POLICE RESPONSE TO STREET GANG VIOLENCE: IMPROVING THE INVESTIGATIVE PROCESS

Executive Summary
(NIJ # 84-IJ-CX-0052)

Malcolm W. Klein
Cheryl L. Maxson
Margaret A. Gordon

Center for Research on Crime and Social Control
Social Science Research Institute
University of Southern California

1987

Introduction

To a considerable extent, both the goals and the methods of this project evolved from our earlier NIJ grant, Evaluation in an Imported Gang Violence Deterrence Program (#81-IJ-CX-0072). The Abstract from the Final Report of that project provides a suitable introduction to the discussion of the current effort:

> Police investigative data describing gang and comparable non-gang violent incidents in two large police jurisdictions in Los Angeles are reported. Approximately 800 homicide as well as over 500 violent, non-homicide incidents occurring between 1978 and 1982 were analyzed to respond to three research goals: descriptions of gang violence; determination of significant discriminators between gang and non-gang incidents; and estimation of the impact of police investigative procedures on the official designation of cases as gang or non-gang.
>
> The data revealed very substantial differences between the character of gang and non-gang violent cases, primarily with respect to descriptors of the participants but also with respect to the settings in which the incidents occurred. Gang incidents involved more participants, lower levels of prior suspect-victim relationships, lower ages, more male-only cases, and more minority involvements. They more often occurred in public locations, involved cars, guns and other weapons, involved more unknown suspects and fears of retaliation, and more often yielded additional charges and additional victim injuries.
>
> A series of discriminant analyses yielded surprisingly high levels of success in classification of cases as gang or non-gang, with younger age, minority status, and number of participants as the best discriminators. Special gang indicators such as argot, turf designations, and special dress and behavioral cues also emerged as excellent discriminators.
>
> Evidence for the impact of police investigation and reporting practices on these gang/non-gang differences was weak, although more so in one jurisdiction than the other. Finally, most of these findings pertain to both homicide and non-homicide events, but more fully to the homicides.

The current project responds to two validation questions and a derivative research question, all of these required by the special urban setting of the first project. Stated globally, these questions are:

1. Can the ability to discriminate between gang-designated and nongang-designated cases in one large urban jurisdiction be replicated in a second such jurisdiction?

2. Can such discriminability be applied (with or without some modification) to smaller jurisdictions with substantial street gang problems?

3. Does a smaller jurisdiction's approach to gang intervention have an effect on such outcomes as gang case clearance rates and prosecutorial charge rates?

These three questions correspond to what we shall refer to as Phases I, II, and III of the current project, where Phases I and II are concerned with validation issues and Phase III with an organizational issue.

Phase I

Phase I was initiated by performing discriminant analyses in the homicide data from the first project, yielding the two lists of variables in Table 1.

Table 1: The Variables in Two Discriminant Functions

A. LAPD Homicide Cases

Acronym	Variable
Vicpart	Number of participants on the victim's side
Suspart	Number of participants on the suspect's side
Stranger	No prior relationship between participants on suspect's and victim's sides
Gunpres	Presence of any form of firearm
Auto	Any form of automobile involvement in the incident
Mnagva	Mean age of all designated victims
Mnagsa	Mean age of all designated suspects
Ethnics	More than 50% of suspects are Black (LAPD only)
Mlprops	Proportion of males on suspect's side
Choloprz*	Presence of any item in this factor
Bndprz**	Presence of any item in this factor

B. LASD Homicide Cases

Acronym	Variable
Vicpart	Number of participants on the victim's side
Suspart	Number of participants on the suspect's side
Street	Incident took place in the street
Stranger	No prior relationship between participants on suspect's and victim's sides
Violent	Presence of an associated violent offense
Gunpres	Presence of any form of firearm
Mnagva	Mean age of all designated victims
Mnagsa	Mean age of all designated suspects
Ethnics	More than 50% of suspects are Hispanic (LASD only)
Mlprops	Proportion of males on suspect's side
Mnagdif	Mean of the differences between ages of designated suspects and designated victims per case
Manifest***	Presence of any item in this factor

* Terms in Choloprz Factor included the term "cholo", a gang tattoo, the term "cruising", the term "homeboy" or "homie", the term "vato", clothing or other behavioral evidence of gang affiliation.

** Terms in Bndprz factor were wearing of a bandana, presence of the term "hoorahing", presence of the term "cuzz" or other related argot, presence of the term "blood" or other related argot, and presence of the term "gangbang(er)".

*** Items in Manifest factor were behavioral evidence of gang affiliation (victim or suspect), the term "homeboys" or "homies", presence of gang tatoos, teardrop tatoos, gang names on personal property, wearing of Pendleton shirts.

Inspection of Table 1 makes it clear that there is a great deal of overlap between the variables emerging from each data set. A function derived from either of them might be expected to do well when applied to the other. Thus differences in the sets of weights might become critical here. Table 2 reports the eta^2 (i.e. the proportion of variance in the function accounted for by the two groups, gang and non-gang) and classification success when applying various combinations of variables and weights.

Table 2: Cross-Validation Results

Source of Variables	Source of Weights	Applied to	eta^2	Classification Success Gang	Non-gang	Overall
LAPD Hom	LAPD Hom	LASD Hom	.51	78.1%	84.7%	81.2%
	LASD Hom	LASD Hom	.51	81.9%	85.8%	83.7%
LASD Hom	LASD Hom	LAPD Hom	.52	77.6%	79.3%	78.5%
	LAPD Hom	LAPD Hom	.49	79.2%	85.7%	82.6%

Since the function comprised of the LAPD variables and LASD weights yields the best results, it is most likely to be useful for future applications, but clearly the loss in choosing one of the alternate functions would not be great. Comparing the cross-validation results for this function with the classification results from the original discriminant analysis is also interesting. The original analyses were performed on each data set (LAPD and LASD) independently, e.g., LAPD variables and LAPD weights used to classify LAPD cases. The gang and non-gang classification success rates were 77.2% and 88.3% in LAPD, 80.7% and 85.9% in LASD. Thus modified cross-validation (Table 2) yields slightly higher success in gang classification and lower

success in non-gang classification. In absolute terms, the differences are not great, and cross-validation has been encouraging.

Phase II

The first step in Phase II was to apply the homicide functions of Tables 1 and 2 to an available set of LASD non-homicide violent incidents. Doing so yielded a rather mixed picture.

Of course, one could make the argument that a gang indicator index could best emerge from derivations from non-homicide data, given that such offenses occur much more frequently than homicides. The direction we had gone was dictated by our original interest in homicides, not from a natural logic of index development. Accordingly, we undertook a full discriminant analysis of the LASD non-homicide data, proceeding in exactly the same fashion we did with the homicide data (including a preliminary factor analysis of the cultural items appearing in the non-homicide case files). Table 3 describes the emergent variables in the analysis.

Table 3: The Variables in the Non-homicide Function

Acronym	Variable
Vicpart	Number of participants on the victim's side
Suspart	Number of participants on the suspect's side
Stranger	No prior relationship between participants on suspect's and victim's sides
Gunpres	Presence of any form of firearm
Auto	Any form of automobile involvement in the incident
Mnagva	Mean age of all designated victims
Mnagsa	Mean age of all designated suspects
Ethnics	More than 50% of suspects are Hispanic
Ethnicv	More than 50% of victims are Hispanic
Mlprops	Proportion of males on suspect's side
Street	Incident took place in the street
Rob	Presence of robbery among the charged offenses
Noffense	Number of offenses listed for the incident
Mldiff	Mean difference between proportion males on suspect's side versus victim's side
Tatooprz*	Presence of any item in this factor

* Items in Tatooprz factor were behavioral evidence of gang affiliation (suspect side), gang tattoos, and teardrop tattoos.

