special needs populations or don't value responding to such surveys. Thus the generalizability of the findings in this study is limited somewhat by the facilities that did not respond to the survey, or were not included in the sampling strategy. While the response rate was somewhat less than Wells et al. (2002) study, the estimates in this research are based on a sample over three times as large.²

Table 1 reveals the organizational characteristics of the facilities that were represented in this study. With an average rated capacity of 941.8 inmates (md. = 512 inmates), jails from large urban areas were over-represented. The standard deviation of 1279.37 inmates, however, indicates considerable skewness. Altogether, the facilities represented in the survey had a total rated capacity of 125,259 beds, or 19 percent of all jail inmates nation-wide. The jails examined in this study were also smaller than those in the research reported by Wells and his colleagues – as the mean size of their sample was 5638 beds.

Respondents reported that their facilities operated near capacity: the average jail operated at 94 percent of its rated capacity (md. = 91%; sd. = 26%). Based on the average daily population and admissions data, we extrapolated several statistics, including an average inmate

turnover of approximately 31 inmates per year, and an average stay of approximately 12 days.³ As most jail inmates only remain in custody for a day or two, this finding suggests that there are a large number of inmates who serve lengthy periods in county jails – either awaiting their court dates, serving a sentence of less than one year – or some combination of these two factors. Consequently, one question on the survey asked respondents to estimate the percentage of inmates that had been in the jail for periods in excess of one year, and the mean was 12.7 percent (md. = 5.0%; sd. = 16.8%).

RESULTS

Jail administrators were asked to select methods of classifying gang affiliation in their facilities. Table 2 outlines the five different options for classifying or defining gang membership that were provided. Respondents overwhelmingly reported that they defined gang membership on the basis of tattoos, clothing ('gang colors'), or hand signs, although designation of gang membership by another law enforcement agency was commonly used to define gang membership. Eighty-one percent of respondents reported that an individual's self-declaration as a gang member was used as a method of classification. Correspondingly, law enforcement agencies report frequent use of this technique as well (Egley & Major, 2004). It is important to report that there is considerable research that supports the validity of this measurement approach (see Esbensen et al, 2001). Further, almost three-quarters of respondents based definitions of membership on the basis of the inmate's associates. Respondents were least likely, however, to base definitions of gang membership on claims by informants. These results indicate that self-report remains a viable and frequent method of identification among criminal justice practitioners. In addition, there is considerable overlap between police and jail methods of classification, extending the validity of the measurement approach to yet another group.

[Insert Table 2. About Here]

Using the methods of designating gang affiliation reported above, respondents were asked to estimate the prevalence of gang members in their jail. Fong and Buentello (1991) outline how correctional administrators have historically been reluctant to provide information to researchers about internal problems, such as gangs or gang violence. Moreover, anecdotal information from administrators suggests that gang members may not be forthcoming about their gang-affiliation with classification or intake officers. As a result, the true rate of gang membership is likely to be undercounted in many places – especially if jails do not collect such data upon admission or do not have gang intelligence officers that track these populations.

The mean (un-weighted) estimate of gang membership among jail inmates was 13.2 percent, which closely approximates the national-level estimate of 16 percent reported by Wells et al. (2002). Estimates varied greatly, from 11 respondents that reported that there were no gang members in their facilities to one California jail administrator who reported that 70 percent of inmates in their facility were gang-involved. In fact, by subtracting the facilities that reported having no gang members in their facility, the mean increased to 15.2 percent. Overall, half of the respondents estimated that the prevalence of gang members in their facilities ranged from one to ten percent.

A number of statistical tests were completed on these data to determine the relationships between jail characteristics and the prevalence of gang members, and these results are presented in Table 3. First, a bivariate correlation between average daily population and percentages of gang membership was estimated, and there was a significant positive association between the rated capacity of the jail and the percentage of gang members. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) models were also estimated to compare the means between gang membership and jail

characteristics, including the size of the facility, the daily cost to house an inmate, and the region where the jail was located (using the four U.S. Census Bureau regions). The only variable that had a statistically significant association with the percentage of gang members was the average daily population of these facilities. Bigger jails were likely to house a greater number of persons thought to be gang members. While gangs are more apt to be found in urban areas, another plausible reason for this finding is that smaller jails have been known to underestimate the true rate of “special needs” populations – such as persons with mental illness (see McClearen & Ryba, 2003). This suggests the need for greater attention to classification issues in such facilities, perhaps not only for gangs.

