

## The Gang Violence Reduction Project

### Executive Summary

#### Gang Member Interview Analysis Time I - Time II

#### Introduction

This report describes the impact of the Gang Violence Reduction Project on targeted youth (n=86) contacted or served by the program, after almost a two year period. Time I or baseline and Time II field interviews were conducted. The interval between interviews was between a year and a year and half.

The primary purpose of the Gang Violence Reduction Project was to decrease violent gang crime -- gang homicides, aggravated gang batteries, and aggravated gang assaults among hardcore gang youth, 17 to 25 years of age in Little Village, a community southwest of the downtown Chicago business center. The project was a test of a collaborative approach between police, adult probation, and community youth workers (University of Chicago), and a local community organization, Neighbors Against Gang Violence, using a set of integrated strategies: suppression, social intervention, provision of social opportunities, and community mobilization.

A field interview self-report instrument, self-esteem inventory (Coopersmith), a Wide-Range Achievement Test (WRAT) and various measures of major delinquency and crime explanatory theories -- social disorganization, anomie, criminal opportunity, differential association, and social control -- were included. Project intervention measures, based on worker program tracking data for each of the youth interviewed, were also analyzed. The preliminary analysis examined change over time for the total sample and the component Latin King and Two-Six samples. Bivariate, correlational, and regression analyses were employed.

#### Dependent Variable: Changes in Criminal and Gang Violent Activities

The key finding was that gang youth in the program reported a significantly lower level of violent behavior in which they engaged, including homicides, drive-by shootings, batteries with and without a weapon, robbery with and without a weapon, and threats with and without a weapon, after approximately one to one and a half years of program contact/service. The level of gang violence declined very sharply for the Latin Kings, but less significantly for the Two-Six. Much of the drop for the Two-Six was accounted for by a lower level of non-violent crime. Reductions in marijuana and cocaine use were also reported. The drop in drug selling by both groups was questioned, however, based on responses to other questions in the interview as well as aggregate police data on arrests.

Much of the gang fighting which occurred continued to take

place between the Latin Kings and the Two-Six in Little Village. A considerable amount, by the Two-Six however, was occurring on the southside and Cicero. Based on self-reports, the consequence of the fighting at Time II produced more serious injury but fewer homicides. Fighting between branches of the gang appeared to be more serious for the Two-Six. Within gang fighting did not generally result in serious injury. Data on the relative decline of gang violence was confirmed by police aggregate data. Official criminal justice Time II data on individual youth in the sample has not yet been fully collected.

### Community Disorganization

Respondents viewed community levels of gang and non-gang crime as significantly reduced at Time II. The Latin Kings saw the community crime situation as less pervasive than did the Two-Six. However, drug dealing and gang fighting were viewed by respondents from both gangs as high or higher than at Time I. Drive-by shootings and gang intimidation, nevertheless, was seen as reduced. Gang youth, especially the Latin Kings, were less fearful about moving around the community alone or going to school.

Criminal elements appeared less dominant while legitimate institutions seemed more active. While opportunities to engage in drug dealing increased, opportunities to engage in property crime seemed to decline for the Latin Kings but to increase for the Two-Six. Agents of the criminal justice system, especially police, were more often perceived as present in the community, but not necessarily more effective. A variety of organizations, community groups, block clubs, churches, alderman's office, and neighborhood watches, were viewed as more active and as providing more of a variety of social services and opportunities at Time II than Time I.

### Differential Gang Association

Gang members tended to gradually withdraw their commitments to gang structure and processes over time. This was especially true for the Latin Kings, whose members were somewhat older than the Two-Six. Family life, parental influence, and "retirement" or "growing out of it" seemed key explanatory factors. Employment and the influence of community youth workers were also important. However, there was no clear or consistent evidence that respondents seriously considered or at least verbally acknowledged the possibility of leaving the gang -- only reducing gang activity.

A reduced commitment to gang life also seemed related to a shift in status or position level. Substantial proportions of respondents had gone from leader or core to regular or peripheral member positions. The Latin Kings experienced a greater shift to reduced gang status than did the Two-Six. The factor that seemed most important in the decision by respondents to make the final

"break" from the gang was "family responsibilities."

### Social Control: Patterns of Social Affiliation

Age differences seemed to explain the more significant transition of the Latin King respondents, who were two years older than the Two-Six, to more conventional or legitimate adult behaviors. Members of both gangs were in varying stages of transition from families of origin to families of procreation. More of the Latin Kings were living with spouses, girlfriends, and children. More of the Two-Six had lived and continued to live in two-parent households. Substantial proportions of the households of respondents were also gang members at both time periods. The percent was particularly high for Latin King respondents at baseline (55.9%).

Not only age and residential pattern -- both gangs resided in the Little Village community from 13 to 16 years on average -- but the exposure to legitimate institutions, such as churches, youth agencies, and other community organizations, may have affected patterns of socialization and strong commitments to gang life. Very few of the gang respondents at either Times I or II were members of or had substantial commitments to established social institutions. Only 7.4% of the Two-Six were members or in significant contact with any of these organizations. The pattern of social isolation was even more marked for the Latin Kings.

### Personal and Family Disorganization

The findings provide ample and consistent evidence of marginal psychological status, as evidenced by self-esteem inventories. While self-esteem improved slightly over the program period, respondents continued to demonstrate poor, if not deteriorating, relationship patterns with spouses, girlfriends, and parents, especially mothers. The families of respondents experienced major crises in the course of the program year or year and a half, including deaths, family illness, drug abuse, arrests, a high level of gang violence victimization, family and job-related problems; 58.8% of the respondent households indicated someone had been arrested, and 37.7% indicated a gang violence victimization. The relationship situation generally seemed to deteriorate more substantially for the Two-Six compared to the Latin Kings.

### Socio-economic Status and Anomie

It was clear that respondents had improved their socio-economic and academic status between Time I and Time II. There was an increase in high school graduates and attainment of GED certificates at Time II. The respondents made employment progress. Roughly one-third of the respondents were employed at Time I but

almost half were employed at Time II. The respondents were receiving more work-related income at Time II, although substantial numbers, especially Two-Six, were still receiving financial support from spouses and families. An important change was that a greater proportion of respondents were receiving income from illegal sources at Time II, almost double that at Time I. Illegal income made up almost a third of the average monthly income for the Latin Kings and 15% of the monthly funds for Two-Six; almost all of such income was from drug sales.

Respondents were asked a series of questions about occupational and income aspirations and realistic expectations. While most gang members had relatively high aspirations for occupational and income success, few believed they would achieve them. The gap or disjuncture was significantly greater for the Two-Six than for the Latin Kings. The amount of disjunction suggested according to anomie theory that the Two-Six were under considerably more social, cultural, and probably psychological strain predisposing them to deviancy.

### Project Intervention

Based on gang member respondents and worker reports, it was clear that a great variety of services were provided by workers and received by gang youth, including contacts with parents, spouses, girl friends, and employers. The youth services were provided mainly by community youth workers (94.3%) and police (45.7%), compared to probation (11.4%) and NAGV (10%). Probation and NAGV joined the Project at a later stage than did community youth workers and police. Also, only a relatively small number of youth were on probation during the program period.

Most youth received a variety of services, including employment and educational referrals, crisis and family counseling, and some recreation. Project workers rated the success of their efforts not as highly as gang youth respondents did. Coordinated or combined worker interventions, especially by police and community youth workers, resulted in more contacts and services than was the case for non-coordinated services.

### Quasi-Control Groups

A limited analysis was conducted to determine whether respondents whom workers reported serving but who said that they did not receive services, in fact received effective services. The evidence suggested that this group received a lower level of services generally. Their pattern of violent crime was lower at Time I and Time II but not as reduced as those who received more services. This provided further indication that Project service and contact patterns had important program effects. An additional group of individuals whom workers reportedly did not serve was compared to those who did receive services. This analysis also suggested that the intervention had an effect on violent and

criminal behavior; decreases in all criminal activities were greater for the group whom workers reported serving. Those who reportedly received no service actually experienced an increase in violent crime levels at Time II.

In sum, the level of gang violence declined more for youth when the worker and gang respondent agreed that worker contacts and services were provided/received. Further, there was evidence that community youth workers were targeting the more violent and probably delinquent youth in the gangs, but further controlled statistical analysis was required.

### Correlation Analysis

The following variables are associated with the dependent variable of violent crime at Time II. These include, in order of greatest to least strongly correlated (also including the causal theory for which the variable is possibly an indicator): proportion of income at Time II from illegal activities (criminal opportunity); respondents' current thoughts about leaving the gang (differential association); total violent crime at baseline (socialization); aspiration-expectation disjunction (anomie); proportion of income from legitimate work (legitimate opportunity); reduction in gang position or level of attachment (differential association/social control); and the gang respondent's report of services received from Project workers.

Other variables which just missed statistical significance when correlated with the violent crime variable at Time II were the Coopersmith Self-Esteem score (social control/personal disorganization) and whether the respondent's household income was at or above the median level of household income for the sample (anomie/family disorganization).

### Regression Models

A series of regression models were analyzed to account for a variety of policy effects, e.g., project intervention, prior criminal history, legitimate and criminal opportunities, and to determine what predictive power these and other causal variables might have. Various models were constructed. The most powerful predictor by far was the availability of criminal opportunity, i.e., proportion of income from illegal activities at Time II. This variable was highly correlated to levels of either violent crime or all crime (including property). While the causal direction is unclear, it can be argued that an environment favorable to illegal money making activity may also foster gang violence. It is likely a system conducive to the production of illegal income had developed in Little Village which depended greatly on the gang youths' capacity to commit violent crimes.

The two other sets of variables that consistently entered a series of regression equations were prior history (at Time I) of

total crime and some combination of service variables (Time II). Also, there was evidence that anomie, as a function of a gap between occupational aspirations and expectations, was an important predictor either of violent or total crime. All analyses indicated that it was extremely difficult, if not impossible, to separate out the effects of violent crime and non-violent or total crime committed by gang youth.

Essentially, the various statistical analyses indicated that the existence of criminal opportunities in the community, especially drug dealing, the respondent's prior history of violence and crime generally were positively associated with and strongly predictive of greater crime levels at times. Remarkably, the Project's services or worker contact pattern was also highly important as an independent factor in predicting a significantly lower level of violent and general crime by respondents at Time II, or the end of the second year of the program.

In effect, the data indicate the Gang Violence Reduction Project was substantially effective with targeted youth based on interview responses from youth and workers--also generally confirmed by aggregate level Chicago Police Department data for the target programs over the same time period. Not yet available were individual level data and Time II community level data to verify the findings of the interview self-report and aggregate level police data.

School of Social Service Administration  
University of Chicago  
April 15, 1995

Evaluation of the Gang Violence  
Reduction Project. Gang Member  
Interview and Analysis, Time I - Time II

Irving Spergel and Susan Grossman  
with Lisa DeVivo, Louis Arata,  
Laura Anderson, and Denis Cronin

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

### **Purpose and Scope of the Gang Violence Reduction Project**

This paper describes the impact of the Gang Violence Reduction Project (GVRP) on targeted youth serviced or contacted by the program. Only a sample of program youth, 86 gang youth interviewed at the beginning of the program and approximately 1 year later are included in the analysis. An additional 22 youth were interviewed at Time I but not at Time II. A further group of 40 youth comprised a second program cohort who were interviewed only at Time II. These latter sets of youth are not included in the present analysis. Complete police and court histories on all youth will be systematically analyzed and integrated into the analysis at a later time.

The present report is a substantive but preliminary analysis of the results of the Time I and Time II interviews with special attention to changes in behavior (including criminal behavior) of gang youth, especially gang-related, which can be attributed to or associated with the effects of the Gang Violence Reduction Program. We attempt, with the aid of theoretical insights, to explain these changes. The data clearly and consistently indicate positive changes resulting from the Project, especially a lowering of gang-related and general criminal behavior and also more conventional adaptation to mainstream behaviors and relationships, such as holding a job and establishing family households for many of the youths in the sample.

Gang Violence Reduction Project. The primary purpose of the Gang

Violence Reduction Project to reduce serious gang-motivated violence, especially gang homicides, aggravated gang batteries, and aggravated gang assaults among hard-core youth, particularly those 17 to 25 years of age in Little Village, a community southwest of the Loop or central business district of Chicago. The Project, initiated in July 1992 as a four year demonstration and research program, employed a basic strategy of coordination and collaboration of efforts managed by the 10th District Commander under the aegis of the Research and Development Unit of the Chicago Police Department.

The key components of the program were a unit of two part-time Neighborhood Relations Officers and two full-time tactical officers, a unit of two or three full-time Probation officers and a full-time supervisor of the Cook County Adult Probation Department, and a unit of three full-time community youth officers and a supervisor from the School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago. A local neighborhood organization, Neighbors Against Gang Violence (NAGV), was also established as an independently funded organization working closely with the GVRP. The Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority funded the demonstration from the Federal Violence Reduction in Urban Area Program. The Chicago Police Department, responsible for the Project, subcontracted with the Cook County Adult Probation Department and the University of Chicago. The Illinois Crime Justice Authority also funded the evaluation component carried out by the University of Chicago. Monies for both the demonstration

and research were obtained from the U.S. Justice Department.

The strategy of the program was to target 200 hardcore gang youth over a four year period through a coordinated program of highly interactive suppression, social intervention, provision of social opportunities, especially job and remedial education, and community mobilization involving local residents and agencies. The program and the strategy, sustained with remarkable results, involved targeting selected youth, joint planning and integrated field operations. Close and frequent formal and informal meetings and contacts among all workers of the Project and Neighbors Against Gang Violence were developed. (See "The Gang Violence Reduction Project: A Case Study of an Interagency and Community Approach.")

Little Village. Little Village, including 10th District Beats 1013, 1024, 1031, 1032, 1033, and 1034, was selected because it was a very high gang violence area that also contained sufficient community assets (included among these were churches, youth agencies, and active community organizations) that would respond positively to Project efforts. Little Village contains approximately 61,000 individuals in the Project target area (almost 90 percent of the population is Mexican or Mexican-American, many recently arrived from Mexico, other states, and communities). It is a working class community; 48 percent of the residents (individuals or families) own their own homes. Males outnumber females by 113 to 100; males 17 to 25 years constitute 24 percent of the population. The disproportionately large number of young

adult males is primarily due to the immigration of males seeking jobs. Unemployment among males is relatively high at 11.3%. Over 50 percent of the population have less than a high school education. While rates of delinquency crime are moderate compared to other working class or low income areas of Chicago, Little Village ranks very high in prevalence of serious gang violence (See Table 1).

Available Police Data. Aggregate level police data was available to the Project evaluator to examine changes in levels of gang violence for the two year pre- and program periods in Little Village and comparable high gang violence district. Using a constructed index of gang homicides, aggravated batteries, and aggravated assaults, we found that the rate of increase of serious gang violence rose 37.1% in the Program area compared to larger increases ranging from 54.6% to 166.0% in Pilsen, the most comparable community, adjoining the Little Village area. Further, in Little Village, gang homicides declined from 15 in the preprogram period to 8, but increased in Pilsen from 7 to 11 over the same period.

Two major gangs, the Latin Kings and the Two-Six, were targeted and served in Little Village. These gangs were distinct from the gangs in Pilsen and there was no "spill over." The two gangs accounted for 80.6% of the gang-related violence in Little Village at the start, but at the end of the two year program period, accounted for a considerably smaller increase, 15.3%. This

is also less than the increase for the other gangs in the area not served, 87.8%. The change in gang-violent crime included an absolute reduction in numbers of Latin King offenders arrested for serious gang violence for the program period (See Table 2). The change for the Two-Six was not so positive, but still the increase was less than for the other gangs not served in the target area.

Time I Justice System Data. We do have available offense histories of the youth interviewed at baseline, but we do not yet have Time II data that could provide information on changes in official offense patterns as a result of or in association with program efforts. Individual gang youth participating in the research signed consent forms to allow a search of their official police and court records both at the juvenile and adult level. One hundred and four of the 108 individuals initially interviewed consented to evaluators searching their official records.

Justice System records indicated that the program youth who were interviewed were clearly hardcore. Of the 82 individuals with information in police records at baseline (78.8%), the average number of misdemeanor and felony charges in total was 8.35. On average, individual youth were slightly older than 15 when they were first arrested by police (15.3). Almost 5% of the sample (4.9%) had at least one arrest for a homicide. Slightly more than 12% were charged by police with aggravated batteries, and 18.3% were charged with aggravated assaults. Twenty-four percent had one or more drug-related charges at baseline.

Juvenile and/or adults court records, also available for 74 people, indicated a pattern similar to the one found in police records. Individuals with court records had been charged with 7.3 crimes on average, indicating a fairly extensive involvement with the criminal court system. Almost 11% (10.8%) of court cases involved charges of homicide; 16.2% were related to charges of aggravated battery; and 18.9% pertained to aggravated assault. An additional 25.7% of all cases involved drug-related offenses.

## II. YOUTH SURVEY (Time I and Time II Target Group Interviewed)

### Methodology

Sampling. A total of 86 individuals were interviewed in the summer and fall of 1993 (referred to as baseline or Time I) and then again during this same time period in 1994 (Time II). This represents 79.6% of the 108 individuals who were interviewed at baseline. Forty-five of these 86 individuals were Latin Kings (52.3%) and 41 (47.7%) were members of the Two-Six. This is a slightly different ratio of gang representation than existed at baseline when 51 of the 108 respondents were Latin Kings (47.2%) and 57 (52.8%) were Two-Six. Clearly, a greater proportion of the Latin Kings were interviewed twice compared to Two-Six. Among the Latin Kings, 88.2% of all people interviewed at baseline were interviewed again. For the Two-Six, the proportion was lower at 71.9%. The latter is still a respectable proportion, given the nature of the sample and the extreme difficulty of obtaining access to this population.

Since possibly a sampling bias may account for some differences between gangs, particularly in respect to the Two-Six, analysis was conducted to compare those who were not interviewed again to the 86 who were on characteristics which might be expected to affect outcomes. These included baseline scores on self-reports of criminal behavior (see discussion below); violent gang and non-gang crime; drug use and drug selling activity; age; leadership position; and employment status at the time of the first interview. Table A1 contains the results of this analysis. For a discussion of sampling issues, see Appendix 1.

The Interview. Individuals interviewed a second time were asked about a number of areas. These included questions about their criminal behavior, particularly violent crimes and drug-related activity; gang fighting; level of involvement in the gang and reasons for changes in status; views of crime and safety in the community; employment and educational progress; sources of income; income and occupational aspirations and expectation; living arrangements and quality of relationships with family and significant others; level of involvement in community organizations; how free time was spent and with whom and family crises which may have occurred. These were similar to questions asked at the baseline interview. However, there were several areas that were covered at baseline which were not asked about again or they were asked about in a slightly different way.

First, questions about basic gang structure and operation were

left out since presumably these characteristics were relatively enduring and would not be influenced by the intervention. Second, questions related to early family involvement and influence were omitted, since these would not have changed. However, items about current or changed relationships with family members or girlfriends in the past year were asked. Several questions, open-ended at baseline, were repeated, but lists of possible answers based on the open-ended responses were provided. Higher response rates at Time II were achieved for these closed-ended questions, and some caution must be exercised in comparing the results of these particular questions to those at baseline, which were similar but posed in a different format.

Finally, an additional section was added to the second interview for the respondent to assess the worker activities and the interventions provided. Information was also requested about agencies and services used the past year, not related to the project.

#### **Nature of the Report**

The following report focuses on change in the first program cohort sample, who were interviewed twice, then looks at changes within each gang over the two time periods and finally, changes between gangs within a given time period (Time I or Time II). In some instances, the number of individuals involved is limited, so that baseline results reported here may differ from those originally

reported in April of 1994.<sup>1</sup>

The report begins with a descriptive discussion of changes in behavior among respondents, specifically in regard to their criminal activity and violent behavior over the program period. It then goes on to identify explanatory variables and provide a framework for understanding these changes. Several statistical and theoretical models, with relevance to policy and practice, are developed to explain changes in criminal behavior and gang patterns probably attributable to program effects. Our analysis at this time is still preliminary. Data from Time II reviews of police and court records have not yet been fully acquired. They should help validate and detail the changes in behavior reported here. They will be included in the later analyses.

In addition, because there were 16 individuals who, according to worker reports, did not receive any services, it was possible to create what can be seen as a "quasi-control" or no intervention group whose outcomes can be compared to those whom workers reportedly served. Later analyses and reports including all gang youth in the program and/or interviewed at Time I and/or Time II will be provided.

---

<sup>1</sup> In order to increase the sample size, the convention of including, as negative responses, individuals who answered a screen question as no and would have been otherwise excluded from the analysis as not applicable was adopted. For example, individuals who reported that they were not thinking about leaving the gang were also included as answering no to further questions about the reasons they might leave the gang. This prevented such individuals from being totally excluded from the analysis and seemed a fair compromise.

### III. FINDINGS

#### Introduction: Summary

This report describes the impact of the Gang Violence Reduction Project on targeted youth served or contacted by the Program. A sample of youth (n=86) interviewed at both baseline and Time II, approximately a year later, are the focus of the report. The findings on the 22 youth only interviewed at Time I and an additional 40 youth (2nd year program cohort) only interviewed at Time II are not included in this analysis.

The primary purpose of the Gang Violence Reduction Project is to decrease serious gang violence, especially gang homicide, aggravated gang batteries, and aggravated gang assaults among hard-core gang youth, 17 to 25 years of age from two gang constellations, Latin Kings and Two-Six. The Project, initiated in July 1992, was established as a four year demonstration and research program. It attempts to coordinate a variety of strategies, suppression, social intervention, provision of social opportunities, and community mobilization through an innovative program structure. The project was managed by the 10th District Commander of the Chicago Police Department, with the aid and involvement of the Cook County Adult Department of Probation, and the School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago. An independent local community organization, Neighbors Against Gang Violence, was established to complement and supplement the efforts of the Gang Violence Reduction Project (GVRP), with special

interest in community mobilization and family interventions.

Little Village, the site of the demonstration, is a recently settled mainly Mexican-American community, with a fairly high level of home ownership, family life, and active local community agencies and organizations. Little Village also ranks very high in prevalence of serious gang violence. Available aggregate level police data indicate Little Village has been associated with a relative reduction in gang-related homicides and a less than average rise in aggravated batteries and aggravated assaults compared to comparable areas of 6 other police districts and compared to gangs not served in the target 10th District over a two year program period.

The youth survey instrument was administered at Time I to 108 youth and at Time II, with minor modifications, to 86 of the same youth. The reinterview rate was 79.6%, with somewhat more of the Two-Six dropping out, mainly because they were older youth, somewhat peripheral and less delinquent than the youth interviewed twice. The Latin Kings in the sample were significantly older than the Two-Six and Time I and Time II.

Some questions were eliminated at the Time II interview, including questions about basic gang structure and operation, and basic family background. The Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT), as well as data on services to the youth interviewed were added at Time II. Such data were mainly available from community youth workers (University of Chicago) and the Project police tactical unit. The key variables discussed in the report include self-

reported violent gang behavior and total criminal behavior, perceptions of community crime and level of community disorganization related to the gang problem; differential group association, especially the extent of the reduction in gang affiliations by respondents; social control or patterns of social attachment; personal and family disorganization, including a self-esteem inventory; socio-economic status and anomie; and the nature and scope of Project intervention.

### Changes in Criminal Activity

Violent Crime. Respondents were asked about their involvement in a series of 16 different crimes, eight of which can be specifically classified as violent crimes.<sup>2</sup> Table 3 presents information on the total number of violent crimes committed on average for the sample as a whole (n=86) and for each gang both at baseline (Time I) and Time II. Information about some of the specific crimes included on the scale is also provided. Table 3 indicates that the average number of violent incidents for the sample as a whole largely decreased between the first and second interviews. Thus, respondents report more than twice as many violent incidents at Time I than at Time II, and the change across time periods for the whole sample (n=86) is statistically significant ( $t=3.19$ ,  $df=84$ ,  $p$

---

<sup>2</sup> These include the following: robbery with and without a weapon, threats to beat someone with or without a weapon, beating someone with or without a weapon, homicides, and drive-by shootings. Extreme scores or outliers were set to equal the highest within range score. Only individuals missing on all 8 items in the scale were eliminated from the analysis.

≤ .01).

Further analysis indicates that the two gangs differ in terms of the extent to which they have changed over the two time periods. Indeed, most changes within the whole sample are mainly attributable to changes among the Latin Kings. At baseline, members of the Latin Kings interviewed twice reported that they had each committed almost 40 (38.07) violent crimes on average in the six months prior to the interview. By the second interview, however, the average number of incidents dramatically decreased to slightly more than 11, a decrease of almost 27 violent crimes on average. This change is statistically significant ( $t=3.31$ ,  $df=44$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ). Among the Two-Six, the change from Time I to Time II is much smaller and not statistically significant; a decrease of 2.71 incidents on average. Since the Two-Six started off significantly lower than the Latin Kings at baseline (13.97 violent crimes), the two gangs' pattern of violent crime appears to be identical at Time II. A comparison of the Violence Difference Score for each gang indicates significant differences exist between gangs with respect to extent of changes which occurred ( $t=2.67$ ,  $df=63.9$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ). Data in Table 3 also indicates that similar statistically significant changes across time occurred for the whole sample in most of the eight separate crimes included in the violence index. The only areas in which significant reductions in the average number of crimes committed at Time I compared to Time II did not occur (although meaningful reductions did occur) were drive-by shootings, homicides and robberies with weapons. In general, the

average number of incidents in these particular most violent categories were small at both baseline and Time II. Statistically significant changes occurred, however, with respect to assaults with weapons ( $t=2.06$ ,  $df=77$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ); assaults without weapons ( $t=2.07$ ,  $df=77$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ) threats with weapons ( $t=2.83$ ,  $df=81$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ), and threats without weapons ( $t=2.77$ ,  $df=83$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ). A significant change also occurred, even though the average number of incidents is small, with respect to the average number of robberies without weapons ( $t=2.44$ ,  $df=83$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ).

The Latin Kings show significant decreases in all of the eight crime categories, except for murders, which changed little, and robberies with weapons. Among the Two-Six, reductions are far more modest and none of the changes between time periods were statistically significant. Further, there was even one small increase with respect to the average number of drive-by shootings. This increase, although not statistically significant, is meaningful and consistent with aggregate police data and field reports that Two-Six increased their participation in gang motivated violent activities.

To some extent, these differences may be attributable to regression or ceiling and age-related effects (as we shall see later). The Two-Six scores were generally considerably lower, on average, compared to the Latin Kings at Time I. The Two-Six reported a significantly lower number of drive-by shootings at baseline ( $t=2.62$ ,  $df=59$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ); fewer assaults with weapons ( $t=2.06$ ,  $df=42$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ); and fewer threats with weapons ( $t=3.29$ ,

df=49.1,  $p \leq .01$ ). They also differed on the low side from the Latin Kings, although not to a statistically significant degree, with respect to murders, assaults without weapons, robberies with weapons, and threats without weapons. The only category in which they were not lower, but slightly higher than average, than the Latin Kings at baseline was the category of robberies with weapons.

This self-report information is also somewhat consistent with Time I police and court data, which indicated the Two-Six were relatively more involved in property crime and the Latin Kings relatively more involved in violent crime. No significant differences exist between the gangs at Time II, and averages (assaults without weapons, robberies with weapons, robberies without weapons and threats without weapons) were higher for the Two-Six than for the Latin Kings.

Total Crimes (Violent and Non-Violent). Table 4 contains information on all crimes (violent and nonviolent) committed at baseline and Time II. Two measures are used. The first is an average of total crimes committed, independent of category. The second is a total count of the different types of crimes in which respondents engaged, ranging from 0 to 16 since there are 16 possible crime categories. Individuals received a point if they had committed any crimes in the category, regardless of the number of times they committed the crime.

The data in Table 4 indicate a statistically significant decrease (between Times I and II) in the total number of crimes

committed for the entire sample ( $t=5.15$ ,  $df=84$ ,  $p \leq .001$ ). Also, both gangs significantly decreased across time periods: for the Latin Kings,  $t=4.46$ ,  $df=44$ ,  $p \leq .001$  and slightly less of a decrease for the Two-Six,  $t=2.77$ ,  $df=40$ ,  $p \leq .01$ . Given the smaller reduction in violent crimes, the Two-Six experienced a decrease primarily in property-related crimes such as theft or property damage. The Latin Kings, on the other hand, who compared to the Two-Six underwent a significantly larger decrease between time periods, probably reduced their incidents of both violent and property crime. The Latin Kings were again higher scoring, on average, in their total crimes at baseline. However, by Time II, they reported fewer crimes than the Two-Six. The reduction for the Latin Kings was more than two times greater than it was for the Two-Six, and the difference between gangs, as noted, was statistically significant ( $t=2.12$ ,  $df=76$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ).

A count of the number of different crimes committed at least once out of the 16 possible crime categories also indicates that statistically significant reductions occurred in the whole sample over the two time periods ( $t=4.60$ ,  $df=84$ ,  $p \leq .001$ ). At baseline, the average respondent had committed as many as six different crimes at least one time; by the time of the second interview, this figure decreased to slightly more than three and a half incidents. The Latin Kings, again experiencing significant decreases in the number of different criminal activities engaged in over the two time periods ( $t=6.02$ ,  $df=44$ ,  $p \leq .001$ ), committed more than seven different crimes at least once at baseline compared to slightly

more than three at Time II. Among the Two-Six, the decrease over time was much smaller and not statistically significant; at baseline, they reported committing slightly less than five different crimes at least once and at Time II slightly more than four. Thus, the Latin Kings experienced a reduction of approximately four different crime categories on average while the Two-Six decreased by only about one half. The difference between gangs on this change score was statistically significant ( $t=3.66$ ,  $df=84$ ,  $p \leq .001$ ).

Drug Use. Data on drug use, contained in Table 5, indicate that for the whole sample, most usage was confined to marijuana and cocaine at both Time I and Time II. According to the Time II self-reports, some reduction in use occurred, particularly among the Latin Kings. Thus, at baseline, 91.1% of the Latin Kings were using marijuana ( $n=45$ ) compared to 62.2% at Time II. Among the Two-Six, there was a slight increase from 73.2% at baseline to 80.5% at Time II ( $n=41$ ). Nonetheless, the two gangs, though significantly different at baseline ( $\chi^2=4.79$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ), were not so at Time II.

A similar pattern also existed with respect to cocaine usage, but the changes were much smaller. There was a slight increase in usage for the whole sample from 33.7% to 34.9%. At baseline, 48.9% of the Latin Kings reported using cocaine compared to 46.7% at time II. Among the Two-Six, 17.1% were using at baseline compared to 21.9% at Time II. Despite this increase among the Two-Six,

significant differences between the gangs existed both at baseline ( $\chi^2=9.72$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ) and Time II ( $\chi^2=5.77$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ).

Only a few members of the sample used crack at baseline (1.2%,  $n=86$ ) and none reported using it at Time II. Similarly, no sample members at Time I or Time II said that they had used heroin. Fairly large proportions of each gang reported using "wickey stick" (PCP soaked marijuana cigarettes), at Time I (20.5% of the Latin Kings and 21.9% of the Two-Six). There was a reduction in use among the Latin Kings (to 9.1%) but there was no change among the Two-Six. There was also an increase in use of acid from 11.8% at baseline to 23.5% of the sample at Time II. As the data in the table indicate, increases occurred in both gangs.<sup>3</sup>

Drug Sales. Respondents were asked whether they had sold any of a number of different drugs in the past six months at both baseline and Time II. Data on the proportion of members in each gang involved in sales at both interviews are presented in Table 6. The data indicate that reductions occurred for the whole sample and within both gangs over the two time periods. As was the case with drug use, few respondents sold anything other than marijuana and cocaine. Thus, 45.1% of the sample reported selling marijuana at

---

<sup>3</sup> Changes in acid use might also be related to differences in the way the question was asked at baseline and Time II. At baseline, acid was mentioned when respondents were asked about other drug use. Given the large number of respondents mentioning this drug at baseline, a separate item asking about use of acid was added at Time II. This separate category did not exist at Time I, however, and it is possible that more respondents might have reported acid use if a category had existed.

Time I compared to 31.7% at Time II. Similarly, 30.1% of the sample was selling coke, compared to 20.5% at Time II. No more than 6% of the total sample at either time period was selling any of the other drugs listed.

Once again, the Latin Kings reported somewhat large reductions, especially for sales of marijuana and cocaine. Approximately 51% of the Latin Kings were selling marijuana at Time I compared to 36.6% at Time II. Similarly, 47.6% of the Latin Kings were selling cocaine at baseline compared to 26.2% at Time II. Overall, there were no categories in which the Latin Kings did not experience decreases in the proportion selling a given drug.

Among the Two-Six, this pattern was somewhat different. Like the Latin Kings, they also reported reductions in reported sales of marijuana, from 39.1% at Time I to 26.8% at Time II. However, they showed a slight increase in cocaine sales. Small increases also occurred in sales of wickey stick and acid.