This list is very similar to those derived from the homicide data as seen in Table 1. Variables which distinguish between homicide events labeled as gang and non-gang also distinguish between other forms of violence labeled as gang and non-gang. Thus one would expect classification success in homicide data using a function derived from non-homicide cases to resemble the success rates we have already reported. Table 4 reports the results.

Table 4: Classification of Homicide Cases with Non-homicide-derived Variables

Source of Variables	Source of Weights	Applied to	Classification Success eta^2	Gang	Non-gang	Overall
LASD Nonhom	LASD Nonhom	LAPD Hom	.37	69.1%	83.2%	76.5%
		LASD Hom	.37	78.6%	87.4%	82.7%
LASD Nonhom	LAPD Hom	LAPD Hom	.48	78.0%	85.4%	81.9%
		LASD Hom	.48	74.0%	83.2%	78.3%
LASD Nonhom	LASD Hom	LAPD Hom	.52	71.5%	74.5%	73.1%
		LASD Hom	.52	84.7%	84.7%	84.7%

The pattern of these results is now familiar. Classification success is obviously better when using weights derived from the target data set (e.g. LASD homicide weights applied to LASD homicide cases). For each function, non-gang classification success exceeds that for gang classification, and in all cases, the functions far exceed chance levels -- the process "works."

The next step was to apply discriminant functions to a set of smaller cities in California which were experiencing serious gang problems. By a variety of means, a pool of 24 California jurisdictions for our Phase II (testing a gang index in smaller cities) and Phase III (the effect of organizational variables on gang clearance rates) was established.

Further criteria were then applied to the 24:

1. Were their gang control and intelligence activities likely to be too influenced by those of the LAPD and LASD, yielding redundancy rather than independence?

2. Did they have a police gang unit with denotable expertise and/or responsibility?

3. Were they able to supply us with designations of cases as specifically gang-related? Some jurisdictions, for example, only record gang-related homicides but do not separate gang cases out in other violence categories (assault, robbery, rape, etc.). Others retain informal tallies of gang-related incidents without a list of case file numbers needed to locate the designated case.

4. Was there a special vertical prosecution program ("Operation Hardcore") in the District Attorney's Office?

A series of further decisions led to the selection of two cities, one northern and one southern, for the Phase II data collection and analysis. Approximately forty gang and forty non-gang cases were collected from the 1984 files in both cities.

In Bergton, the Southern California city,[1] the transition from a predominantly middle-to-upper class city to a highly mixed area with steady immigration of minority populations is typical of many California areas. Bergton gang specialists estimate an average of 10 violent gang incidents per month. All violent (gang and non-gang) offenses recorded in a recent year included almost 30 homicides, 1300 assaults, and 1000 robberies. The once quiet streets of many areas in suburban Bergton are now troubled streets.

Gang incidents are more narrowly defined than in either Los Angeles jurisdiction. The special unit that handles gang matters prefers to limit labeling gang-related offenses as those

---

1. Pseudonyms are used for each of our cooperating jurisdictions.

involving known or suspected gang members on both the victim and assailant sides. Likely inclusions in gang offense recording are incidents identified directly by victim and assailant affiliation, or territorial location which leads to discovery of such affiliations. Thus Bergton has a more "pure" gang designation policy which might be expected to increase the differences between gang and non-gang differences in bivariate and discriminant analyses. Actual practice, however, rather notably departed from this exclusionary policy.

The second city, Valeton, is a northern California city with a more stable history of minority settlement, located in a generally less urbanized context than Bergton. Nonetheless, Valeton has a gang history of some years' duration, with from 25 to 35 groups noted by the police as "active" at a given time. Homicides average 36 per year over the last six year period, about one quarter of these being designated as gang-related.

In contrast to Bergton, the special unit in Valeton employs a broader definition of gang-related violent incidents, similar to that found in Los Angeles. A known or suspected gang member on either the victim or suspect side is sufficient to define the incident as gang-related. Indications of gang motives (retaliation, territorial imperatives) are also employed, but not systematically. In designating cases as gang-related, officers in the gang unit review all station incident reports and arrests, looking for names, areas, motives, and other indications of gang involvement. These incidents are then entered in the gang log

along with others which may not have been reported formally to the police such as drive-by shooting episodes with unknown suspects.

External Validity

How effectively will the discriminant functions derived in Los Angeles apply to smaller cities? In a very real sense, the answer to this question provides a test of external validity, or the generalizability of Los Angeles gang findings to the situation in other, small cities now experiencing gang problems. Valeton and Bergton are quite different kinds of cities with similar gang problems yet somewhat dissimilar approaches to gang incident definition within their police departments. Combining the data from the two cities gives us stable numbers and broad representation, adequate for testing the generalizability of the gang index variables.

We first applied to these new data the LAPD discriminant function with the LASD homicide weights, and then the LAPD function with the LAPD weights. In both cases, the classification success rates were derived for functions including as well as excluding the "cultural items" (Choloprz, Bndprz, Manifest -- see Table 1 footnotes). The first finding to report is that in the smaller cities, the cultural items proved to be useless. When they were included in the function, classification success of non-gang cases using LASD weights was 94.4% and using LAPD weights was 93.1%. However, the corresponding rates for gang cases was 45.6% in both instances. The cultural items

appeared much less frequently in the Valeton/Bergton cases than was true in Los Angeles; while their presence in non-gang cases was minimal, yielding high classification success, their presence was relatively low even in gang cases.

Two probable explanations occur to us. First, smaller city gangs may not be as culturally distinct as they are in the more sophisticated traditional gang settings of Los Angeles. Second, patrolmen, detectives, and gang unit specialists in the smaller cities may not attend to and record items of argot and dress as uniformly as do their more gang-experienced counterparts in the Los Angeles Sheriff's and Police Departments. Both factors may be involved and are probably interactive. In any case, our analyses hereafter will omit the cultural items.

Our second finding constitutes a slight reversal of expectations. In the full report we noted that LAPD variables with LASD weights performed slightly better on the LASD non-homicide data than LAPD variables with LAPD weights. Applying both functions to the Valeton/Bergton data yields the reverse. As seen in Table 5, the data favor the use of the LAPD weights.

Table 5: Classification Rates with LAPD Function Applied to Valeton/Bergton Data

Source of Weights	Classification Success		
	Gang	Non-gang	Overall
LAPD Hom	79.4%	72.2%	75.7%
LASD Hom	45.6%	87.5%	67.1%

The overall classification success of the better set of weights (LAPD) is not as high as the cross-validation rates reported for Phase I analyses (see Table 2). However, it is higher than we had anticipated, given the conceptual and methodological leaps involved in moving from data taken from the nation's most gang-ridden city to two medium-sized cities with suburban reputations. To judge from these data, and limiting ourselves to incident and participant variables excluding cultural items, a limited police-based gang indicator index might be applied with utility to the distinction between gang and non-gang cases in both major urban areas and in the kinds of smaller cities where gang activity has become so prevalent of late.

Further verification comes in part from a comparison of the variables which enter the discriminant analyses of the LAPD, LASD, and Valeton/Bergton data. Table 6 displays the standardized coefficients for all four available sets of data; these are the original discriminant functions, derived from separate analyses of each data set and based on setting and participant variables, rather than the functions obtained in the validation analyses.