[Insert Table 3. About Here]

Forty-five percent of jail administrators reported that the gang problem had increased over the past five years, and an additional 40 percent said it had stayed the same. The finding that a majority of respondents report a decreasing or stabilizing gang problem notably corresponds to law enforcement reports of local gang problems over the same time period. From 1996 through 2002, declining or stabilizing gang problems and populations were increasingly reported among police and sheriff’s agencies, especially among those serving the less-populated, rural areas (Egley et al., 2004). These parallel findings suggest a dynamic and divergent gang problem both within the general population and within correctional settings.

Table 4 presents the perceptions of jail administrators regarding the likelihood of problem behaviors in special needs populations. These problem behaviors included suicide, incidents of self-harm, victimization, assault (either inmates or staff), disruptive behavior within the facility, escapes (or attempts), or other criminal conduct. Gang members were compared to three other “special needs” populations; inmates with severe mental illness, “frequent flyers” (repeat

offenders with over 20 admissions), and long-term inmates (prisoners who had served more than one-year of jail incarceration). A disruption index was calculated where one point was counted each time a respondent checked that a special needs group was likely to be involved in one of the disruptive behaviors listed above. Of a possible total value of 1072 (if inmates were coded as being disruptive in all of the categories – by all respondents) inmates with mental illness had the highest disruption score of 610.⁴ Gang members followed with a value of 367, while the remaining groups had much lower scores. This finding reinforces the findings of previous research that found gang members represent a significant challenge to correctional operations (Fischer, 2001).

[Insert Table 4. About Here]

In addition to estimating the overall potential for disruption, perceptions of involvement in violent behavior were also collected. Jail administrators reported that gang members were more likely to assault other inmates than any other group of special needs inmates. Fischer's (2001: 172) surveys of 463 Arizona prisoners found that,

Inmates believe that inmates who are not members of a gang are safer than those who are: 69% said that inmates who are not members of a gang are very safe, safe, or somewhat safe, while only 57% said inmates who were members of a gang were very safe, safe, or somewhat safe.

Further, while inmates with mental illness were perceived as the most likely "special needs" group to assault officers and staff, gang members were also considered to pose a physical threat to jail staff.

Administrators were also asked about the efficacy of ten different jail-based interventions to respond to gangs. Of the tactics presented in Table 5, the three that were considered most effective were segregation or separation of gang members, intelligence gathering, and sharing this information with other agencies. Thus, these results are consistent with the findings reported in the earlier national study of jail interventions (Wells et al., 2002) as well as Decker's (2003) research. It is interesting to note that for every category, the not effective category was the lowest for every intervention strategy. Stated differently, jail administrators were highly inclined to view any intervention strategy as effective.

[Insert Table 5. About Here]

The strategies perceived as least successful in reducing the influence of jail gangs were placing restrictions on outside visitors, transfers of gang members to other facilities, or legal sanctions for criminal behavior. Few administrators reported that they used these tactics, and those facilities that used these approaches did not deem them very effective. Transferring gang members is not, for example, a feasible approach in most local jails. Respondents also indicated that some approaches were ineffective, including the loss of "good time" credits, and limiting program participation for gang-involved jail inmates.

The finding that 15 jail administrators reported that their facilities used none of the interventions outlined above was surprising. Chi-square analyses were used to evaluate the relationships between the number of gang interventions used by a given jail (split at the median) and the following variables split at their median values; the daily cost to house an inmate, the estimated gang membership, and the rated capacity of the facility. Consistent with expectations the only variable that had a significant association with high levels of gang interventions was the size of facility – larger facilities used a greater variety of interventions.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This research examined the perceptions of jail administrators about the problems that gang members cause in their facilities, the prevalence of these populations, methods of classifying gang membership, and approaches that may reduce the disruption or violence associated with these groups. The findings reported above suggest that the estimate of gang populations vary greatly by location, and while there were no statistically significant regional differences, smaller jails were more unlikely to report the presence of gangs and, when present, high levels of gang membership. While 11 facilities reported that they had no gang members in their populations, a number of jails reported that over half of their populations were gang involved.