These changes within gangs and the slightly different pattern of shifts are reflected in changes in significance levels between the gangs within time periods. Thus, a significantly greater proportion of the Latin Kings were selling cocaine at Time I compared to the Two-Six ( $\chi^2=12.37$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p \leq .001$ ). By Time II, the change among the Latin Kings was so great that the difference between gangs was longer statistically significant. Changes in self-reported drug selling behavior need to be interpreted very cautiously, however. Reports from the workers as well as answers to other items in the questionnaire contradict statements of

reduced drug dealing, especially by the Latin Kings. Illegal income from drug selling, and increased perceptions of neighborhood crime related to drugs, and gang fighting over drugs were especially noticeable among the Latin Kings. Forthcoming information from official police and court records will better substantiate the scope and nature of drug selling behavior since the intervention began. Our speculation, at this time, is that while gang members interviewed, especially Latin Kings, were forthcoming and reasonably honest in most of their reports on crime in other categories, they may have been hesitant to describe drug selling experiences because of recently developing drug business and local crime organization connections.

Detention Information. Table 7 presents data on involvement with the criminal justice system. The information indicates that greater proportions of the sample, particularly the Two-Six, had been in adult detention of some kind (Cook County Jail or State Correctional Facilities) in the six months prior to the interview at Time II than at baseline. At baseline, only 4.9% of the Two-Six (n=41) reported having been in adult detention while 43.9% had adult detention experience at Time II. Among the Latin Kings, the increase was less extreme but still somewhat large: from 28.9% to 44.4%. Significant differences between gangs existing at Time I ( $\chi^2=8.9$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ) disappeared by Time II when the two gangs were virtually identical.

Few respondents were in juvenile detention at baseline or Time

II. Similarly, only 7.1% of the sample were in a juvenile prison at some point as reported at baseline while none of the sample were in this situation just prior to the second interview. These reduction may have been due to the aging of the samples, especially among the Two-Six; a sizable subgroup were just turning 17 years at baseline. Also, perhaps some of those formerly in juvenile detention or prison were in adult detention at Time II. The data in Table 7 indicate that the proportion on probation was reduced slightly from 25.9% to 20.0% for the whole sample, but the shift was larger for the Latin Kings than for the Two-Six, who actually experienced a small increase in this category over the two time periods.

Also, looking within time periods, a significantly greater proportion of the Latin Kings were on parole at Time I compared to the Two-Six ( $\chi^2=5.56$ ,  $df=1$ , Fisher's Exact,  $p \leq .05$ ), and even though there was a reduction at Time II among the Latin Kings, the difference between gangs was still almost statistically significant at Time II ( $p=.056$ ); none of the Two-Six reported that they were on parole at Time II.

### **Gang Fighting**

Reasons for Fighting Between Gangs. Respondents were asked about fighting other gangs in the three month period before the interview at baseline and at Time II. Almost all respondents indicated at both time intervals that fighting occurred (96.1% at Time I and 94.9% at Time II,  $n=78$ ), with virtually no differences between

gangs. However, the reasons respondents gave for fighting changed.<sup>4</sup> These data are presented in Table 8. With the exception of the proportion endorsing gang rivalry/retaliation or "other" reasons, there were large changes in the proportions mentioning the various reasons over the two time periods. For example, only slightly more than 8% of the sample reported that values or seeing gang fighting as a way of life accounted for the fighting at baseline while 54.8% cited this reason at Time II. Similarly, 24.7% of the sample mentioned territorial or turf issues as a factor at Time I compared to 68.5% at Time II, and slightly less than 7% endorsed gang signs or colors as a motive at baseline compared to 60.3% at Time II. Issues of personality conflict and reputation or the need to impress women, as well as drug-related reasons for gang fighting at Time I changed less dramatically.

Each gang followed similar patterns of increase, with a few minor exceptions. Larger changes occurred over time within the Latin Kings related to the proportion of those endorsing values or a way of life, territory/turf issues, and gang signs and colors. Smaller increases existed in relation to reputation or the need to impress women and personality conflicts. Only a minor increase occurred in the proportion endorsing gang rivalry or retaliation as

---

<sup>4</sup> Questions were asked slightly differently at Time II than at baseline. At the first interview, respondents were asked if their gang had been fighting with other gangs in the last three months and if so, why. Up to five responses could be given. These responses were subsequently categorized for purposes of analysis. At the second interview, individuals who reported that their gang was fighting with other gangs were then asked to pick five reasons for the fighting from the list developed from the categories identified at baseline.

a motivating factor. This reason was very important at baseline and remained so at Time II for both the Latin Kings and the Two-Six. Compared to the sample as a whole, the Latin Kings somewhat increasingly mentioned drugs as a reason for gang fights.

Similar to the Latin Kings, the Two-Six displayed large increases in the proportions endorsing values or way of life, territory/turf issues, and gang signs or colors as reasons for fighting at the time of the second interview. In contrast to the Latin Kings, however, they also showed a larger increase in response to reputation or impressing women as motivating factors. There was a decrease for those Two-Six mentioning gang rivalry/retaliation between baseline and Time II, and a modest increase related to drugs as a reason for fighting.

While the gangs are somewhat different at Time II in relation to the proportions endorsing a given reason for fighting, none of the differences are large enough to be statistically significant. This is a change from Time I, when there were significant differences in the proportion endorsing gang signs or colors ( $\chi^2=5.51$ ,  $df=1$ , Fisher's Exact,  $p \leq .05$ ) and endorsing gang rivalry/retaliation as reasons for gang fighting ( $\chi^2=8.13$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ). At the same time, we note the relatively greater and consistent number of Two-Six endorsing more reasons for gang fighting at Time II than at Time I. Possibly the Two-Six were entering peak gang fighting years, while the Latin Kings were aging out. Furthermore, gang structures were different, with the Two-Six more fragmented and less responsive to gang leadership directives.

Location of Fighting Between Gangs. Table 9 contains information on the location of fighting between gangs at Time II.<sup>5</sup> The responses are not mutually exclusive across the different locations. As the data indicate, 84.9% of the sample agreed that fighting was occurring on Latin King Turf, while 90.4% reported that it was occurring on Two-Six territory. The largest proportion of respondents, however, said that fighting was occurring in contested turf (94.4%). A higher proportion of the total sample also said that fighting was occurring on the southside, (83.3%) compared to the northside, 39.4%, while 62.9% agreed that fighting was occurring outside the city. The Latin Kings were less likely to mention Two-Six Turf compared to the Two-Six, and this difference just missed attaining statistical significance ( $\chi^2=4.10$ ,  $df=1$ , Fisher's Exact,  $p = .056$ ). They were also significantly less likely to mention the southside ( $\chi^2=4.01$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ), suggesting that the Two-Six were perhaps fighting with gangs other than the Latin Kings in this part of the city.

The Seriousness of Fighting with Other Gangs. A comparison between responses at Time I and Time II with respect to the degree of seriousness of fighting with other gangs was attempted. Because items are not exactly comparable<sup>6</sup>, the changes should be viewed

---

<sup>5</sup> There was no comparable question on location at Time I.

<sup>6</sup> At baseline, respondents were asked how serious the fighting was between gangs. Answers were open-ended and coded in several ways--first, to determine if a weapon was used and second, what the results of the fighting were (i.e, hospitalization, death, not serious injury, and so on). At Time II, respondents were asked

with caution. The data are presented in Table 10. Preliminary analysis indicates a large increase in the number of incidents involving assault with a weapon between Times I and II. Among the total sample was a threefold increase from 22.9% at baseline to 79.7% at Time II. The Latin Kings increased from 17.7% at Time I to 76.5% at Time II; for the Two-Six, from 29.6% to 81.5%.

Despite an apparent increase in the use of weapons, there was a decrease in the reported number of deaths. For the whole sample, the decrease was from 68.3% to 25.4%. For the Latin Kings, this drop was especially dramatic, from 80.0% at baseline to 25.7%; for the Two-Six, the change was from 53.6% to 25.0%. On the other hand, there was a substantial increase in the proportion of respondents reporting that fighting resulted in very serious injury. As the data in Table 10 indicate, almost 8% of the total sample said at baseline that fighting resulted in very serious injury compared to 33.3% at Time II.<sup>7</sup> Fourteen percent of the Latin Kings mentioned very serious injuries at Time I compared to 37.1% at Time II; none of the Two-Six mentioned serious injuries at baseline while 28.6% did so at Time II.

These findings are in keeping with aggregate police statistics related to homicides and aggravated batteries for the district.

---

specifically whether or not fighting involved assault with a weapon and, as a separate question, whether the fighting resulted in death, very serious injury, serious injury, or not serious injury. Respondents were required to select one answer from these choices.

<sup>7</sup> Note that at baseline, the category used was hospitalization. This was felt to be equivalent to very serious injury, as was asked at Time II.

Data indicate a drop in the rate of gang-related homicides in the intervention district (District 10) from 15 in the two years prior to the project to 8 in the two years since the project began, or a 46.7% decrease. On the other hand, there was an increase in gang-related aggravated batteries from 137 to 198 in the two-year period since the intervention began.

Reasons for Fighting Between Gang Branches. Respondents were also asked, at both interviews, whether their section fought with other branches of the same gang in the last three months,<sup>8</sup> and the reasons for this fighting. Compared to responses at baseline, more respondents reported fighting between gang branches; 40.6% at baseline compared to 57.8% at Time II (See Table 11). Thus, 47.3% of the Latin Kings answered affirmatively at Time I compared to 52.6% at Time II (n=38), while 30.8% of the Two-Six said yes at baseline compared to 65.4% at Time II (n=26). Respondents as a whole were much more likely to endorse reasons such as status/power (an increase from 8.3% at baseline to 61.1% at Time II), alcohol (an increase from 2.8% to 41.7%), personality conflicts (from 19.4% to 52.8%), rivalry (from 5.6% to 33.3%) and gang violations (from 2.8% to 19.4%). Mention of drugs as a cause for fights between

---

<sup>8</sup> At baseline, this question was "Has your gang been fighting with other branches of the same gang in the last 3 months?" If respondents answered in the affirmative, they were asked the following open-ended questions: "Why all the fighting with the gang?"; "Why did the fighting start?"; and "How serious is the fighting?" Responses to these open-ended items were categorized and analyzed at baseline. These categories were then used to create a list of responses from which respondents at Time II selected up to 5 reasons for current fighting.

branches also increased, but the jump was particularly great for the Latin Kings. At baseline, 5.3% of the Latin Kings mentioned drugs as a factor, while 42.1% selected drugs as a reason at Time II (n=19). Again, the increase in reasons given could have been partially an artifact of a change in the way questions were asked (close-ended choices provided) at Time II.

Location of Fighting Between Gang Branches. The two gangs differed in respect to the location of branch fights. Not surprisingly 100.0% of the Latin Kings reported branch fighting occurred on Latin King Turf, and 100.% of the Two-Six said branch fights occurred on Two-Six Turf. While none of the Latin Kings said that they were having branch fights in Two-Six territory, a small proportion of Two-Six (3.7%, n=27) agreed that fighting between branches was occurring in Latin King territory. As was true with respect to the location of fights between gangs, the Two-Six were significantly more likely to also report fighting on the southside (i.e., south of the target area); 59.3% of the Two-Six agreed that fighting between branches took place on the southside compared to 5.3% of the Latin Kings (n=19;  $\chi^2=13.96$ , df=1, Fisher's Exact,  $p \leq .001$ ). No Latin Kings reported branch fights on the northside of the area. By and large, the Latin Kings on the northside would be considered a somewhat separate but closely aligned part of the Latin King "Nation."

Seriousness of Fights Between Branches. Respondents in both gangs

said the fighting primarily involved assault without a weapon<sup>9</sup> (84.1%, n=46). This was true somewhat more of the Latin Kings (94.1%, n=17) compared to the Two-Six (77.8%, n=27). However, no one at either baseline or Time II said that the incidents resulted in death. In the majority of cases at Time II, the responses were not serious injury (75.8%, n=33) with slightly more Latin Kings falling into this category than the Two-Six (81.3% versus 70.6%).

Fighting within Gangs. Based on a small group of answers at Time I which indicated that fighting within each gang branch also sometimes occurred, those interviewed again were asked specifically about fighting within their own section. Twenty percent of all respondents said that such activity was occurring (n=79), but while a significant difference between the gangs exists with regard to this variable. Thus, 15.4% of the Latin Kings (n=39) reported fighting within their gang compared to 35.0% of the Two-Six (n=40,  $\chi^2=4.02$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ). In the majority of cases (89.5%, n=19), those engaged in such fighting reported that it involved assault without a weapon and that it did not result in serious injury (90%, n=20). No one reported that it resulted in death.

#### **Summary: Changes in Criminal and Gang-Violent Activity**

The effectiveness of the Gang Violence Reduction Program for the purpose of this report was measured based on the extent to

---

<sup>9</sup> There is no comparable data on weapons for baseline interviews.

which self-reported gang violence by program youths changed or was reduced. Of special interest was change in the pattern of the following self-reported offenses while the youth was in the program: homicides, drive-by shootings, batteries with and without a weapon, robberies with and without a weapon, and threats with and without a weapon. These measures were combined into a violence index, broader than the one used in the analysis of police and court data, individually and at aggregate area levels. The self-report violence index did not distinguish between gang and non-gang violence.<sup>10</sup>

The key finding was that gang youth in the program reported a significantly lower level of violent crime in each of the eight component violence measures at the Time II interview, after program services or contact with Project staff had occurred for approximately one year. The decreases were particularly marked for the Latin Kings. In general, the level of gang violence was much higher for the Latin Kings at Time I, and with a sharp drop at Time II, was essentially at the same level as violent crime reported by the Two-Six. There was evidence of a slight increase in drive-by shootings by Two-Six at Time II, based on self-reports. All other indicators of gang violence by the Two-Six, however, declined.

Analysis of all crime--violent and property--indicated a significant drop for Latin Kings and Two-Six. An average of

---

<sup>10</sup>It was assumed, based on the findings of the Time I survey, in which almost all violent and non-violent crime was committed in association with gang peers, that a broader based definition of gang crime was appropriate.

different types of crime was computed for the two gangs. The types of crimes for both gangs were reduced, but to a much greater degree for the Latin Kings. Much of the drop for the Two-Six was accounted for by a decrease in non-violent crime. Drug use data, especially of marijuana and cocaine, suggested a large decline for the Latin Kings, but a slight increase for the Two-Six. Both gangs increased their use of "wickey-stick," i.e., marijuana cigarettes dipped in PCP. The data on drug sales was less reliable, with some questionable reports of a drop in sale of marijuana and cocaine.

Respondent reports of involvement with the Justice System suggested an aging out of contact with the juvenile justice system and to some extent the adult system. The important difference was an increase in adult detentions for both gangs, but especially for the Two-Six.

Of interest was information on the extent to which gang fighting was still occurring in the community. The data indicated that a high level of such activity was still occurring for both gangs. Whether gang member respondents were involved in such activities, directly or indirectly, was not clear, however. There was some evidence for increase in traditional gang fighting values and norms associated with gang violence, but whether there was an increase in actual gang violent conduct was not apparent based on self-report data.

Between the gangs, most fighting tended to occur within the Little Village area. A considerable amount, however, also took place outside the area, particularly on the southside, i.e., south

of the program area and in the western suburbs, especially Cicero. The reported gang incidents appeared to be increasingly violent, but resulted significantly less often in murders and more often in very serious injury. Also escalating were fights within respective gangs, especially across the different branches, but this did not result generally in serious injury.

The self-reported behavioral data indicating the extent and nature to which violent crime (and non-violent crime) decreased during the program period was generally significant for both gangs, but especially for the Latin Kings. Some positive changes or decreases occurred in self-reported drug use and property crime, mainly for the Two-Six. Reports of a decrease in drug selling, however, were questionable, based on field observations. In any case, the self-report data strongly indicated that gang members served by the program had indeed experienced an important, if not statistically significant, decline in violent behavior. Reasons or explanation for the decline, especially the direct effects of the program, have to be determined.

### **Explanatory Variables**

In the remainder of this report, we attempt to account for the change in violence and criminal behavior of program youth, particularly the youth interviewed at baseline and at Time II. The intent of an analysis is to determine whether, to what extent, and how the Gang Violence Reduction Project contributed to the changes described in the findings presented above. However, the causation,

control, and remediation of gang crime, particularly of hard-core late adolescents and early young adults, in an inner-city, low income Latino community are complex matters. Not only the possible effects of the Gang Violence Reduction Project but other factors must also be examined to account for these changes.

Our analysis and discussion, therefore, are guided by theory and data derived from other findings of the Gang Youth Interviews bearing on community disorganization, anomie or alienation, opportunity, socioeconomic status, socialization, differential group association, and personal and family disorganization. These as well as specific variables derived from project worker efforts and respondent perceptions of the program are examined for the entire sample and particular gangs over time and within time periods.

Community Disorganization. Respondents were asked a series of questions about the scope and nature of crime in the community at both the baseline and Time II interviews in an effort to address issues of community disorganization. Perceptions of gang youth regarding criminal justice agency efforts to deal with this problem were solicited. Questions were asked about levels of community gang and non-gang crime, including general gang activities, fear of victimization, actions taken to avoid gang crime, and whether adults used youth in the community for illegal activities, and if so, the nature of these activities.

Table 12 presents data on the overall severity of gang and

non-gang crime in the community.<sup>11</sup> A change score, reflecting the difference between ratings at baseline and Time II, was computed. The data indicate significant declines in ratings or perceptions between baseline and Time II for non-gang and gang-related crime (for non-gang crime,  $t=9.30$ ,  $df=81$ ,  $p\leq.001$ , and for gang crime,  $t=5.97$ ,  $df=83$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ). Gang crime at both interview periods was seen as a more serious problem than non-gang crime. However, gang as well as non-gang-related crime at Time II was perceived as significantly less serious than at baseline.

The Two-Six experienced a change in perceptions between time periods on non-gang crime in the community generally, reflected by a decrease of almost one full point in the scale value; this change was statistically significant ( $t=7.18$ ,  $df=39$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ). There was also a statistically significant reduction in evaluations of the seriousness of gang crime across time periods as perceived by the Two-Six ( $t=6.84$ ,  $df=40$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ), but this change was slightly smaller than the one for non-gang crime.

The Latin Kings also underwent significant reductions in their views of the seriousness of non-gang and gang crime problems (for non-gang crime,  $t=6.01$ ,  $df=42$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ; for gang crime,  $t=2.58$ ,

---

<sup>11</sup> The questions asked were "How serious a crime problem do you think exists in your community (within the last 6 months) in regard to each of the following gang and nongang-related crimes: graffiti, breaking and entering, car theft, robbery, intimidation, fights without a weapon, drive-by shooting, possession of a knife, possession of a gun, drug selling and drug use. The options were (1) "no problem", (2) "a small problem", (3) "a serious problem", and (4) "a very serious problem. The scores were aggregated for each item per individual by type, gang or nongang, and then divided by the total number of items (12) in the scale.

df=43,  $p \leq .05$ ). However, the reductions were smaller for the Latin Kings than for the Two-Six. Within time periods, there were relatively small differences between the evaluation of the level of gang and non-gang crime by the Two-Six and Latin Kings at baseline. However, the Latin Kings perceived non-gang crimes as significantly more serious compared to the Two-Six at Time II ( $T=2.66$ ,  $df=81$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ). The gangs were almost identical with respect to their rating of gang-related crime at Time II.

**Fear of Victimization** - Respondents in the total sample were less likely to report that they were afraid to walk in the community at Time II compared to their responses at baseline (43.4% at Time I versus 34.9% at Time II). However, this change was primarily accounted for by the decrease in the number of Latin Kings who expressed fear (38.1% at baseline, 23.8%, at Time II,  $n=42$ ). Among the Two-Six, the change was minimal (48.8% at baseline and 46.3% at Time II,  $n=41$ ). Also, there were significant differences between the gangs on this question at Time II ( $\chi^2=4.63$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ). In addition, the Latin Kings were less likely to report that they were afraid because of specific gang-related concerns at Time II compared to their responses at baseline (30.9% at Time I versus 21.4% at Time II,  $n=42$ ). Slightly more of the Two-Six, however, had this concern at the time of the second interview than at baseline (41.5% at baseline compared to 43.9% at Time II,  $n=41$ ). Again, significant differences existed between the gangs at Time II ( $\chi^2=4.63$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ). The Latin Kings consistently showed less fear about moving about in the

community.

The respondent groups reduced their estimate of the likelihood of someone in their families being a victim of crime in the community at the time of the second interview compared to their rating at Time I (an average of 1.97 at baseline versus 2.19 at Time II, n=73).<sup>12</sup> While differences between ratings at Time I and II were not statistically significant for the whole sample, they were significant for the Two-Six ( $t=-2.34$ ,  $df=38$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ) whose average rating changed from 1.87 to 2.23 at Time II.

**Seeing and Avoiding Gang-Related Crime** - Table 13 provides information on changes in the percent of respondents in the sample as a whole and in each gang who reported witnessing gang-related crimes in the six months prior to the interview at baseline and Time II. The data indicate a small increase in the proportion of respondents witnessing fighting within and between gangs at the time of the second interview compared to responses at baseline. Witnesses to drug selling activity remained constant over time. On the other hand, there were small decreases in the proportions of the sample witnessing gang intimidation and gang recruitment activities. Larger reductions were in the proportion witnessing drive-by shootings. Overall, the sample experienced a small decrease in the average number of total crimes witnessed across time periods, but none of the changes was statistically

---

<sup>12</sup> Ratings were based on responses to a question which asked "What would you say is the likelihood that anyone in your family will be a victim of crime in your community during the coming year?" Responses were 1=high, 2=moderate and 3=low.

significant, except for the decrease in the average number of crimes observed at Time II compared to baseline for the Two-Six ( $t=2.42$ ,  $df=40$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ).

Data on specific activities undertaken to avoid gang crime is presented in Table 14. Members of both gangs were less likely to engage in avoidance measures of legitimate situations at Time II compared to their responses at baseline. Thus, 41.5% of all respondents reported at baseline that they turned down a job because of concerns about gang crime while 31.7% reported doing so at Time II ( $n=82$ ). Similarly, 61.5% of the sample reported that they went out with someone else so as not to be alone at the time of the first interview, but by Time II, this percent had decreased to 49.4% ( $n=83$ ). In general, the number of items endorsed by the total sample related to avoidant behaviors at Time II was lower than the total at baseline (2.53 items at baseline compared to 2.15 items at Time II) though the change was slightly greater among the Latin Kings than the Two-Six.

As the data indicate, the Latin Kings, at the time of the second interview, were often much less likely to engage in avoidance or special protection measures on two items: going out with someone else so as not to be alone or avoiding school, compared to their responses at baseline. Indeed, there were statistically significant differences between the two gangs at Time II on these two particular items (going out with someone,  $\chi^2=6.37$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ; avoiding school,  $\chi^2=5.31$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ). The Two-Six, more often, had changed less on specific measures or had

increased slightly.

**Adults Using Gang Youth For Illegal Activities** - There was evidence that contextual opportunities, inducements, or temptations for criminal behaviors decreased somewhat between baseline and Time II. Table 15 contains information on adults' use of gang youth for illegal activity. Respondents were asked if in the past year adults in the community used gang youth for illegal or criminal activities and if so, what activities. While the reduced sample size suggests a need for caution in generalizing about the findings, the data indicate that overall, based mainly on opportunities or inducements available to the Two-Six, an increased proportion of the total sample agreed at Time II that adults use gang youth for illegal activities. The most striking increase in the types of activities for which respondents reported adults used gang youth were related to both selling and using drugs. Among the total sample, there was an increase in the proportion endorsing this category from 3.5% at baseline to 36.8% at Time II. There were also small increases for those endorsing gang crime and firearm-related activities (e.g., holding guns, etc.). Apart from these three categories, there were somewhat slight decreases compared to reports at baseline in the proportions who mentioned personal crime, property crime, protection related activities and "other" illegal activities. In contrast to drug-related activities, the biggest decrease for the sample pertained to activities involving alcohol (drinking with minors, for example). At baseline, almost 44% of the sample mentioned these activities,

while no one endorsed this category at Time II.

Patterns of the two gangs over time were somewhat different from whole sample trends. The Latin Kings experienced a reduction in the proportion who believed that adults used gang youth for illegal activities between the two Time periods. Further, there were substantial decreases in the proportions stating that inducements to personal crime, property crime and alcohol-related activities existed at Time II compared to responses at Time I. However, a larger proportion of Latin King respondents mentioned that adults used gang youths to distribute drugs at Time II.

Among the Two-Six, there was a large increase in the number endorsing or saying yes to the screen question. Further, and in contrast to the Latin Kings, the Two-Six underwent increases in the proportions mentioning personal and property crime at Time II compared to responses at Time I. As was the case with the Latin Kings, more of the Two-Six mentioned drug-related activities at Time II than at baseline, and this increase was almost comparable to that of the Latin Kings. There were slight increases in the proportions mentioning firearms and gang crime as well. Finally, the Two-Six experienced a reduction in the proportion mentioning alcohol-related activities, but the reduction was much more modest than the change among the Latin Kings.

Perhaps as a result of the differential change patterns between the gangs over time, some significant differences between the gangs at baseline no longer existed at Time II. In effect, the two gangs, which differed substantially in responses to these

questions at baseline, became more similar at Time II. Thus, significant differences relating to the proportion endorsing the screen question ( $\chi^2=18.31$ ,  $df=1$ , Fisher's Exact,  $p \leq .001$ ), as well as those mentioning personal crime ( $\chi^2=19.46$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p \leq .001$ ), property crime ( $\chi^2=26.29$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p \leq .001$ ) and alcohol ( $\chi^2=23.62$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p \leq .001$ ) which existed at baseline were no longer apparent at Time II.

The same pattern is evident among those respondents who agree that these adults, who use gang youth in such activities, are current or former gang members. Among the whole sample, there were slight increases in the proportions agreeing with both these statements across time periods. However, the number of Latin Kings who endorsed these statements decreased, while there was an increase among the Two-Six. Thus, while significant differences between the gangs were present at Time I, with the Latin Kings significantly more likely to answer positively in both cases, the decrease among members of the Latin Kings and increase among members of the Two-Six resulted in almost identical proportions for these items at Time II.

**Criminal Justice and Community Change that Might Account for Improvement in the Gang Situation** - Several questions in both interviews related to police, probation and community group involvement in dealing with the gang problem. Total sample responses at the second interview indicate a perception of agency and community change for the better.

Table 16 contains information about respondents' evaluation of

police effectiveness in dealing with the gang problem in comparison to their evaluation at Time I. Responses were based on a three point scale with 1=better, 2=the same and 3=worse. The data indicate gang respondents overall felt the police improved in the majority of the nine performance activities. The exceptions were in respect to arrests of those getting in trouble, speed of response, effectiveness specifically with the gang problem, and ability to solve community problems. Generally, in these latter categories, respondents saw the police as about equally effective as they did at baseline or slightly worse. The gangs were similar in most respects although there were significant differences at the .05 level with respect to the evaluation of patrolling in cars, arrests of known criminals, and speed of response. In all cases, the Latin Kings gave a lower evaluation of the effectiveness of police performance at Time II than did the Two-Six.

Probation - Respondents were also asked whether they had known any probation officers in the past year who had dealt with the gang problem, and if so, questions were asked about the activities of these officers. At the time of the baseline interview, 22.4% of all respondents (n=76) knew a probation officer dealing with the gang problem compared to 18.4% at Time II. There was little change in the general view about the kinds of activities probation officers engaged in. Roughly 15% of all respondents agreed that probation officers were doing a good job of supervision at both interview periods (14.5% at baseline; 15.8% at Time II). There was a small decrease or no change in the proportion aware of officers

who helped individuals obtain job training (13.3% at baseline versus 8.0% at Time II) or get a job (12.0% at baseline compared to 12.0% at Time II). The largest change occurred with respect to the proportion who knew a probation officer who had violated a probationer; at baseline, 10.8% of the sample (n=74) knew an officer who had done this compared to only 2.7% at Time II.

At baseline, the Latin Kings had limited awareness of probation officers dealing with the gang problem (10.5% (n=38)). The percentage fell to 5.3% at Time II. More of the Two-Six knew probation officers at both interview times (34.2% at baseline and 31.6% at Time II, n=38). The difference between gangs at both time periods was statistically significant (at baseline,  $\chi^2=6.14$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ; at Time II,  $\chi^2=8.76$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ). There was little change over time within each gang in relation to the number who felt probation officers did a good job of supervision, helped with personal problems, helped with school problems, helped obtain job training and jobs, or violated a probationer. In all cases, smaller proportions of the Latin Kings answered affirmatively compared to the Two-Six. This is not surprising given that fewer members of the Latin Kings knew probation officers at either interview. Roughly 15% to 25% of the Two-Six endorsed one of these items at both Time I and Time II compared to between 0% and 9% of the Latin Kings. Relatively more Latin Kings had committed serious crimes of violence, had relatively greater experience with the prison system, and consequently were likely to know more about parole than probation.

Resident/Community Involvement in the Gang Problem - Despite methodological limitations in interpreting some of the findings, the gangs clearly saw community groups as more active in dealing with the gang problem and involved in a broader range of positive activities at Time II than at Time I. Respondents were asked about the efforts of local residents or organizations to reduce gang crime. Those answering affirmatively to the screen question ("In the past year, have residents or organizations done anything to help reduce gang crime?") were then asked to identify those individuals or organizations involved in such activities from a list of groups.<sup>13</sup> A further question about the types of activities was asked as an open-ended item.

Table 17 indicates that substantially more individuals in both gangs responded positively to the screen question at Time II than at baseline, particularly for the Latin Kings, although there was a large increase among the Two-Six as well. Further, in all cases, more individuals were likely to name a group at Time II compared to Time I for both gangs (see Note 13 regarding a caution in interpreting this finding). Large increases for both gangs are particularly noticeable with respect to those mentioning church

---

<sup>13</sup> Note that at the time of the baseline interview, the question about the specific groups involved in such activities was open-ended and the categories used at Time II were derived from responses to this question. However, it is possible that changes or the increase in the magnitude of responses are related to the change in the way the question was asked since those being given a list and asked to respond in a yes/no fashion to the list may have endorsed more items than those who were simply asked to list answers, as was the case at baseline. The question about activities engaged in by those involved remained open-ended for both interviews.

groups, community groups, police, and the alderman. In addition, large increases among the Latin Kings in particular exist with respect to neighborhood watch groups while the same is true for the Two-Six with respect to block clubs.

When asked to indicate specifically what groups were doing, substantially more respondents in both gangs mentioned community organizing and recreational activities compared to responses at Time I (See Table 18). In addition, small but still larger proportions of the sample mentioned jobs at Time II compared to Time I. The Latin Kings in particular were somewhat more likely to mention intervention/counseling and community policing at Time II compared to baseline while the Two-Six changed little or not at all in these categories. Further, none of the Two-Six mentioned education/awareness-related activities at either interview while increasing proportions of the Latin Kings did so. Differences between the gangs at Time II in this category were statistically significant ( $p \leq .05$ ). The Two-Six were more likely to mention clean-up activities at Time II compared to baseline while few of the Latin Kings mentioned such activities at either interview.

**Summary: Community Disorganization** - It is likely that certain changes in the Little Village environment, social, economic, and organizational, could explain or account for the changes in gang youth behaviors and a modification of gang crime patterns, especially a reduction in gang violence. Many of these changes in community environment--structural and process--probably acted through the gang structure to change behavior. We examine

these changes in gang structure and process in the next section. In the present section, we are especially interested in the degree to which gang youth, a year after Program exposure, were integrated into the adult criminal structure and the extent to which criminal justice agencies and community groups were active in their efforts to deal with gang crime.

In general, the total sample viewed the levels of gang and non-gang crime in the Little Village community as significantly reduced at Time II. The Latin Kings saw the community crime situation as somewhat less pervasive than did the Two-Six at Time II. Drug dealing and gang fighting were perceived as still high if not higher, but drive-by shootings and gang intimidation had been reduced. Gang member respondents seemed somewhat less fearful about moving about alone in the community. Fewer of them turned down a job or stopped attending school because of fear of gang crime.

Access to the criminal structure mainly through adults who wanted to use gang youth for a variety of illegal activities were somewhat less available to the total sample, except for access to drug selling opportunities. Personal and property crime opportunities seemed to be increasing in the Two-Six territory but reducing in the Latin King territory at Time II. The adults or former gang members who involved gang youth in illegal activities appeared generally to be less evident in the area of the Latin Kings but were more evident in the area of the Two-Six.

Agents of the criminal justice system and community groups

were perceived as doing a better job in a variety of ways at Time II than they were at Time I. The police were more often viewed as present (i.e., walking the streets, patrolling in cars, arresting criminals, arresting and harassing gang members), but not as effectively solving gang or community problems compared to Time I. In general, there was a general perception that police as well as other community groups, including block clubs, churches, alderman's office, and neighborhood watch groups, were more involved or active in trying to deal with the gang problem. The Little Village community generally seemed less conducive to gang crime and better organized at Time II than at baseline.