Table 6: Variables and Standardized Coefficients for Four Data Sets (with rank orderings inserted)

Variables	LASD Homicide	LASD Non-Homicide	LAPD Homicide	Valeton/Bergton*
Mean Age of Suspects	-.491 (1)	-.539 (1)	-.736 (1)	-.759 (1)
Predominantly Hisp/Blk Suspects	+.415 (2)	+.244 (4)	-.248 (3)	+.260 (4)
Street Location	+.322 (3)	+.125 (11)	-	-
No. of Participants on Suspect Side	+.307 (4)	+.354 (2)	+.196 (6)	+.209 (5)
Presence of Gun	+.279 (5)	+.128 (10)	+.238 (4)	+.107 (7)
Mean Age of Victims	-.237 (6)	-.109 (13)	-.342 (2)	-.281 (3)
Proportion of Male Suspects	+.185 (7)	+.166 (7)	+.218 (5)	+.073 (8)
No Prior Contact between Suspect and Victim	+.164 (8)	+.194 (6)	+.189 (7)	-
Number of Participants on Victim Side	+.156 (9)	+.121 (12)	-.063 (9)	+.171 (6)
Associated Violent Charges	+.152 (10)	-	-	-
Mean Age Difference between Suspect and Victim	+.113 (11)	-	-	-
Automobile Involved	-	+.155 (8)	+.188 (8)	+.299 (2)
Differrence in Proportion of Males, Suspect & Victim	-	-.088 (14)	-	-
Proportion Hispanic or Black Victims	-	+.153 (9)	-	-
Robbery as a Case Offense	-	+.266 (3)	-	-
Number Case Offenses	-	+.205 (5)	-	-

* In the case of Valeton/Bergton, the coefficients are based on LAPD variables with Valeton/Bergton weights. When we reviewed the Valeton/Bergton bivariate gang/non-gang differences to select variables for the discriminant analysis, the result was a list of variables nearly identical to the variables in the LAPD function. Therefore, the fourth column is quite similar to an independent discriminant function derived for Valeton/Bergton. Only the no-prior-contact variable would not have entered an independent discriminant analysis; the gang/non-gang difference was not significant.

Valeton/Bergton Discriminant Analysis

The perceptive reader may already have anticipated our next comment. Referring to Table 6, it may be seen that the LAPD Homicide variables are exactly the same as those emerging from the bivariate analyses of the Valeton/Bergton data with the exception of the no-prior-contact variable. Table 6 already reports the use of the Valeton/Bergton weights on these variables. Further, we noted earlier the non-utility of the gang culture items in the Valeton/Bergton data, so there are no new variables to be entered into an independent discriminant analysis.

What we have found, then, is that to all intents and purposes the final column in Table 6 actually represents an "independent" discriminant analysis of the Valeton/Bergton data. The discriminant function consists of the variables for which a standardized coefficient is listed in the last column of Table 6. The classification success is roughly 76%, as depicted in Table 5. There is, as it happens, no point in undertaking a separate discriminant analysis. The results are already in hand, however inadvertently.

Phase III

In our report of the earlier project, we reported some analyses relating gang unit involvement to investigative thoroughness and arrest rates. In the Sheriff's Department, the data suggested that homicide cases directly involving the gang unit received somewhat more thorough investigations and somewhat higher proportions of suspect arrests. The non-homicide cases

did not present as clear a picture. More importantly, the Los Angeles Police Department data failed to show the same evidence relating unit involvement to investigative outcome. Since the two departments had gang units with both structural and functional differences of some note, Phase III of the current project was designed to look further into this issue.

Five smaller jurisdictions were selected, in part, to represent a wide range of approaches to gang unit structure and function.[2] With arrest rates and prosecution filing rates collected in all five, as well as investigative variables collected in four of the five,[3] we positioned ourselves to assess the effects of amount and type of gang unit involvement on the outcome of gang-related cases. Clearly, there would be important policy implications of findings relating kind or volume of unit involvement to arrests and filing rates. Differences in

---

2. In addition to Valeton and Bergton, these include "Seaside," a large urban center, "Salton," a smaller but well-known urban center, and "Solaris," an inland city less well-known nationally but prominent in the California scene. All three of these additional jurisdictions contain large minority communities and a broad mix of demographic and occupational status. They have gang details in units of from two to ten persons, initiated in the late 1970s and early 1980s in response to gangs appearing a few years earlier in each case. Designations of gang-related crimes in all three are limited to violence--mostly assaults an robberies. In once case, gang-related incidents are defined by a suspect's gang membership, while in the other two, either suspect or victim may be sufficient. None of these operational definitions are as broad as those used in Los Angeles.

3. Bergton, due to some changes in research methodology during the project, did not have investigative variables extracted from its files. It had not originally been planned to include it in the Phase III analyses.

investigative thoroughness would presumably help to explain such relationships.

Table 7 summarizes the placement of the five units on dimensions of importance to our concerns. As can be seen, the five jurisdictions have both common and unique features.

Table 7: Five Gang Units Compared

	Bergton	Valeton	Salton	Seaside	Solaris
Size	Large	Small	Small	Large	Small
Placement	Patrol	Juvenile	Detective	Detective	Patrol
Full-time Gang	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Intelligence	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Surveillance	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Investigation	No	No	Yes	Yes	No

To investigate our Phase III interests, data were gathered from a target number of 40 gang cases in each jurisdiction; the actual numbers, as displayed in the tables below, varied as a function of case peculiarities, log/file charge discrepancies, missing information, low numbers of cases (Solaris), and underestimates (Salton).

Comparative Data

Our hopes for the Phase III analyses have not been realized for the most part. The expectation that different organizational forms -- types of gang units -- would result in manifestly different outcomes is not supported by the data. Table 8 reports the results for arrest rates, and Tables 9 and 10 for prosecution filing rates.

Table 8: Gang Case Arrest Rates in Five Cities

	Bergton	Valeton	Salton	Seaside	Solaris
Open or Inactive*	8	17	15	12	14
Arrest or Charges Filed	30(79)**	21(55)**	26(63)**	25(68)**	20(59)**
Missing	0	0	6	1	0
TOTAL	38	38	47	38	34

* Investigation continuing; insufficient information; uncooperative victims.
** Percentages represent cases with arrests or charges filed over the total cases minus those missing.

Table 9: Gang Case Prosecution Rates in Five Cities

	Bergton	Valeton	Salton	Seaside	Solaris
No filing	14	18	18	14	19
Charges filed	18(56)*	16(47)*	14(44)*	21(60)*	12(39)*
Missing data	6	4	15	3	3
TOTAL	38	38	47	38	34

* Percentages represent cases with one or more filings over the total cases minus those missing.

Table 10: Gang Case Prosecution Rates Among Cases with Arrests or Charges Filed (from Table 9)

Bergton	Valeton	Salton	Seaside	Solaris
60%	76%	54%	84%	60%

We note two general features of these tables. First, there is not as much variance in these outcome variables as we had hoped to see, leaving not much room for differential effects of gang unit involvement. Second, discerning any consistent pattern among the five cities is very difficult. For instance:

1. The two largest units, Bergton and Seaside, have the highest arrest rates but only Seaside has a high filing ratio (Table 10).

2. Those with the highest filing ratios, Valeton and Seaside,

seem to have nothing in common organizationally.

3. The units which engage in investigative functions, Salton and Seaside, have the highest and the lowest filing rates and only middle-range arrest rates.

4. The three units with commitments of full-time gang officers -- Valeton, Salton, and Seaside -- show no consistent patterns of arrests or filing ratios.

In sum, there is not all that much to be said about widely varying outcome rates nor about differential relationships to the organizational dimensions we have used to characterize the units. Another approach to the issue is to compare cases which were handled by the gang units with those which were not. Our data collection procedure included this information in each set of files. However, once again the data present us with a problem, as seen in Table 11.

Table 11: Gang Unit Involvement in Gang Cases

Level of Involvement	Bergton	Valeton	Salton	Seaside	Solaris
No mention	*	30	11	2	12
Copies sent to G. U.	*	1	0	0	13
G.U. used as resource	*	1	8	0	2
Active G.U. involvement	*	6	28	36	7
	*	38	47	38	34

* Data not collected, but Bergton officers are part-time and not detailed to act as investigators in any case.

Comparing unit-involved to non-unit-involved cases within Bergton cannot be done, and within Valeton and Seaside also is fruitless because there is so little variance. The distributions in the table for Salton and Solaris, however, do hold some promise, so analyses

were undertaken within those two departments. Taken separately, neither presents a clear picture of the relationship between gang unit involvement and case outcome; the numbers are too small. When one combines the data from Salton and Solaris, the data in Tables 12 and 13 emerge.