Estimating the true population of gang members is problematic, especially considering that there are different degrees of membership. Silverman (2001: 284) outlined seven different classifications of membership, from hard core members to “sympathizers and wanna-be’s.” The United States Department of Justice (1992) estimated that hard core members represent only 15 to 20 percent of the total gang membership. It is important to distinguish between these different categories of gang membership, although there is little evidence to suggest this is regularly performed within prisons and jails. There is an intuitive conceptual appeal to the notion that strategies for long-term hard core members need to be fundamentally different than those who have less commitment to the gang.

Depending on the categories and methods of classifying gang members, estimates of the prevalence of gang members within jails are likely to vary greatly. The definition of gang membership used in this study was broadly inclusive in that it asked respondents to base their estimates on the five categories outlined in the survey – and didn’t distinguish between “street-

gangs”, “prison-gangs”, “unaffiliated gangs,” and “security threat groups.” Still, the finding that 13.2 percent of all jail inmates in this national sample were gang-involved suggests that accurately estimating the gang populations is an important step for jail administrators. Extrapolating this estimate to the 2003 national jail population, for example, would result in 90,000 gang members held in American jails. A second relevant research question is to evaluate the commitment to the gang of these 90,000 inmates – are the estimates of 15 to 20 percent of hard core members accurate today?

Eleven jails reported having no gang members. Of these facilities, the mean rated capacity was 271 inmates (md. = 119 beds), which is approximately one-third the size of the average jail in this study. Yet, one of the jails that reported having no gang members had a capacity of nearly 1500 inmates, which does not seem plausible. While rural communities are less likely than other localities to develop gang problems, a number of scholars have found that these areas are not immune to gangs (Egley & Major, 2004; Weisheit & Wells, 2004). It is likely that some administrators are not aware of the scope of the problem, are in denial, deliberately under-report the percentages of gang-involved inmates, or do not regard gangs as problematic (Fong & Buentello, 1991)—concerns that apply elsewhere to law enforcement officials (Huff, 1990).

Most administrators reported that gang members challenged the operations of their facilities, through illegal or disruptive behaviors, and a greater involvement in violence. In response to these problems, jails have adopted a number of strategies to reduce the prevalence or harm that these special needs inmates pose. The foremost of these strategies was gathering intelligence and disseminating this information within the facility, and to other law enforcement agencies. Also effective was the segregation or separation of gang-involved jail inmates,

although this strategy may not be feasible in all locations, or in some jails. An examination of the American Jail Association's (2003) national inventory of jails reveals that there are some 650 facilities of 25 beds or less, and these institutions are unlikely to have the ability to separate or segregate any inmate.

Despite the fact that most inmates serve short-terms of temporary incarceration, there are long-term jail populations that may be vulnerable to gang recruitment. Moreover, of the estimated 13 percent of gang members estimated in this sample – some may have weak ties with the gang. If jail-based interventions can prevent gang recruitment, or prevent those “wannabes” from becoming full-fledged gang members, the benefits may be felt throughout justice systems. First, by reducing gang populations, jails will be safer. Safe jails are important not only from a human rights perspective, but high levels of violence might also contribute to increased membership as inmates affiliate themselves with gangs in search of safety (Lhotsky, 2000; Ross & Richards, 2002).

A second advantage of jail-based gang interventions is that jails serve as the entry point for prison populations. Reducing gang membership in local facilities, and information-sharing with state correctional systems may enhance the effectiveness of prison-based gang interventions. Further, high-visibility interventions may deter non-affiliated inmates from joining gangs by increasing the “costs” of membership. Some jail systems, for instance, provide inmates with “guidelines” of the lost opportunities that occur when they affiliate with a gang (see Connecticut Department of Corrections, 1995).