Differential Group Association. In this section, we examine measures of group association, particularly involvement in gangs, i.e., their structure and process, including the respondent's level of activity in the gang, his status in the gang, and his or her plans to leave the gang. The results suggested not only changes in respondent perceptions about the community, but changes in gang members' involvement in the gang. By the time of the second interview, gang participation seems to have diminished a little for respondents. A slightly smaller percent of members of both gangs were likely to indicate that they were active members compared to baseline (94.2% at baseline versus 87.2% at Time II, n=86). More members of both gangs described themselves as former gang members at Time II (8.9% at Time I versus 13.3% for the Latin Kings and 2.4% versus 9.8% at Time II for the Two-Six). While none of the

members of either gang identified themselves as non-gang members at baseline, a small percent of the Latin Kings said that they were not gang members at Time II (2.2%, n=45).

**Reduction in Gang Association** - All individuals who reported that they were currently active gang members were asked if they had been active continually with their gang section in the past year, and if they were less active, why. A similar question was asked at baseline, permitting comparison of the two time periods.<sup>14</sup> Table 19 contains information about the proportion of respondents who were less active and the reasons.

As the data in the table indicate, a greater proportion of all respondents reported being less active at Time II than at Time I (11.5% at baseline compared to 35.9% at Time II). Not all responses concerning reasons for reduced activity included at Time II were also included at baseline. However, where comparisons are possible, the data indicate that a large proportion of the sample said they were less active because they were working. We examine this factor further in another section. Also, an increased proportion reported they were less active because they had retired or grown out of gang involvement. The aging of the sample might

---

<sup>14</sup> Individuals were asked, at baseline, if they had been a member of their present gang section actively and continually. Those who said no were asked to explain interruptions. From these explanations, a series of categories were derived and these were used to classify data at baseline. The same categories, as well as some additional ones, were used at Time II. However, at the second interview, respondents who said they were less active in the past year were read the list of possible reasons and asked to indicate if this was a reason or not. This may account for the higher levels of endorsement at Time II in general.

explain such changes. Few respondents at either interview mentioned that they were less active because they were in school or because they had moved out of the neighborhood.

While there is no comparable data from baseline, it is worth noting that fairly large proportions of the sample acknowledged the influence of parents or spouses/girlfriends as factors in their reduction of gang activity. The influence of the community youth worker also seemed to have been important, as was pressure from police, more so than pressure from probation.

With few exceptions, the pattern of change for the whole sample were reflected in each gang across time periods. Slightly more Latin Kings mentioned school as a reason for reduced activity at Time I compared to Time II. Yet there was also an increase in the proportion of Two-Six mentioning this. More of the Two-Six than Latin Kings reported that they had retired or grown out of gang activity at Time II, but the difference between gangs was not statistically significant. Significantly more of the Two-Six than Latin Kings acknowledged the influence of the community worker in their decreased activity ( $\chi^2=4.31$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ). The Two-Six were also slightly more likely to mention the influence of parents and pressure from probation and police. As later analysis will show, the Two-Six were more likely to be living with parents at Time II. In addition, police and probation officers reported more contact with members of the Two-Six than with the Latin Kings. Such differences may account for the variations reported here. Finally, we note that individuals who reported that they were

former gang members or no longer active at the time of the second interview were also asked about the reasons they left the gang. Although the number of individuals involved is quite small (n=10), the reasons cited most often were family responsibilities (wife or girlfriend 50%) followed by growing out of it (20%). Again, the aging factor may have been particularly important; the Latin Kings were older than the Two-Six by a little more than a year.

**Changes in Status within the Gang** - A second measure of involvement in gang life was derived from responses to a question about status or position in the gang at the time of each interview. Respondents were given a choice of identifying themselves as leader, core member (with the gang all the time), regular member (not with the gang all the time), or peripheral member (don't hang out at all or minimally hang out).<sup>15</sup> In addition, a fifth category was created in which individuals who said they were no longer active or those who said they were former gang members in response to the question about activity level discussed previously were grouped together for purposes of analysis, particularly for examining movement or shifts from one status to another.

Table 20 compares status or position at Time I and Time II and includes some summary measures of position shifts. The data indicate a smaller proportion of the sample were leaders and core members at Time II than at Time I. Conversely, increases occurred

---

<sup>15</sup> At Time I, a fifth category of "associate" was included, but this was felt to be similar to regular member and was dropped at Time II. For purposes of comparison, the regular member category at Time I included both those who said they were regular members and associates.

over time with respect to the proportions who said they were regular members. Slightly more than half (53%) of the sample were less involved or at a lower status at Time II compared to their status at baseline, while only 14.5% reported greater involvement. In addition, almost 10% of the sample moved from positions of leadership or core membership to peripheral positions or to non-active status by Time II.

The Latin Kings experienced a small increase between the two interviews in the proportion who were in leadership positions, but there was a very large drop in the proportion identifying themselves as core members (from 60.0% at baseline to 31.4% at Time II). The number of regular members also increased substantially. In sum, a total of 58.1% of the Latin Kings indicated less involvement in the gang compared to the 18.6% who indicated greater involvement between baseline and Time II. Sixteen percent specifically moved from leadership or core positions to peripheral or non-active ones.

The pattern of change was slightly different for the Two-Six. In contrast to the Latin Kings, a substantial proportion decreased in leadership positions at Time II compared to Time I, but there was only a small decrease for core members. As was true of the Latin Kings, there was an increase in the proportion of regular members at Time II among the Two-Six, but it was not as great as for the Latin Kings. Nonetheless, almost half of the Two-Six underwent a change in status to being less involved at Time II. Further, only 10.0% were more involved than they had been at Time

I. However, slightly more than 42% of the Two-Six experienced no change in status between the time of the two interviews compared to 23.3% of the Latin Kings. This difference between the gangs falls just short of statistical significance ( $p=.061$ ).

Other differences between the gangs within time periods indicate that among those interviewed twice a significantly smaller proportion of the Latin Kings identified themselves as leaders at Time I compared to the proportion of Two-Six in this category ( $\chi^2=9.36$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ). Some of this might have been due to a prohibition, especially by the Latin Kings, against discussing such matters and differential adherence within the gangs to this prohibition. The data indicate that members of both gangs were less likely to identify themselves as leaders or core members at Time II compared to Time I, but the Latin Kings were significantly less likely to do so at Time II than were the Two-Six ( $\chi^2=3.87$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ).

**Plans to Leave the Gang** - Respondents at both interviews were asked if they thought they would ever leave the gang, the reasons they would do so and if they were currently thinking about leaving.<sup>16</sup> Data in Table 21 indicate a shift in the proportion of individuals thinking they would ever leave. Among the sample as a whole, this shift was slight, from 65.1% at baseline to 68.2% at

---

<sup>16</sup> Note that at baseline, respondents who thought they would leave the gang were asked to list the reasons. These reasons were then categorized and formed the basis for the choices with which respondents were presented at Time II. At baseline, respondents could give more than one reason. At Time II, they had to choose the main reason from the list provided.

Time II. Also, only slightly more respondents in the total sample were currently thinking of leaving at Time II than at baseline, but there were some noticeable changes in the reasons for leaving.

Twice as many individuals mentioned family responsibilities as a reason at Time II compared to Time I, while half as many mentioned getting married as a reason. Few respondents mentioned job responsibilities although, as noted above, it was apparently an important factor in reducing gang activity. Only a small increase in the proportion of the total sample mentioned retirement or growing out of it as reasons for leaving. Again, this was viewed as an important factor in reduction of gang activity. Apparently, gang members made a distinction between leaving the gang and reducing gang activity. The proportion mentioning personal goals at Time I and Time II did not change.

There were somewhat different patterns of change within each gang across time with regard to thoughts about leaving. Of particular interest was a decrease in the number of Two-Six who thought they would ever leave the gang, while the Latin Kings increased. However, significant differences between the gangs at baseline ( $\chi^2=3.96$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ) no longer existed at Time II. A similar converse pattern of change was evident in relation to the proportion currently thinking about leaving at Time I and Time II; thus, at baseline, 31.4% of the Latin Kings were thinking of leaving compared to 57.1% at Time II, while among the Two-Six, 51.6% were considering leaving at the time of the first interview compared to 35.5% at Time II.

Differences between the gangs were also evident in the reasons for leaving. The number of Latin Kings mentioning family responsibilities more than doubled across the two time periods, but there was only a small increase in this category among the Two-Six. Thus, while the two gangs were similar in this category at baseline, significant differences were present at Time II ( $\chi^2=4.28$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ). Similarly, both gangs experienced increases across time periods for those who said that they would leave because they had grown out of gang activity or retired. However, at both baseline and Time II, the Two-Six were significantly more likely to give this answer (for baseline,  $\chi^2=9.52$ ,  $df=1$ , Fisher's Exact,  $p \leq .01$ ; for Time II,  $\chi^2=4.04$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ). Fewer Latin Kings mentioned marriage as a reason at Time II compared to their responses at baseline, but there was no change in this response among the Two-Six.

**Summary: Differential Gang Association** - The youth's relation to the gang was viewed as extremely important in determining to what extent he would adhere to values and behaviors of criminal conduct. The data indicated that gang members tended to withdraw their commitments to gang life over time. More gang members considered themselves less active or even former gang members at Time II than at baseline. Family life, parental influence and "retirement" or "growing out of it" seemed to be key factors in the reduction of commitment to gang structure and process. Employment and the influence of community youth workers were also important.

A reduced commitment to gang life also seemed to be related to

a shift in status level or position in the gang. Substantial proportions of youth went from leader or core to regular or peripheral positions or at least to stated less involvement in gangs by Time II. The Latin Kings experienced a greater status shift toward reduced gang involvement than did the Two-Six. The data suggest, however, that reduced commitment or position in the gang was not quite equivalent to leaving or planning to leave the gang, at least not for highly committed gang members, as most of the interviewed youth were.

There was no clear or consistent evidence that gang youth considered leaving the gang--only reducing gang activity. Certain factors considered important in reducing commitment were not critical in the decision to leave the gang. Job, "retirement," "growing out of it," and even "getting married" were not as important in the decision to make the final break as where "family responsibilities."

Each gang seemed to have a different pattern of reduced contact or termination from the gang. The Latin Kings, a more cohesive and structured gang, seemed to be less exposed or responsive than the Two-Six to influences of job, parents, police, probation, community youth worker and rationalization in leaving the gang. On the other hand, the Latin Kings seemed to be more responsive to status shifts within the gang, from leader and core to regular or peripheral member. These shifts seemed to account for more of the decreased involvement in the gang than was the case for the Two-Six.

Social Control: Patterns of Social Attachment. In this section we examine the changing patterns of social attachment of gang youth to normative adolescent and young adult socialization structures or institutions, household, family, children, friends, youth agencies. The nature and extent of such socialization imply variable social control mechanisms which compel or encourage youth toward either legitimate or criminal patterns of socialization. The youths in this study have deeply ingrained gang attachments, yet other institutional pulls in their environment serve to mitigate their ties to gangs. Over time, these other, often legitimate sources of social attachment, facilitate the reduction of gang activity and even cessation of gang contact by youth.

Certain conditions (i.e., age, length of time resident is in the community, and existence and ties to established institutions, such as churches, youth agencies and other community organizations) structure these evolving conventional socialization patterns. In this section, we emphasize the structural aspect of these attachments, and the degree to which they exist. In the following section, we look more closely at the quality or psychological dynamics of the relationships to these institutions, e. g., parents, family, girlfriends, over time.

**Age Differences** - Age affects socialization. As noted earlier, significant age differences existed between the two gangs at the time of the second interview. Among the Two-Six, the average age of respondents as measured at the first interview was 18.0 years (n=41) compared to an average of 20.2 for the Latin

Kings (n=46;  $t=4.39$ ,  $df=84$ ,  $p \leq .001$ ). This two year difference among those interviewed twice is greater than the difference between gangs which existed at baseline among the 108 who were interviewed. Among this group, the average age for the Two-Six was 18.7 compared to 20.2 years for the Latin Kings. While the difference between gangs on age was statistically significant for the baseline sample ( $t=3.15$ ,  $df=106$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ), the gap was somewhat smaller compared to the difference in the sample of those interviewed twice. This suggests that age may be an even stronger factor in explaining differences between the gangs for this sample of individuals interviewed twice than it was at baseline. Regression analysis which controls for age, will attempt to clarify this issue.

**Residence** - Most respondents in both gangs lived in Little Village at the baseline (83.5% of the sample, n=85) and second interview periods (75.3%). However, perhaps because of their older age, on average, the Latin Kings had spent slightly more years in Little Village than had Two-Six at Time II. For the Latin Kings, the average length of stay was 16.3 years (n=43) compared to 13.5 (n=41) for the Two-Six. On the other hand, among the group interviewed twice, a greater proportion of the Two-Six were born in the United States (92.7%, n=41) compared to the Latin Kings (82.2%, n=45). This suggests that the families of the Latin Kings were slightly more likely to be recent immigrants who moved to and remained in Little Village once they arrived in the United States.

**Organizational Involvement** - A variety of established

organizations in Little Village function as institutions of legitimate socialization. A close relationship or affiliation of gangs with these organizations would suggest a source of positive socialization for them. The degree to which respondents were members of one of these organizations indicates a certain control on delinquent or criminal tendencies. We were especially interested in the degree of isolation of gang members from these institutions and the possible changes between baseline and Time II interviews. Respondents were asked about involvement in youth agencies, church groups and other organizations at both interviews.

Few respondents at either time were members of any organized group. However, by Time II there was slightly increased involvement, primarily by the Two-Six. Thus, while none of the Two-Six were members of any of these three organizations at baseline, 7.4% reported they were members at Time II. This increase still indicates only minimal change. The Latin Kings seem to have experienced no change or to have undergone a further decrease. Thus, for all three types of organizations, the total number of gang respondents who were members, whether Latin Kings or Two-Six, remained very low. Members of both gangs were highly isolated from existing neighborhood organizations.

**Living Arrangements** - Respondents were asked a series of questions about their living arrangements and the characteristics of those with whom they lived at both baseline and Time II. For the entire sample, the average number of individuals with whom the respondent lived had diminished slightly between the first and

second interviews, from 3.98 to 3.42 people. However, the Latin Kings' households decreased significantly from an average of 4.09 people at baseline to 3.27 at Time II ( $t=2.51$ ,  $df=43$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ). In large part, the change was related to a decrease in the number of individuals over 14 living in the household (among the Latin Kings, a decrease from 3.47 to 2.37; and among the Two-Six from 2.92 to 2.69). For the Latin Kings, this difference between the average number over 14 at Time I and Time II was statistically significant ( $t=3.85$ ,  $df=37$ ,  $p \leq .001$ ). Further, there were statistically significant differences between the gangs on the change score ( $t=3.69$ ,  $df=77$ ,  $p \leq .001$ ).

The household composition changed, both for the sample as a whole and for each gang, particularly among the Latin Kings. As the data in Tables 22A through 22D indicate, none of the changes for the entire sample were very large, although the decrease in the proportion living with mothers or siblings at Time II compared to Time I was more substantial. In general, respondents underwent downward shifts across time in the proportions living with their families of origin (mothers, fathers, siblings) and upward trends in the proportions living with their families of procreation (children, girlfriends, spouses). There was also a small decrease in the proportions living with friends at Time II compared to Time I and a very small increase in the proportion living alone.

This pattern of change is more pronounced among the Latin Kings. Thus, 45.5% lived with fathers at baseline compared to 31.1% at Time II; 77.3% lived with their mothers at Time I compared

to 61.4% at Time II; and 77.3% lived with siblings versus 59.1% at the time of the second interview. On the other hand, the proportion of Latin Kings living with their children at Time II was more than double the proportion at baseline. Increases also occurred related to those living with spouses and girlfriends at Time II. Among the Latin Kings, one fifth were in this arrangement by the second interview.

Changes were more modest and in somewhat different directions among the Two-Six. For the Two-Six, a slightly larger proportion lived with fathers at Time II and there was only a small drop in the number of those living with mothers and siblings compared to baseline reports. In contrast to the Latin Kings, none of the Two-Six lived with girlfriends at either time interval and only 2.4% lived with spouses at Time II; none reported living in this situation at baseline. Similarly, the increase in the proportion living with children at Time II was minimal, which suggests that the shift from families of origin to families of procreation was more limited among the Two-Six. Indeed, there was a slight increase among the Two-Six in the proportion living in two parent families at Time II. There was also a slight rise in the proportion who lived with no parents across the two time periods.

Again, the different patterns of change between the two gangs was probably related to the fact that the Two-Six at Time II were younger, on average, than the Latin Kings. Indeed, as noted, the difference between gangs related to age is statistically significant, suggesting that patterns might have been more similar

among the gangs if age were controlled.

**Social Characteristics of Household Residents** - At both interviews, respondents were asked about the employment status of each individual over 14 in the household over 14. These data, as well as data about the proportions on probation, in gangs and in jail, are presented in Table 22E. There was little change within the sample as a whole related to the proportions employed at each time period. Almost 72% of the Latin Kings lived with someone who was employed at the time of both interviews, compared to 90% of the Two-Six at baseline and 92.5% at Time II. These differences between the gangs were statistically significant at both time periods ( $p \leq .05$ ), but the differences are more marked if we look at the actual number of persons employed in each household. Thus, at Time I, the average number of individuals in the household, excluding the respondent, who were employed among the Latin Kings was 3.10; at Time II, this figure had dropped to 1.28 (See Table 22F). This decrease was statistically significant ( $t=6.30$ ,  $df=38$ ,  $p \leq .001$ ). Among the Two-Six, there was also a decrease in the average number of employed individuals living in the household, and although the change was smaller compared to the Latin Kings, it was statistically significant as well. At baseline, an average of 2.85 individuals in the household were employed compared to 1.80 at Time II ( $t=5.03$ ,  $df=39$ ,  $p \leq .001$ ).

There was a reduction in the proportion of household members on probation (from 27.6% to 13.8% among the Latin Kings and 24.4% to 17.2% among the Two-Six), but in absolute numbers (Table 22F),

the changes were minimal. Also, there was a substantial reduction in the proportion of respondents living in the same household with other gang members. At Time I, 55.9% of the Latin Kings lived with at least one other gang member compared to 23.5% at Time II. The reduction, in average numbers of gang members, living in the household from baseline to Time II was statistically significant among the Latin Kings (See Table 22F). At baseline, an average of 0.61 individuals in the household were in gangs (excluding the respondent); at Time II the average was 0.21 ( $t=2.37, df=27, p \leq .05$ ). For the Two-Six, the reduction in the proportion of gang members living in the household from Time I to Time II was smaller than for the Latin Kings, but still fairly large (from 31.7% to 19.5%). Nonetheless, in absolute numbers, the decrease was not statistically significant, from an average of 0.39 individuals at baseline to 0.27 at Time II.

**Friends** - Respondents were asked about close friends and the proportion of these who were gang members at both baseline and Time II. Both gangs experienced a decrease in the number of close friends between the two interviews. Thus, at baseline, the average number of friends for the whole sample was 7.35 while it was 5.26 at Time II ( $n=78$ ). There was also a decrease in the proportion of all friends who were gang members. Thus, 46.6% of the sample ( $n=73$ ) said that all their friends were gang members at baseline compared to 37.0% at Time II. Similarly, 8.2% reported that they had no friends in gangs at the first interview compared to 11.0% at the time of the second interview.

Among the Latin Kings (n=37) 40.5% said that all their friends were gang members at baseline compared to 27.0% at Time II. For the Two Six, the change was smaller, from 52.8% at Time I (n=36) to 47.2% at Time II. Twice as many of the Latin Kings were also likely to say that none of their close friends were gang members at Time II compared to their response at baseline (16.2% versus 8.1% at baseline). Among the Two Six, there was a slight decrease in the percent who said that none of their friends were gang members at the time of the second interview (8.3% at baseline versus 5.6% at Time II, n=36).

**Summary:** Social Control - Socialization structures and patterns were examined for gang youths between Time I and Time II. Age differences between Latin Kings and Two-Six seemed particularly important in possibly explaining the transition of Latin Kings to more conventional or legitimate adult behaviors. Members of both gangs had been long term residents in Little Village. While the Latin Kings had a longer residence in the area, more of the Two-Six were born in the United States. The families of the Latin Kings were more likely to have been more recent immigrants than the parents of the Two-Six.

Members of both gangs were in varying stages of transition from families of origin to families of procreation. At Time I, household characteristics were different for Latin Kings and Two-Six, and even more markedly so at Time II. Family households were smaller in size, at least in terms of household members over 14 years of age. More of the respondents, especially Latin Kings,

lived with spouses, girlfriends, and children at Time II. More Two-Six continued to live in two parent households. In contrast to the Latin Kings, none of the Two-Six lived with girl friends and only 2.4% with spouses at Time II. However, at Time II, 11.4% of the Kings lived with spouses and 20.5% with girl friends.

The social characteristics of household members (over 14 years) were different but their change patterns did not vary by gang. Most households had at least one person who was employed, and for the Two-Six, more household members other than the gang members themselves were employed at both time periods. Substantial proportions of the households, other than the respondents, were also gang members at baseline, particularly for the Latin Kings (55.9%), but there was a fairly large reduction for both gangs at Time II.

At Time II, respondents from both gangs experienced a decline in the proportion of close friends who were gang members. Twice as many Latin Kings said that none of their close friends were gang members (16.2% at Time II compared to 8.1% at Time I). The pattern was somewhat reduced for the Two-Six (5.6% at Time II compared to 8.3% at Time I). While the data suggest that the Two-Six were coming from more cohesive, stable, less gang-oriented families, the fact that the Latin Kings were older than the Two-Six also indicated a more substantial transition by them to conventional adult adaptations, such as marriage, girl friends, and non-gang associates.

Not only age and residential pattern, but the nature of gang

youth exposure to legitimate community institutions, such as churches, youth agencies, and other community organizations, may have affected patterns of socialization for gang youths. Few of the gang respondents at either Time I or Time II were members of or had substantial contact with these local institutions. The pattern of social isolation was especially marked for the Latin Kings.

Personal and Family Disorganization. In the following section, we focus on the quality of relationship as it may throw light on issues of personal and family disorganization, rather than the social aspect of relationship. It is not simply the youth's status in the gang or whether he or she is living with a parent, spouse or friend, but the quality or psychological aspects of relationships that is important as a precursor to problematic or deviant behavior. How the youth regards or esteems himself or herself, how he or she gets along with spouses or girlfriends, how the youth gets along with family members, especially fathers or mothers, and how family crises affect him or her are characteristics of the youth's self or psychological environment which may be associated with or predict problematic gang behavior.

**Self-Esteem** - The Coopersmith Self-Esteem Scale was administered at both baseline and at the time of the second interview. Scores for each gang and the sample as whole in both time periods are presented in Table 23. The mean for the combined sample of Latin Kings and Two-Six was 60.9 at Time I and 68.00 at Time II, an average increase of 7.05 points; this change in scores

was statistically significant ( $t=3.37$ ,  $df=74$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ) Both gangs experienced a similar pattern of change. Among the Two-Six there was an increase of 7.1 points, from 64.5 on average at baseline to 71.6 at the second interview; the difference between the two scores was statistically significant ( $t=2.44$ ,  $df=37$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ). The Latin Kings mean score at the first interview was significantly lower compared to the Two-Six, an average of 57.4 ( $t=2.03$ ,  $df=74$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ). However, the increase between Time I and Time II for the Latin Kings was almost identical to the change among the Two-Six, an increase of 7.0 points ( $t=-2.30$ ,  $df=37$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ). Thus, their mean at the second interview rose to 64.4.

Despite these shifts, the self-esteem score remained low for the sample. The combined sample at baseline fell into the lower range of standardized scores or classification of low-self esteem; at Time II, the sample had risen only into the upper range of the low self-esteem category.

**Relations with Spouses and Girlfriends** - Table 24 presents information on the relationship of respondents to spouses/girlfriends. At baseline, the question about quality of relationship was open-ended (i.e., "Generally, how do you get along with your wife (girlfriend)?"). The responses were classified into three categories: get along well, some problems, don't get along. These closed categories were then used directly at Time II.

As the data in the table indicate, the quality of relationships shifted at Time II. Relationships seemed to be worsening. Thus, while 70.8% of the sample reported that they got

along well with girlfriends or spouses at baseline, only 47.9% gave this response at Time II. The decrease was particularly great among the Two-Six, from 81.3% to 43.7%. On the other hand, almost twice as many respondents said they were having some problems at Time II compared to Time I. As we would expect, this increase was greater among the Two-Six. In addition, when we converted responses to categorical scores, there was a larger decrease in the overall rating of the relationship among the Two-Six compared to the Latin Kings. The difference between ratings at Time I and Time II within the Two-Six as a group was statistically significant ( $t = -3.0$ ,  $df = 15$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ) while this was not the case for the Latin Kings.<sup>17</sup>

**Familial Relationships** - A series of questions at both baseline and Time II were intended to assess problems within families of origin. Questions about the nature of relationships between the respondent and his parents were asked at both interviews, whether they always got along, got along most of the time, sometimes got along, or never got along with their father (or

---

<sup>17</sup> It is important to note that in another portion of the interview which asked about how happy respondents were in various areas of their lives, the Two Six were more likely to indicate that they were happy with girlfriends or spouses at Time II compared to the Latin Kings. Twenty percent of the Two Six who answered this question at Time I and Time II ( $n = 15$ ) reported that they were happy in this area compared to 9.4% ( $n = 32$ ) of the Latin Kings. The discrepancy between findings in Table 29 and the results of this question may be related to differences in the focus of the questions. One asks about overall happiness with the relationship while the other asks for an evaluation of the degree of problems. It is the latter question which we believe to be a more reliable indicator of the quality of relationships.

step-father) and mother (or step-mother).<sup>18</sup> These responses were then ranked from 1 (always got along) to 4 (never got along), and a rough relationship scale was derived.

Most respondents at baseline and Time II reported that they always got along with their fathers although slightly more said so at Time II (from 40.6% at baseline to 46.8% at Time II, n=64). Also, there was a small increase in the proportion of the sample who said they got along most of the time (from 25.0% to 28.1%) and a slight decrease in the proportion who said they sometimes (28.1% to 21.9%) or never got along (6.3% to 3.1%).

Among the Latin Kings, 44.4% reported at baseline that they always got along compared to 55.6% at Time II (n=27). Roughly 38% of the Two-Six (n=37) were in this category at baseline and 40.5% at Time II. While 8.1% of the Two-Six said they never got along at Time I, none of the Two-Six gave this response at Time II. Among the Latin Kings, there was an increase in the proportion of respondents who said they never got along with their fathers (from 3.7% to 7.4%), but the overall percent remained small. Thus, the overall scale score for the sample as a whole between interviews changed only slightly, from 2.0 at baseline to 1.81 at Time II, reflecting improvements in paternal relations. The average ranking for the Latin Kings at baseline was 1.85, while it improved to 1.74 at Time II. Among the Two-Six, the change was from 2.11 to 1.86.

Relations with mothers had worsened at Time II. At Time II,

---

<sup>18</sup> At Time I, this question was asked in terms of lifetime relations while at Time II it was asked about the past year.

fewer respondents said that they always got along with their mothers. The proportion of respondents in this category for the sample as whole went from 69.2% at baseline to 66.7% at Time II (n=78). The Two-Six decreased from 71.8% to 66.7%, n=39. There was no change at all over time in this category for the Latin Kings, however (66.7% were in this category for both interviews, n=39). Almost four percent of the sample (3.9%) reported that they never got along with mothers at Time I, but the proportion was slightly higher (7.7%) at Time II. Among the Two-Six, there was actually a decrease in this category (from 2.6% at baseline to 0% at Time II). However, the proportion of Latin Kings in this category increased by slightly over 10% from baseline to Time II (from 5.1% to 15.4%). Thus, the gangs were significantly different in this category at Time II ( $\chi^2=6.50$ ,  $df=1$ , Fisher's Exact,  $p \leq .05$ ). Overall scale scores worsened, increasing for the sample as a whole (from 1.45 to 1.61) and for both gangs (indicating more problems), but the average scores were still quite good. Among the Latin Kings, scores changed from an average of 1.51 at baseline to 1.72 at Time II. Among the Two-Six, scores went from 1.38 on average at Time I to 1.51, at the second interview.

**Family Crises** - Respondents were asked about crises occurring in their families at both interview times. The findings need to be viewed with some caution, since the question was open-ended at Time I but closed at Time II.<sup>19</sup> Table 25 presents this information.

---

<sup>19</sup> At baseline, respondents were asked if there were any serious illnesses, deaths, hospitalizations, divorces, or other major crises in their families. If so, they were asked to describe

Only a small proportion of the Two-Six answered this question at Time I and Time II (n=10), so results must be viewed cautiously.

The data indicate, however, that a large portion of the sample represented here experienced problems at baseline and especially during the first year of the program. Almost 20% of the sample experienced a death in their family at Time II compared to 11.3% at Time I, i.e., over an interval of a year or year and a half. Further, more than a third of both gangs reported family members (including themselves) who were victims of gang violence at Time II. Drug abuse among family members also increased from roughly 2% to 17%. The only area in which problems decreased for the whole sample was with respect to physical abuse, and this was due to a decrease among the Two-Six (again, the Two-Six sample was quite small). Among the Latin Kings, there was actually a small increase in the proportion of abuse incidents that occurred.

Table 25 also contains information about a few areas for which there was no equivalent category at Time I. Of interest here is that more of the Latin Kings interviewed at Time II reported family crises related to job problems compared to the Two-Six. This difference just misses being statistically significant ( $p=.053$ ) and is interesting given the fact that more of the Latin Kings were employed compared to the Two-Six. Similarly, even though the Latin

---

these incidents. Incidents could have occurred in their childhood or more recently. Answers were classified into a series of response categories for purposes of analysis and reporting. These same categories were used at Time II. At the second interview, respondents were asked if any of the following major problems had occurred in their household and were read a list of items derived from the classification system used at baseline.

Kings had higher individual income at Time II (discussed below), they reported more income related family problems. Perhaps this is related to the lower household income of the Latin Kings compared to the Two-Six (to be discussed subsequently).

**Summary: Personal and Family Disorganization** - The assessment of the psychological status of youth and changes over time of youth in the project provided a mixed but generally more bleak than positive picture. The self-esteem levels of these youth were quite low at baseline and improved only slightly at Time II. There was little difference between the two gangs, although the Two-Six evidenced slightly higher scores. The quality of relationships generally deteriorated between program youth and their spouses or girlfriends. The quality of relationships, which was higher or more positive at Time I, deteriorated more rapidly for the Two-Six than for the Latin Kings. The pattern of relationships with fathers seemed better than with spouses or girlfriends and indeed seemed to improve over time. Relationships with mothers seemed a little more problematic, especially at Time II for the Latin Kings. The proportion of respondents from both gangs indicating they "always got along" with their mothers declined.

Possibly, the quality of interpersonal relationships was affected by family crises. An attempt was made, therefore, to assess the extent of such family life crises at baseline and at Time II. The results for this analysis, especially bearing on the Two-Six, have to be viewed cautiously since only ten Two-Six

responded to these questions. However, clearly the combined gang sample experienced a large number of family crises at Time I and especially at Time II. Almost 20 percent of the sample experienced a death in the family during the first year of their exposure to the program, considerable family illness (37.7%), drug abuse (17.0%), crime related problems (21.1%), extraordinarily high levels of gang violence victimization (37.7%), and household arrest (58.8%). Family income (29.4%) and job-related problems (21.2%) were also present. In almost all cases, except in regard to family job and income related problems, the Two-Six seemed to be doing more poorly than the Latin Kings, especially at Time II.

Overall, the level of personal self-esteem and quality of relationships by gang youth with significant others was not high and in a number of cases deteriorated during the first program year. Generally, the level was higher for the Two-Six than for the Latin Kings.

Socio-economic Status and Anomie. This section deals with social and economic strain on individuals that can contribute to deviance and criminal behavior. American society and culture demand that each person achieve or seek high levels of education and income as evidence of success. To the extent that the individual achieves less than some standard of success status, he or she may be subject to pressure and strain. Strain theory suggests that if the gap between aspirations for success and reality expectations in regard to income or occupation is great, frustration may result. A

related set of theories takes into consideration the availability of differential opportunities, especially illegitimate sources of income or criminal occupations, to mitigate such disjunction between aspirations and expectations, with resultant commitment to high levels of criminal behavior. The following analysis examines data on respondent academic, income, and occupational level aspirations, expectations, and achievements.

**Educational Achievement** - There was evidence of improved academic and employment achievement by respondents over the program period. The number of high school graduates increased by the time of the second interview. Thus, while 16.7% of the sample had graduated high school or earned their GED equivalents at baseline, an additional 21.8% had done so by the time of the second interview, more so for the Latin Kings, who had fewer high school graduates than the Two-Six at baseline (14.3% versus 19.4%). By the time of the second interview, an additional 23.8% of the Latin Kings (n=42) had graduated or earned a GED compared to an additional 19.4% of the Two-Six (n=36). Priority Project efforts were directed to getting youth back in school or special training programs, as well as jobs.

While some of the academic improvement at Time II might be ascribed to younger respondents' remaining in and completing school in the year between the two interviews, a certain percent is probably attributable to those who had dropped out and subsequently entered and completed GED programs, perhaps as a result of Project worker efforts. Almost a third of the sample was enrolled in a GED

or continuing education program at the time of the second interview (30.5%, n=65); and 11.3% (n=80) reported that they had received a GED or more education after dropping out of high school. This was true of slightly more of the Latin Kings compared to the Two-Six (13.6%, n=44, versus 8.3%, n=36).