Table 12: Gang Unit Involvement and Case Clearance by Arrest, Salton plus Solaris

	Missing	Not Cleared	Uncooperative Victim	Cleared by Arrest
No unit Involvement	0	3	6	14
Passive Involvement*	1	8	2	13
Active Involvement*	5	5	5	19

* Passive involvement means the unit received report copies, or was used for identifications, or unit supervisors signed off on reports. Active involvement means that unit officers were directly involved in case investigation.

The data in Table 12 show no particular pattern, and no strong support for the efficacy of active unit involvement. One can attempt to increase the Ns by collapsing columns, or collapsing rows, but these procedures do not help. Not surprisingly, then, the prosecution's filing rates are similarly unimpressive, as seen in Table 13.

Table 13: Gang Unit Involvement and Prosecution Filings, Salton plus Solaris

	Missing	Not Filed	Accepted or Filed
No Unit Involvement	4	12	7
Passive Involvement	4	13	7
Active Involvement	10	12	12

In sum, then, the data suggest that neither organizational form (as represented by the five departments) nor level of gang unit involvement in case investigation relates meaningfully to case outcome as measured in this project. For policy purposes, this is of course a discouraging finding. Explaining it is difficult. Perhaps the cases are not so difficult that special expertise is needed. Perhaps the available gang expertise and intelligence does not add appreciably to normal investigative processes. Perhaps smaller city gangs do not differ from non-gang perpetrators enough to warrant special attention, although our prior data seem to suggest otherwise.

Summary and Conclusion

This project has fulfilled most of our desires for learning more about the generalizability of data from traditional big city gangs to gangs in smaller cities now facing up to gang problems. We have cross-validated the gang descriptors across big city jurisdictions, and found them applicable to a significant degree in the smaller cities.

However, a practical aim of the project cannot be achieved, namely the development of useful training materials for officers in these smaller cities. Our data suggest that the sorts of distinctive cultural indicators of gang cases found in Los Angeles are generally not found in the smaller cities. Officers cannot be trained to be sensitive to non-existent discriminators. Further, the variables which emerge from the discriminant analysis (see Table 6) are conceptually important to the criminologist, but not very effective <u>practical</u> discriminators, yielding in all a classification success

between gang and non-gang cases about halfway between perfection and pure chance (see Table 5). Little special training is needed to tell officers, "Watch for a larger number of younger suspects and victims with firearms and a car."

Perhaps this limited sort of guideline is precisely what explains the failure of gang unit involvement to result in better case outcomes; we may have statistically significant differences that are insignificant for practical purposes. If gang units cannot make a difference in these smaller cities, including those that are actively involved in case investigations, there is little reason to think that specialized gang training for patrol officers can yield much of practical value to their departments.

In making these statements, we do not wish to imply that the smaller city gangs are not "real" gangs. Analysis of the incidents recorded by the five police departments confirms the existence and seriousness of these groups. A most valuable future research enterprise would be a field study of smaller city gangs to establish similarities and differences in gang structure compared to big city gangs. If the structures are similar and the level of gang-related crime serious, then a legitimate question could be raised about the utility of maintaining specialized gang units in the forms we have described in this report. Our Los Angeles experience has made us proponents of gang specialization in such a traditional gang area; our data in the current project do not allow us, as yet, to be equally sanguine about such specialization in smaller gang cities.

POLICE RESPONSE TO STREET GANG VIOLENCE: IMPROVING THE INVESTIGATIVE PROCESS

Final Report
(NIJ # 84-IJ-CX-0052)

Malcolm W. Klein
Cheryl L. Maxson
Margaret A. Gordon

Center for Research on Crime and Social Control
Social Science Research Institute
University of Southern California

1987

ABSTRACT

This is the second of two reports of research based on police investigations of street gang violence. In the first, it was established that gang violence differed substantially from non-gang violence in characteristics of its participants (suspects and victims) and in characteristics of the setting of the violent incidents. It was also established that, for the two enforcement jurisdictions involved -- the Los Angeles Police Department and the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department -- the designation of cases by police as gang and non-gang was primarily a function of these participants and setting characteristics rather than police practices in reporting and recording them.

These findings set the context for the second research project and the current report, concerned principally with similar issues in smaller, less traditional gang cities where gang problems had nonetheless become sufficiently serious to justify the establishment of specialized police gang units. This report details findings related to three major aims:

1. Can the ability to discriminate between gang and non-gang cases in one large urban jurisdiction be replicated in a second such? This was an issue of cross-validation.

2. Can such discriminability be applied to smaller jurisdictions with substantial street gang problems? This was an issue of external validity.

3. Does a smaller jurisdiction's approach to gang investigations have an effect on case clearance rates and

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE

GRANT MANAGER'S ASSESSMENT REPORT

Grant/Contract/IAA # 84-IJ-CX-0052

Grant/Contract/IAA Title	Grantee/Contractor/Agency Name & Address
Police Response to Street Gang Violence: Improving the Investigative Process	Social Science Research Institute University of Southern California University Park Los Angeles, California 90089-1111

Project Director, Address & Phone #	Funding Level This Phase	Total Level
Malcolm Klein Social Science Research Institute University of Southern California University Park Los Angeles, California 90089-1111	$120,798	$120,798
	Project Period This Phase	Total Period
	9/19/84 - 3/18/87	2-1/2 years

Products

	Title & Author	Date Submitted
1.	Police Response to Street Gang Violence: Improving the Investigative Process, by Malcolm Klein, Cheryl Maxson and Margaret Gordon	3/18/87
2.	Executive Summary of above report	3/18/87
3.	Data Tape and Codebook	8/87

Project Monitors

1.	Winifred Reed	From	9/19/84	To	3/18/87
2.		From		To	
3.		From		To	

Outside Reviewers

Name and Title

1. None of this Report
2.
3.

Staff Reviewers

1. Winifred Reed
2. Fred Heinzelmann
3. _____
4. _____

PUBLICATION RECOMMENDATIONS AND APPROVAL

_____ _____
Project Monitor Date
Winifred Reed

_____ _____
Division Director Date

_____ Oct 1987
Office Director Date
Joseph T. Kochanski

1. Grant Managers Assessment Report

Provide a narrative assessment not to exceed 200 words describing the following: problem addressed and major objectives, accomplishments, activities undertaken, principal findings and documents produced. This report will be entered into the LEAA Grant PROFILE File (PROFILE) to be used by criminal justice planners and LEAA management and staff. For further clarification of the requirements, see LEAA Handbook HB Procedures for Administration of Categorical Grants, Chapter 6.

This project was a continuation of research conducted under grant number 81-IJ-CX-0072. It had a number of goals. The first was to cross-validate a gang indicators index developed during the previous project and to test for useful alternative forms of the index for application to cities of varying sizes. The researchers also assessed the usefulness of this index in police investigations in terms of police clearance rates and prosecutorial conviction rates. Finally, the rearchers assessed various organizational forms of police gang units depending on the level of gang activity in a jurisdiction. The project was conducted using law enforcement data in Los Angeles and other California citites of varying sizes. The results of the cross validation of the gang indicators index were favorable. It was found, however, that when applying data from larger cities to smaller ones that one should generalize with considerable caution as uniform results were not forthcoming from this analysis. Finally, this project yielded little support for a relationship between the organizational form of gang units or their level of involvement in gang investigation and the case outcomes in terms of clearance or filing rates. The final report and executive summary of this report are available on loan from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service. The authors of the report also plan to publish journal articles based on this research.

prosecution filing rates? This was an issue of evaluating a form of organizational effectiveness.

The first aim was studied by undertaking discriminant analyses of LAPD and LASD gang and non-gang data and applying the discriminant functions of each to the data of the other. The results were encouraging, as classification success rates were substantial.