One issue that requires careful consideration is whether society can provide realistic alternatives to the safety and status that gangs offer. Returning vulnerable young people from jails to the community with little hope of meaningful opportunities makes joining a gang more

likely. Fleisher and Decker (2001b: 69-70) outline the many barriers to successful reintegration of gang members into the community. Thus, while correctional interventions can attempt to reduce the prevalence of gangs, and control their criminal behaviors within these institutions, these jail or prison-based programs need to be supplemented with a corresponding increase in community-based gang-intervention programs to support prisoner re-entry.

FOOTNOTES

1. Jails are operated by city or county governments, and some jurisdictions may have a “jail system” where the population resides in several facilities. Moreover, some states, such as West Virginia, are moving towards regional jails, where operations are consolidated between several counties. Lastly, jails in “Indian Country” or detention centers and Metropolitan Correctional Centers operated by the Federal Bureau of Prisons also house jail populations. We use the term jail to describe these different variations.
2. Within the sample, response rates for the jails larger than 1500 beds was 42.6 percent, while the response rate for the jails of less than 1500 beds was 29.8 percent.
3. Average length of stay in jail depends on a number of factors, including the number of sentenced and detained inmates in a particular facility. The California Board of Corrections (2004) notes that increasing the number of detainees will reduce overall length of stay.
4. In some cases, the respondents did not complete all categories, so the total of 1072 represents the highest possible total of all participants who provided a response. It is likely that these categories are not mutually exclusive as there is some possibility of overlapping categories (e.g., an inmate who was a long-term inmate could also be a gang member).

REFERENCES

- Adams, S., & Olson, D.E. (2002). *An analysis of gang members and non-gang members discharged from probation*. Springfield, IL: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority.
- American Jail Association. (2003). *Who's who in jail management*. Hagerstown, MD: American Jail Association.
- Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. (2002). *Dangerous convictions: An introduction to extremist activities in prisons*. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.
- California Board of Corrections. (2004). *Jail profile survey 2004, 1st quarter results*. Sacramento, CA: California Board of Corrections.
- Camp, G.M., & Camp, C.G. (1985). *Prison gangs: their extent, nature, and impact on prisons*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Connecticut Department of Corrections. (1995). *Gang membership*. Wethersfield, CT: Connecticut Department of Corrections.
- Cunniff, M. A. (2002). *Jail crowding: Understanding jail population dynamics*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.
- Davis, R. K., Applegate, B.K., Otto, C.W., Surette, R., & McCarthy, B.J. (2004). Roles and responsibilities: Analyzing local leaders' views on jail crowding from a systems perspective. *Crime and Delinquency*, 50, 458-482.
- Decker, S. H. (2003). *Understanding gangs and gang processes*. Richmond, KY: Eastern Kentucky University.
- Egley, A. H., Howell, J.C., & Major, A.K. (2004). Recent patterns of gang problems in the

- United States: Results from the 1996-2002 National Youth Gang Survey. In F. Esbensen, L. Gaines, & S.G. Tibbetts (Eds.) *American Youth Gangs at the Millennium* (pp. 90-108). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- Egley, A. H., & Major, A.K. (2004). *Highlights of the 2002 youth gangs survey*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Esbensen, F., Winfree, L. T., He, N., & Taylor, T.J. (2001). Youth gangs and definitional issues: When is a gang a gang, and why does it matter? *Crime and Delinquency*, 47, 105-130.
- Fischer, D. R. (2001). *Arizona Department of Corrections: Security threat group (STG) program evaluation, final report*. Retrieved September 25, 2004, from: <http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/grants/197045.pdf>
- Fleisher, M. S., & Decker, S.H. (2001a). Overview of the challenge of prison gangs. *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 5, 1-9.
- Fleisher, M. S., & Decker, S.H. (2001b). Going home, staying home: Integrating prison gang members into the community. *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 5, 65-77.
- Fong, R.S., & Buentello, S. (1991). The detection of prison gang development: An empirical assessment. *Federal Probation*, 55, 66-69.
- Fortune, S. H. (2003). *Inmate and prison gang leadership*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Johnson City, TN: East Tennessee State University.
- Gaes, G. G., Wallace, S., Gilman, E., Klein-Saffran, J., & Suppa, S. (2002). Influence of prison gang affiliation on violence and other prison misconduct. *Prison Journal*, 82, 359-385.
- Goldfarb, R. (1975). *Jails: The ultimate ghetto of the criminal justice system*. Garden City,