Results of the WRAT - Table 26 contains the standard and grade level mean scores on the subscales of the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) for the total sample and each of the gangs. The test was administered at Time II only, so there is no baseline comparison data. However, the information enables us to place the sample in the context of a normative sample on academic achievement.

Standard scores, as noted, are broken down into age groups and permit samples to be normed and rated according to the categories of very superior, superior, high average, average, low average, borderline and deficient (see Methodology section for cutoffs). The low score for the total sample on Spelling was 48 while the highest score was 113. The mean for the total sample was 86.5. Both the Latin Kings and Two-Six fell into the low-average classification for spelling ability. The lowest standard score for Arithmetic was 47 and the highest was 115, while the mean for the total sample was 78.0. This puts both samples into the upper range of the borderline classification for mathematical ability. As for Reading, the lowest standard score was 55, the highest was 115 and the mean for the combined sample was 93.4. Both the Latin Kings and Two-Six fell into the lower range of the average rating for

reading.

Grade scores indicate that the total samples scores on Spelling fell into the mid 7th grade level (7.55) but the range of scores was broad; from 1st grade to post high school. For Arithmetic, there was a similar range (from 2nd grade to post high school) with the average for the total sample falling in the upper 5th grade (5.73). Reading scores were higher, for an average score placing the total sample in the high 9th grade (9.79), but the range of scores was similar to the range for math, from 2nd grade to post high school.

Both standard and grade scores were not significantly different between the gangs. Averages were quite similar for the two groups in general, although the Latin Kings' average standard scores on spelling and reading were slightly higher as were their average grade level scores on all three subscales. The averages indicated that both gangs fell generally in the low average or borderline categories of academic achievement.

**Employment** - Roughly one third of those interviewed twice were employed at baseline (30.6%, n=72); by the second interview, almost half of the sample reported that they were currently employed (47.2%, n=72). Increases occurred within both gangs. Among the Latin Kings (n=40), 35.0% were employed at baseline compared to 52.5% at Time II; for the Two-Six (n=32), 25.0% were employed at Time I and 40.6% at Time II.

**Income** - Data on individual income also reflects increasing employment. As the data in Table 27A indicate, a greater

proportion of respondents in both gangs reported that they had work-related income at Time II than at baseline. As employment information would suggest, the Latin Kings were somewhat more likely to report income from work at Time II and a greater proportion of their total income came from work related sources than for the Two-Six, but the differences were not statistically significant.

Small percentages of the sample at both interviews were receiving income from public sources, such as public assistance or unemployment compensation. More individuals reported getting money from friends at the second interview, but the number involved is still quite limited.

The majority of respondents at baseline reported getting income from family and/or spouses and girlfriends. At the second interview, however, while still receiving a large proportion of income from family and/or spouses, fewer respondents reported income from this source, particularly among the Latin Kings.

Illegal Respondent Income - An important change between the interviews is that greater proportions of respondents reported receiving income from illegal sources at Time II compared to baseline. The proportion of Latin Kings receiving such funds across the time periods doubled; among the Two-Six the increase was less dramatic. Further, illegal funds make up almost a third of average monthly income among the Latin Kings and 15% of the income received by the Two-Six. This difference between gangs at Time II falls just short of statistical significance ( $p=.0695$ ).

While comparable data on the percentage of income accounted for by illegal funds at baseline is not available, information about the amount of illegal monthly income at Time I compared to Time II indicates that illegal income increased an average of \$684.00 per month among the Latin Kings and \$177 among the Two-Six (see Table 27B). Because of the limited sample size, this difference between gangs in the amount of increase in illegal income over time falls just short of statistical significance ( $p=.077$ ), but it suggests that the Latin Kings are not only engaged in more illegal money-making efforts but that they also make more money at such activities compared to the Two-Six.

Responses from baseline interviews about illegal funds were classified according to income from drug sales and income from other illegal activities. At Time II, respondents were specifically asked about money from drug selling and money from "other" illegal funds. Analysis of these responses indicates that all of the increase in illegal funds is the result of drug sales among the Latin Kings; none of the Latin Kings interviewed at baseline and Time II gave information about illegal income from sources other than drug sales. Among the Two-Six, almost all of the increase is attributable to the drug sales, while an additional 3.7% of the Two-Six ( $n=27$ ) report money from "other" illegal activities at Time II.

Respondents from both gangs also reported comparable increases in legitimate money from work at the time of the second interview compared to the first. For the Latin Kings, work income increased

by \$227 on average, from \$323 at baseline to \$551.22; for the Two-Six, the increase was from \$245 to \$462, for an average increase of \$217.

Not surprisingly, total monthly income increased also for the sample as whole by the second interview.<sup>20</sup> Indeed, the change in the average monthly income across time periods for the sample as a whole was statistically significant ( $t=2.24$ ,  $df=56$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ). As the data in Table 27C indicate, however, the increase for the Latin Kings was quite dramatic compared to the change for the Two-Six; average monthly income almost doubled between the two interviews<sup>21</sup> to a significant degree ( $t=2.60$ ,  $df=32$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ). Median income almost doubled among the Latin Kings, while it actually decreased among the Two-Six.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Because income questions were not strictly comparable, comparisons need to be interpreted cautiously. At baseline, respondents were asked what their weekly income was from their job and from other sources. If the respondent was not working, they were asked what they did for money and what their weekly income was. Responses to open ended items were coded into income source categories. In many instances, individuals named a source but did not indicate the amount of income involved or only reported income from jobs and were not asked consistently about other sources. This may have led to an underreporting of income at Time I. At the time of the second interview, respondents were asked about their monthly income from a list of specific sources, derived from the categories used at Time I.

<sup>21</sup> There was an outlier of \$10,580 at Time II which was recoded in the analysis to the closest value within range of \$4000. If this value was not recoded, the mean for the Latin Kings was \$200 more.

<sup>22</sup> This decrease in median income across time periods among the Two Six, even though mean income increased slightly, was probably due to the fact that the maximum value at Time II for the Two Six was \$5600 ( $n=1$ ). While this amount is not an extreme outlier, the next closest value in range was \$2000 which explains why the median was so much less than the mean at Time II. If the

**Legal Household Income** - Because reduced income may result in family difficulties (and add to pressures for income), respondents were also asked about family income, especially illegal income, at baseline and Time II.<sup>23</sup> Income was grouped into intervals of 10,000 dollar increments with a lower range of 0 and an upper limit of \$60,000 or more.<sup>24</sup> In addition, a median income category was identified for both time periods. At baseline, this category was the one ranging from \$20-30,000; at the time of the second interview, the median category was between \$10,001 and 20,000. In both cases, the sample was divided according to whether a respondent's category was at or above this median category versus below. It is important to note in interpreting the results that, as discussed previously, most respondents, especially the Latin Kings, were living with their families of origin at baseline while more were living with families of procreation at Time II.

Data on household income analysis indicated similar proportions of the sample falling into each group at both baseline

---

\$5600 is recoded to the next within range value (\$2000), there was an actual decrease in the mean at Time II to \$781.40.

<sup>23</sup> No distinction was made between legal and illegal income at baseline, and it was assumed that reported household income included legal sources only. At Time II, separate questions asked about legal and illegal household income. Further, interviewers tried to check to be sure individuals who reported illegal income in the questions about individual respondent income were also reporting this in the household income section when asked about illegal funds. In some cases, respondents reported that individual illegal money was not going into the household, which accounts for discrepancies.

<sup>24</sup> Intervals were slightly different at baseline than Time II. However, adjustments were made in the analysis to permit comparisons of the percents above \$10,000 and \$20,000 respectively.

and Time II. For the Latin Kings (n=40), 55.0% of the sample were at or above the median category at Time I compared to 57.5% at Time II. For the Two-Six (n=38), a greater proportion were at or above the median income level at baseline (71.1%) compared to Time II (63.2%). There was a downward drift of family income for the Two-Six. However, in both time periods, the proportion of Two-Six at or above the median income level was greater than that of Latin Kings. As noted in the discussion of household composition, this difference may be related to the smaller number of employed individuals in the households of the Latin Kings (see Table 22F).

The advantage of households among the Two-Six compared to the Latin Kings was also apparent when the sample was divided according to the percent who had incomes greater than \$10,000 and \$20,000 respectively. Thus, at baseline, 80% of the Latin Kings (n=40) had income greater than \$10,000 compared to 97.1% of the Two-Six ( $\chi^2=5.01$ ,  $df=1$ , Fisher's Exact  $p \leq .05$ ). However, at Time II, the difference was no longer significant primarily due to a decrease among the Two-Six, but the Latin Kings were still at a disadvantage; 77.5% of the Latin Kings had income greater than \$10,000 compared to 88.2% of the Two-Six.<sup>25</sup>

**Illegal Household Income** - Respondents were asked specifically about illegal household income at Time II. Results indicated that

---

<sup>25</sup> If a cutoff of \$20,000 or more is used instead, the Latin Kings are still at a disadvantage, but there are no statistically significant differences. Thus, at baseline, 57.5% of the Latin Kings and 70.6% of the Two Six report household income of more than \$20,000. At Time II, 55.0% of the Latin Kings and 73.5% of the Two Six are in this category.

20.0% of all respondents (n=85) had some illegal income. However, the Latin Kings were significantly more likely to report such income (31.1% of the Latin Kings (n=45) versus 7.5% of the Two-Six (n=40);  $\chi^2=7.38$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ). Half of the Latin Kings reporting illegal household income made less than \$10,000 a year, while half had illegal household income over \$10,000. Given the differences in the proportions and amount of illegal income reported by the Latin Kings compared to the Two-Six at Time II (see Tables 27A and 27B), these differences are not surprising and suggest that respondents were fairly truthful in their reports about the illegal income they were earning.<sup>26</sup>

**Aspiration, Expectation, and Disjunctures** - Respondents were asked a series of questions about their occupational and income aspirations at both interviews. They were also asked about the likelihood of achieving their goals. In addition, individuals interviewed at Time II were asked specifically about their actual expectations with respect to occupation and income in the future. By comparing responses to these questions to those relating to aspirations, a rudimentary measure of the gap between aspiration

---

<sup>26</sup> Interviewers specifically checked to be sure that respondents who reported that they had monthly illegal income also reported this income in questions about illegal household funds. In some cases, respondents said that illegal money did not go into the household. This may be why the proportion who reported illegal household income is lower than the proportion who reported that they had illegal income individually, particularly among the Two Six. Given that the households of the Two Six generally had greater amounts of legal funds, it is possible that respondents were indeed able to keep illegal income to themselves.

and expectation or anomie was derived for individuals interviewed at Time II.<sup>27</sup>

Occupational Aspirations - Responses to questions about occupational aspirations at baseline and Time II were not totally equivalent so a complete comparison of responses at both interviews is not possible. Some common categories do exist and suggest a shift over time (see Table 28A). As the data indicate, 20.2% of the total sample at baseline hoped to be in some type of professional or executive position in the next ten years compared to 26.2% at Time II. Slightly more of the Two-Six had this goal at both interviews than the Latin Kings, although increases in this category across time periods were similar for the two gangs. At Time II, many more individuals in both gangs (40.5%) wanted their own business, compared to 10.7% at Time I. More individuals in both gangs also aspired to managerial positions at the time of the second interview. About 15% of all respondents aspired to a trade labor/mechanical position at both baseline and Time II. Finally, at baseline, 8.3% of the sample felt that they would be unemployed 10 years from now, while no one at Time II gave this response.

Table 28B includes data on the degree to which individuals believed they would meet their career aspirations at baseline and

---

<sup>27</sup> Attempts were made to derive a "gap" or disjunction measure at baseline as well, but because aspirations and expectations were asked about in the same question, it was not possible to determine what the respondent hoped for and what he or she expected. Responses were generally treated as "hopes" at baseline and not as expectations. Therefore, comparable data on the difference between the aspirations and expectations is not available from the baseline interview.

at the second interview. The data indicate that while slightly more of the sample were very optimistic at Time II than at baseline, more individuals in both gangs felt that they actually had little chance to achieve their professional goals. For the Latin Kings, the shift was slightly greater, from 4.8% at baseline to 21.4% at Time II. The Two-Six changed from 0% at baseline to 12.5% at the time of the second interview. These differences across time were statistically significant at the .05 level for both gangs.

Occupational Aspiration-Expectation Disjuncture at Time II - Tables 28C and 28D contain further information on the difference between aspiration and expectation based on Time II data only. As noted, comparable information for baseline was not available. While 26.7% of those interviewed at Time II hoped to be in professional or executive positions ten years from now, only 11.2% expected to actually be. Similarly, a smaller proportion of those hoping to have their own business at Time II thought they would really have one (40.7% compared to 31.3%). This difference was largely due to responses among members of the Two-Six: 36.6% hoped to have their own business but only 18.4% thought they actually would. Little difference between aspirations and expectations existed for Latin Kings on this variable--44.4% hoped to have their own business and 42.9% expected to do so. In fact, the difference between the Latin Kings and Two-Six with respect to expectations about business ownership was statistically significant ( $\chi^2=5.55$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ).

While only 11.6% of the sample hoped to be in managerial positions, 22.5% expected to be. As the data in Tables 28C and 28D indicate, this pattern was almost identical for members of both gangs. Approximately 17% of the members of both gangs aspired to trade labor or mechanical jobs. For the Latin Kings, the proportion who expected to be in such positions was similar at 16.7%. Among the Two-Six, the proportion who thought they actually would be in these types of jobs in the next ten years was almost 50% greater than those who hoped for such positions (28.9% versus 17.1%). Further, none of the Latin Kings expected to be working in semi-skilled or unskilled positions in the future, while a small proportion of the Two-Six had such expectations.

In order to further understand the occupational aspirations/expectations gap, occupational categories were ranked from 1=professional to 8=unemployed or not working and individuals were given two "scores" depending on their career aspiration and expectation. The difference between these scores was used as a rudimentary measure of disjuncture.<sup>28</sup> Scores for the sample and each gang are presented with the data in Tables 28C and 28D. Among the Latin Kings, the average ranking for career aspirations at Time II was 2.55 or somewhere between owning a business and being in a management position. For the Two-Six, the rank was similar at

---

<sup>28</sup> Again, caution should be used in interpreting the findings since the categories may not necessarily be equivalent in their distinctions. For example, while there may be little difference between trade labor/mechanical positions and factory/semi-skilled positions, more differences probably exist between managerial and clerical jobs. Nonetheless, the scale allows for some rough sense of differences between types of aspirations and expectations.

2.36.

However, the two gangs differed in their ranking of expectations. Thus, the average rank for the Latin Kings was 2.90 and the average disjuncture score was 0.36. For the Two-Six, the average rank for expectations of 3.62 was lower, and the disjuncture score between aspirations and expectations was 1.27, a statistically significant difference ( $t=-4.35$ ,  $df=36$ ,  $p \leq .001$ ). Further, the difference in the expectation levels of the two gangs was just short of statistical significance ( $p=.060$ ), but the difference in the disjuncture scores was statistically significant ( $t=-2.35$   $df=77$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ).

Income Aspirations - Questions about financial goals were asked slightly differently<sup>29</sup> at baseline than at Time II. Therefore, not all responses were comparable. However, some comparisons are possible and these are presented in Table 28E. Generally, income aspirations shifted upward for the sample as a whole as well as for each gang. At baseline, 53.9% of the sample hoped to make between \$29,000 and 50,000 a year. This proportion was slightly less at Time II (42.3%). The change was largely attributable to a drop from 50% at baseline to 34.2% at Time II among the Two-Six. There was a smaller decrease among the Latin

---

<sup>29</sup> At baseline, individuals were asked about the amount of money they would like to make a year in an open-ended question. Some individuals did not give an actual dollar figure. Responses were assigned to income categories. At Time II, respondents were specifically asked about the income they hoped (and then expected) to make ten years from now in \$10,000 intervals. For purposes of comparison, these intervals were collapsed so that they were equivalent to those used to code baseline responses.

Kings (57.5% to 50.0%). At the same time, a much greater proportion of those interviewed twice hoped to make more than \$50,000 in ten years at Time II compared to baseline. Both gangs increased greatly in this category, for the Two-Six, an increase from 26.3% to 65.8% and for the Latin Kings, from 10.0% to 42.5%. There were significant differences, however, between the gangs at Time II ( $\chi^2=4.25$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ), further reflecting the greater aspirational level of the Two-Six.

Income Disjuncture at Time II - As was done for occupational aspirations and expectations, a comparison of income aspirations and expectations was conducted for those interviewed at Time II (presented in Tables 28F and 28G). The majority of respondents in both gangs hoped to make more than \$60,000 (40.0%); however, about 25% of the Latin Kings and 15% of the Two-Six mentioned levels less than \$40,000. As noted, the Two-Six generally had higher aspirations related to income. A significantly greater proportion of Two-Six aspired to more than \$60,000: (51.2% versus 29.5%;  $\chi^2=4.15$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ), and their mean aspiration level for income was significantly higher on average (5.97 versus 5.25 on a seven point scale, with 0=no income to 7=more than \$60,000 a year;  $t=-2.70$ ,  $df=83$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ).

On the other hand, the Latin Kings generally had higher expectations than the Two-Six. Roughly 42.8% of the Latin Kings as opposed to 27.5% of the Two-Six fell into categories of \$40,000 a year or higher. The majority of all respondents as a group and in both gangs expected to make between \$30 and \$40,000, but more Two-

Six expected to make lower sums of money. For example, 12.5% of the Two-Six expected to make between \$10,001 and \$20,000 compared to 4.8% of the Latin Kings.

As expected from these data, the Latin Kings had a higher ranking an average for the salary they expected to make compared to the Two-Six (4.31 versus 3.97; see Table 28G), but not to a statistically significant degree. There was a statistically significant difference between the two gangs with respect to the gap between aspirational and expectational rank for income (See Table 28F); the average difference for the Latin Kings was 0.88, while it was 2.03 for the Two-Six ( $t=-3.06$ ,  $df=79$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ). In addition, the difference between aspiration and expectation level for both gangs and the sample as a whole was significant at the .001 level.

**Summary: Socioeconomic Status and Anomie** - A variety of analyses were conducted to establish the socio-economic status of respondents at baseline and Time II. In addition efforts were made to determine whether differences existed in certain dimensions of income and occupational aspirations and expectations across and within time periods. Certain disjunctures between aspirations and expectations could be interpreted as indicators of anomie or alienation that could provide pressure for deviance, including gang crime.

It was clear that between Time I and Time II members of both gangs had, with some exceptions, more or less improved their socio-economic standing, using education, employment and income as

indicators. There was an increase in high school graduates and attainment of GED certificates at Time II. An additional 23.8% of Latin Kings, for a total of 38.1%, had graduated or earned their high school or equivalent certificates. An additional 19.4% of Two-Six, for a total of 38.8%, had earned their certificates. The Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT), administered at Time II suggested some improvement, but scores indicated rather low academic performance for both groups, with only slight difference between them.

The respondents made employment progress in the course of the program. Roughly one third of the respondents were employed at Time I but almost half were employed at Time II. More than half of the Latin Kings, the older group, were employed at Time II. Data also indicated that youth were receiving more work-related income at Time II, but that substantial numbers (Latin Kings, 32.0% and Two-Six, 53.6%) were still receiving financial support from spouses or families. An important change also was that a greater proportion of respondents were receiving income from illegal sources at Time II, almost double that at Time I. Illegal income made up almost a third of average monthly income for the Latin Kings and slightly more than 15% of monthly funds for the Two-Six; almost all of such income was from drug sales.

Respondents were asked a series of questions about occupational and income aspirations and realistic expectation in 10 years. While most gang members had relatively high aspirations for occupational and income success, few believed they would achieve

them. The gap or disjuncture was significantly greater for the Two-Six than the Latin Kings. Still, most of the youth, especially the Latin Kings, expected to have either their own business or head management positions. The decline was mainly in the category of professional and executive job positions.

Income aspirations were quite high in the \$50 to 60,000 range. The level of income aspiration was higher for the Two-Six than the Latin Kings. The most common income expectation, however, was only in the \$30 to 40,000 range. Income expectations were also higher for the Latin Kings. The disjunction between income aspirations and expectations was significantly greater for the Two-Six than the Latin Kings, suggesting, according to anomie theory, that the Two-Six were under considerably more social, cultural, and psychological strain predisposing to deviancy.

On the other hand, responses from program youth indicated that considerably more of the Latin Kings had developed access to illegitimate opportunities and income through drug dealing than the Two-Six. There was a larger growth in illegal income for the Latin Kings than for the Two-Six, and this, at least in part, could have contributed to a higher level of expectation and less pessimism about future socio-economic achievement among the Latin Kings.

### **Project Intervention**

Introduction. The Gang Violence Reduction Project was established primarily to reduce the level of hard-core gang violence in Little Village through a series of interventions guided by certain

strategies, including social intervention, opportunities provision, suppression, and community mobilization. Interagency coordination i.e., close collaboration of police, probation, community youth workers, and community agencies were also critical components of the program.

Of special interest, for purpose of the evaluation, was the analysis of the effects of intervention during the first year of the program. A variety of research means were used to determine the nature and scope of such services and their impact. In the following discussion we focus only on the responses directly obtained from the gang youth interviewed at Time II and mainly program reports about these youth, especially those of community youth workers and police, who had the most extensive and intensive contacts with youth, and to a lesser extent, those of probation officers and the local community organization, Neighbors Against Gang Violence (NAGV) targeting these same interviewed youth. Project impact or actions related to Project services or contacts are discussed in terms of bivariate relationships, but are included in correlation analyses and regression models later in the report.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup>A more extensive discussion of the process and roles of Project staff, especially coordination of project staff and community efforts, is found in a companion report, The Gang Violence Reduction Project. A Case Study of an Interagency and Community Approach. April 15, 1995. The present report does not describe changes in patterns of delinquent or criminal behavior of the youth interviewed between baseline and Time II, based on criminal justice individual level records. The report also does not describe changes in gang crime at the aggregate level for the Little Village police beats where the Project was active. Further, not included are the results of two community surveys, at baseline

Respondents were asked a series of questions related to worker intervention in the year prior to the Time II interview. In addition, gang workers, police, probation and staff of Neighbors Against Gang Violence provided information about their work with gang youth. Respondent information is reviewed first, followed by information from project workers.

Respondent Evaluations of Worker Interventions. This first part of the analysis focuses on contacts and services provided by the community youth workers. Later and more briefly in this section we address the nature and affects of joint or coordinated contacts across community youth workers, police, probation, and NAGV. Of the 86 gang members interviewed at Time II, roughly 59 individuals or two thirds (68.6%) reported that they had contact with a community youth worker from the Project in the past year. The two gangs were very similar in response to this question, with only slightly more Two-Six reporting contact compared to the Latin Kings (70.7% versus 66.7%).<sup>31</sup>

Data on the duration and nature of the interaction with workers is presented in Table 29. Respondents report an average of 11.8 months of service with an average frequency of 5.85 contacts

---

and at Time II, to measure community experiences relevant to changes in gang crime and program impact. These analyses will be integrated into a comprehensive report to be developed at the end of 1995.

<sup>31</sup> Of note is that 21 individuals who reported that they had no contact were served by community youth workers according to data collected from project staff. This service discrepancy will be examined shortly.

per month, lasting 2.25 hours each. Little difference existed between the two gangs on these measures. The Latin Kings reported 6.1 contacts per month for an average of 2.0 hours each, while the Two-Six averaged 5.5 contacts for an average of 2.5 hours each. The workers were similar with respect to the duration of their intervention efforts, based on gang member reports.

Table 29 also has information about where interactions occurred and whether the community youth worker was involved, to some extent, with other individuals important to the respondent, such as parents, spouses and employers. Again, there were few differences between the gangs. The majority of community youth worker interactions occurred on the street, possibly as group contacts, although workers also went to respondents' homes fairly regularly; two thirds of the sample reported that they met with workers at their homes. About one fifth of the sample met the worker "somewhere else" as well (i.e., restaurants, gyms, parks, court, jail).

According to the data in Table 29, almost half of all respondents reporting worker contact reported that workers met with their parents at least once. Similarly, among those with girlfriends, slightly less than 43% said that workers met with them as well. Among the small number of individuals with spouses, almost half of the Latin Kings report that the worker met with their husbands or wives. For the Two-Six, there was no contact with spouses, but the number of respondents involved is quite small. Even though more of the Latin Kings were employed at Time

II, the Two-Six were more likely to report that workers had contact with employers. However, for both gangs, the proportions involved were small.

Almost 58% of those reporting worker contact said that the worker got them involved in some type of activity (see Table 30), with more of the Two-Six endorsing this item (67.9% of the Two-Six versus 48.3% of the Latin Kings). Activities that were mentioned included sports (75.8%), job-related or job-training activities (15.2%), youth programs such as Latino Youth (6.1%) and recreational/social events (6.1%). Of interest is that slightly more of the Latin Kings were involved in job-related activities compared to the Two-Six (21.4% versus 10.5%). The Two-Six were more involved in sports (84.2% versus 64.3%) and youth programs (15.3% versus 7.1%).

According to the data in Table 31, almost 61% of those with worker contact said that they received some type of help with a problem. The proportion was slightly higher among the Latin Kings, but the difference was minimal (63.0% versus 58.6%). Among the 16 Latin Kings who received help, the majority said that they received some type of counseling (50%) or help with an employment problem (43.7%). A smaller proportion received help related to a justice system issue (12.5%). Sixteen individuals in the Two-Six also obtained help. The majority (25.0%) received assistance related to a gang issue, specifically, their desire to leave the gang. Smaller proportions received help with employment (18.7%), counseling (18.7%), school problems (18.7%), and justice system

assistance (12.5%). In addition, a small proportion of the Two-Six (6.2%) but none of the Latin Kings received help related to a substance abuse problem.

**Evaluation of Worker Efforts** - Respondents were asked to rate the worker in terms of the quality of his efforts, availability, honesty, ability in providing things to do, his effectiveness with others in the group and his relationships with other workers.<sup>32</sup> Scales ranged from 1=very good to 4=very poor. The average ratings are presented in Table 32. There are no significant differences between the gangs on the variables assessing effort, availability, honesty and ability in providing things to do. Significant differences exist, however, on the general effectiveness rating, with the Two-Six ranking the worker less satisfactorily compared to the Latin Kings ( $t=-3.06$ ,  $df=50$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ).<sup>33</sup> Two-Six respondents also rated their workers less well, on average, with respect to availability and honesty, but these differences were not statistically significant, and the average for both gangs still

---

<sup>32</sup> Data on the variable assessing the worker's relationship with other workers is not reported here because so few respondents answered this question ( $n=28$ ). The data indicate significant differences between gangs on this variable. The average score for the Latin Kings on this measure is 1.36 ( $n=14$ ) or a rating between very good and good versus 1.90 ( $n=10$ ) or a rating closer to good for the Two Six ( $t=-2.49$ ,  $df=22$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ).

<sup>33</sup> Individuals were specifically asked how effective they thought the worker was with the rest of the fellows (girls) in the group. It is unclear exactly how respondents interpreted this term.

fell between very good and good.<sup>34</sup> The Two-Six did rate their workers more favorably in "ability at providing things to do." Both gangs were similar with respect to their views about worker efforts; the average rating was highly favorable.

**Agency Contacts** - All members of the sample were asked about contact with eight different agencies in the program year between baseline and Time II interviews. For those respondents reporting Project worker contact, an additional question about whether a Project worker referred them to an agency was asked (see Table 33). Table 34 has this information for those respondents who reportedly had no involvement with Project workers.

Among those claiming to have received project services, there were no significant differences between gangs. The Two-Six had an average of slightly more overall contacts with agencies. The Latin Kings reported slightly more contact with five agencies (employment, substance abuse treatment, family planning, youth and "other" agencies), and the Two-Six reported more contact with three agencies (counseling, job training, and GED programs). Employment and training organizations, including GED programs, were clearly the most frequently contacted agencies or programs. Few respondents in either gang became involved with substance abuse or family planning agencies, whether contact with those agencies was initiated by Project workers or otherwise. Slightly larger proportions of the Latin Kings were involved with youth agencies

---

<sup>34</sup>The honesty variable may have special importance as evidenced in further analysis in the section on correlation and regression analysis.

and, as noted, a fair number of the Two-Six were in contact with counseling agencies. Nonetheless, the average number of social agencies with which respondents had contact in the program year was quite small, only slightly more than one.

Note that the number of individuals referred to the different agencies is quite small, with no significant difference between the gangs. In regard to employment agencies, 62.5% (n=8) of the Latin Kings compared to 37.5% (n=8) of the Two-Six were referred by Project workers. Similarly, 50% of the Latin Kings (n=4) were referred to a job training program compared to 20.0% (n=5) of the Two-Six. Eighty percent (n=5) of the Latin Kings involved with GED programs were referred by workers as were 66.7% (n=12) of the Two-Six.

Table 34 presents information on agency involvement by respondents who said they had no project worker contact. These data, suggest that Project workers may have facilitated agency interactions.<sup>35</sup> Although the number of respondents involved was small, the data indicate that fewer respondents not served by project workers had contacts with agencies compared to those who said they had project workers. The average number of agencies with which these so-called non-project served respondents were in contact was smaller by almost half, and the average number of agencies was particularly reduced among the Two-Six (from 1.24 in

---

<sup>35</sup> It is also possible, of course, that those who became involved with project workers were more likely to use programs and services in the first place so that the difference may be due to a selection bias and not worker efforts.

Table 33 to 0.22 in Table 34). Indeed, among those reporting no worker involvement, there is a significant difference between gangs in the average number of agencies with which respondents had contact in the past year; the Latin Kings had a significantly greater average compared to the Two-Six ( $t=2.33$ ,  $df=17$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ). However, the numbers were very small for both gangs. The situation of so-called no worker contacts reported by certain respondents is discussed below.

Worker Reports of Activities. Table 35 presents information on worker efforts as reported by Project workers rather than by gang member respondents. The data indicate that interviewed gang members had contact with at least one and probably two workers, since the intervention began in August of 1992.<sup>36</sup> Based on worker reports, almost all gang members received services from at least one of the community youth workers. In addition, almost half (45.7%) of the gang member sample had some involvement with the police. Based on worker reports, 40% of the targeted gang youth received services from both police and gang workers. Smaller percentages had involvement with Probation and Neighbors Against Gang Violence (NAGV), which may be related to the fact that these agencies became involved in service provision at a later date in

---

<sup>36</sup> As noted, gang member respondents were also asked whether they had contact with workers in the past year. Of the 70 individuals reported on here, only 70% ( $n=49$ ) indicated that they had worker contact. Thus, 30% of those who workers reported serving did not themselves report any worker involvement. It is possible that contacts did occur, but might have been more peripheral.

the Project.

The average number of contacts per month reported by Project workers was slightly more than 12 which is more than gang member respondents stated. The discrepancy may be due to several factors. First, the number reported here takes into account all four types of Project workers contacting individuals while the number reported by gang member respondents includes contacts with community youth workers only. As a rule, the gang member was not as likely to report contacts, often arrests, by the police members of the Gang Violence Reduction Project. Second, youth may not perceive contact as occurring when workers may in fact be doing their job. The youth may perceive the gang worker as "hanging out" with him and his friends or addressing his attention primarily to others in the group in the street setting rather than him.

A total of 78.6% of the sample received a referral or assistance related to a school or work problem from one of the four Project service providers based on worker reports. Table 35 indicates that these referrals were provided primarily by the community youth workers (22.6%) or by police (18.8%). More than 90% received some type of "counseling" or advice with a somewhat larger proportion of the Two-Six falling into this category compared to the Latin Kings. On average, workers did not ascribe a great deal of success to their counseling efforts. However, they were somewhat more positive about their success with family interventions particularly for the Latin Kings. Workers for both gangs reported family involvement in almost two thirds of all

cases; this is in keeping with reports of respondents.

**Efforts Reported by Community Youth Workers - Table 36** presents community youth worker perceptions of their efforts. Almost all of the 70 individuals identified were contacted by community youth workers, with somewhat more of the Latin Kings contacted. On the other hand, there were more frequent contacts with Two-Six. This latter difference was just short of statistical significance ( $p=.06$ )<sup>37</sup> Workers serving the Two-Six reported a slightly lower proportion of referrals for jobs than did workers with the Latin Kings. Workers also reported somewhat similar percentages of youth referrals for school problems, with Two-Six workers slightly more active. The Latin Kings' workers rated their school and job related activities as more successful than did the Two-Six workers. In agreement with gang member respondents, workers stated they served all of the Two-Six with some type of "counseling" while workers serving the Latin Kings provided "counseling" to a only a slightly smaller proportion of individuals. The Two-Six workers had contact with families in fewer cases than was true for workers serving the Latin Kings. Again, as indicated above in Table 35, community youth workers were slightly more positive about their family interventions than they were about counseling activities with gang youth.