The second aim was studied in several ways: by applying the Los Angeles functions to data from two smaller jurisdictions, by comparing bivariate results from Los Angeles with those from these two smaller jurisdictions, and by comparing univariate gang findings in Los Angeles with those in five smaller jurisdictions. In terms of external validity, the results of these comparisons were mixed.

Variables included in the Los Angeles discriminant functions were found to apply with some consistency to the two smaller cities, but the weights (standardized coefficients) associated with them were similar only in the case of the highest ranking variables. In other words, gang/non-gang differences were similar in content more than in relative importance. The bivariate comparisons revealed a number of shared variables along with a number of unshared ones (i.e., whether or not they achieved statistically significant differences between gang and non-gang cases). Finally, the univariate analyses similarly revealed that a number of important variables described both Los Angeles and five-city incidents, but that a number of others did

not apply well to the five-city incidents. "Gang culture" variables, such as special clothing and argot, seldom appeared in the gang investigation files of the five cities. On the other hand, the five-city assaultive incidents were characterized by a surprisingly high number of variables associated with gang homicides in Los Angeles. Only further research could establish the reasons for these differences. It does seem clear at this point, however, that generalizing from gang incidents in traditional settings to those in newer, smaller gang cities should be done with considerable caution. The same might be true, therefore, with attempts to apply traditional police gang practices to these newer settings.

This latter point is buttressed by our findings related to the third project aim having to do with investigative effectiveness. The data from the five cities yielded little support for a relationship between the organizational <u>form</u> of gang units or their <u>level</u> of involvement in gang investigations and the outcomes in terms of clearance or filing rates. This does not mean that the quality of investigation is unimportant, but rather that gang-specific characteristics of investigations may not add much to normal investigative effectiveness in smaller gang cities.

Introduction

To a considerable extent, both the goals and the methods of this project evolved from our earlier NIJ grant, Evaluation in an Imported Gang Violence Deterrence Program (#81-IJ-CX-0072). The Abstract from the Final Report[1] of that project provides a suitable introduction to the discussion of the current effort:

> Police investigative data describing gang and comparable non-gang violent incidents in two large police jurisdictions in Los Angeles are reported. Approximately 800 homicide as well as over 500 violent, non-homicide incidents occurring between 1978 and 1982 were analyzed to respond to three research goals: descriptions of gang violence; determination of significant discriminators between gang and non-gang incidents; and estimation of the impact of police investigative procedures on the official designation of cases as gang or non-gang.
>
> The data revealed very substantial differences between the character of gang and non-gang violent cases, primarily with respect to descriptors of the participants but also with respect to the settings in which the incidents occurred. Gang incidents involved more participants, lower levels of prior suspect-victim relationships, lower ages, more male-only cases, and more minority involvements. They more often occurred in public locations, involved cars, guns and other weapons, involved more unknown suspects and fears of retaliation, and more often yielded additional charges and additional victim injuries.
>
> A series of discriminant analyses yielded surprisingly high levels of success in classification of cases as gang or non-gang, with younger age, minority status, and number of participants as the best discriminators. Special gang indicators such as argot, turf designations, and special dress and behavioral cues also emerged as excellent discriminators.
>
> Evidence for the impact of police investigation and reporting practices on these gang/non-gang differences

---

1. Details not provided here can be found in that report (Klein, Maxson, and Gordon, 1984).

was weak, although more so in one jurisdiction than the other. Finally, most of these findings pertain to both homicide and non-homicide events, but more fully to the homicides.

The current project responds to two validation questions and a derivative research question, all of these required by the special urban setting of the first project. Stated globally, these questions are:

1. Can the ability to discriminate between gang-designated and nongang-designated cases in one large urban jurisdiction be replicated in a second such jurisdiction?

2. Can such discriminability be applied (with or without some modification) to smaller jurisdictions with substantial street gang problems?

3. Does a smaller jurisdiction's approach to gang intervention have an effect on such outcomes as gang case clearance rates and prosecutorial charge rates?

These three questions correspond to what we shall refer to as Phases I, II, and III of the current project, where Phases I and II are concerned with validation issues and Phase III with an organizational issue.

Phase I

In the earlier project, several basic steps were taken to develop a "gang indicator index," a set of weighted variables capable of discriminating between cases designated as gang and as non-gang. In the investigation files of both the Los Angeles Police Department and the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department,

treated separately, variables were extracted that were descriptive of (a) the setting of violent incidents, (b) the participants in violent incidents, and (c) investigative procedures which might affect the processes by which cases are designated as gang or non-gang. In the materials to follow, we will be using only the first two types of data, setting and participant descriptors.[2]

All cases were labeled either as gang or as non-gang according to a priori designations by the special gang intelligence units of the LAPD and LASD. The data on a wide variety of variables were extracted from the case files for homicide cases in both jurisdictions and for a group of violent, non-homicide cases in LASD. Additionally, we extracted numerous items pertaining specifically to gang culture (argot, dress, tatoos, etc.).

Bivariate analyses of setting and participant descriptors were used to determine the variables on which gang-designated and non-gang cases differed significantly. Discriminant analyses were performed to derive a function or preliminary gang indicator index for each jurisdiction.

Although a split-half procedure was used to increase the certainty that the derived function was stable, there remained the question of cross-validation, and Phase I of the current

---

2. Analyses of the investigative issues are reported in the Final Report and in an article published in Criminology, 1986, 24. The impact of investigative variables proved to be minimal.

project dealt with this issue. Our original intention was to use the derived LAPD discriminant function and cross-validate it on the LASD homicide data. But as our purpose was to develop a function that provided the greatest discrmination between gang and non-gang cases, we expanded the analysis somewhat to go back and forth between the two data sets (e.g. derive a function from LASD data and cross-validate on LAPD).

The first step was to do factor analyses of the gang cultural items in each data set in order to reduce the large number of single items to a smaller number of factors. Items that did not vary across gang and non-gang cases (e.g., appeared only in gang cases) were eliminated. Treating these factors as present or not present in any given file, they were added as variables in the discriminant analyses. For instance, an LAPD item factor was composed of the presence of the term "cholo," a gang tatoo, the term "cruising," the term "homeboy" or "homie", indication that the incident occurred in a gang area, behavioral evidence of a suspect's gang affiliation, behavioral indications of a non-participant's gang affiliation (e.g. witness), an indication that a participant was linked to a gang area, and presence of the term "vato." If <u>any</u> of these items were found in a case file, that case was scored 1; if no such item were found, the case was scored 0 for that factor.[3] With pertinent factors

---

3. Factor item sums were also used, but this yielded no improvement; in the discriminant analyses, the simple dichotomy between presence or absence of a factor yielded slightly better results.

entered, the discriminant analyses in each data set yielded a set of variables and a set of weights (discriminant function standardized coefficients). In Table 1, we present the variables in the discriminant functions derived from both data sets.

Several choices present themselves concerning using various of these sets. For example, one could apply LAPD variables to LASD cases, but use either LAPD-derived weights or LASD-derived weights. Inspection of Table 1 makes it clear that there is a great deal of overlap between the variables emerging from each data set. A function derived from either of them might be expected to do well when applied to the other. Thus differences in the sets of weights might become critical here. Table 2 reports the eta^2 (i.e. the proportion of variance in the function accounted for by the two groups, gang and non-gang) and classification success when applying various combinations of variables and weights.