- NY: Anchor Press.
- Harrison, P. M., & Karberg, J.C. (2004). *Prison and jail inmates at midyear 2003*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Howell, J. C., Egley, A. H., & Gleason, D.K. (2002). *Modern day youth gangs*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Huff, C. R. (1990). Denial, overreaction and misidentification: A postscript on public policy. In C.R. Huff (Ed.) *Gangs in America* (pp. 310-317). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ingraham, B.L., & Wellford, C.F. (1987). The totality of conditions test in eighth-amendment litigation. In S.D. Gottfredson, & S. McConville, (Eds.). *America's correctional crisis: prisons populations and public policy* (pp.13-36). New York: Greenwood Press.
- Irwin, J. (1985). *The jail: Managing the underclass in American society*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- James, D.J. (2004). *Profile of jail inmates, 2002*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Kerle, K. E. (1998). *American jails: Looking to the future*. Boston: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Klein, M. W., & Maxson, C. L. (1996). *Gang structures, crime patterns and police responses*. Los Angeles, CA: Social Science Research Institute.
- Knox, G. W., & Tromanhauser, E.D. (1991). Gangs and their control in adult correctional institutions. *The Prison Journal*, 71, 15-22.
- Lhotsky, N. (2000). The L.A. county jail. In R. Johnson & H. Toch (Eds.), *Crime and punishment: Inside views* (pp. 211-213). Los Angeles: Roxbury Press.
- Mays, G. L., & Ruddell, R. (2004, Nov. 18). *Frequent flyers, gang-bangers, and old-timers:*

- Understanding the population characteristics of jail populations.* Presented at the American Society of Criminology Annual Meetings, Nashville, TN.
- McLearen, A. M., & Ryba, N.L. (2003). Identifying severely mentally ill inmates: Can small jails comply with detection standards? *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 37*, 25-40
- Nadel, B.A. (1997). Slashing gang violence, not victims: New York City Department of Corrections reduces violent jail incidents through computerized gang tracking data base. *Corrections Compendium, 22*, 20-22.
- Norris, T. (2001). Importance of gang-related information sharing. *Corrections Today, 63*, 96-99.
- Olson, D. E., Dooley, B., & Kane, C.M. (2004). *The relationship between gang membership and inmate recidivism.* Springfield, IL: Illinois Criminal Justice Authority.
- Rainville, G., & Reaves, B.A. (2003). *Felony defendants in large urban counties.* Washington DC: US Department of Justice.
- Ralph, P.H., & Marquart, J.W. (1991). Gang violence in Texas prisons. *Prison Journal, 71*, 38-49.
- Richards, S. C. (2002). My journey through the Federal Bureau of Prisons. In S. C. Richards & J.I. Ross (Eds) *Convict Criminology* (pp. 120-149). Belmont, CA: Thompson/Wadsworth.
- Rivera, B. D., Cowles, E.L., & Dorman, L.G. (2003). Exploratory study of institutional change: Personal control and environmental satisfaction in a gang-free prison. *Prison Journal, 83*, 149-170.
- Ross, J. I., & Richards, S.C. (2002). *Behind bars: Surviving prison.* Indianapolis, IN:

Alpha Books.

Santos, M. G. (2004). *About prison*. Belmont, CA: Thompson Wadsworth.

Sherman, L. W., Gottfredson, D., MacKenzie, D., Eck, J., Reuter, P., & Bushway, S.

(1997). *Preventing crime: What works, what doesn't, what's promising*. Washington, DC:

United States Department of Justice.