---

<sup>37</sup> The figures reported in the Tables are based on the total for all workers. If contacts with more than one worker are averaged instead, there is a statistically significant difference between the gangs. The average number of contacts for the Latin Kings drops to 7.3 compared to 12.6 for the Two-Six ( $t=-3.46$ ,  $df=64$ ,  $p \leq .001$ ).

**Combined Services** - Table 37 compares the 40% of the sample who received a combination of police and community youth worker services with those gang youth who did not receive services from these providers. This part of the analysis was an attempt to test the value of cross-agency type services. Not surprisingly, those who received services from both police and gang youth workers had more than twice the number of project contacts than did youth not receiving coordinated service; this difference was statistically significant ( $t=-5.81$ ,  $df=68$ ,  $p \leq .001$ ). Also, significantly more workers were involved per contact ( $t=-8.32$ ,  $df=38$ ,  $p \leq .001$ ).

Those youth provided with coordinated services from police and community youth workers were likely to receive more assistance related to school or job problems compared to those not provided combined worker services. Also, family members were more likely to have been contacted and this difference was statistically significant ( $\chi^2=5.59$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ). Further, more youth receiving a coordinated service pattern obtained crisis counseling services than did individuals who were not getting such coordinated services. This difference fell just short of statistical significance (Fisher's Exact,  $p = .073$ ). On the other hand, for both those receiving combined (usually coordinated) services and those not, ratings by workers of the success of advice/crisis counseling activity and family involvement were in the "somewhat" category on average.

Summary: Project Intervention. Evaluation of Project

effectiveness involved the use of both gang respondent and Project worker estimates. Of the 86 gang members interviewed, only 59 (or about two thirds) indicated they had been contacted or had received services by Project workers. On the other hand, Project workers said they had contacted 70 of the youth interviewed. There was some apparent contradiction in these reports.

However, in the first program year, gang member respondents reported an average of 11.8 months of service contact and approximately 5.8 contacts per month. Project workers, however, reported slightly more than 12 contacts per month with the total sample. To a large extent, the discrepancy can be explained by the fact that certain youth were not always aware they were receiving services, which were often provided in a street group context. Also gang youth did not ordinarily report services or contacts provided by police, but mainly those provided by the community youth workers.

Again, the discrepancy can also be accounted for by the fact that worker reports were obtained from police, probation, community youth workers, and NAGV staff, whereas gang member respondents only reported community youth worker contacts.

A great variety of services were provided by workers and received by gang youth, including contacts with parents, spouses, girlfriends, employers, and others. However, most contacts were with youth on the street (96.5%) or with parents in their homes (44.6%). Most youths were provided and received employment and educational referrals, crisis and family counseling. On the

average, youth respondents rated the quality of service as good or very good. However, the Latin Kings rated their workers' effectiveness significantly higher compared to the average rating of the Two-Six.

By and large, most of the Project contacts and services provided to youth were by community youth workers (94.3%) and police (45.7%) compared to probation (11.4%) and NAGV (10%). These differences may be due to the fact that Probation and NAGV joined the Project efforts at a later stage. Also, only a relatively small number of youth were on probation. In general Project workers rated the success of their efforts less optimistically than did the gang youth who received these services. Project staff rated contacts with parents or other family members as more effective than contacts with the gang youth themselves.

An effort was also made to compare the extent, type, and success of services provided by multiple or coordinated worker efforts compared to contacts and services by individual workers. Operationally, coordination meant mainly services provided by a combination of police and community youth workers. It was likely that the youth receiving such combined services were core gang members and those most targeted by the Project. In all cases, such combined efforts resulted in significantly more workers getting involved with the youth who were contacted and more frequent interactions. More of these youth received counseling, family-related services and referrals pertaining to school programs or jobs. However, workers did not generally view the results of

coordinated services as more successful than non-coordinated or combined services.

**Quasi-Control Groups: Youth Claiming Services Not Received; and  
Youths Whose Workers Claimed Services Not Provided**

In this section, we report briefly on youth who were interviewed at baseline and Time II (n=86) who are in one of two groups: (a) those whom workers report serving but who say they received no service (n=21); and (b) those whom workers say they did not serve (n=16). In our view the critical respondent group for a comparison of "treatment" vs. "no treatment" effects is not the (a) group, youth who stated they received no services, since in fact, they probably did receive some limited worker service (from one or more of the different kinds of workers), but for whatever reason did not recognize this, but rather the (b) group, i.e., the group of respondents to whom workers say they did not provide services. Nevertheless, we will examine the contact and service patterns for both types of "non-served" youth.

Table 38 is intended to clarify the (a) issue. The table compares service and worker contact patterns for those youth who said they received and those who said they did not receive services even though workers reported that they provided service. The results, based on worker reports, suggest that those who reported no worker contacts may indeed have received fewer services in some areas. In most cases, all youth were served, but the group which claimed no contact received less extensive and fewer services.

Based on worker program tracking records, these youth were in contact with significantly fewer Project service providers ( $t=2.90$ ,  $df=68$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ) and fewer workers ( $t=2.52$ ,  $df=68$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ). Respondents reporting no worker interaction also had significantly fewer contacts with those workers they did see ( $t=4.39$ ,  $df=61$ ,  $p \leq .001$ ) compared to individuals reporting contact. Finally, they were significantly less likely to receive services from the police alone ( $\chi^2=5.80$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ) or from the police and gang workers together ( $\chi^2=8.27$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ).

While there were no other statistically significant differences, those reporting no contact were consistently less likely to receive referrals for jobs or school, and contacts with family members were more limited. The groups did not differ greatly in relation to counseling services received or with respect to workers evaluations of the success of their interventions. It was quite clear that the "no service" group received services but it was apparently a nontargeted group.

Based on self-report data, it was possible to compare the average number of violent crimes at Time I and Time II for those respondents who said they had no worker contact and those who reported contact. It is clear from Table 39 that the greater worker efforts were directed toward the gang youth who exhibited greater violence at Time I. Those who reported worker contact reported significantly greater numbers of violent crimes at baseline compared to those who reported no contact ( $t=1.99$ ,  $df=65.5$ ,  $p = .05$ ). Further, while both groups experienced a sharp

drop in violent crimes at Time II, the group reporting service decreased more. Indeed, the change over time for this group was statistically significant ( $t=3.14$ ,  $df=48$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ) while the change between interviews for those claiming no service was not.

Gang Members Not Served, According to Workers.<sup>38</sup> As

noted above, workers provided information on service to 70

---

<sup>38</sup> Because 10 of these 16 respondents said that they had received service from project workers, even though project staff did not report that they had provided service, further analysis was conducted looking specifically at the individuals for whom there was congruence between worker and self-reports of non service. One of these individuals was a Latin King. The other 5 were Two Six. The analysis therefore focused on these 5 individuals only compared to the other 36 members of the Two Six for whom there were worker reports of service. The findings indicate that significant differences existed between those who did not receive service and those who did with respect to their levels of violent crime at Time I (for the non-served group, the average was 3.20, compared to 15.5 for those who workers served,  $t=-2.27$ ,  $df=23.5$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ). There were also differences between the groups with respect to total number of crimes (violent and nonviolent) at baseline. The average number of crimes for the no service group was 29.0 compared to 57.6 for those members of the Two Six who received service. This relationship just failed to attain statistical significance ( $t=-1.90$ ,  $df=20.6$ ,  $p \leq .071$ ).

The groups also continued to differ at Time II, even though the no service group increased slightly with respect to the average number of violent crimes and the service group decreased. Thus the average number of violent crimes for the no service group was 4.2 at Time II compared to 12.3 for the service group ( $t=-1.9521$ ,  $df=23$ ,  $p \leq .063$ ). Changes in violent crime over time periods were not statistically significant within or across groups.

The results were slightly different with respect to all crime. The change was greater among individuals receiving services. Both groups experienced decreases in the average number of violent crimes committed at Time II. The average for the group which did not receive service was 10.0 while the service group had an average of 31.6 at Time II ( $t=-2.23$ ,  $df=17.1$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ). Further, the change between Time I and Time II for the service group was statistically significant ( $t=2.54$ ,  $df=35$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ) while this was not the case for individuals who did not receive services ( $t=1.41$ ,  $N=5$ ).

individuals. However, 86 individuals were interviewed at both baseline and Time II. There were therefore 16 individuals who had apparently not received any or perhaps only peripheral services, based on worker records. This, in some sense, provides us with a possible "no treatment" group and we examined some of the outcome measures provided by the interviews for this group in comparison to members of the sample who did receive services according to worker reports. Because 15 of these 16 individuals were members of the Two-Six, the analysis focused on comparisons of this gang only.<sup>39</sup> Data on specific outcome measures are presented in Table 40.

The data in this table indicate that it is likely many, if not most of the youth who workers reported they did not serve may have been deliberately omitted because they had less potential at Time I for gang crime. Because they could have been similar in many respects to other gang members served, however, they conceivably could be regarded as a comparison or a "quasi-control" group. At Time I, this non-targeted or no treatment group reported fewer violent crimes (by approximately 34%). However, at Time II, this same group reported almost two-times as many violent crimes compared to the Two-Six who workers said they did serve. Further,

---

<sup>39</sup> The decision to compare this no service or no intervention group using Two-Six only instead of the whole sample was related to the fact that the Two-Six generally did less well on the outcome measures compared to the Latin Kings (i.e., changes in violent and criminal activity, increases in employment). Since most of this no intervention group were Two-Six (all but 1 individual), it is possible that the difference between gangs on outcomes was due to the presence of this no intervention subgroup among the Two-Six. Comparing them to the rest of the total sample would not clarify this issue.

while there is no significant difference between the time periods with respect to the change in total violent and nonviolent crimes for the not served group, the decrease for those receiving worker services across time periods was statistically significant ( $t=2.86$ ,  $df=25$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ). In addition, again looking at the total number of all crimes committed, there was a greater decrease, almost 3 times as great, among those who received some kind of service compared to those in the no treatment or no intervention group. While the results should be viewed with caution, they suggest that the intervention did indeed have a strong impact on the reduction of both criminal and violent activity. Such impact is further indicated in the regression analysis described below.

Summary of Control Group Analysis. Two "quasi-control" groups were established in the analysis: those youth who said they received no service from workers to whom workers said they provided service; and those youth whom workers said they did not serve. In the first analysis, youth who said they received no service, in fact did receive services, but such services were limited. Based on self-report data, there was a sharp drop in violent crime for both of these groups at Time II.

In the second "quasi-control" group analysis of the "no service" group, the findings revealed that this group was less violent and delinquent at baseline but became more violent and delinquent at Time II, while the opposite was true of the group whom workers said they served. It was evident from both of these

"quasi-control" groups that youth who were served benefitted from the program. Youth who workers said they did not serve did not exhibit a sharp decline in violence, although they were not as seriously delinquent as the targeted group.

### **Correlations and Regression Analysis**

Correlations. More focused analysis of the effectiveness of the Gang Violence Reduction Project was conducted in an attempt to identify key variables which might be related to the outcomes of reduced criminal behavior at Time II, particularly with respect to the decrease in violent criminal behavior. Variables which were utilized were selected for several reasons. First, they represented key theoretical concepts (e.g, anomie or the disjuncture between aspiration and expectation; differential association, i.e., levels of association or identification with particular gang culture; community level disorganization and social control or personal/family disorganization) or they were critical control variables such as age. Second, there was variance in the sample on the measure based on the organization of the Project and its targeting efforts, often indicated by significant differences between the two gangs on the variable. The third criterion was that a large enough proportion of the sample be included, i.e., enough people had to respond to the question of interest.

Using these criteria, we selected variables (which are listed in Table 41A). Their correlation coefficients related to each of three different outcome variables are presented in Tables 41B, 41C,

and 41D. The outcome measures of interest are: 1) the total number of violent crimes committed at Time II (Table 41B); 2) the total number of all crimes, including violent crimes, committed at Time II (Table 41C); and 3) the change in violent crimes between Time I and Time II (Table 41D).

**Violence at Time II** - Table 41B contains information about the key variables and their relation to violent crime at Time II. We did not differentiate gang motivated and non-gang motivated violence generally in this analysis, since respondents indicated that all or almost all of the violence (and crime generally) was committed in association with gang peers. As we would expect, violence at Time I is significantly correlated to violence at Time II, but, there are a number of other significant relationships, most notably related to indicators of group association or involvement with the gang and socio-economic status. Thus, those who reduced their level of involvement with the gang as well as those who were thinking about leaving the gang at the time of the second interview had lower scores on violent crime at Time II. Of note is that these two variables (gang status reduction or lower position in the gang and thoughts about leaving the gang) are not themselves highly correlated ( $r=.19$ ,  $p=0.13$ ,  $N=67$ ) suggesting that they may be measuring different aspects of group-related attachment associated with violent activity.

While employment status at Time II was not itself related to violent activity, the amount of income from work was significantly related; individuals whose work income comprised a smaller

proportion of their total income had significantly higher scores on total violence at Time II than those who were getting more of their total income from work money. The opposite was true with respect to illegal funds; the greater the amount of illegal funds as a proportion of total income, the higher the number of total violent incidents at Time II. As noted earlier, most of this illegal income was reportedly from drug sales, suggesting that legitimate and especially illegal opportunities do not necessarily serve as a substitute for violence. Rather it is possible that illegal income may be a cause of or a response to violent activity. One explanation may be that an illegal income and opportunity culture exists which is conducive to and at least partially dependent on gang violence. In other words, from a theoretical perspective, violence and criminal gang cultures or subcultures are not independent but interdependent and variable.

A significant relationship also existed with respect to the gap between occupational aspirations and expectations. As we would expect from theoretical arguments about the role of anomie in gang violence, those who had a larger gap between their aspirations and expectations also had reported higher levels of violence at Time II. On the other hand, the disjuncture related to income was not related to violent crime.

None of the variables representing community disorganization or socialization and types of social control, including the age of the respondent at the time of the first interview were significantly associated with total violent crime at Time II.

Again, we observe that the age range of the sample at Time I was quite limited, from about 16 or 17 years to 24 or 25 years. In addition, affiliation with the Two-Six or Latin Kings was not differentially associated to a significant degree with violence. This last finding is not surprising since previous analysis indicates little difference between the gangs in total violence at Time II (See Table 3), although the difference was significant at Time I. The Latin Kings were than a much more violent gang.

Two other variables, the Coopersmith self-esteem score at baseline, and whether or not the respondent was at or above the median household income range had borderline relationships ( $p \leq .10$ ) to violence. Thus, those who scored higher on the Coopersmith at Time I and individuals whose household income was less than the median range reported higher rates of violent crime at Time II. These findings suggest that violent activity may serve as a means of attaining social status and personal esteem for those who have limited opportunities to make a mark in the world by other means. However, poverty or low income alone is an insufficient explanation of high levels of gang crime.

Finally, the data related to worker intervention variables generally indicate few significant relationships apart from a statistically significant relationship between respondent's reports of service received and total violence at Time II. In this case, the direction of the relationship indicates that those who received services had higher violence scores at Time II. Given the high correlation between violence at Time I and Time II, it is likely

that this relationship is present because those who were targeted for service had high levels of violence at baseline as well. Indeed, further analysis reveals that there is a borderline relationship between reports by respondents of worker contact and violence at Time I ( $r=0.19$ ,  $p=.07$ ).

**Total Crime at Time II** - Table 41C contains information about the relationships between the key variables and total crime at Time II. As the data indicate, there are many similarities between the results for total crime and total violent crime at the time of the second interview. However, there is at least one important difference. Specifically, age at the time of the first interview, which was not significantly related to total violent crime at Time II is highly significantly related to total crime; individuals who were younger reported higher rates of crime across all 16 crime categories at Time II. This finding suggests that younger respondents may be more involved in property crimes even though they are not, apparently more likely to be involved in violent crime.<sup>40</sup>

As was the case for total violent crime at Time II, there are significant relationships in similar directions between total crime at Time II and baseline gang involvement level, thoughts about leaving the gang, the proportion of total income accounted for by work and by illegal means, and the gap between occupational

---

<sup>40</sup> It is also possible that the relationship between violence and age is suppressed by other variables. Regression analysis, in which age serves as a control variable, will explore this possibility.

aspirations and expectations. Again, as in the previous table, the strongest relationship is between violent total crime and illegal income.

Some slight differences exist when all crime at Time II is the focus rather than all violent crime. Thus, the relationship between respondent reports of service and all crime is borderline ( $p=.08$ ) and again indicates that higher crime scores at Time II are associated with receipt of service. Reasons for this are probably similar to those for the relationship between this variable and total violence--more problematic individuals, that is, those who commit more crimes, are targeted for service more than those who are less delinquent. Coopersmith scores at Time I also attain statistical significance in relation to total crimes, but no significant association occurs between median household income and total crime.

**Change in Violent Crime from Baseline to Time II - Table 41D** contains the correlation results between the variables of interest and the violent crime change score. In contrast to the results reported for total crime and total violent crime, few variables predict the change over time, apart from total violent crime at baseline, gang affiliation, whether or not individuals received services and whether those services were coordinated services (i.e., from police and gang workers together).

Perhaps expectedly, total violence at Time I is an important predictor (it explains almost all the variance in the violence score) since scores at baseline set the ceiling in some respects

for the degree to which change is possible. Individuals whose scores are higher at Time I have more room to change compared to individuals who report lower rates of violence.<sup>41</sup> Thus, where one begins is an important determinant of the degree of change. Surprisingly, though, few other variables of interest are related to the change score.

One additional explanation may be that other variables are indirectly related through their relationship to gang affiliation, so it is not possible to see these relationships because of the association between gang and change scores. In other words, differential gang membership is serving as a proxy for other variables which might be associated to change scores.

Further analysis of the relationships between particular gang membership and some of the other variables of interest indicates that there were indeed several significant correlations with gang. The results show that younger age was associated with membership in the Two-Six ( $r=-0.43$ ,  $p \leq .001$ ), as was a larger occupational and income aspiration/expectation gap (for the occupational gap,  $r=-0.26$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ; for the income gap,  $r=0.33$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ). As expected, living with either or both parents was associated with membership in the Two-Six ( $r=0.26$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ) while living with girlfriends or spouses was associated with membership in the Latin Kings ( $r=-0.38$ ,  $p \leq .001$ ). A greater proportion of gang to non-gang friendships

---

<sup>41</sup> Of course, it is possible that individuals who are low at baseline could increase, but either way, where individuals start is an important determinant in where they end up. Further, because the average direction of change was downward, it appears that the critical issue here is how high a respondent was at Time I.

was also related to membership in the Two-Six ( $r=0.25$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ) as were higher scores on the Coopersmith at Time I ( $r=0.22$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ). The Two-Six were less likely to be among those served, based on respondent reports ( $r=-0.44$ ,  $p \leq .001$ ), and had a lower likelihood of receiving referrals related to jobs or school problems ( $r=-0.25$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ). Finally, individuals who tended to rate the police as more effective were more likely to be Two-Six ( $r=-0.24$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ) as were those who saw the gang crime problem as more serious at Time II ( $r=0.23$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ). Since differential gang characteristics will be controlled, regression analysis, will help to further clarify whether some of these variables are also related to changes in gang violence over time.

Also important, the change score is significantly related to reports of workers providing service as well as to receipt of coordinated services. Both variables were associated with greater reductions of violence between the two time periods. A very positive finding, this again suggests that the intervention may be having an impact, particularly when services combine efforts between criminal justice and social service workers. However, the exact mechanisms involved are not clear, since there is no relation between measures of service intensity, such as months of contact or frequency of interaction each month, and change scores. Nonetheless, a significant and positive correlation between referrals for jobs and/or school problems and change indicates that those who received such referrals experienced greater decreases in violence. Again, neither the worker effectiveness variable nor the

rating of the quality of the intervention were significantly correlated to change scores. One interesting finding, however, indicates that individuals who more often rated the worker highly in terms of honesty also had greater reductions in their violence scores at Time II ( $r=-0.27$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ,  $n=56$ ). None of the other items on the scale were significantly associated with change scores even though the items were all correlated with each other at the .05 level or less. <sup>42</sup>

Regression Models. We are primarily interested in the relevance of the Gang Violence Reduction Project and certain theoretical variables for the development of effective public policy.

**Predictors of Total Violence at Time II** - In order to better identify the critical components predictive of total violence (and total crime) and its control at Time II, a series of regression analyses was undertaken. Table 42A contains the variables which are in the first model, including total violence at the time of the first gang survey or baseline interview, membership in the Two-Six or Latin Kings, age at the time of the first interview, proportion of total income derived from illegal activity, and whether the respondent reported contact with project workers. The findings suggest that those who received a greater proportion of their income from illegal income as well as those who report that they received services from Project staff had higher levels of violent

---

<sup>42</sup>Items included in the scale were the rating of worker effort, availability, and ability at providing things for respondents to do.

crime at Time II. Further, those who were more violent at Time I were somewhat more likely to be violent at Time II. Neither age nor particular gang affiliation were significantly related to violent crime at Time II. Together these variables, accounting for almost 33% of the variance in this model, predicting violent gang crime at Time II.

As noted in the discussion of correlations between variables, these data suggest that access to illegal income, particularly income from drug sales (the primary source of illegal funds for the sample at Time II), does not relate to decreases in violence, as traditional delinquent subcultural and differential opportunity theory (Cloward and Ohlin 1960) might suggest. Rather, the relationship between violent gang crime and property-based illegal crime, based on drug-dealing, may be independent dimensions of the same factor, which predicts both total and violent gang crime for the sample, i.e., for Latino gang youth, age 17-25 years in Little Village. Possibly, violence is highly functional to the production of illegal income, and indeed the reverse may be more important. An economy based on illegal income may require for its perpetuation high level of gang violence. Conversely, an economically driven drug dealing culture may be strongly predictive of high levels of gang violence, at least under certain community circumstances, e.g., the transition of a conflict or gang violence subculture to a drug economy. Traditional differential opportunity theory may need to be modified to consider that gang violence and drug dealing

may be closely related, but in variable terms.<sup>43</sup>

Information about services is not simple to interpret because of the direction of the relationship. As noted, it is likely that those who were targeted for service at baseline were more violent individuals and individuals who were more violent at Time I, as the equation indicates, were also more violent at Time II. However, if violence levels at Time I were the critical issue, we would expect violence at Time I to attain significance and the service variable to drop out. This is not the case; in fact, total violence at baseline is the more borderline variable in the analysis. Part of the explanation may reside, as explained above, in the transitional nature of the gang respondents as well as the changing character of the gang in this stage of development from emphasis on mainly violence to drug involvement and related violent activity.<sup>44</sup>

On the other hand, the significant variable in this model is

---

<sup>43</sup> Also of note is that, when accounting for the proportion of income from employment rather than illegal means, the overall adjusted R square for the model is lower at 0.178. The proportion of all income accounted for by employment is significantly related to violence at Time II, i.e., those who have a greater proportion of their income accounted for by employment income commit fewer violent crimes (beta=-12.08, t=-2.31,  $p \leq .05$ , N=71). This suggests that legitimate opportunities may indeed take the place of gang violence as a means of obtaining status, but receipt of illegal income appears to be a better predictor of violence, overall.

<sup>44</sup> Note that analysis in which the same variables presented in Table 43a are included, with the exception of the total violence at baseline variable, is almost as predictive as the model in which the baseline measure is included. In this model, the adjusted R square=0.31. The variable measuring respondent's reports of service is significant in this model (beta=10.95, t=-2.493,  $p \leq .05$ ), as is the illegal income variable (beta=29.344, t=5.09,  $p \leq .001$ ). Age attains borderline status (beta=-1.63, t=-1.741,  $p=.086$ ). Gang affiliation remains non-significant.

the one based on respondent reports of service and not on worker reports. In an alternative model, when the worker's reports of service is included instead, it fails to attain statistical significance (beta=-7.55, t=-1.30, p = .20). However, level of violent crime at baseline does attain significance in this alternative model (beta=0.104, t=2.277, p ≤ .05), suggesting that such levels explain the relationship between worker's reports of intervention and violence at Time II even if they do not account for reports from respondent's that they were served.

When both variables are included in the equation (only a weak relationship exists between worker reports of service and respondent reports of being served (r=0.063, n=86, p=.5651); only the respondent's report variable is statistically significant (b=9.515, t=2.15, p ≤ .05). Further, when an interaction term combining the two variables is used, respondent's reports of service remains statistically significant (beta=19.25, t=2.044, p ≤ .05), while neither the interaction term nor the variable measuring service receipt on the basis of worker reports attains statistical significance.

In addition to those in the Table 42A model, several other variables were examined. These models were rejected in the end because the number of individuals missing from the analysis sometimes exceeded 20. Thus, it was possible that outcomes were related to some bias in the individuals remaining in the analysis. However, because several models included important variables, they are discussed here, with the caution that findings may not be

generalizable to all respondents.

The variable which measures drops in involvement or gang position level, and the one assessing thoughts about quitting the gang were included separately in a model with the same variables as the final Table 42A model. The change in status variable did not attain statistical significance, ( $\beta=-0.305$ ,  $t=-0.064$ ,  $p=.95$ ,  $n=71$ ) but the variable examining plans to leave was statistically significant ( $\beta=10.540$ ,  $t=2.199$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ,  $n=62$ ), suggesting that those currently thinking about leaving are committing more violent crimes at Time II. Perhaps this is why they are thinking about retiring.

Finally, the variable assessing the gap in occupational aspirations and expectations was included in a further variation of the Table 42A model. Those who had bigger aspiration/expectation gaps committed a significantly greater number of violent crimes at Time II ( $\beta=-9.82$ ,  $t=-2.152$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ,  $N=65$ ). Also significant in this model was the proportion of all income accounted for by illegal income ( $b=23.34$ ,  $t=3.71$ ,  $p \leq .001$ ) and the variable reflecting the respondent's report of service receipt ( $\beta=9.82$ ,  $t=-2.15$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ). None of the other three variables in the model (total violent crime at baseline, gang affiliation, or age at the time of the baseline interview) were statistically significant. The adjusted  $r^2$  was 0.3395.

**Total Crimes at Time II** - Table 42B contains the second major model, which predicts all crimes at Time II. Because of the close association of the respondents with other gang members in the

committing of all reported crimes, the total crime variable at Time II was considered an appropriate dependent variable. The variables included in this equation account for slightly more than 45 percent of the variance in crimes committed at Time II (adjusted  $r^2=0.452$ ). Variables which remain significant in the equations are total crimes at baseline ( $b=0.114$ ,  $t=2.89$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ), the proportion of the respondent's income accounted for by illegal income ( $b=45.83$ ,  $t=4.98$ ,  $p \leq .001$ ), respondent's reports of service ( $b=39.88$ ,  $t=2.70$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ), and a term combining whether the respondent reports that he or she received service and whether workers report that they provided service ( $b=-37.62$ ,  $t=-2.28$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ). Finally, a borderline relationship exists between age and total crimes at Time II ( $b=-2.52$ ,  $t=-1.69$ ,  $p=.097$ ).

The results of this model are slightly different than the one predicting total violent crime at Time II, particularly in relation to the service-related variables. As was the case with total crime, the variable related to respondent reports of service attains significance while the variable reflecting worker reports of service is not significantly related to total crime. However, the interaction term, which basically corrects for discrepancies between worker and respondent reports of service, retains significance. The beta coefficient indicates that total crime is significantly lower among individuals who say they received service and for whom workers also report service. Respondents whose reports are discrepant with those of workers (either they claim they received services and the workers do not or they claim they

received no service but workers say they served them) or respondents whose reports of no service are in accord with workers are more likely to have higher total crime scores at Time II.

The results are difficult to interpret, especially since the worker reports of service variable is not significant when it is in the equation alone ( $b=-12.38$ ,  $t=-1.348$ ,  $p=0.18$ ), while the respondent report of service variable is significant with and without the inclusion of the interaction term. Clearly, the data suggest that again there is something unique about the gang member reporting service which is independent, to some extent, of whether they actually received service, in relation to crime levels. There must be some positive benefit to respondent's perception of having received a service whether he received it or not (at least based on worker reports). Perhaps those who said they received service and who got served received something extra, which is then critical in the reduction of crime.<sup>45</sup>

A further difference about this model compared to the model in Table 42A is that total crime at Time I remains an important

---

<sup>45</sup> As noted, neither the interaction term nor the worker reports of service variables were significant in the equation predicting violent crime specifically at Time II, suggesting that there are some different dynamics involved with violent crime.

In addition, because the intensity of the service package might be a critical factor, an equation was run, in which the variable measuring whether or not the respondent received services from both police and gang workers versus those who did not, was substituted for worker and respondent reports of service. This variable failed to attain statistical significance in the model ( $\beta=2.69$ ,  $t=0.364$ ,  $p=0.72$ ), and the overall variance explained was lower (adjusted R square=0.394). When the service interaction term was added into the model with the police/gang variable in it, it also failed to attain statistical significance ( $\beta=-6.36$ ,  $t=-0.78$ ,  $p=0.437$ ).

predictive variable even when the service variables are included in the equation. This suggests that it has an influence independent of its relationship to services or to other variables, such as age, which might account for differences in total crime at Time I. Indeed, age assumes borderline significance in this equation when total crime at Time I is added to the equation. When the total crime variable is excluded from the model, the relation between age and total crime at Time II is significant ( $\beta = -3.46$ ,  $t = -2.251$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ), such that those who were younger at the time of the first interview had higher levels of all crime at Time II.

As was the case with predictors of violent crime at Time II, the proportion of total income accounted for by illegal income remains the most important predictive variable of total crime at Time II. The proportion of income accounted for by work income, when it is substituted for illegal income, is also predictive of total crime at Time II ( $b = -26.08$ ,  $-3.22$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ), but the proportion of variance accounted for is lower (adjusted  $r^2 = 0.348$ ).<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> In order to see the extent to which illegal income might be the result of mainly property crimes, an equation was run in which the dependent variable was all crimes that are not violent in nature (i.e., the other 8 crimes in the self-report section, which include crimes such as car theft, and burglary). In this equation, which also included gang affiliation, age at the time of the first interview and the worker reports of service, the illegal income variable failed to attain statistical significance ( $\beta = 22.72$ ,  $t = 1.36$ ,  $p = 0.18$ ,  $n = 74$ ). This suggests that income from criminal activity is not the result of property crime, nor are those who receive more illegal income from activities such as drug sales more likely to commit property crimes. Rather, it seems, as in the analysis of violent crime at Time II, that illegal income is critical to the concept of violent crime and vice versa, at least for the present sample.

Several other variables, significantly correlated with total crime and important in terms of violent crime also increased the overall variance explained, but the sample size in this model dropped to a problematic level. Thus, when the variable measuring the gap between occupational aspirations and expectations was added to the model, the adjusted r increased to 0.527, but the sample size dropped to 67. Note that those who had larger "gaps" reported higher levels of crime at Time II to a significant degree (beta=-6.21, t=-3.31,  $p \leq .01$ ). The two service variables remained statistically significant (respondent reports of service and the interaction term) as did the variables measuring proportions of illegal income and total crime at Time I. Age at the time of the first interview was no longer even close to statistically significant (beta=-1.466, t=-0.778,  $p=0.44$ ), but this might have been an artifact of the drop in the sample size.<sup>47</sup>

The variables measuring drops in gang involvement or lowered position and current thoughts about leaving the gang were also fit into the model. Neither variable attained statistical significance (for the change in status or position, beta=3.51, t=0.454,  $p=0.65$ , n=71; for thoughts of leaving, beta=5.86, t=0.797,  $p=0.43$ , n=62). This suggests that, after controlling for other factors, changes in association levels are not as important to levels of crime in general even though they may be important in terms of violent

---

<sup>47</sup>Note that analysis of age differences for those still in the sample and those who dropped out of the analysis indicates no significant differences. Among missing cases, the average age at the time of the first interview was 19.1, which was the same age as those respondents still included in the sample.

crime.

In both the models predicting violent crime at Time II and total crime at Time II, variables accounting for variance were in the following order of importance related to variance explained: proportion of total income derived from illegal activity, total crime at baseline, and the service variable, especially as experienced and perceived by the gang respondent. From a theoretical perspective, the strongest conditions conducive to criminal, including gang violent, behavior were access to criminal opportunities, differential association or prior socialization to crime, while at the same time, the strongest variable controlling or minimizing criminal, including gang violent, behavior, was highly targeted social intervention, particularly as manifested in the Gang Violence Reduction Project.

Furthermore, we note that in those models with increased variance and smaller n's, these theoretically relevant variables remain, but occupational differences (i.e., the aspiration-expectation gap or anomie variable), powerfully enters the equation. In all cases, access to illegal income or opportunities is the most powerfully related variable to gang violence.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> Even though the illegal income variable can be seen as emerging strongly in the regression analysis, it is not clear, as noted in the text, that it is predictive of gang violence. Rather, the two may be highly correlated such that involvement in gang violence may increase access to illegal money-making opportunities and vice versa. Thus, because the causal ordering of the two variables is ambiguous, the regression analysis was rerun, deleting the illegal income variable from the model for total violent crime and total crime at Time II. In addition, the occupational aspiration/expectation gap variable was included in each model. This variable was added because it was a strong predictor and

---

because once the illegal income variable was omitted, the number of missing cases decreased, even when the occupational "gap" variable was included.