Table 1: The Variables in Two Discriminant Functions

A. LAPD Homicide Cases

Acronym	Variable
Vicpart	Number of participants on the victim's side
Suspart	Number of participants on the suspect's side
Stranger	No prior relationship between participants on suspect's and victim's sides
Gunpres	Presence of any form of firearm
Auto	Any form of automobile involvement in the incident
Mnagva	Mean age of all designated victims
Mnagsa	Mean age of all designated suspects
Ethnics	More than 50% of suspects are Black (LAPD only)
Mlprops	Proportion of males on suspect's side
Cholopr[z]*	Presence of any item in this factor
Bndprz**	Presence of any item in this factor

B. LASD Homicide Cases

Acronym	Variable
Vicpart	Number of participants on the victim's side
Suspart	Number of participants on the suspect's side
Street	Incident took place in the street
Stranger	No prior relationship between participants on suspect's and victim's sides
Violent	Presence of an associated violent offense
Gunpres	Presence of any form of firearm
Mnagva	Mean age of all designated victims
Mnagsa	Mean age of all designated suspects
Ethnics	More than 50% of suspects are Hispanic (LASD only)
Mlprops	Proportion of males on suspect's side
Mnagdif	Mean of the differences between ages of designated suspects and designated victims per case
Manifest***	Presence of any item in this factor

---

* See paragraph above

** Terms in Bndprz factor were wearing of a bandana, presence of the term "hoorahing", presence of the term "cuzz" or other related argot, presence of the term "blood" or other related argot, and presence of the term "gangbang(er)".

*** Items in Manifest factor were behavioral evidence of gang affiliation (victim or suspect), the term "homeboys" or "homies", presence of gang tatoos, teardrop tatoos, gang names on personal property, wearing of Pendleton shirts.

Table 2: Cross-Validation Results

Source of Variables	Source of Weights	Applied to	eta^2	Classification Success Gang	Non-gang	Overall
LAPD Hom	LAPD Hom	LASD Hom	.51	78.1%	84.7%	81.2%
	LASD Hom	LASD Hom	.51	81.9%	85.8%	83.7%
LASD Hom	LASD Hom	LAPD Hom	.52	77.6%	79.3%	78.5%
	LAPD Hom	LAPD Hom	.49	79.2%	85.7%	82.6%

Perhaps the most noteworthy feature of Table 2 is the small difference among the four functions. Not surprisingly, in each case classification success is increased somewhat by applying the variables from one jurisdiction to the data from the second using the weights taken from the second. Also, it appears that using the LAPD function is slightly preferable to using the LASD function; i.e. it yields slightly better classification success on the other jurisdiction.

Finally, it seems that the better choice for gang classification is in each case better for non-gang as well. For limited police goals, gang classification is most important; they want to be able to "target" gang cases accurately. For limited civil libertarian goals, better non-gang classification is more important; the interest here is in avoiding the false labeling of a non-gang case as gang-related. Coincidentally, the cross-validation with the crossed variables and weights (rows 2

and 4 in Table 2) best satisfy both goals.

Since the function comprised of the LAPD variables and LASD weights yields the best results, it is most likely to be useful for future applications, but clearly the loss in choosing one of the alternate functions would not be great. Comparing the cross-validation results for this function with the classification results from the original discriminant analysis is also interesting. The original analyses were performed on each data set (LAPD and LASD) independently, e.g., LAPD variables and LAPD weights used to classify LAPD cases. The gang and non-gang classification success rates were 77.2% and 88.3% in LAPD, 80.7% and 85.9% in LASD. Thus modified cross-validation (Table 2) yields slightly higher success in gang classification and lower success in non-gang classification. In absolute terms, the differences are not great, and cross-validation has been encouraging.

However, all of this applies only to the classification of homicide cases. In most cities, especially those smaller cities now facing increased gang problems, there are too few homicide cases to benefit from a gang homicide index. How well our work to date applies to non-homicide cases then becomes critical, and this issue is the subject of our Phase II analysis.

Phase II

It might seem that either an LAPD homicide function or an LASD homicide function could be appropriate for testing a non-homicide data base. However, the data on non-homicides from

our first project were taken from LASD files only, suggesting that we should first test our concern using the less redundant LAPD function. Table 3 reports the results of using the LAPD homicide function with three different sets of weights to derive the classification success with the LASD non-homicide data.[4]

Table 3: Classification of LASD Non-homicide Cases with LAPD Homicide Variables

Source of Variables	Source of Weights	eta^2	Classification Success Gang	Non-gang	Overall
LAPD Hom	LAPD Hom	.51	53.9%	87.4%	69.4%
LAPD Hom	LASD Hom	.51	66.7%	83.0%	74.2%
LAPD Hom	LASD Non-hom	.37	74.9%	79.6%	77.1%

Clearly, the homicide function works less well when applied to these non-homicide data. Gang classification success hardly exceeds chance (50%) using the LAPD weights, improves considerably using the LASD homicide weights, and improves more using the weights from the non-homicide data. This latter, however, is associated with a far lower explanation of variance than that obtained using the homicide weights. The original independent discriminant analysis of the non-homicide data had yielded classification success rates of 75.6% for gang, 76.7% for nongang, and 76.1% overall. Validation yields the opposite trend, better non-gang than gang classification.

---

4. These include over 500 cases, combined, of armed robbery, attempted murder, shooting into an inhabited dwelling, assault with a deadly weapon, other felonious assaults (excluding those on a police officer), rape and related sexual assaults, and felony child endangerment (see Klein, and Gordon, 1985, for more detail).

Of course, one could make the argument that a gang indicator index could best emerge from derivations from non-homicide data, given that such offenses occur much more frequently than homicides. The direction we have gone was dictated by our original interest in homicides, not from a natural logic of index development. Accordingly, we undertook a full discriminant analysis of the LASD non-homicide data, proceeding in exactly the same fashion we did with the homicide data (including a preliminary factor analysis of the cultural items appearing in the non-homicide case files). Table 4 describes the emergent variables in the analysis.

Table 4: The Variables in the Non-homicide Function

Acronym	Variable
Vicpart	Number of participants on the victim's side
Suspart	Number of participants on the suspect's side
Stranger	No prior relationship between participants on suspect's and victim's sides
Gunpres	Presence of any form of firearm
Auto	Any form of automobile involvement in the incident
Mnagva	Mean age of all designated victims
Mnagsa	Mean age of all designated suspects
Ethnics	More than 50% of suspects are Hispanic
Ethnicv	More than 50% of victims are Hispanic
Mlprops	Proportion of males on suspect's side
Street	Incident took place in the street
Rob	Presence of robbery among the charged offenses
Noffense	Number of offenses listed for the incident
Mldiff	Mean difference between proportion males on suspect's side versus victim's side
Tatooprz[5]	Presence of any item in this factor

This list is very similar to those derived from the homicide data as seen in Table 1. Variables which distinguish between homicide events labeled as gang and non-gang also distinguish between other forms of violence labeled as gang and non-gang.

---

5. Items in Tatooprz factor were behavioral evidence of gang affiliation (suspect side), gang tatoos, and teardrop tatoos.

Thus one would expect classification success in homicide data using a function derived from non-homicide cases to resemble the success rates we have already reported. Table 5 reports the results.

Table 5: Classification of Homicide Cases with Non-homicide-derived Variables

Source of Variables	Source of Weights	Applied to	Classification Success eta^2	Gang	Non-gang	Overall
LASD Nonhom	LASD Nonhom	LAPD Hom	.37	69.1%	83.2%	76.5%
		LASD Hom	.37	78.6%	87.4%	82.7%
LASD Nonhom	LAPD Hom	LAPD Hom	.48	78.0%	85.4%	81.9%
		LASD Hom	.48	74.0%	83.2%	78.3%
LASD Nonhom	LASD Hom	LAPD Hom	.52	71.5%	74.5%	73.1%
		LASD Hom	.52	84.7%	84.7%	84.7%

The pattern of these results is now familiar. Classification success is obviously better when using weights derived from the target data set (e.g. LASD homicide weights applied to LASD homicide cases). For each function, non-gang classification success exceeds that for gang classification, and in all cases, the functions far exceed chance levels -- the process "works."