Silverman, I. (2001). *Corrections: A comprehensive review*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Stastny C., & Tyrnauer, G. (1983). *Who rules the joint? The changing political culture of maximum-security prisons in America*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Stephan, J.J. (2001). *Census of jails, 1999*. Washington DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Tartaro, C. (2002). The impact of density on jail violence. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30, 499-510.

United States Department of Justice. (1992). *Management strategies in disturbances and with gangs/disruptive groups*. Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice.

Weisheit, R. A., & Wells, L.E. (2004). Youth gangs in rural America. *National Institute of Justice Journal*, 251, 2-7.

Wells, J. B., Minor, K.I., Angel, E., Carter, L., & Cox, M. (2002). *A study of gangs and security threat groups in America's adult prisons and jails*. Indianapolis, IN: National Major Gang Task Force.

Wright, C., & Goering, S. (1989). Litigation can stop unnecessary jail building. *National Prison Project Journal*, 18, Winter.

Table 1. Jail Characteristics: National Jail Sample

Participating Jails	134
States	39
Rated Capacity (beds)	941.8 (sd. 1279.4)
Average Daily Population	898.7 (sd. 1261.2)
Percent Rated Capacity	93.8 (sd. 26.2)
Daily Cost	55.4 (sd. 19.1)
Turnover (Annual admits/ADP)	30.8 (sd. 64.4)
Total Rated Capacity	125,259 beds
Region	
Northeast	7
Midwest	36
South	45
West	44

Table 2. Jail Administrator Definitions of Gang Membership

Inmate has been designated a gang member by another law enforcement agency.	83.3 %
Inmate has been identified as a gang member by a reliable informant.	65.3 %
Inmate claims to be a gang member.	81.7 %
Inmate displays symbols of membership: clothing, “colors”, hand signs or tattoos.	86.8 %
The inmate is known to associate with and/or has been arrested with known gang members.	71.4 %
Average reported gang membership (84 jails reporting estimates)	13.2 % (sd. 15.5) Range 0-70%
Jails reporting no gang membership (11 jails) ¹	13.1 %
Jails reporting 1 to 10 % gang membership (42 jails)	50.0 %
Jails reporting 11 to 25 % gang membership (19 jails)	21.4 %
Jails reporting more than 25 % gang membership (12 jails)	14.3 %
Admissions of gang members have increased – past 5 years	45.0 %
Gang members younger than other jail inmates	55.0 %

¹ Totals might not add up to 100 percent due to rounding.

Table 3. Tests of Association between Jail Characteristics and Gang Membership

Jail Characteristics	Test	F Value
Average Daily Population	Correlation $r = .240^*$	
Average Daily Population	ANOVA	2.349**
Daily Cost	ANOVA	.689
Region	ANOVA	.478

* $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$

Table 4. Perceptions of Jail Administrators on the Involvement of Special Needs Populations in Problem Behaviors.

Population	Disruption¹	Assault Inmates	Assault Staff
Gang Members	367	90	65
Frequent Flyers	233	44	30
Inmates with Mental Illness	610	78	81
Long-Term Inmates	201	35	21

1. Disruption Index – Sum of the following categories: likelihood of suicide, self-harm, victimization, assault (other inmates or staff), disruptive behavior, escapes (or attempts), and other criminal conduct (Highest possible value = 1072).

Table 5. Perceptions of Jail Administrators about the Efficacy of Gang Interventions (Percentage of Respondents).

Programs or Responses	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Not Effective	Not Applicable
Segregation or separation	36.2	30.8	1.5	31.5
Restrict outside visitors	10.9	15.5	5.4	68.2
Transfer (e.g., other jail)	5.5	20.5	4.7	69.3
Facility sanctions - gang behavior	27.5	36.6	6.1	29.8
Legal sanctions - gang behavior	11.6	20.9	9.3	58.1
Loss of 'good time' credits	19.8	22.9	9.2	48.1
Information sharing (other agencies)	36.6	35.1	3.8	24.4
Intelligence gathering	33.1	39.2	3.1	24.6
Written policies or procedures	26.8	40.9	2.4	29.9
Limit program participation	15.4	26.9	11.5	46.2

Jails that report using none of these tactics = 15

Jails that report using two or fewer of these tactics = 34