Results for the model predicting total violent crime at Time II indicate that about 18% of the variance in violent crime (adjusted R square=0.183) is explained by the model which includes violence at baseline, gang affiliation, age at baseline interview, respondent reports of service receipt and the occupational aspiration/expectation gap variable. Only two variables attain statistical significance; total violence at Time I (beta=0.1366, t=2.724, p=.0081, N=79) and the occupational "gap" variable (beta=-3.484, t=-2.587, p=0.0117).

Further analysis using the occupational "gap" variable and the worker reports of service rather than respondent reports (there is some bias related to missing cases for the respondent report variable), as well as an interaction term combining these two variables, indicates that there is an improvement in the predictive power of the model (adjusted R square=0.222). Variables attaining statistical significance include total violence at baseline (beta=0.1561, t=3.250, p=0.0018) and the occupational "gap" variable (beta=-9.910, t=-2.686, p=0.0090). In addition, the term combining worker reports of service and the "gap" variable achieves borderline significance (beta=7.073, t=1.775, p=.0801), indicating that those with smaller occupational aspiration/expectation gaps who received service, according to workers, reported less violence at Time II.

Prediction is better for the model using total violence at Time II. In a model similar to the one presented in Table 43b in which the occupational "gap" variable is substituted for the illegal income variable, approximately 30% of the variance in total crime at Time II is explained (adjusted R square=0.308). Significant variables in the model include total crime at Time I (beta=0.170, t=3.997, p=.0002) and the occupational "gap" variable (beta=-6.678, t=-3.110, p=.0027). In addition, the respondent reports of service variable and the variable combining worker and respondent reports of service attain borderline significance (for respondent reports, beta=33.221, t=1.863, p=.0666 and for the interaction term, beta=-33.083, t=-1.696, p=.0942).

Additional analysis using the variable of worker reports of service and a measure combining this variable and the occupational "gap" variable, as well as total crime at baseline, gang affiliation, age at the time of the baseline interview and the occupational "gap" measure, indicates that slightly more of the variance in total crime at Time II is explained (adjusted R square=0.354). In this case, total crime at baseline, the occupational "gap" variable and the interaction of worker reports of service and the "gap" variable are all statistically significant at the .01 level or greater. Coefficients indicate that those who committed more crimes at baseline (beta=0.185, t=4.607, p=.0001), those with larger occupational aspiration/expectation gaps (beta=-

The Change in Violence Levels From Time I to Time II - Table 42C contains the final model of the variables which predict the change in violence from Time I to Time II. Because few variables were related to the change score in the correlational analysis, especially with respect to those variables associated with overall crime and violence levels at Time II, a somewhat different model was attempted. As the results indicate, only slightly more than 11% of the variance in change scores is explained by the variables which were included. One of the two variables to attain statistical significance was whether respondents rated the worker's honesty as very good or not ( $\beta=23.36$ ,  $t=2.29$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ), such that those who rated the worker's honesty as very good experienced a significantly larger decrease in violence levels. In effect, positive relations (the respondent's perception of the worker's honesty or integrity) suggest a larger decrease in violence between the two time periods. Further, gang affiliation was statistically significant ( $\beta=-24.53$ ,  $t=-2.206$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ), indicating that membership in the Latin Kings was more strongly associated with decreases in violence.

One important difference in this model from those described in Tables 42A and 42B, apart from the inclusion of different variables, is that the variable measuring total violent crime at baseline was excluded because it accounted for so much of the change score. Also, this was done in an attempt to identify other variables which were strongly associated with changes in violence

---

21.546,  $t=-3.737$ ,  $p=.0004$ ) and those with larger "gaps" who did not receive service according to worker reports ( $\beta=17.424$ ,  $t=2.797$ ,  $p=0.0066$ ) reported more crimes at Time II.

levels. Indeed, when added to the equation, neither the worker honesty nor gang affiliation variables are significant. Only the variable accounting for violence at Time I attains significance ( $\beta=0.85$ ,  $t=16.68$ ,  $p \leq .001$ ), explaining 81% of the variance in change scores (adjusted  $r=0.81$ ).

These results suggest that even the effect of gang affiliation and worker characteristics are somehow related to change through their association to violence at Time I. Indeed, as the data in Table 3 indicated, the Latin Kings were more involved in violent crime at Time I. Probably they had higher change scores because they had more room to change. Further, the honesty variable and violence at Time I are positively correlated ( $r=0.32460$ ,  $p=.003$ ,  $n=83$ ), suggesting that individuals with higher violence scores at baseline rated worker's honesty as very good more often than those with lower violence scores. Most importantly though, these results indicate that any interpretation of findings when the violence at Time I variable is excluded must be viewed cautiously since effects are probably mediated by the inclusion of the violence variable. Further analysis is needed to identify the exact path of change. With this in mind, however, some other findings are important to note.

Because the assessment of worker honesty was so closely correlated with other measures of worker behavior, such as effort, availability and ability at providing things for respondents to do, these three variables were included in place of the honesty variable in three separate equations. None of the three attained

statistical significance, suggesting that despite the correlations between variables, something about worker honesty or integrity in particular is important. In addition, the same three service variables (respondent reports of service, worker reports and the interaction term) were added separately and together to the model and none of the three attained statistical significance, while the honesty variable remained significant or attained borderline status. The coordinated service variable (i.e., service provided by both police and gang workers) was also included yet failed to attain significance ( $\beta=10.79$ ,  $t=0.965$ ,  $p=0.338$ ). These findings suggest that the actual amount of service is less critical to decreases in violent crime than the way in which service is provided.

Finally, some of the other variables which predicted violent and total crime at Time II were included in the equation. None of the following variables attained statistical significance: the occupational aspiration/expectation gap ( $\beta=2.25$ ,  $t=0.754$ ,  $p=0.45$ ); the change in gang involvement level or reduced position ( $\beta=-14.208$ ,  $t=-1.473$ ,  $p=0.1449$ ); the variable assessing plans to leave the gang ( $\beta=8.955$ ,  $t=0.744$ ,  $p=-.45$ ); and the proportion of total income from illegal means ( $\beta=4.11$ ,  $t=0.284$ ,  $p=0.778$ ).

Summary of Correlational and Regression Analysis. Correlation and regression analyses focused on variables which could be used to assess the effectiveness of the Gang Violence Reduction Project. The variables, furthermore, represented key theoretical concepts

with implications for public policy. Ideas from anomie, social control, differential opportunity (criminal opportunity), and differential association were employed.

Three sets of correlations were conducted, each with a different dependent or outcome measure which indicated change in the gang crime situation based on individual self-reported and interview data. The dependent variables were violent crime at Time II (in almost all cases, gang youths committed their violent crime with gang peers); all crime (property or violent) at Time II; and change in violent crime between Time I and Time II. When the dependent variables of violent crime at Time II and total crime were considered, a number of correlations were statistically significant. Fewer variables were correlated with the change score.

The following variables were most closely associated with the dependent variable of violent crime at Time II, listed in order of greatest to least strongly correlated: Proportion of income at time II from illegal activities (criminal opportunity); respondent's current thoughts about leaving the gang (differential association); total violent crime at baseline (socialization); occupation aspiration-expectation disjunction (anomie); proportion of income from work at Time II (legitimate opportunity); reduction in gang position or level of attachment (differential association/social control); and the gang respondent's report of services received from Project workers. Other variables which just missed statistical significance when correlated with the violent

crime variable at Time II were the Coopersmith Self-Esteem score ( $p=.09$ ; social control/personal disorganization), and whether the respondent's household income was at or above the median level of household income for the sample ( $p=.10$ ; anomie/family disorganization).

When using all crime (violent and property) as the dependent variable, the same variables with some minor changes in strength of association and ordering was evident in the correlation analysis. The substitution of total crime for total violent crime at baseline had the same effect. The only additional variable strongly correlated with the all crime variable at Time II was age. The younger the age of the respondent, the more likely he or she was to report high levels of all types of crime at Time II. The age variable was not significantly correlated when using only violent crime as a dependent variable.

Thus, we find that access to criminal opportunities, early histories of crime (whether violent or a combination of violent and non-violent), and the size of the aspiration-expectation gap for the future are most highly correlated to the outcome measures of violent and total crime at Time II such that they are related to increased levels of crime. Differential association i.e., considerations of leaving the gang or reducing contact with the gang and services received by the Project are negatively correlated; these latter variables mitigate or reduce the number of crimes in which the respondent is involved.

The extent to which violent crime was reduced at Time II was

the dependent variable in the third set of analyses. Far fewer variables were significantly correlated. The highest correlation coefficient by far (.9) was total violent crime at baseline. A ceiling effect suggested that the higher the violence level at Time I, the greater the decrease at Time II. The gang variable, Latin King, was strongly associated with reductions in gang violence at Time II, and the coordinated Project service variable was also somewhat significantly correlated, in such a way as to suggest that service by both police and gang workers is associated with a greater decrease in violent crime. Surprisingly, the proportion of total income derived from illegal activity no longer was significantly correlated with the difference score on violent crime between Time I and Time II.

A series of regression analyses were next conducted to account for a variety of policy effects, e.g., project intervention, prior criminal history, legitimate job and criminal opportunities, and to determine what predictive power these and other causal variable might have. Three key models were constructed, using the same three dependent variables as in the correlational analysis. Similar predictive or independent variables entered the equation, whether the dependent variable was total violent crime or all crime at Time II. The most powerful predictive variable by far was the availability of criminal opportunities, i.e., proportion of income from illegal activities at Time II. Total crime and the service variables also entered the equation at a significant level of probability, especially when all crime at Time II was used as the

dependent variable. In addition, there was evidence that anomie, at least in relation to a gap between occupational aspirations and expectations, is an important predictor of violent and total crime.

In a third, fairly weak regression model, with difference in violent crime between Time I and Time II as the dependent variable, we deliberately did not enter any other crime variables. Only the gang affiliation and a service delivery variable--the honesty or integrity of the worker were statistically significant. The relationships were such that membership in the Two-Six was associated with less of a reduction in violent crime between Time I and II, but a key service delivery characteristic or variable, worker honesty, predicted a greater difference, i.e., a larger reduction in violent gang crime over the course of the Project.

Essentially, these statistical analyses indicated that the existence of criminal opportunities in the community, the prior history of violence, and the total crimes by respondents were associated with and strongly predictive of greater crime levels at Time II, but remarkably the Project's services or worker contact pattern was also significant and important in predicting a lower level of violent and general crime by the respondents at Time II.

In effect, the data suggest that the Project was substantially effective with targeted youth, based on interview responses from youth and workers. Official aggregate or area level data, already available, confirmed the reduction of the level of gang violence for the Latin Kings over the same time period. Time II criminal justice system individual level data and Time II community level

data to verify the interview self-report and aggregate level police data are still being collected, and have not yet been analyzed.

## Appendix A

Sampling Issues. The data presented in Table A1 indicate that among the two gangs the Two-Six make up a significantly greater proportion of those interviewed only at baseline compared to the Latin Kings ( $\chi^2=4.41$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Almost three quarters of this subgroup were Two-Six. In addition to this difference, those interviewed at baseline only (mainly Two-Six) were significantly older, on average, compared to those who were interviewed twice ( $t=2.18$ ,  $df=106$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ). Apart from this difference, the baseline only group is no more likely to have been employed at Time I (which might have made it more difficult for them to find time for a second interview). They were not more likely to report that they were in leadership positions (which might have made them more likely to refuse interviews). They report somewhat more total crimes at baseline compared to those interviewed twice, suggesting that they may be more delinquent, but they are almost identical to the group interviewed twice on the average number of violent incidents at baseline. Though quite similar with respect to drug selling activity, at baseline, they are somewhat less likely to be using marijuana, but slightly more likely to be using cocaine than those interviewed twice.

Because the majority of the baseline only group were Two-Six, the same analysis of differences at baseline and Time II was repeated for the Two-Six only to determine if the group that was not re-interviewed was different enough from those who were to raise concerns about observed differences among the Two-Six. The results of this analysis are in Table A2.

As the data indicate, there are several statistically significant differences. Similar to the findings in Table 3, the baseline only group is significantly older on average ( $t=2.80$ ,  $df=20.2$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ). Indeed, the 16 individuals who were not reinterviewed were more than two years older than the group of Two-Six who were reinterviewed. Changes in the sample at Time I might therefore be explained as resulting from an aging out process, (particularly for the Two-Six). At Time II, the average age of the Latin Kings who were interviewed was 20.2, more than two years greater than the average for the Two-Six interviewed<sup>1</sup>. The difference between gangs on this variable at Time II was statistically significant ( $t=4.39$ ,  $df=84$ ,  $p \leq .001$ ).

Other significant differences exist between those Two-Six interviewed only at baseline and those interviewed twice, but these are not meaningful for purposes of the analysis. Those interviewed only at baseline were less involved in violent or serious gang

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that there was little difference among those Latin Kings who were and were not interviewed twice with respect to age. The six individuals who were interviewed at baseline only had a mean age of 20.7 compared to the mean of 20.2 for those interviewed twice.

activity. They averaged slightly more than four violent incidents compared to the average of 14 for those interviewed twice. They were much less likely to be in leadership positions in the gang as well. Further, they reported engaging in fewer criminal behaviors in general.<sup>2</sup> They were slightly less likely to be employed at baseline. Compared to those interviewed twice, they were somewhat less likely to report that they were engaged in selling marijuana or cocaine at baseline. This helps to rule out the possibility that the baseline-only group was not interviewed again because they did not need the money.<sup>3</sup>

These findings suggest that those who were interviewed only at baseline among the Two-Six were more peripheral members of the gang who should not have been included initially in the sample. Our concern about this issue at baseline may have been warranted. Indeed, the Two-Six gang worker did not know several of these individuals. The findings indicate that this group, which was not reinterviewed, was not more extreme in terms of violence or strong gang attachment. From a programmatic point of view, the findings provide further evidence that project workers targeted hard-core and not peripheral or non-violence prone gang youth.

Self-Report Information. As in the first interview, each respondent was asked whether he or she had been involved in one of 16 criminal activities during the previous six months. If involvement had occurred, additional questions were asked about the number of times the activity occurred, the number of people who were with the respondent at the event, whether the group involved included gang members, nongang members or both, whether the respondent was arrested for the crime and, if so, the number of times.

The 16 criminal activities again included writing nongang graffiti; gang graffiti; destroying property (worth \$300 or less);

---

<sup>2</sup> A concern was that this group was primarily from a branch known to be served less rigorously by the gang worker serving the Two Six. Analysis indicates that 31.2% of the baseline only group was from this branch compared to 9.8% of those interviewed twice, but the groups did not differ significantly in this regard ( $\chi^2=3.99$ ,  $df=1$ , Fisher's Exact=0.10).

<sup>3</sup> Possibly those interviewed once were making more money from work or drug sales if engaged in these activities. However, further analysis does not totally support this conclusion. The average monthly income from drug sales reported by those interviewed only at baseline was approximately \$77.00, while those interviewed twice reported a baseline average of \$300.00 a month from drug sales. On the other hand, those interviewed only at baseline made about a hundred dollars more, on average, each month in work income. Their average work income was \$320.00 compared to a total of \$268.30 for those interviewed twice. This difference was not statistically significant, however.

breaking and entering to commit theft; store theft; stealing a car for joyriding purposes; breaking into a car and stealing parts; robbery (by force or threat of force) without a weapon; robbery with a weapon (gun or knife); gang-motivated intimidation; threat to attack a person without a weapon; threat with a dangerous weapon; battery without a gun, knife or dangerous weapon; battery with a gun, knife, or dangerous weapon; drive-by shooting; and homicide. At both interviews, the respondent was asked the same questions about their use and sale of marijuana, cocaine, crack, heroin, "happy stick" (marijuana soaked in PCP), and other drugs. At baseline, respondents were also asked about their use and sale of pills. Since few respondents were using or selling pills, however, this specific item was dropped at Time II. Use and sales of acid were substituted since more respondents mentioned this drug under the "other" category at baseline.

The respondent was also asked if he or she had ever been in juvenile detention, on probation, parole, served time in a juvenile correctional institution or in an adult correctional institution, and, if so, how many times.

Because our primary concern was with gang violence, a "total violence" index was developed based on the number of times the respondent had robbed someone without and with a weapon, threatened someone without and with a weapon, beat someone without and with a weapon, taken part in a drive-by shooting, and participated in a homicide in the six months prior to the interview.

Respondents did not always provide complete information in the self-report section of the questionnaire. In some instances, respondents gave information about arrests or the number of people involved in an activity but did not indicate the number of times they committed the crime. We interpreted these data conservatively. When significant information was missing, the case was dropped for particular analyses. If there was information on some crimes but not others, available information sometimes was used to derive a total. We were likely to undercount some crimes. In addition, outliers or extreme scores were adjusted to equal the highest within range value. In this way, the weight of extreme scores was taken into account but averages were not overly inflated by their inclusion.

Coopersmith Self-Esteem Scale. To assess changes in self-esteem over time, the Coopersmith Self Esteem Inventory was administered both at baseline and Time II. Respondents were asked to answer a series of statements, such as "I'm a lot of fun to be with", "My family usually considers my feelings", and "Most people are better liked than I am," with responses "like me" or "unlike me." Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .79 for standardized variables showed this scale's reliability for our sample.<sup>4</sup> T h e

---

<sup>4</sup> Note that the scale was self administered at baseline. At Time II, interviewers initially read the scale to some respondents (n=51) until it was discovered that this was different from the

Coopersmith Inventory ranges the mean scores as follows: high self-esteem (88-100), good self-esteem (72-87), low self-esteem (56-71), and poor self-esteem (0-55).

Wide Range Achievement Test. The Wide Range Achievement Test-Version 3 (WRAT-3), administered at Time II to measure academic achievement, expands on the educational information gathered at Time I. The results of the WRAT-3 provides a more reliable picture of ability and achievement in the language arts and mathematics.

The WRAT, administered at the conclusion of the Individual Gang Member Survey, took approximately 15 to 30 minutes to complete. Since the instrument was given after the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory and the Individual Gang Member Survey, a fatigue factor may have been present in some cases.

Scoring - The WRAT was scored using two different methods-- first, scores are standardized by breaking them down into 32 age groups, each with a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15. Standardized scores are classified as follows: very superior (130 and up), superior (120 to 129), high average (110-119), average (90 to 109), low average (80 to 89), borderline (70-79), and deficient (69 and below) as compared to the normative sample. Second, grade scores are compared to a normative sample of individuals from a given grade level for two purposes: to determine if our sample scored higher or lower than this average score and to evaluate their grade level against general age-related population norms.

Tracking Information. In addition to collecting information from respondents about worker efforts, project workers provided tracking information on their activities with each program youth, including the number of months of service; referrals related to school and employment; the success of referrals; and evaluations of the increase or decrease in each gang member's gang-related activity and violence. All project staff, including gang workers, police and probation officers and NAGV staff, completed tracking forms on individuals to whom they provided service. Tracking data was provided for a total of 70 of the 86 individuals interviewed twice.

---

procedure at Time I. The remaining 25 individuals who completed the Coopersmith took it themselves. Alpha coefficients for each group were computed separately to see if the difference in procedures affected the reliability at Time II. The coefficients were very similar: 0.75 for those who took the test themselves at Time II and 0.81 for those who had the test read to them. There were also no significant differences between the groups on scores at Time II.

**Table 1**  
**Community Characteristics and Problems**  
**Census 1989: Little Village**  
**(Based on Gang Violence Reduction Project Boundaries)**

Census Characteristics	Little Village Total	Little Village Percent
Population	60,829	
Households	14,287	
Males	32,211	52.9%
Females	28,684	47.1%
Gender Ratio	113 Males to 100 Females	
Mexican	52,781	86.8%
White	3,269	5.4%
Black	1,479	2.4%
Home Ownership	5,525	48.4%
Total Household Units	15,579	
Housing Units Built 1939 or Earlier	8,339	53.5%
Mean Household Income	\$22,974	
Mean Family Income	\$23,445	
Per Capita Income	\$6,480	
Married Couples With Own Children Under 18	7,089	49.6%
Male Unemployment	2,051	11.3%
Males 17-25 Years of Age	5,471	24.03%
Education: Less Than 9th Grade	15,199	53.0%
Education: 9th to 12th Grade	5,367	18.7%
Education: College	1,929	6.7%

**Table 2**

**Total for Combined Homicides, Aggravated Batteries  
& Aggravated Assaults by Gang,**

**Pre-Program Versus Program Period  
District 10**

<b>Gang</b>	<b>2 Years Prior To Project August 1990 - July 1992</b>	<b>1st And 2nd Project Years August 1992 - July 1994</b>	<b>Percentage Change</b>
<b>Tuo-Six</b>	52	79	+ 51.9%
<b>Latin Kings</b>	105	102	- 2.9%
<b>Other Latino</b>	18	32	+ 77.8%
<b>Other Black</b>	23	45	+ 95.7%
<b>Total</b>	198	258	+ 30.3%

<sup>1</sup> Based on Chicago Police Department aggregated data for beats 1013, 1024, 1031, 1032, 1033, 1034.

**Table 3**  
**Self-Report Data Of Violent Crimes<sup>1</sup>**

Gang	Average # of Violent Incidents Time I	Average # of Violent Incidents Time II	Average Difference Between Time I and Time II
Latin Kings (45)	38.07*	11.18	26.89**##
Two-Six (41)	13.97	11.27	2.71
Total (86)	26.58	11.22	15.36##

Gang	Average # Driveby Shootings at Time I	Average # Driveby Shootings at Time II	Average Change Between Time I & Time II on Drivebys
Latin Kings (45)	1.67** (39)	0.72 (39)	- 0.95*## (39)
Two-Six (41)	0.51 (39)	0.67 (39)	+ 0.15 (39)
Total (86)	1.09 (78)	0.69 (78)	- 0.40 (78)

For difference between gangs within time periods:

\* p ≤ .05

\*\*p ≤ .01

For difference between time periods within gangs:

##p ≤ .01

<sup>1</sup> Includes the following 8 crimes: Robbery with and without a weapon; Threats to beat someone with or without a weapon; Beating someone with or without a weapon; Homicides; and Driveby shootings committed in the 6 months prior to the interview. Note that extreme high scores or outliers were set to equal the highest, within range score. Only individuals missing on all 8 items in the scale were eliminated from the analysis.

**Table 4**  
**Total Crimes Violent and NonViolent**

Gang Type	Avg. # of Total Crimes Time I	Avg. # of Total Crimes Time II	Difference in Avg. # of Total Crimes Time I - Time II
Latin Kings (45)	78.6	19.3	- 59.3***
Two-Six (41)	54.1	28.9	- 25.2**
Total (86)	66.9	23.9	- 43.0***

For difference between gangs within time periods:  
\* p ≤ .05

For difference between time periods within gangs:  
\*\* p ≤ .01  
\*\*\* p ≤ .001

**Table 4**  
**Total Crimes Violent and NonViolent, cont.**

Gang Type	Avg. # of Total Different Crimes Time I	Avg. # of Total Different Crimes Time II	Difference in Avg. # of Total Different Crimes Time I - Time II
Latin Kings (45)	7.24*	3.09	- 4.15***###
Two-Six (41)	4.78	4.24	- 0.54
Total (86)	6.07	3.64	- 2.34###

For difference between gangs within time periods:

\*  $p \leq .05$

\*\*\* $p \leq .001$

For difference between time periods within gangs:

### $p \leq .001$

**Table 5**  
**Drug Use at Baseline and Time II**

Gang Type	% Ever Using Marijuana Time I	% Ever Using Marijuana Time II	% Ever Using Cocaine Time I	% Ever Using Cocaine Time II	% Ever Using Crack Time I	% Ever Using Crack Time II
Latin Kings	91.1% * (45)	62.2%	48.9% ** (45)	46.7% *	0% (45)	0%
Two-Six	73.2% (41)	80.5%	17.1% (41)	21.9%	2.4% (41)	0%
Total	82.6% (86)	70.9%	33.7% (86)	34.9%	1.2% (86)	0%

Gang Type	% Ever Using Heroin Time I	% Ever Using Heroin Time II	% Ever Using Wickey Time I	% Ever Using Wickey Time II	% Ever Using Pills Time I	% Ever Using Pills Time II
Latin Kings	0% (45)	0%	20.5% (44)	9.1%	2.2% (45)	NA
Two-Six	0% (41)	0%	21.9% (41)	21.9%	4.9% (41)	NA
Total	0% (86)	0%	21.2% (85)	15.3%	3.5% (86)	NA

For difference between gangs within time periods:

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

**Table 5**  
**Drug Use at Baseline and Time II, cont.**

Gang Type	% Ever Using Acid Time I	% Ever Using Acid Time II	% Ever Using Other Drugs Time I	% Ever Using Other Drugs Time II
Latin Kings	11.4% (44)	18.2%	0%	0%
Two-Six	12.2% (41)	29.3%	0%	0%
Total	11.8% (85)	23.5%	0%	0%

---

<sup>1</sup> There was no direct question about acid, but those who endorsed other drugs specified acid as the drug they used.

**Table 6**  
**Drug Sales at Baseline and Time II**

Gang Type	% Ever Selling Marijuana Time I	% Ever Selling Marijuana Time II	% Ever Selling Cocaine Time I	% Ever Selling Cocaine Time II	% Ever Selling Crack Time I	% Ever Selling Crack Time II
Latin Kings	51.2% (41)	36.6%	47.6% *** (42)	26.2%	2.4% (42)	0%
Two-Six	39.1% (41)	26.8%	12.2% (41)	14.6%	4.9% (41)	2.4%
Total	45.1% (82)	31.7%	30.1% (83)	20.5%	3.6% (83)	1.2%

Gang Type	% Ever Selling Heroin Time I	% Ever Selling Heroin Time II	% Ever Selling Wickey Time I	% Ever Selling Wickey Time II	% Ever Selling Pills Time I	% Ever Selling Pills Time II
Latin Kings	4.8%	0%	9.5%	2.4%	8.9%	NA
Two-Six	4.9%	0%	2.4%	7.3%	2.4%	NA
Total	4.8%	0%	6.0%	4.8%	5.8%	NA

For difference between gangs within time periods:

\*\*\*  $p \leq .001$

**Table 6**  
**Drug Sales at Baseline and Time II, cont.**

Gang Type	% Selling Acid Time I	% Selling Acid Time II	% Selling Other Drugs Time I	% Selling Other Drugs Time II
Latin Kings	2.4% (41)	0%	0% (40)	0%
Two-Six	0% (41)	4.9%	0% (41)	0%
Total	1.2% (82)	2.4%	0% (82)	0%

---

<sup>1</sup> Question was asked about other drugs, but all answers specified acid.

**Table 7**  
**Involvement with the Criminal Justice System**  
**Baseline vs. Time I**

Gang Type	% in Juvenile Detention Time I	% in Juvenile Detention Time II	% in Juvenile Prison Time I	% in Juvenile Prison Time II	% on Probation Time I	% on Probation Time II
Latin Kings	15.6% (45)	4.4%	11.4% (44)	0%	31.8% (44)	18.2%
Two-Six	9.8% (41)	2.4%	2.4% (41)	0%	19.5% (41)	21.9%
Total	12.8% (86)	3.5%	7.1% (85)	0%	25.9% (85)	20.0%

Gang Type	% on Parole Time I	% on Parole Time II	% in Adult Detention Time I	% in Adult Detention Time II
Latin Kings	18.2%* (44)	11.4% <sup>Ⓜ</sup>	28.9%** (45)	44.4%
Two-Six	2.4% (41)	0%	4.9% (41)	43.9%
Total	10.6% (85)	5.9%	17.4% (86)	44.2%

For differences between gangs within time periods:

\* p ≤ .05

\*\*p ≤ .01

<sup>Ⓜ</sup> p = .056

**Table 8**  
**Reasons For Fighting With Other Gangs**

Gang Type	Values/Way Of Life Time I	Values/Way of Life Time II	Territory/Turf Time I	Territory/Turf Time II
Latin Kings (36)	8.3%	58.3%	27.8%	61.1%
Two-Six (37)	8.1%	51.3%	21.6%	75.7%
Total (73)	8.2%	54.8%	24.7%	68.5%

Gang Type	Gang Signs/Colors Time I	Gang Signs/Colors Time II	Reputation/ Impress Women Time I	Reputation/ Impress Women Time II
Latin Kings (36)	13.9%*	58.3%	13.9%	16.7%
Two-Six (37)	0%	62.2%	5.4%	21.6%
Total (73)	6.9%	60.3%	9.6%	19.2%

For difference between gangs within time period:

\*  $p \leq .05$

**Table 8**  
**Reasons For Fighting With Other Gangs, cont.**

Gang Type	Gang Rivalry/ Retaliation Time I	Gang Rivalry/ Retaliation Time II	Drugs Time I	Drugs Time II
Latin Kings (36)	52.8%**	55.6%	2.8%	25.0%
Two-Six (37)	83.8%	67.6%	2.7%	10.8%
Total (73)	68.5%	61.6%	2.7%	17.8%

Gang Type	Personality Conflicts Time I	Personality Conflicts Time II	Other Time I	Other Time II
Latin Kings (36)	5.6%	16.7%	2.8%	8.3%
Two-Six (37)	0%	13.5%	2.7%	0%
Total (73)	2.7%	15.1%	2.7%	4.1%

For difference between gangs within time periods:

\*\*p ≤ .01

**Table 9**  
**Where Fighting with Other Gangs is Occurring at Time II.**

Gang Type	Latin King Turf	Two-Six Turf	Contested Turf	Northside	Southside	Outside City
Latin Kings (36)	77.8%	83.3%*	94.3% (35)	50.0% (32)	74.3%* (35)	55.9% (34)
Two-Six (37)	91.9%	97.3%	94.6%	29.4% (34)	91.9%	69.4% (36)
Total (73)	84.9%	90.4%	94.4% (72)	39.4% (66)	83.3% (72)	62.9% (70)

For difference between gangs within time periods:

\*  $p \leq .05$

**Table 10**  
**Degree Of Serious Of Fighting With Other Gang**

Gang Type	X Who Say Incidents Primarily Involve:			
	Assault With Weapon Time I	Assaults With Weapon Time II	Assaults Without Weapon Time I	Assaults Without Weapon Time II
Latin Kings	17.7% (34)	76.5% (34)	NA 1	16.2% (37)
Two-Six	29.6% (27)	81.5% (27)	NA	23.1% (39)
<b>Total</b>	<b>22.9%</b> <b>(61)</b>	<b>78.7%</b> <b>(61)</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>19.7%</b> <b>(76)</b>

Gang Type	X Who Say Fighting Has Resulted In:			
	Death Time I	Death Time II	Very Serious Injury Time I	Very Serious Injury Time II
Latin Kings	80.0%* (35)	25.7% (35)	14.3% (35)	37.1% (35)
Two-Six	53.6% (28)	25.0% (28)	0% (28)	28.6% (28)
<b>Total</b>	<b>68.3%</b> <b>(63)</b>	<b>25.4%</b> <b>(63)</b>	<b>7.9%</b> <b>(63)</b>	<b>33.3%</b> <b>(63)</b>

<sup>1</sup> Comparable data were not available at Time I.

<sup>2</sup> Originally categorized as hospitalization.

**Table 11**  
**Reasons for Fighting Other Branches of the Same Gang**  
**Baseline versus Time II**

Gang Types	% Who Report Fighting Between Branches Time I	% Who Report Fighting Between Branches Time II	Status/Power Time I	Status/Power Time II
Latin Kings	47.3% (38)	52.6% (38)	0% (19)	63.2% (19)
Two-Six	30.8% (26)	65.4% (26)	17.7% (17)	58.8% (17)
Total	40.6% (64)	57.8% (64)	8.3% (36)	61.1% (36)

Gang Types	Drugs Time I	Drugs Time II	Alcohol Time I	Alcohol Time II	Personality Conflicts Time I	Personality Conflicts Time II
Latin Kings (19)	5.3%	42.1%	0%	47.4%	21.1%	57.9%
Two-Six (17)	0%	17.7%	5.9%	35.3%	17.7%	47.1%
Total (36)	2.8%	30.6%	2.8%	41.7%	19.4%	52.8%

**Table 11  
Reasons for Fighting Other Branches, cont.**

Gang Types	Gang Violations Time I	Gang Violations Time II	Crime Time I	Crime Time II	Rivalry Time I	Rivalry Time II
Latin Kings (19)	5.3%	21.1%	0% (43)	NA 1	5.3%	26.3%
Two-Six (17)	0%	17.7%	0% (28)	NA	5.9%	41.2%
Total (36)	2.8%	19.4%	0% (71)	NA	5.6%	33.3%

Gang Types	Other Time I	Other Time II
Latin Kings (19)	10.5%	5.3%
Two-Six (17)	0%	0%
Total (36)	5.6%	2.8%

---

<sup>1</sup> Comparable data were not available at Time I.