Finally, it seems clear that an index derived from non-homicide data is roughly as useful as one derived from homicide data for use on homicide data. For our purposes in Phase II -- testing LAPD and LASD functions in smaller cities -- this means that we have a wide choice of discriminant functions to try out on our smaller cities.

The Smaller Cities

Cities[6] in California which might have street gang problems were determined in several ways:

1. The authors' personal knowledge derived from past experience in gang research.

2. Reports from knowledgeable informants -- police and other enforcement personnel, probation and parole officials, news reports.

3. The list supplied in the research of Stapleton and Needle (1982).

4. A review of statewide data (Bureau of Criminal Statistics) on violent crime.

A total of 45 jurisdictions constituted the final list. Further data collection and personal inquiry pared the list to about 38 jurisdictions that might fit our research needs. But another 14 of these reported such low levels of gang activity that they too were pared from the list, leaving a pool of 24 California jurisdictions for our Phase II (testing a gang index in smaller cities) and Phase III (the effect of organizational variables on gang clearance rates).

Further criteria were then applied to the 24 remaining gang cities:

1. Were their gang control and intelligence activities likely to be too influenced by those of the LAPD and LASD, yielding redundancy rather than independence?

---

6. "Cities" should really be interpreted here as "jurisdictions", since some of them were County Sheriff's Departments.

2. Did they have a police gang unit with denotable expertise and/or responsibility?

3. Were they able to supply us with designations of cases as specifically gang-related? Some jurisdictions, for example, only record gang-related homicides but do not separate gang cases out in other violence categories (assault, robbery, rape, etc.). Others retain informal tallies of gang-related incidents without a list of case file numbers needed to locate the designated case.

4. Was there a special vertical prosecution program ("Operation Hardcore") in the District Attorney's Office?

One of the jurisdictions was judged to be too affected by LAPD/LASD procedures (in fact it has been accused of manipulating its gang homicide data as reported to the LASD). Four did not have gang experts or units. And three of these four were among the 13 jurisdictions which did not have designations of cases as gang or non-gang. This a priori designation was crucial to our applying bivariate and discriminant analyses to the data in Phases II and III. That so many jurisdictions with serious gang problems (serious enough to establish a gang unit) did not record their gang-related violent incidents as such came as a major surprise to us, and forced changes in our design. We were left with only nine appropriate jurisdictions. When we solicited cooperation from the chiefs in all nine, as well as facilitating court orders from the presiding juvenile court judge in each county, we obtained eight commitments and one chief's refusal. Three of the eight were in Southern and five in Northern

California. Two were selected for Phase II purposes, and these two were later combined with three others for Phase III purposes. The remaining three were omitted becase they were too similar to the patterns of the chosen five for Phase III purposes.[7]

Once the two Phase II cities were selected (one in the north, one in the south), a series of design issues required solution. Our goal was to sample 40 designated gang cases and an equal number of non-gang cases, spanning a one-year period, preferably 1984. The gang sample was taken from the gang unit's log of cases.

The non-gang sample was obtained from the station or offense logs including all violent incidents included in the gang designation listing (e.g., if the gang unit counted robbery or rape as a gang crime, then the non-gang sample source or log needed to include robbery or rape). Ideally, the non-gang sample would reflect the offense proportions in the gang case population (e.g., if 10% of the gang incidents were robberies, then 10% of the sampled non-gang offenses would be robberies). Both gang and non-gang sampled cases met the criterion of yielding at least one named or described suspect between the ages of ten and thirty years. Accommodations to these guidelines were required in each Phase II site; these are detailed in the pages below. Non-gang

---

7. On the basis of (1) number of gang personnel, (2) exclusive vs partial gang focus in the special unit, and (3) performance of the three functions of intelligence, surveillance, and investigation, the five chosen sites encompassed the full range of these dimensions of specialization. The three other sites added no new combinations, and resources for data collection were limited.

cases were not collected in the three sites used only for the Phase III analyses described in later sections of this report.

In Bergton, the Southern California city,[8] the transition from a predominantly middle-to-upper class city to a highly mixed area with steady immigration of minority populations is typical of many California areas. Bergton gang specialists estimate an average of 10 violent gang incidents per month. All violent (gang and non-gang) offenses recorded in a recent year included almost 30 homicides, 1300 assaults, and 1000 robberies. The once quiet streets of many areas in suburban Bergton are now troubled streets.

Gang incidents are more narrowly defined than in either Los Angeles jurisdiction. The special unit that handles gang matters prefers to limit labeling gang-related offenses as those involving known or suspected gang members on both the victim and assailant sides. Likely inclusions in gang offense recording are incidents identified directly by victim and assailant affiliation, or territorial location which leads to discovery of such affiliations. Thus Bergton has a more "pure" gang designation policy which might be expected to increase the differences between gang and non-gang differences in bivariate and discriminant analyses. Actual practice, however, rather notably departed from this exclusionary policy.

---

8. Pseudonyms are used for each of our cooperating jurisdictions.

Incidents were taken from logs for December 1983 through October 1984, omitting January and November 1984 because of inadequate gang entries for those months. The gang incident sample was drawn from the monthly reports of the special unit investigating gang cases (and selected other incidents). There were 88 gang cases, of which 72 met the criteria of violent offense, and an identified suspect between 10 and 30 years of age. From the Crimes Against Persons log, a comparable pool of 80 non-gang cases was established by random sampling. From these two pools, samples of 41 gang and 45 non-gang cases were randomly selected. A final reduction was necessitated by age restriction problems, lack of a clear violent offense, and absence of an identified victim. A final combined sample of 76 cases resulted from these procedures, evenly split between the gang and non-gang categories.

These cases, located variously in the investigators' files and in centralized record collections, were then coded by trained U.S.C. research personnel under supervision, using the coding manual appended to this report. In Bergton, police investigation data items were not included in the data collection form.[9] However, police clearance and prosecution filing rates were obtained.

---

9. The decision to include the two Phase II cities in the Phase III analyses took place after the Bergton data collection had been completed.

The second city, Valeton, is a northern California city with a more stable history of minority settlement, located in a generally less urbanized context than Bergton. Nonetheless, Valeton has a gang history of some years' duration, with from 25 to 35 groups noted by the police as "active" at a given time. Homicides average 36 per year over the last six year period, about one quarter of these being designated as gang-related.

In contrast to Bergton, the special unit in Valeton employs a broader definition of gang-related violent incidents, similar to that found in Los Angeles. A known or suspected gang member on either the victim or suspect side is sufficient to define the incident as gang-related. Indications of gang motives (retaliation, territorial imperatives) are also employed, but not systematically. In designating cases as gang-related, officers in the gang unit review all station incident reports and arrests, looking for names, areas, motives, and other indications of gang involvement. These incidents are then entered in the gang log along with others which may not have been reported formally to the police such as drive-by shooting episodes with unknown suspects.

This log for 1984 yielded a pool of 80 eligible violent gang incidents. A sample was drawn by selecting every other case, with contiguous case replacement for eight sampled incidents which later were revealed as ineligible (suspect ages not ascertainable, charges reclassified to non-sampled offense

categories, etc.). The final sample included 38 gang cases.[10]

Sampling of non-gang cases was more complex. To give the reader a feeling for the sorts of issues that typically arise in these situations, we quote directly from the field notes of the researcher who carried out the sampling procedure.