**Table 12**  
**Difference Between Non-Gang and Gang Crime in Community<sup>1</sup>**

Gang Type	Non-Gang Crime Scale Time I	Non-Gang Crime Scale Time II	Non Gang Scale - Diff. Between Time I & Time II
Latin Kings	2.93 (43)	2.29** (43)	0.64### (43)
Two-Six	2.79 (40)	1.93 (40)	0.86### (40)
Total	2.86 (83)	2.12 (83)	0.75### (83)

Gang Type	Gang Crime Scale Time I	Gang Crime Scale Time II	Gang Scale - Diff. Between Time I & Time II
Latin Kings	3.40 (44)	3.09 (44)	0.31*# (44)
Two-Six	3.61 (41)	2.97 (41)	0.64### (41)
Total	3.50 (85)	3.03 (85)	0.47### (85)

For difference between gangs within time periods:

\* p ≤ .05

\*\*p ≤ .01

For difference between time periods within gangs:

# p ≤ .05

###p ≤ .001

<sup>1</sup> The questions asked were "How serious a crime problem do you think exists in your community (within last 6 months) in regard to each of the following gang and nongang-related crimes: graffiti, breaking and entering, car theft, robbery, intimidation, fight without weapon, fight with weapon, drive-by shooting, possession of knife, possession of gun, drug selling, and drug use." The options were no problem (1), a small problem, a serious problem, a very serious problem (4). The scores were aggregated for each item per individual by type, gang or nongang and then divided by the total number of items (12) in the scale.

**Table 13**  
**Witness Any Gang Crimes In Past Six Months**

Gang Type	Selling Drugs - Time I	Selling Drugs - Time II	Fighting Within Own Gang - Time I	Fighting Within Own Gang - Time II	Fighting Between Different Gangs - Time I	Fighting Between Different Gangs - Time II
Latin Kings (45)	88.9%	93.3%	75.6%	86.7%	81.8% (44)	93.3%
Two-Six (41)	92.7%	87.8%	90.2%	92.7%	92.7%	87.8%
Total (86)	90.7%	90.7%	82.6%	89.5%	87.1% (85)	90.7%

Gang Type	Drive-by Shooting - Time I	Drive-by Shooting - Time II	Gang Intimidation - Time I	Gang Intimidation - Time II
Latin Kings (45)	75.6%	50.0% (44)	71.1%	61.4% (44)
Two-Six (41)	80.5%	53.7%	80.5%	73.2% (41)
Total (86)	77.9% (85)	51.8% (85)	75.6%	67.1% (85)

Gang Type	Gang Recruitment - Time I	Gang Recruitment - Time II	Avg. # Crimes Seen in Past 6 Months - Time I	Avg. # Crimes Seen in Past 6 Months - Time II	Avg. Diff. Between Time I & Time II on Total # Items Endorsed
Latin Kings (45)	71.1%	63.6% (44)	4.62 (41)	4.44	- 0.18
Two-Six (41)	87.8%	73.2%	5.24	4.68	- 0.56#
Total (86)	79.1%	68.2% (85)	4.92 (86)	4.56	- 0.36

For differences between time periods within gangs:

#p ≤ .05

**Table 14**  
**Percentage Who Did the Following to Avoid Gang Crime**

Gang Type	Turned Down Job Time I	Turned Down Job Time II	Kept Gun at Home Time I	Kept Gun at Home Time II	Go Out With Someone, So Not Alone Time I	Go Out With Someone, So Not Alone Time II	Choose Residence for Safety Features Time I	Choose Residence for Safety Features Time II
Latin Kings	31.7% (41)	31.7% (41)	66.7% (42)	64.3% (42)	57.1% (42)	35.7%** (40)	57.5% (40)	40.0% (40)
Two-Six	51.2% (41)	31.7%	68.3% (41)	70.7% (41)	65.9% (41)	63.4% (41)	57.5% (40)	37.5% (40)
Total	41.5% (82)	31.7% (82)	67.5% (83)	67.5% (83)	61.5% (83)	49.4% (83)	57.5% (80)	38.7% (80)

Gang Type	Not Go to School Time I	Not Go to School Time II	Avg. # Total Items Endorsed Time I	Avg. # Total Items Endorsed Time II	Difference Between Total at Time I & Time II
Latin Kings	39.5% (38)	21.1%* (38)	2.37 (43)	1.86 (43)	0.51 (43)
Two-Six	29.3% (41)	43.9% (41)	2.70 (41)	2.46 (41)	0.24 (41)
Total	34.2% (79)	32.9% (79)	2.53 (84)	2.15 (84)	0.38 (84)

For difference between gangs within time periods:

\* p ≤ .05

\*\*p ≤ .01

**Table 15**  
**Adults Use Gang Youth for Illegal Activities**

Gang Type	Screen Question Yes Response Time I	Screen Question Yes Response Time II	Personal Crime Time I	Personal Crime Time II	Property Crime Time I	Property Crime Time II
	1					
Latin Kings (25)	80.0%***	60.0%	48.0%***	24.0%	76.0%***	20.0%
Two-Six (32)	18.7%	56.3%	0%	15.6%	9.4%	37.5%
Total (57)	45.6%	57.9%	21.1%	19.3%	38.6%	29.8%

Gang Type	Drugs Time I	Drugs Time II	Alcohol Time I	Alcohol Time II	Firearms Time I	Firearms Time II
Latin Kings (25)	4.0%	36.0%	80.0%***	0%	0%	8.0%
Two-Six (32)	3.1%	37.5%	15.6%	0%	3.1%	9.4%
Total (57)	3.5%	36.8%	43.9%	0%	1.7%	8.8%

For difference between gangs within time periods:  
\*\*\* p ≤ .001

<sup>1</sup> The screen question was "In the past year, were there adults in the community who used gang youth for illegal or criminal activities?" For those answering yes, a further question was asked about what activities. These responses were open ended and assigned to the categories above on the basis of categories used at Baseline--see April, 1994 report for specific examples of items in each category.

**Table 15**  
**Adults Use Gang Youth for Illegal Activities, cont.**

Gang Type	Gang Crime Time I	Gang Crime Time II	Protection Time I	Protection Time II	Other Time I	Other Time II
Latin Kings (25)	0%	4.0%	8.0%	0%	16.0%	8.0%
Two-Six (32)	9.4%	15.6%	0%	0%	6.3%	6.3%
Total (57)	5.3%	10.5%	3.5%	0%	10.5%	7.0%

Gang Type	Adults are Gang Members - Yes Response Time I	Adults are Gang Members - Yes Response Time II	Adults are Former Gang Members - Yes Response Time I	Adults are Former Gang Members - Yes Response Time II
Latin Kings (25)	70.4%*** (27)	48.1% (27)	66.7%*** (24)	45.8% (24)
Two-Six (32)	6.5% (31)	48.4% (31)	18.7% (32)	37.5% (32)
Total (57)	36.2% (58)	48.3% (58)	39.3% (56)	41.1% (58)

For difference between gangs within time periods:  
 \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$

**Table 16**  
**Average Rating at Time II of Perceived Change in Police Effectiveness In Dealing With Gang Problem <sup>1</sup>**

Gang Type	Walk Streets	Patrol In Cars	Arrest Known Criminals	Arrest Known Gang Members
Latin Kings	1.69 (45)	1.44* (45)	1.63* (43)	1.3 (44)
Two-Six	1.85 (40)	1.15 (40)	1.30 (40)	1.2 (40)
Total	1.76 (85)	1.31 (85)	1.47 (83)	1.29 (84)

Gang Type	Arrest Those Getting In Trouble	Harass Gang Members	Respond Quickly
Latin Kings	2.1 (41)	1.2 (44)	2.4* (42)
Two-Six	1.9 (40)	1.05 (40)	1.9 (40)
Total	2.04 (81)	1.14 (84)	2.18 (82)

Gang Type	Are Effective in Dealing With Gang Problem	Solve Community Problems
Latin Kings	2.4 (43)	2.3 (38)
Two-Six	2.3 (40)	2.2 (39)
Total	2.33 (83)	2.26 (77)

For difference between gangs within time period:  
 \* p ≤ .05

<sup>1</sup> Based on a 3 point scale with 1 = Better, 2 = the Same and 3 = Worse.

**Table 17**  
**Specific Groups/Residents Dealing With Gang Crime**

Gang Type	Screen Question Yes Response Time I	Screen Question Yes Response Time II	Block Clubs Time I	Block Clubs Time II	Churches Time I	Churches Time II	Community Groups Time I	Community Groups Time II
Latin Kings	33.3% (27)	70.4% (27)	4.0% (25)	8.0%* (25)	0% (25)	40.0% (25)	14.8% (27)	48.1% (27)
Two-Six	38.7% (31)	61.3% (31)	0% (29)	34.5% (29)	0% (27)	29.6% (27)	14.3% (28)	50.0% (28)
Total	36.2% (58)	65.5% (58)	9.1% (11)	22.2% (54)	0% (52)	34.6% (52)	14.5% (55)	49.1% (55)

Gang Type	Police Time I	Police Time II	Alderman Time I	Alderman Time II	Neighborhood Watch Time I	Neighborhood Watch Time II
Latin Kings	7.4% (27)	40.7% (27)	0% (26)	26.9% (26)	0%* (26)	53.9% (26)
Two-Six	0% (28)	39.3% (28)	3.6% (28)	28.6% (28)	20.7% (29)	44.8% (29)
Total	3.6% (55)	40.0% (55)	1.9% (54)	27.8% (54)	10.9% (55)	49.1% (55)

For difference between gangs within time periods:  
 \*  $p \leq .05$

**Table 17**  
**Specific Groups/Residents Dealing With Gang Crime, cont.**

<b>Gang Type</b>	<b>Gangs Time I</b>	<b>Gangs Time II</b>	<b>Other Time I</b>	<b>Other Time II</b>
<b>Latin Kings</b>	<b>NA 1</b>	<b>15.6% (32)</b>	<b>3.7% (23)</b>	<b>18.5% (23)</b>
<b>Two-Six</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>27.5% (40)</b>	<b>4.3% (27)</b>	<b>8.7% (27)</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>22.2% (72)</b>	<b>4.0% (50)</b>	<b>14.0% (50)</b>

---

<sup>1</sup> Comparable data were not available at Time I.

**Table 18**  
**What Groups/Residents Are Doing To Reduce Gang Crime**

Gang Type	Intervention/ Counseling Time I	Intervention/ Counseling Time II	Education/ Awareness Time I	Education/ Awareness Time II
Latin Kings (25)	8.0%	20.0%	8.0%	16.0%*
Two-Six (31)	16.1%	16.1%	0%	0%
Total (56)	12.5%	17.9%	3.6%	7.1%

Gang Type	Community Policing Time I	Community Policing Time II	Clean Up Time I	Clean Up Time II	Community Organization Time I	Community Organization Time II
Latin Kings (25)	0%**	24.0%	0%	4.0%	0%	24.0%
Two-Six (31)	25.8%	32.3%	6.5%	22.6%	0%	16.1%
Total (56)	14.3%	28.6%	3.6%	14.3%	0%	19.6%

Gang Type	Recreation Time I	Recreation Time II	Providing Jobs Time I	Providing Jobs Time II	Other Time I	Other Time II
Latin Kings (25)	4.0%	24.0%	8.0%	12.0%	4.0%	4.0%
Two-Six (31)	3.2%	22.6%	0%	6.5%	0%	3.2%
Total (56)	3.6%	23.2%	3.6%	8.9%	1.8%	3.6%

For difference between gangs within time periods:

\* p ≤ .05

\*\*p ≤ .01

**Table 18**  
**What Groups/Residents Are Doing To Reduce Gang Crime, cont.**

Gang Type	Intervention/ Counseling Time I	Intervention/ Counseling Time II	Education/ Awareness Time I	Education/ Awareness Time II
Latin Kings (25)	8.0%	20.0%	8.0%	16.0%*
Two-Six (31)	16.1%	16.1%	0%	0%
Total (56)	12.5%	17.9%	3.6%	7.1%

Gang Type	Community Policing Time I	Community Policing Time II	Clean Up Time I	Clean Up Time II	Community Organization Time I	Community Organization Time II
Latin Kings (25)	0%**	24.0%	0%	4.0%	0%	24.0%
Two-Six (31)	25.8%	32.3%	6.5%	22.6%	0%	16.1%
Total (56)	14.3%	28.6%	3.6%	14.3%	0%	19.6%

Gang Type	Recreation Time I	Recreation Time II	Providing Jobs Time I	Providing Jobs Time II	Other Time I	Other Time II
Latin Kings (25)	4.0%	24.0%	8.0%	12.0%	4.0%	4.0%
Two-Six (31)	3.2%	22.6%	0%	6.5%	0%	3.2%
Total (56)	3.6%	23.2%	3.6%	8.9%	1.8%	3.6%

For difference between gangs within time periods:

\*  $p \leq .05$

\*\* $p \leq .01$

**Table 19**  
**Reason Respondent Is Less Active In Gang <sup>1</sup>**

Gang Type	% Less Active in Past Year Time I	% Less Active in Past Year Time II	Working Time I	Working Time II	Retired/Grew Out of It Time I	Retired/Grew Out of It Time II
Latin Kings	13.2% (38)	31.6% (38)	0% (38)	21.1% (38)	0% (35)	14.3% (35)
Two-Six	10.0% (40)	40.0% (40)	2.6% (38)	23.7% (38)	2.6% (38)	31.6% (38)
Total	11.5% (78)	35.9% (78)	1.3% (76)	22.4% (76)	1.4% (73)	23.3% (73)

Gang Type	Police Time I	Police Time II	Parents Time I	Parents Time II	Wife/Girlfriend Time I	Wife/Girlfriend Time II
Latin Kings	NA 2	16.2% (37)	NA	18.9% (37)	NA	28.9% (38)
Two-Six	NA	25.6% (39)	NA	25.6% (39)	NA	29.7% (37)
Total	NA	21.1% (76)	NA	22.4% (76)	NA	29.3% (75)

<sup>1</sup> Percents do not add to 100 percent, since multiple reasons could be given.

<sup>2</sup> Comparable data were not available at Time I.

**Table 19**  
**Reason Respondent Is Less Active In Gang, cont.**

Gang Type	Community Youth Worker Time I	Community Youth Worker Time II	School Time I	School Time II
Latin Kings	NA 1	11.1%* (36)	5.4% (37)	2.7% (37)
Two-Six	NA	30.8% (39)	0% (34)	8.8% (34)
Total	NA	21.3% (75)	2.8% (71)	5.6% (71)

Gang Type	Moved Out Time I	Moved Out Time II	Other Time I	Other Time II	Pressure From Probation Time I	Pressure From Probation Time II
Latin Kings	2.8% (36)	5.6% (36)	2.6% (38)	5.3% (38)	NA	7.9% (38)
Two-Six	0% (37)	8.1% (37)	2.9% (35)	14.3% (35)	NA	14.7% (34)
Total	1.4% (73)	6.9% (73)	2.7% (73)	9.6% (73)	NA	11.1% (72)

For difference between gangs within time periods:

\* ps .05

<sup>1</sup> Comparable data were not available at Time I.

**Table 20  
Status in Gang**

Gang Type	Leader Time I	Leader Time II	Core Member Time I	Core Member Time II	Regular Member Time I	Regular Member Time II
Latin Kings (35)	8.6%**	11.4%	60.0%	31.4%	14.3%	42.9%
Two-Six (38)	39.5%	23.7%	47.4%	42.1%	5.3%	28.9%
Total (73)	24.7%	17.8%	53.4%	37.0%	9.6%	35.6%

Gang Type	Peripheral Member Time I	Peripheral Member Time II	% of Individuals Who are Leaders or Core Members Time I	% of Individuals Who are Leaders or Core Members Time II
Latin Kings (35)	17.1%	14.3%	68.6%	42.9%**
Two-Six (38)	5.3%	5.3%	86.8%	65.8%
Total (73)	11.0%	9.6%	78.1%	54.8%

For difference between gangs within time periods:

\*  $p \leq .05$

\*\*  $p \leq .01$

**Table 20**  
**Changes in Status - i.e. Gang Position**  
**in Time I Vs. Time II**

Gang Type	Mean Status Rank Time I	Mean Status Rank Time II	% No Change in Status	% Less Involved Time II	% More Involved Time II	% Moving From Leader or Core to Peripheral or Not Active Time II	% Not Active (Based on Status) Time II
Latin Kings (43)	2.28**	3.05**	23.3% <sup>a</sup>	58.1%	18.6%	16.3 %	18.6%
Two-Six (40)	1.85	2.30	42.5%	47.5%	10.0%	2.6%	5.0%
Total (83)	2.07	2.68	32.5%	53.0%	14.5%	9.9%	12.1%

For difference between gangs within time periods:

\*\* p ≤ .01

<sup>a</sup> p = .061

**Table 21**  
**Reason Respondent Would Leave Gang**

Gang Type	Think Will Ever Leave Gang Yes Response Time I	Think Will Ever Leave Gang Yes Response Time II	Currently Thinking of Leaving Time I	Currently Thinking of Leaving Time II
Latin Kings	53.1%* (32)	68.7% (32)	31.4% (35)	57.1% (35)
Two-Six	76.5% (34)	67.7% (34)	51.6% (31)	35.5% (31)
Total	65.1% (66)	68.2% (66)	40.9% (66)	47.0% (66)

Gang Type	Family Responsib. Time I	Family Responsib. Time II	Job Responsib. Time I	Job Responsib. Time II	Getting Married Time I	Getting Married Time II
Latin Kings	19.3% (31)	45.2* (31)	6.5% (31)	0% (31)	22.6% (31)	6.5% (31)
Two-Six	11.5% (26)	19.2% (26)	3.9% (26)	0% (26)	7.7% (26)	7.7% (26)
Total	15.8% (57)	33.3% (57)	5.3% (57)	0% (57)	15.8% (57)	7.1% (57)

For difference between gangs within time periods:

\* p ≤ .05

**Table 21**  
**Reason Respondent Would Leave Gang, cont.**

Gang Type	School Time I	School Time II	Retirement/Grow Out of It Time I	Retirement/Grow Out of It Time II
Latin Kings (31)	0%	3.2%	0%**	9.7%*
Two-Six (26)	3.9%	0%	26.9%	30.7%
Total (57)	1.7%	1.7%	12.3%	19.3%

Gang Type	Personal Goals Time I	Personal Goals Time II
Latin Kings (31)	3.2%	3.2%
Two-Six (26)	7.7%	7.7%
Total (57)	5.3%	5.3%

Gang Type	Other Time I	Other Time II
Latin Kings (31)	0%	0%
Two-Six (31)	3.9%	0%
Total (57)	1.7%	0%

For difference between gangs within time periods:

\*  $p \leq .05$

\*\* $p \leq .01$

**Table 22A**  
**\* Living With any of the Following in Household**

Gang Type	Father Time I	Father Time II	Mother Time I	Mother Time II
Latin Kings (44)	45.5%***	31.1%***	77.3%***	61.4%**
Two-Six (41)	75.6%	80.5%	92.7%	87.8%
Total (85)	60.0%	56.5%	84.7%	74.1%

Gang Type	Sibling Time I	Sibling Time II	Child Time I	Child Time II
Latin Kings (44)	77.3%	59.1%*	9.1%	22.7%**
Two-Six (41)	85.4%	80.5%	0%	2.4%
Total (85)	81.2%	69.4%	4.7%	12.9%

For difference between gangs within time periods:

\*  $p \leq .05$

\*\*  $p \leq .01$

\*\*\*  $p \leq .001$

**Table 22B**  
**\* Living With any of the Following in Household, cont.**

Gang Type	Spouse Time I	Spouse Time II
Latin Kings (44)	6.8%	11.4%
Two-Six (41)	0%	2.4%
Total (85)	3.5%	7.1%

Gang Type	Girlfriend/ Boyfriend Time I	Girlfriend/ Boyfriend Time II
Latin Kings (44)	13.6%*	20.5%**
Two-Six (41)	0%	0%
Total (85)	7.1%	10.6%

For difference between gangs within time periods:

\*  $p \leq .05$

\*\* $p \leq .01$

**Table 22C**  
**\* Living With any of the Following in Household, cont.**

Gang Type	Grandparent Time I	Grandparent Time II
Latin Kings (44)	2.3%	2.3%
Two-Six (41)	2.4%	2.4%
Total (85)	2.3%	2.3%

Gang Type	Cousin Time I	Cousin Time II	Nephew/Niece Time I	Nephew/Niece Time II
Latin Kings (44)	0%	2.3%	6.8%	6.8%
Two-Six (41)	2.4%	2.4%	0%	2.4%
Total (85)	1.2%	2.3%	3.5%	4.7%

Gang Type	Uncle/Aunt Time I	Uncle/Aunt Time II
Latin Kings (44)	0%	2.3%
Two-Six (41)	0%	2.4%
Total (85)	0%	2.3%

\* p ≤ .05  
 \*\*p ≤ .01

**Table 22D**  
**\* Living With any of the Following in Household, cont.**

Gang Type	Friend Time I	Friend Time II	% Live Alone Time I	% Live Alone Time II
Latin Kings (44)	20.5%*	6.8%	0%	4.5%
Two-Six (41)	2.4%	0%	0%	2.4%
Total (85)	11.8%	3.5%	0%	3.5%

Gang Type	% Live W/ Mom & Dad Time I	% Live W/ Mom & Dad Time II	% Live W/ Mother Only Time I	% Live W/ Mother Only Time II
Latin Kings (44)	45.5%**	27.3%***	31.8%	34.1%**
Two-Six (41)	73.2%	78.1%	19.5%	9.8%
Total (85)	58.8%	51.8%	25.9%	22.3%

Gang Type	% Live W/ Father Only Time I	% Live W/ Father Only Time II	% Live W/ No Parents Time I	% Live W/ No Parents Time II
Latin Kings (44)	0%	6.8%	22.7%*	27.3%*
Two-Six (41)	2.4%	2.4%	4.9%	7.3%
Total (85)	1.2%	4.7%	14.1%	17.7%

For difference between gangs within time periods:

\* p ≤ .05

\*\* p ≤ .01

\*\*\* p ≤ .001

**Table 22E**  
**Of Those in Household, Besides Repondent**  
**(Includes Only Those Over 14)**

Gang Type	% Employed Time I	% Employed Time II	% on Probation Time I	% on Probation Time II
Latin Kings	71.8%* (39)	71.8%* (39)	27.6% (29)	13.8% (29)
Tuo-Six	90.0% (40)	92.5% (40)	24.4% (41)	17.2% (41)
Total	81.0% (79)	82.3% (79)	25.7% (70)	15.7% (70)

Gang Type	% in Gang Time I	% in Gang Time II	% in Jail Time I	% in Jail Time II
Latin Kings	55.9%* (34)	23.5% (34)	NA 1	38.6% (44)
Tuo-Six	31.7% (41)	19.5% (41)	NA	21.9% (41)
Total	42.7% (75)	21.3% (75)	NA	30.6% (85)

For difference between gangs within time periods:

\*  $p \leq .05$

<sup>1</sup> Comparable data were not available at Time I.

**Table 22F**  
**Average Number of Individuals in Household Who are in the**  
**Following Categories - Time I Versus Time II**  
**(Includes Only Those Over 14)**

Maximum = 7

Gang Type	Employed Time I	Employed Time II	Difference Between Time I and Time II	On Probation Time I	On Probation Time II	Difference Between Time I and Time II
Latin Kings	3.10 (39)	1.28* (39)	1.82*** (39)	0.32 (28)	0.25 (28)	0.07 (28)
Two-Six	2.85 (40)	1.80 (40)	1.05*** (40)	0.27 (40)	0.25 (40)	0.03 (40)
Total	2.97 (79)	1.54 (79)	1.43*** (79)	0.29 (68)	0.25 (68)	0.04 (68)

Gang Type	In Gang (Not Including Respondent) Time I	In Gang (Not Including Respondent) Time II	Difference Between Time I and Time II	In Jail Time I	In Jail Time II
Latin Kings	0.61 (28)	0.21 (28)	0.39# (28)	NA 1	0.43 (42)
Two-Six	0.39 (41)	0.27 (41)	0.12 (41)	NA	0.37 (41)
Total	0.49 (69)	0.25 (69)	0.23# (69)	NA	0.40 (83)

For difference between gangs within time periods:  
 \* p ≤ .05

For difference between time periods within gangs:  
 # p ≤ .05  
 ## p ≤ .01  
 ### p ≤ .001

<sup>1</sup> Comparable data were not available at Time I.

**Table 23**  
**Coopersmith Self Esteem Scale Scores**  
**Average Time I Versus Time II**

Gang Type	Coopersmith Score Mean - Time I	Coopersmith Score Mean - Time II	Difference Between Time I - Time II Scores
Latin Kings (38)	57.41*	64.42	+ 7.00#
Two-Six (38)	64.48	71.58	+ 7.10#
Total (76)	60.95	68.00	+ 7.05##

For difference between gangs within time periods:

\*  $p \leq .05$

For difference between time periods within gangs:

#  $p \leq .05$

##  $p \leq .01$

**Table 24**  
**How Respondent Get Along With Spouse/Girlfriend**

Gang Type	Get Along Well Time I	Get Along Well Time II	Some Problems Time I	Some Problems Time II	Don't Get Along Time I	Don't Get Along Time II
Latin Kings (32)	65.6%	50.0%	34.4%	46.9%	0%	3.1%
Two-Six (16)	81.3%	43.7%	18.7%	56.3%	0%	0%
Total (48)	70.8%	47.9%	29.2%	50.0%	0%	2.1%

Gang Type	Avg. Time I	Avg. Time II	Difference in Rating of Relationship Time I - Time II
Latin Kings (32)	1.34	1.53	- 0.19
Two-Six (16)	1.19	1.56	- 0.37##
Total (48)	1.29	1.54	- 0.25#

For difference between time periods within gangs:

# p ≤ .05

##p ≤ .01

---

<sup>1</sup> Based on a 3 point scale with 1=get along well, 2=some problems and 3=don't get along.

**Table 25**  
**Crisis in Family of Respondent- Time I and Time II**

Gang Type	Death Time I	Death Time II	Illness Time I	Illness Time II
Latin Kings (43)	11.6%	16.3%	16.3%	37.2%
Two-Six (10)	10.0%	30.0%	30.0%	40.0%
Total (53)	11.3%	18.9%	18.9%	37.7%

Gang Type	Drug Abuse Time I	Drug Abuse Time II	Physical Abuse Time I	Physical Abuse Time II
Latin Kings (43)	2.3%	13.9%	7.0%	9.3%
Two-Six (10)	0%	30.0%	15.0%	0%
Total (53)	1.9%	17.0%	10.8%	4.8%

Gang Type	Crime-Related Problems Time I	Crime-Related Problems Time II	Victim of Gang Violence Time I	Victim of Gang Violence Time II
Latin Kings (43)	7.1%	16.7%	4.7%	32.6%
Two-Six (10)	10.0%	40.0%	10.0%	60.0%
Total (53)	7.7%	21.1%	5.7%	37.7%

**Table 25**  
**Crisis in Family of Respondent, cont.**

Gang Type	Arrest in Household Time I	Arrest in Household Time II	Family Relationship Problems Time I	Family Relationship Problems Time II
Latin Kings	NA 1	56.8% (44)	4.7% (43)	18.6% (43)
Two-Six	NA	61.0% (41)	0% (10)	30.0% (10)
Total	NA	58.8% (85)	3.8% (53)	20.7% (53)

Gang Type	Family Job-Related Problems Time I	Family Job-Related Problems Time II	Family Income- Related Problems Time I	Family Income- Related Problems Time II
Latin Kings	NA	38.6% (44)	NA	27.3% (44)
Two-Six	NA	19.5% (41)	NA	14.6% (41)
Total	NA	29.4% (85)	NA	21.2% (85)

Gang Type	Other Time I	Other Time II
Latin Kings (36)	2.8%	0%
Two-Six (7)	0%	0%
Total (43)	2.3%	0%

$\alpha p = .053$

<sup>1</sup> Comparable data were not available at Time I.

**Table 26**  
**Mean Scores for Standard and Grade Level Subscales**  
**on the Wide Ranging Achievement Test (WRAT)**  
**at Time II**

Gang Type	Standard Scores Spelling	Standard Scores Arithmetic	Standard Scores Reading
Latin Kings	87.1 (29)	77.8 (40)	94.4 (35)
Two-Six	85.9 (38)	78.2 (39)	92.5 (38)
Total	86.5 (67)	78.0 (79)	93.4 (73)

Gang Type	Grade Level Spelling	Grade Level Arithmetic	Grade Level Reading
Latin Kings	7.97 (29)	5.93 (41)	9.89 (35)
Two-Six	7.24 (38)	5.51 (39)	9.71 (38)
Total	7.55 (67)	5.73 (80)	9.79 (73)

For difference between gangs within time periods:

\*p ≤ .05

**Table 27A**  
**Income Comparisons - Respondent's Reported Monthly Income**

Gang Type	% Any Work-Related Money Time I	% Any Work-Related Money Time II	Proportion of Total Income From Work Time I	Proportion of Total Income From Work Time II	% Any Money From Aid/Unemployment Time I	% Any Money From Aid/Unemployment Time II
Latin Kings (25)	44.2% (43)	65.1% (43)	NA	0.55 (38)	4.0%	8.0%
Two-Six (28)	31.6% (38)	52.6% (38)	NA	0.47 (36)	0%	0%
Total (53)	38.3% (81)	59.3% (81)	NA	0.51 (74)	1.9%	3.8%

Gang Type	% Income From Family/Spouse Time I	% Income From Family/Spouse Time II	% Any Money From Friends Time I	% Any Money From Friends Time II
Latin Kings (25)	52.0%	32.0%	0%	8.0%
Two-Six (28)	64.3%	53.6%	0%	7.1%
Total (53)	58.5%	43.4%	0%	7.5%

<sup>1</sup> Comparable data were not available at Time I.

**Table 27A  
Income Comparisons, cont.**

Gang Type	% Any Illegal Money Time I	% Any Illegal Money Time II
Latin Kings (25)	16.0%	32.0%
Two-Six (28)	17.9%	21.4%
Total (53)	17.0%	26.4%

Gang Type	Proportion of Income From Illegal Activities Time I	Proportion of Income From Illegal Activities Time II
Latin Kings (25)	NA	0.312 (38)
Two-Six (28)	NA	0.15 (36)
Total (53)	NA	0.24 (74)

a p = .0695

**Table 27B**  
**Respondent's Monthly Illegal Income**  
**Time I and Time II**

Gang Type	Avg. Illegal Income Time I	Avg. Illegal Income Time II	Avg. Difference in Illegal Income Time I Vs. Time II
Latin Kings (25)	\$171.20	\$856.00 <sup>a</sup>	+\$684.80 <sup>aa</sup>
Two-Six (28)	\$302.86	\$125.00	-\$177.86
Total (53)	\$240.75	\$469.81	+\$229.06

a p = .102

aa p = .077

**Table 27C  
Respondent's Total Monthly Income**

Gang Type	Avg. Total Monthly Income Time I	Avg. Total Monthly Income Time II	Difference in Income Between Time I Versus Time II	Median Income Time I	Median Income Time II
Latin Kings (33)	\$626.06	\$1176.85	\$+550.79#	\$540	\$900
Two-Six (25)	\$812.00	\$925.40	\$+113.40	\$600	\$450
Total (58)	\$706.21	\$1068.47	\$+362.26#	\$600	\$807.50

For difference between time periods within gangs:

# p ≤ .05

**Table 28A**  
**Occupational Aspirations - Time I and Time II**

Gang Type	Professional/ Executive Time I	Professional/ Executive Time II	Have Own Business Time I	Have Own Business Time II
Latin Kings (45)	17.8%	22.2%	15.6%	44.4%
Two-Six (39)	23.1%	30.8%	5.1%	35.9%
Total (84)	20.2%	26.2%	10.7%	40.5%

Gang Type	Manager/ Managerial Position Time I	Manager/ Managerial Position Time II	Clerical Time I	Clerical Time II
Latin Kings (45)	4.4%	11.1%	NA 1	2.2% (45)
Two-Six (39)	0%	12.8%	NA	2.4% (41)
Total (84)	2.4%	11.9%	NA	2.3% (86)

Gang Type	Trade Labor/ Mechanical Time I	Trade Labor/ Mechanical Time II	Factory/ Semi-Skilled Time I	Factory/ Semi-Skilled Time II
Latin Kings (45)	15.6%	17.8%	NA	2.2% (45)
Two-Six (39)	15.4%	17.9%	NA	0% (41)
Total (84)	15.5%	17.9%	NA	1.2% (86)

<sup>1</sup>  
 Comparable data were not available at Time I.

**Table 28A  
Occupational Aspirations, cont.**

Gang Type	Unskilled Labor Time I	Unskilled Labor Time II	Unemployment/ Not Working Time I	Unemployment/ Not Working Time II
Latin Kings (45)	NA 1	0% (45)	6.7%	0%
Two-Six (39)	NA	0% (41)	10.3%	0%
Total (84)	NA	0% (86)	8.3%	0%

Gang Type	Other Time I	Other Time II
Latin Kings (45)	2.2%	0%
Two-Six (39)	7.7%	0%
Total (84)	4.8%	0%

---

<sup>1</sup> Comparable data were not available at Time I.

**Table 28B  
Optimism to Achieve Profession**

Gang Type	Very Optimistic Time I	Very Optimistic Time II	Somewhat Optimistic Time I	Somewhat Optimistic Time II
Latin Kings (42)	40.5%	50.0%	54.8%	28.6%
Two-Six (32)	46.9%	50.0%	53.2%	37.5%
Total (74)	43.2%	50.0%	54.1%	32.4%

Gang Type	Little Chance to Achieve Time I	Little Chance to Achieve Time II	Mean Ranking Time I <sup>1</sup>	Mean Ranking Time II	Difference in Ranking Time I Versus Time II
Latin Kings (42)	4.8%	21.4%	1.64	1.71	-0.07
Two-Six (32)	0%	12.5%	1.53	1.63	-0.09
Total (74)	2.7%	17.6%	1.59	1.67	-0.08

<sup>1</sup> Scale ranges from 1=very optimistic to 3=little chance to achieve.

**Table 28C**  
**Profession Aspired To - Time II Only**

Gang Type	Professional /Executive	Have Own Business	Manager/ Managerial Position	Clerical	Trade Labor/ Mechanical	Factory/ Semi-Skilled	Unskilled Labor	Unemployment /Not Working	Other	Mean Ranking
Latin Kings (45)	22.2%	44.4%	11.1%	2.2%	17.8%	2.2%	0%	0%	0%	2.55
Two-Six (41)	31.7%	36.6%	12.2%	24%	17.1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2.36
Total (86)	26.7%	40.7%	11.6%	2.3%	17.4%	1.2%	0%	0%	0%	2.5

**Table 28D**  
**Profession Respondent Expects to Enter - Time II Only**

Gang Type	Professional /Executive	Have Own Business	Manager/ Managerial Position	Clerical	Trade Labor/ Mechanical	Factory/ Semi-Skilled	Unskilled Labor	Unemployment /Not Working	Other	Mean Ranking
Latin Kings (42)	9.5%	42.9%*	21.4%	7.1%	16.7%	0%	0%	2.4%	0%	2.90*
Two-Six (38)	13.2%	18.4%	23.7%	0.70%	28.9%	7.9%	2.6%	2.6%	2.6%	3.12 (27)
Total (80)	11.2%	31.3%	22.5%	3.7%	22.5%	3.7%	1.3%	2.5%	1.3%	3.24 (79)

For difference between gangs within time periods:

\*  $p \leq .05$

**Table 28E**  
**Income Respondent Hopes to Make a Year**  
**According to Categorical Responses**  
**Time I and Time II**

Gang Type	\$0 Time I	\$0 Time II	% Aspiring to \$20,000 or Less Time I	% Aspiring to \$20,000 or Less Time II
Latin Kings (40)	0%	0%	0%	7.5%
Two-Six (38)	0%	0%	2.6%	0%
Total (78)	0%	0%	1.3%	3.9%

Gang Type	% Aspiring to Between \$20 - \$50,000 Time I	% Aspiring to Between \$20 - \$50,000 Time II	% Aspiring to Make More Than \$50,000 Time I	% Aspiring to Make More Than \$50,000 Time II
Latin Kings (40)	57.5%	50.0%	10.0%	42.5%*
Two-Six (38)	50.0%	34.2%	26.3%	65.8%
Total (78)	53.9%	42.3%	17.9%	53.9%

For difference between gangs within time periods:  
 \*p < .05

**Table 28F**  
**Income Respondent Hopes to Make a Year - Time II Only**

Gang Type	\$0	\$1 - \$10,000	\$10,001 - \$20,000	\$20,001 - \$30,000	\$30,001 - \$40,000	\$40,001 - \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$60,000	More Than \$60,000	Mean Ranking
Latin Kings (42)	0%	0%	6.8%	4.6%	18.2%	27.3%	13.6%	29.5%*	5.25*
Two-Six (40)	0%	0%	0%	4.9%	9.8%	19.5%	14.6%	51.2%	5.97
Total (82)	0%	0%	3.5%	4.7%	14.1%	23.5%	14.1%	40%	5.60

**Table 28G**  
**Income Respondent Expects to Make a Year - Time II Only**

Gang Type	\$0	\$1 - \$10,000	\$10,001 - \$20,000	\$20,001 - \$30,000	\$30,001 - \$40,000	\$40,001 - \$50,000	\$50,001 - \$60,000	More Than \$60,000	Mean Ranking
Latin Kings (42)	0%	2.4%	4.8%	23.8%	26.2%	23.8%	9.5%	9.5%	4.31
Two-Six (40)	0%	5%	12.5%	15%	40%	12.5%	5%	10%	3.97
Total (82)	0%	3.7%	8.5%	19.5%	32.9%	18.3%	7.3%	9.8%	4.15

For difference between gangs within time periods:

\*  $p \leq .05$

**Table 29**  
**Interactions with Community Youth Workers:**  
**Duration of Contacts and Worker Activities**

Gang Type	Avg. Number of Months of Contact	Frequency of Contacts Per Month	Length of Contact in Hours
Latin Kings	10.9 (27)	6.15 (29)	2.0 (28)
Two-Six	12.6 (28)	5.55 (29)	2.49 (29)
Total	11.78 (56)	5.85 (58)	2.25 (57)

Gang Type	Worker Met Respondent At Home	Worker Met Respondent On Street	Worker Met Respondent In Jail	Worker Met Respondent Somewhere Else
Latin Kings	64.3% (28)	92.9% (28)	10.5% (19)	19.2% (26)
Two-Six	69% (29)	100% (29)	10% (20)	24.1% (29)
Total	66.7% (57)	96.5% (57)	10.3% (39)	21.8% (55)

Gang Type	Worker Met Parents	Worker Met Spouse	Worker Met Girlfriend	Worker Met Employer	Worker Met Other Agency Person
Latin Kings	48.1% (27)	40.0% (5)	46.1% (26)	4.8% (21)	7.7% (26)
Two-Six	41.4% (29)	0% (2)	39.1% (23)	15.4% (26)	10.7% (28)
Total	44.6% (56)	28.6% (7)	42.9% (49)	10.6% (47)	9.3% (54)

**Table 30**  
**Percentage of Respondents Involved by Worker**  
**in the Activities and the Types of Activities**

Gang Type	Involved	Not Involved	Sports	Job/Job Training	Youth Programs 1	Recreation/Social
Latin Kings	48.32% (29)	51.7% (29)	64.3% (14)	21.4% (14)	7.1% (14)	7.1% (14)
Two-Six	67.9% (28)	32.1% (28)	84.2% (19)	10.5% (19)	15.3% (19)	5.3% (19)
Total	57.9% (57)	42.1% (57)	75.8% (33)	15.2% (33)	6.1% (33)	6.1% (33)

**Table 31**  
**Percentage of Respondents Who Received Help with a Problem**  
**and the Type of Help**

Gang Type	Received Help	Did Not Receive Help	Counseling/ Personal Counseling	Employment	Gang Issues 2	Justice System Assistance	School	Subst Abuse Assistance	Other
Latin Kings	63% (27)	37.0% (27)	50% (16)	43.7% (16)	0% (16)	12.5% (16)	0% (16)	0% (16)	6.2% (16)
Two-Six	58.6% (29)	41.4% (29)	18.7% (16)	18.7% (16)	25% (16)	12.5% (16)	18.7% (16)	6.2% (16)	0% (16)
Total	60.7% (56)	39.3% (56)	34.4% (32)	31.2% (32)	12.5% (32)	12.5% (32)	9.4% (32)	3.1% (32)	3.1% (32)

1  
Includes programs such as Latino Youth.

2  
Includes responses such as helping individuals get out of gangs, or get off the street.

**Table 32**  
**Ratings of Worker Efforts and Qualities<sup>3</sup>**

Gang Type	Quality of Effort	Quality of Availability	Quality of Honesty	Ability in Providing Things to Do	Effectiveness of Worker
Latin Kings	1.41 (28)	1.55 (27)	1.50 (27)	1.79 (22)	1.37** (24)
Two-Six	1.47 (29)	1.69 (29)	1.62 (29)	1.69 (29)	1.82 (28)
Total	1.44 (57)	1.63 (56)	1.56 (56)	1.73 (56)	1.61 (52)

For difference between gangs within time periods:

\*\* p ≤ .01

---

<sup>3</sup> Based on a 4 point scale with 1 = very good; 2 = good; 3 = poor and 4 = very poor.

**Table 33**  
**Agency Contacts for Individuals Reporting Receipt of Project Service**

Gang Type	Employment Agency	Counseling Agency	Substance Abuse Treatment Agency	Job Training Agency
Latin Kings (26)	34.6%	7.7%	7.7%	15.4%
Two-Six (29)	27.6%	17.2%	0%	20.7%
Total (55)	30.9%	12.7%	3.6%	18.2%

Gang Type	GED Program	Family Planning Agency	Youth Agency	Other Agency	Average # of Agencies in Contact Within Last Year
Latin Kings	22.2% (27)	7.7% (26)	15.4% (26)	8.0% (25)	1.15 (27)
Two-Six	41.4% (29)	3.4% (29)	6.9% (29)	7.7% (26)	1.24 (29)
Total	32.1% (56)	5.4% (55)	10.9% (55)	7.8% (51)	1.20 (56)

**Table 34**  
**Agency Involvement for Those With No Reported Worker Contacts**

Gang Type	Employment Agency	Counseling Agency	Substance Abuse Treatment Agency	Job Training Agency
Latin Kings (13)	38.5%	7.7%	7.7%	15.4%
Two-Six (9)	11.1%	0%	0%	11.1%
Total (22)	27.3%	4.6%	4.5%	13.6%

Gang Type	GED Program	Family Planning Agency	Youth Agency	Other Agency	Avg. # of Agencies in Contact Within Past Year
Latin Kings (13)	25.0% (12)	0%	8.3% (12)	0% (10)	1.00*
Two-Six (9)	0%	0%	0%	0% (9)	0.22
Total (22)	14.3% (21)	0%	4.8% (21)	0% (19)	0.68

For difference between gangs within time periods:

\*  $p \leq .05$

**Table 35**  
**Worker Information by Gang - All Project Workers**

Gang Type	% Receiv. Serv. From at Least 1 Gang Worker	% W/Police Involv.	% W/ Probation Involv.	% W/MAGV Involv.	% Receiv. Serv. From All 4 Service Providers	Avg. # of Serv. Agencies Prov. Serv.	Avg. # of Workers Prov. Serv.	% Receiv. Serv. From Both Police and Gang Workers
Latin Kings (44)	97.7%	38.6%	4.5%*	4.5%	0%	1.48	1.82	36.4%
Two-Six (26)	88.5%	57.7%	23.1%	19.2%	3.9%	1.88	2.00	46.1%
Total (70)	94.3%	45.7%	11.4%	10.0%	1.4%	1.6	1.89	40.0%

Max = 4

Max = 6

Gang Type	% Receiving any Referrals for School or Jobs	% Receiving any Advice or Crisis Counseling	Avg. Rating of Success of Advice of Crisis Counseling 1	% W/Family Contacts by Worker	Avg. Rating of Success of Family Interaction 1
Latin Kings (44)	77.3%	90.9%	2.13 (40)	61.4%	1.79 (25)
Two-Six (26)	80.8%	96.1%	2.27 (23)	73.1%	2.12 (17)
Total (70)	78.6%	92.9%	2.18 (63)	65.7%	1.92 (42)

For difference between gangs within time periods:

\* p ≤ .05

<sup>1</sup> Based on a 4 point scale with 1=very much, 2=some, 3=little and 4=not at all.

**Table 35**  
**Worker Information by Gang - All Project Workers, cont.**

Gang Type	% Referred Re: Job or School by Police	% Referred Re: Job or School by Probation	% Referred Re: Job or School by MAGV	% Referred Re: Job or School by Gang Worker	Avg. # of Worker Contacts per Month <sup>1</sup>
Latin Kings (44)	18.2%	4.5%*	4.5%	20.9% (43)	11.1
Two-Six (26)	20.0%	23.1%	19.2%	30.8% (26)	14.3
Total (70)	18.8%	11.4%	10.0%	22.6% (69)	12.3

For difference between gangs within time periods:

\* p < .05

---

<sup>1</sup> Based on the total number of contacts for all workers across service providers. If the average number of contacts for all workers across service providers is used instead, the average for the Latin Kings = 6.20, the average for the Two-Six = 8.21 and the average for the total sample = 6.95.

**Table 36**  
**Community Youth Worker Intervention**

Gang Type	% Reporting Contact with Gang Youth Served by Project Staff	Avg. # of Contacts per Month 1	% Referred to Jobs	Avg. Success of Job Referral 2	% Referred Re: School Problems	Avg. Success of School-related Referral 2
Latin Kings	97.7% (44)	9.3 (43)	65.8% (38)	1.57 (21)	54.8% (42)	1.71 (17)
Two-Six	88.5% (26)	12.6 (23)	59.1% (22)	2.18 (11)	65.2% (23)	2.20 (10)
<b>Total</b>	<b>94.3%</b> (70)	<b>10.5</b> (66)	<b>63.3%</b> (60)	<b>1.78</b> (32)	<b>58.5%</b> (65)	<b>1.89</b> (27)

Gang Type	% Receiving any Counseling	Avg. Rating of Success of Counseling 2	% W/Family Contacts by Worker	Avg. Rating of Success of Family Interaction 2
Latin Kings	95.1% (41)	1.83 (39)	61.9% (42)	1.62 (25)
Two-Six	100.0% (23)	1.85 (20)	52.2% (23)	2.0 (8)
<b>Total</b>	<b>96.9%</b> (64)	<b>1.81</b> (59)	<b>58.5%</b> (65)	<b>1.71</b> (33)

For difference between gangs within time periods:

\* p ≤ .05  
\*\* p ≤ .01

<sup>1</sup> Figure includes the total for all workers.

<sup>2</sup> Based on 4 point scale with 1=very much, 2=some, 3=little and 4=not at all .

**Table 37  
Combined Police/Gang Efforts**

Level of Coordination	% Referred Re: Job or School	% Receiving Advice of Crisis Counseling	Avg. Rating of Success of Advice/ Crisis Counseling 1	% Reporting Contact W/Family	Avg. Rating of Success of Family Interaction 1	Avg. # of Per Youth Contacts per Month 2	Avg. # of Workers Involved
Received Services From Both Police & Gang Workers (28)	89.3%	100%	2.19 (28)	82.1%*	1.99 (22)	18.3*** (28)	2.82***
Did Not Receive Services From Both Providers 3 (42)	71.4%	88.1%	2.17 (35)	54.8%	1.85 (20)	8.2 (42)	1.26
<b>Total (70)</b>	<b>78.6%</b>	<b>92.9%</b>	<b>2.18 (63)</b>	<b>65.7%</b>	<b>1.92 (42)</b>	<b>12.3 (67)</b>	<b>1.89</b>

For difference between gangs within time periods:

\*  $p \leq .05$

\*\*\* $p \leq .001$

<sup>1</sup>  
Based on a 4 point scale with 1=very much, 2=some, 3=little and 4=not at all.

<sup>2</sup>  
Based on the total number of contacts for all workers across service providers. If the average number of contacts for all workers across services providers is used instead, the average for those being served by both police and gang workers=7.13 versus the average for those not being serve by both providers; 6.82.

<sup>3</sup>  
Of those not being served by both police and gangworkers (n=42), 1 individual (2.4%) was served by both police and probation; 1 individual was served by probation and gang workers (2.4%); and 3 individuals were served by MAGV and gang workers (7.1%).

**Table 38**  
**Worker Information - Worker Reported Contact**  
**and Respondent Did Not**

Gang Type	Average Number of Worker Contacts Per Month 3	% Receiving any Referrals for School or Jobs	% Receiving any Advice of Crisis Counseling	Avg. Rating of Success of Advice of Crisis Counseling 2	% W/Family Contacts by Worker	Avg. Rating of Success of Family Interaction 2
No Reported Contact (21)	7.0***	66.7%	90.5%	2.16 (18)	52.4%	2.05 (9)
Reported Contact (49)	14.5	83.7%	93.9%	2.19 (45)	71.4%	1.89 (33)
Total (70)	12.3	78.6%	92.9%	2.18 (63)	65.7%	1.92 (42)

Group Type	% Receiv. Serv. From at Least 1 Gang Worker	% W/Police Involv.	% W/ Probation Involv.	% W/MAGV Involv.	% Receiv. Serv. From All 4 Service Providers	Avg. # of Project Agencies Prov. Serv.	Avg. # of Workers Prov. Serv.	% Receiv. Serv. From Both Police and Gang Workers
No Reported Contact (21)	90.5%	23.8%*	9.5%	0%	0%	1.24**	1.43**	14.3%**
Reported Contact (49)	95.9%	55.1%	12.2%	14.3%	2.0%	1.77	2.08	51.0%
Total (70)	94.3%	45.7%	11.4%	10.0%	1.4%	1.61	1.89	40.0%

For difference between gangs within time periods:  
 \* p ≤ .05  
 \*\*p ≤ .01

<sup>3</sup>  
 Based on the total number of contacts for all.

<sup>2</sup>  
 Based on a 4 point scale with 1=very much, 2=some, 3=little and 4=not at all.

**Table 39**  
**Self-Report Information**  
**Worker Reported Contact and Respondent Did Not**

Gang Type	Avg. # Violent Crimes Reported at Time I	Avg. # of Violent Crimes Reported at Time II	Difference Between Time I and Time II
Reporting No Worker Contact (21)	16.05*	4.43*	11.6
Reporting Contact (49)	36.5	12.82	23.7##
Total (70)	30.39	10.3	20.09##

Max = 8

For difference between gangs within time periods:

\*p ≤ .05

For difference between time periods within gangs:

## p ≤ .01

### p ≤ .001

**Table 40**  
**Comparison for Two-Six of Those With No Worker Reports of Service**  
**Vs. Those With Worker Reports of Service**

Group	Avg. # Violent Crimes Time I	Avg. # of Violent Crimes Time II	Difference in # of Violent Crimes Between Time I and Time II	Avg. # Total Crimes Time I	Avg. # Total Crimes Time II	Difference in # of Total Crimes Between Time I & Time II
No Tracking Data (15)	10.5	16.1	+5.7	49.0	37.3	11.7
Tracking Data (26)	16.0	8.5	-7.5	57.1%	24.1	32.9##
Total (41)	14.0	11.3	2.7	54.1	28.9	25.2

For difference between time periods within gangs:

## p ≤ .01

Table 41A: Variables Included in Correlational Analysis

**Control Variables:**

Gang Affiliation (Two Six or Latin King)  
Total Violent Crime at Baseline  
Total Crime at Baseline

**Measures of Community Disorganization**

Difference Between Perceived Seriousness of Gang Crime at Baseline and Time II  
Overall Evaluation of the Change in Police Effectiveness in Dealing with the Gang Problem and Time II compared to Time I<sup>1</sup>

**Measures of Differential Group Association**

Whether or not the Respondent Experienced a Change in Status at Time II that Indicated Reduced Involvement with the Gang  
Whether or not the Respondent was Currently Thinking of Leaving the Gang at the Time of the Second Interview

**Measures of Socialization/Social Control**

Age at the Time of the First Interview (also a control variable)  
Proportion of All Friends at Time II who were Gang Members  
Whether the Respondent Lived with One or Both Parents at Time II Versus No Parents  
Whether or not the Respondent Lived with Girlfriends or Spouses at Time II

**Measures of Socioeconomic Status**

Whether or not the Respondent was Employed at Time II  
The Proportion of Total Individual Income which is Accounted for by Work Income at Time II  
The Proportion of Total Individual Income which is Accounted for by Illegal Income at Time II  
The Difference Between Occupational Aspirations and Expectations at Time II  
The Difference Between Income Aspirations and Expectations at Time II

**Measures of Personal Disorganization/Wellbeing**  
Score on the Coopersmith at Baseline<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> This variable was created by summing all the items that were asked about police effectiveness (see Table 17) and dividing by the total number of items answered to derive an average effectiveness score.

<sup>2</sup> The difference score was also included in some of the analyses. This is noted and outcomes are discussed in footnotes in the text.

Table 41A (con't.)

**Measures of Family Disorganization**

Whether the Respondent was Above or Below the Median Household Income Category at Time II.

**Measures of Project Intervention**

Total Number of Months of Service by Project Service Workers Based on Worker Reports

Total Number of Contacts Workers Had with Respondents Per Month Based on Worker Reports

Whether or Not the Respondent Received Service From Both Gang Workers and Police

Whether or Not the Respondent Received and Referral for Job or School Problems Based on Worker Reports

Whether or Not Respondents Report that They Received Services from Project Workers

Ratings by Respondent of Worker Effectiveness

Ratings by Respondent of Workers Intervention Based on Their Average Rating of Worker Effort, Honesty, Availability and Ability in Finding Things for the Respondent to Do<sup>3</sup>

**No Treatment Group Measures**

Whether or not the Respondent was Received Services According to Worker Reports

---

<sup>3</sup> Note that ratings of effort, honesty, availability and ability at finding things to do were all significantly correlated with each other while effectiveness, which was asked about separately, was not. Consequently the four correlated items were combined to form an overall scale based on the average of their responses to all four items. Individuals missing on more than two of the four items were considered missing on this scale.

**Table 41B**  
**Correlations Between Key Variables**  
**and Violent Crime at Time II**

Variable	Correlation (R) (N)	P
Gang (Two-Six=1, LK=0)	0.00218 (86)	0.98
Total Violent Crime at Baseline	0.34326 (86)	0.0012
Seriousness of Gang Crime 1	- 0.4317 (85)	0.6948
Rating of Police Effectiveness 2	- 0.12122 (85)	0.2691
Reduction in Gang Involvement Level (1=yes, 0=no)	- 0.27130 (83)	0.0131
Currently Thinking About Leaving Gang (1=yes, 0=no)	- 0.35339 (70)	0.0027
Age at First Interview	- 0.16127 (86)	0.1380
Proportion of Gang Friends	0.15420 (83)	0.1640
Live with Parent/Parents Time II (1=yes, 0=no)	- 0.11442 (86)	0.2942
Live with Spouse/Girlfriend Time II (1=yes, 0=no)	- 0.12310 (86)	0.2588
Employed at Time II (1=yes, 0=no)	- 0.02640 (74)	0.8234
Proportion of Income from Work Money Time II	- 0.2842 (74)	0.0139

1  
 Negative score indicates change to seeing problem as more serious.

2  
 Higher score indicates rating of less effectiveness.

Proportion of Income from Illegal Activities Time II	0.49134 (74)	0.0001
Occupation Aspiration/ Expectation Gap 3 (Anomie)	- 0.31070 (79)	0.0053
Income Aspiration/ Expectation Gap 4 (Anomie)	-0.02105 (81)	0.8520
Coopersmith Self Esteem Score at Time I	0.19335 (78)	0.0899
At or Above Median Household Income Cut Off (1=yes, 0=no)	-0.18822 (78)	0.0989
Total Months of Service	0.00614 (81)	0.9566
Total Worker Contacts Per Month	0.06288 (86)	0.5652
Received Service from Police & Gang Workers (1=yes, 0=no)	0.13618 (86)	0.2112
Received Job/School Referral (1=yes, 0=no)	- 0.06440 (86)	0.5558
Respondent Reported any Service from Project (1=yes, 0=no)	0.22587 (86)	0.0365
Rating of Effectiveness	0.10489 (52)	0.4593
Rating of Intervention	- 0.10604 (56)	0.4367
Worker Reported Service (1=yes, 0=no)	- 0.09288 (86)	0.3950

<sup>3</sup> Negative values indicate large aspiration, lower expectations.

<sup>4</sup> Positive values indicate larger aspiration, lower expectations.

**Table 41C**  
**Correlations Between Key Variables**  
**and All Crime at Time II**

Variable	Correlation (R) (N)	P
Gang (Two-Six=1, LK=0)	0.13317 (86)	0.2216
Total Crime at Baseline	0.43696 (86)	0.001
Seriousness of Gang Crime 1	0.04653 (85)	0.6724
Rating of Police Effectiveness 2	- 0.04989 (85)	0.6503
Reduction in Involvement Level (1=yes, 0=no)	- 0.31335 (83)	0.0039
Currently Thinking About Leaving Gang (1=yes, 0=no)	- 0.32205 (70)	0.0066
Age at First Interview	- 0.27930 (86)	0.0092
Proportion of Gang Friends	0.09977 (83)	0.3695
Live with Parent/Parents Time II (1=yes, 0=no)	0.00342 (86)	0.9751
Live with Spouse/Girlfriend Time II (1=yes, 0=no)	- 0.15900 (86)	0.1437
Employed at Time II (1=yes, 0=no)	- 0.10012 (74)	0.3960
Proportion of Income from Work Money Time II	- 0.33253 (74)	0.0038
Proportion of Income from Illegal Activities Time II	0.49046 (74)	0.0001

1  
 Negative score indicates change to seeing problem as more serious.

2  
 Higher score indicates rating of less effectiveness.

Occupation Aspiration/ Expectation Gap 3 (Anomie)	- 0.35813 (79)	0.0012
Income Aspiration/ Expectation Gap 4 (Anomie)	0.00609 (81)	0.9570
Coopersmith Self Esteem Score at Time I	0.22452 (78)	0.0481
At or Above Median Household Income Cut Off (1=yes, 0=no)	-0.08422 (78)	0.4635
Total Months of Service	0.03798 (81)	0.7364
Total Worker Contacts Per Month	0.07792 (86)	0.4758
Received Service from Police & Gang Workers (1=yes, 0=no)	0.16307 (86)	0.1336
Received Job/School Referral (1=yes, 0=no)	- 0.06288 (86)	0.5652
Respondent Reported any Service from Project (1=yes, 0=no)	0.19021 (86)	0.0794
Rating of Effectiveness	0.10489 (52)	0.4593
Rating of Intervention	- 0.14908 (56)	0.2728
Worker Reported Service (1=yes, 0=no)	- 0.14751 (83)	0.1753

3  
Negative values indicate large aspiration, lower expectations.

4  
Positive values indicate larger aspiration, lower expectations.

**Table 41D**  
**Correlations Between Key Variables**  
**Change in Violent Crime Between Time I and Time II**

Variable	Correlation (R) (N)	P
Gang (Two-Six=1, LK=0)	- 0.27214 (86)	0.0112
Total Violent Crime at Baseline	0.89853 (86)	0.0001
Seriousness of Gang Crime 1	0.13059 (85)	0.2336
Rating of Police Effectiveness 2	- 0.05849 (85)	0.5949
Reduction in Involvement Level (1=yes, 0=no)	- 0.11680 (83)	0.2930
Currently Thinking About Leaving Gang (1=yes, 0=no)	0.00154 (70)	0.9899
Age at First Interview	0.03569 (86)	0.7443
Proportion of Gang Friends	0.15190 (83)	0.1704
Live with Parent/Parents Time II (1=yes, 0=no)	- 0.11883 (86)	0.2758
Live with Spouse/Girlfriend Time II (1=yes, 0=no)	0.03883 (86)	0.7257
Employed at Time II (1=yes, 0=no)	+ 0.03583 (76)	0.7618
Proportion of Income from Work Money Time II	0.01713 (74)	0.8848
Proportion of Income from Illegal Activities Time II	0.05043 (74)	0.6696

1  
 Negative score indicates change to seeing problem as more serious.

2  
 Higher score indicates rating of less effectiveness.

Occupation Aspiration/ Expectation Gap 3 (Anomie)	0.09707 (79)	0.3947
Income Aspiration/ Expectation Gap 4 (Anomie)	-0.08901 (81)	0.4294
Coopersmith Self Esteem Score at Time I	0.00489 (78)	0.9661
At or Above Median Household Income Cut Off (1=yes, 0=no)	-0.18822 (78)	0.1103
Total Months of Service	0.10220 (81)	0.3639
Total Worker Contacts Per Month	0.15692 (86)	0.1491
Received Service from Police & Gang Workers (1=yes, 0=no)	0.23031 (86)	0.0329
Received Job/School Referral (1=yes, 0=no)	0.20964 (86)	0.0527
Respondent Reported any Service from Project (1=yes, 0=no)	0.09921 (86)	0.3634
Ratings of Effectiveness	0.10192 (52)	0.4722
Rating of Intervention	- 0.05816 (53)	0.6703
Worker Reported Service (1=yes, 0=no)	0.22270 (86)	0.0393

3 Negative values indicate large aspiration, lower expectations.

4 Positive values indicate larger aspiration, lower expectations.

**Table 42A**  
**Model Predicting Total Violent Crime at Time II <sup>1</sup>**

Variable	Beta	T Value	Prob > T Value
Intercept	23.641	1.185	0.2400
Total Violent Crime at Baseline	0.078	1.693	0.0950
Member of the Two-Six	0.507	0.104	0.9178
Age at Time of Baseline Interview	- 1.403	- 1.504	0.1372
Proportion of Total Income Derived from Illegal Activity	27.102	4.638	0.0001
Respondent Reported Receipt of Service from Project Workers	9.189	2.060	0.0433
Overall Adjusted R Square for the Model = 0.326 DF for the Model = 5, N=74			

<sup>1</sup> Includes the following crimes: Homicides, Drive-by shootings, Battery with and without weapons, Assaults with and without weapons and Robberies with and without weapons.

**Table 42B**  
**Model Predicting Total Crime at Time II**

Variable	Beta	T Value	Prob > T Value
Intercept	37.300	1.040	0.3020
Total Crime at Baseline	0.114	2.894	0.0052
Member of the Two-Six	6.303	0.760	0.4502
Age at Time of Baseline Interview	- 2.523	- 1.686	0.0965
Proportion of Total Income Derived from Illegal Activity	45.827	4.976	0.0001
Worker Reported Service was Provided	9.809	0.733	0.4663
Respondent Reported Receipt of Service from Project Workers	39.88	2.700	0.0088
Interaction of Worker and Respondent's Reports Regarding Service Receipt	- 37.625	- 2.284	0.0256
Overall Adjusted R Square for the Model = 0.452 DF for the Model = 7, N=74			

**Table 42C**  
**Model Predicting Change in Violent Crimes**  
**Between Baseline and Time II**  
**Change in Violent Crime Between Time I and Time II:** <sup>1</sup>

Variable	Beta	T Value	Prob > T Value
Intercept	37.338	0.814	0.4180
Member of the Two-Six	- 24.526	- 2.206	0.0303
Age at Time of Baseline Interview	- 1.128	- 0.535	0.5944
Rated the Worker's Level of Honesty as Very Good	21.778	2.086	0.0402
Received a Referral Related to Job and/or School Problems	8.506	0.806	0.4228
Overall Adjusted R Square for the Model = 0.115 DF for the Model = 4, N=83			

<sup>1</sup> Increases in the change variable reflect decreases in violence between the two time periods.

**Table A1**

**Comparison of Those Interviewed at Baseline Only  
& Those Interviewed Twice - Whole Sample**

Group	Gang		Avg. # All Crimes at Baseline	Avg. # Violent Crimes at Baseline	Age at Baseline
	Two-Six	Latin Kings			
Time 1 Only (22)	72.7% (16)	27.3%# (6)	75.90	27.78	20.50*
Interviewed Twice (86)	47.7% (41)	52.3% (45)	66.93	26.58	19.14
Total (108)	52.8% (57)	47.2% (51)	68.76	26.82	19.42

Group	% Who Were Leaders at Baseline	% Employed at Baseline
Time 1 Only (22)	14.3% (21)	18.2% (22)
Interviewed Twice (86)	22.4% (85)	27.4% (84)
Total (108)	20.8% (106)	25.5% (106)

For difference between gangs within time periods:  
#p ≤ .05

For difference between time periods within gangs:  
#p ≤ .05

Table A1

Comparison of Those Interviewed at Baseline Only  
& Those Interviewed Twice - Whole Sample, cont.

Group	% Selling Cocaine at Baseline	% Selling Marijuana at Baseline	% Using Cocaine at Baseline	% Using Marijuana at Baseline
Time 1 Only (22)	22.7%	45.4%	36.4%	72.7%
Interviewed Twice (86)	29.1%	45.4%	33.7%	82.6%
Total (108)	27.8%	45.4%	34.3%	80.6%

Table A2

Comparison of Those Interviewed at Baseline Only  
& Those Interviewed Twice Among the Two-Six

Group	Avg. # All Crimes Committed at Baseline	Avg. # Violent Crimes Committed at Baseline	Age at Baseline	% in Leader Positions at Baseline	% Employed at Baseline
Time 1 Only (16)	32.38	4.44	20.44**	6.2%	18.8%
Interviewed Twice (41)	54.12	13.98	18.00	37.5%	23.1%
Total (57)	48.02	11.30	18.68	28.6%	21.8%

Group	% Selling Cocaine at Baseline	% Selling Marijuana at Baseline	% Using Cocaine at Baseline	% Using Marijuana at Baseline
Time 1 Only (16)	6.2%	31.2%	18.8%	62.5%
Interviewed Twice (41)	12.2%	39.0%	17.1%	73.2%
Total (57)	10.5%	36.8%	17.5%	70.2%

For difference between gangs within time periods:  
\*\*p ≤ .01

**I<sup>st</sup>** Impression™ Covers Item No. 03533 3/8" for 51 to 90 sheets  
Avery Dennison 1-800-DENNISON