> "Non-gang sampling: I obtained separate logs for P.C.[11] 211/armed, 211/strongarm, and MISC (included 187, 664/187, 245, 246). The MISC log also contained 243 (battery), 207 (kidnapping), 244 (assault with caustic chemicals which I should have included but didn't), 451 (arson) -- these also's were not included. Only cases logged with suspect age within our range were included in sample. Age or estimate was fairly consistently entered on log (80%?) if there was any suspect info provided, but there was no way to check case files during sampling so if age wasn't on log, it didn't get included in the sample pool. The log containing sex offenses was not used (too few gang cases to make it worth it). As all three logs had many entries, I estimated the total number of eligible cases by taking an average per page and multiplying it (i.e. 211 armed: 49 pp x 5.5 incidents/page = 269; 211/strongarm: 59 pp x 6 incidents/page = 342; MISC: 510 count, not estimate). Since 74% of the gang sample pool were offenses represented in MISC log, I decided to sample 30 cases (30/40 = 75% total non-gang offenses), or every 17th eligible case, with a random start at the 297th case. The remaining 10 cases were taken by treating the two 211 logs as continuous, taking every 61st eligible case (estimated by page, systematically distributed across page), with a random start at the 720th eligible case. As these logs included gang cases as well, I used the gang log to reject any selected case that was gang, and replaced it with the first eligible non-gang case preceding the discarded case. While this procedure was convoluted and not strictly

---

10. Minor sampling errors -- e.g. omission of assault with intent to commit mayhem, robbery in an inhabited dwelling -- were excluded from the non-gang sampling pool to ensure comparability.

11. P.C. refers to Penal Code, e.g. p.c. 187 is murder, p.c. 245 is aggravated assault, p.c. 664/--- refers to attempts.

> random. I don't think there was a problem with representativeness.
> Beware: The non-gang sample from Valeton will have a (slightly) different proportion of offenses than did Bergton. While the Valeton non-gang offenses are roughly proportional to Valeton gang offenses, this is not true in Bergton. In Bergton, we drew the non-gang sample from the general Crimes Against Persons log which did not permit offense-based sampling (i.e. proportional representation) of offenses as emerged in gang sample. The projected result is proportionally more 211s in non-gang Bergton sample."

Following sampling, four cases were dropped during the coding process. Two were ineligible assaults on police officers, one turned out to be a false report, and another file contained too little information on the participants. Forty cases remained in the final non-gang coded sample.

Following a review of coding procedures and necessary data cleaning, the coded data from Bergton and Valeton were prepared for several sets of analysis for our Phase II interests.

External Validity

How effectively will the discriminant functions derived in Los Angeles apply to smaller cities? In a very real sense, the answer to this question provides a test of external validity, or the generalizability of Los Angeles gang findings to the situation in other, small cities now experiencing gang problems. Valeton and Bergton are quite different kinds of cities with similar gang problems yet somewhat dissimilar approaches to gang incident definition within their police departments. Combining the data from the two cities gives us stable numbers and broad representation, adequate for testing the generalizability of the

gang index variables.

We first applied to these new data the LAPD discriminant function with the LASD homicide weights, and then the LAPD function with the LAPD weights. In both cases, the classification success rates were derived for functions including as well as excluding the "cultural items" (Choloprz, Bndprz, Manifest -- see Table 1 footnotes). The first finding to report is that in the smaller cities, the cultural items proved to be useless. When they were included in the function, classification success of non-gang cases using LASD weights was 94.4% and using LAPD weights was 93.1%. However, the corresponding rates for gang cases was 45.6% in both instances. The cultural items appeared much less frequently in the Valeton/Bergton cases than was true in Los Angeles; while their presence in non-gang cases was minimal, yielding high classification success, their presence was relatively low even in gang cases.

Two probable explanations occur to us. First, smaller city gangs may not be as culturally distinct as they are in the more sophisticated traditional gang settings of Los Angeles. Second, patrolmen, detectives, and gang unit specialists in the smaller cities may not attend to and record items of argot and dress as uniformly as do their more gang-experienced counterparts in the Los Angeles Sheriff's and Police Departments. Both factors may be involved and are probably interactive. In any case, our analyses hereafter will omit the cultural items.

Our second finding constitutes a slight reversal of

expectations. In prior pages we reported that LAPD variables with LASD weights performed slightly better on the LASD non-homicide data than LAPD variables with LAPD weights. Applying both functions to the Valeton/Bergton data yields the reverse. As seen in Table 6, the data favor the use of the LAPD weights.

Table 6: Classification Rates with LAPD Function Applied to Valeton/Bergton Data

Source of Weights	Classification Success		
	Gang	Non-gang	Overall
LAPD Hom	79.4%	72.2%	75.7%
LASD Hom	45.6%	87.5%	67.1%

The overall classification success of the better set of weights (LAPD) is not as high as the cross-validation rates reported for Phase I analyses (see Table 2). However, it is higher than we had anticipated, given the conceptual and methodological leaps involved in moving from data taken from the nation's most gang-ridden city to two medium-sized cities with suburban reputations. To judge from these data, and limiting ourselves to incident and participant variables excluding cultural items, a police-based gang indicator index can be applied with utility to the distinction between gang and non-gang cases in both major urban areas and in the kinds of smaller cities where gang activity has become so prevalent of late.

Further verification comes in part from a comparison of the variables which enter the discriminant analyses of the LAPD, LASD, and Valeton/Bergton data. Table 7 displays the standardized coefficients for all four available sets of data; these are the original discriminant functions, derived from

Table 7: Variables and Standardized Coefficients for Four Data Sets (with rank orderings inserted)

Variables	LASD Homicide	LASD Non-Homicide	LAPD Homicide	Valeton/Bergton*
Mean Age of Suspects	-.491 (1)	-.539 (1)	-.736 (1)	-.759 (1)
Predominantly Hisp/Blk Suspects	+.415 (2)	+.244 (4)	-.248 (3)	+.260 (4)
Street Location	+.322 (3)	+.125 (11)	-	-
No. of Participants on Suspect Side	+.307 (4)	+.354 (2)	+.196 (6)	+.209 (5)
Presence of Gun	+.279 (5)	+.128 (10)	+.238 (4)	+.107 (7)
Mean Age of Victims	-.237 (6)	-.109 (13)	-.342 (2)	-.281 (3)
Proportion of Male Suspects	+.185 (7)	+.166 (7)	+.218 (5)	+.073 (8)
No Prior Contact between Suspect and Victim	+.164 (8)	+.194 (6)	+.189 (7)	-
Number of Participants on Victim Side	+.156 (9)	+.121 (12)	-.063 (9)	+.171 (6)
Associated Violent Charges	+.152 (10)	-	-	-
Mean Age Difference between Suspect and Victim	+.113 (11)	-	-	-
Automobile Involved	-	+.155 (8)	+.188 (8)	+.299 (2)
Differrence in Proportion of Males, Suspect & Victim	-	-.088 (14)	-	-
Proportion Hispanic or Black Victims	-	+.153 (9)	-	-
Robbery as a Case Offense	-	+.266 (3)	-	-
Number Case Offenses	-	+.205 (5)	-	-

* In the case of Valeton/Bergton, the coefficients are based on LAPD variables with Valeton/Bergton weights. When we reviewed the Valeton/Bergton bivariate gang/non-gang differences to select variables for the discriminant analysis, the result was a list of variables nearly identical to the variables in the LAPD function. Therefore, the fourth column is quite similar to an independent discriminant function derived for Valeton/Bergton. Only the no-prior-contact variable would not have entered an independent discriminant analysis; the gang/non-gang difference was not significant.

separate analyses of each data set and based on setting and participant variables, rather than the functions obtained in the validation analyses.

There is a good deal of consistency in these data. Most variables turn out to be discriminators in most instances. In all the data, there are only two sign reversals. In all four data sets mean age of suspects emerges as the best discriminator. The rank order correlations between columns range from +.59 to +.84, all significant beyond the .05 level. The highest correlation of +.84 is between the LAPD Homicide and Valeton/Bergton functions.

We may conclude from Table 7, then, some confirmation of the generalizability of findings across jurisdictions. However, the level of variation among the rankings of the variables in the four data sets makes us cautious about the <u>particular</u> weights in the case of any variable other than mean age of suspects. If these data were used to construct a predictive index, i.e. an index to discriminate between gang-related and other cases, it would be wise to assign equal weight to each variable (with the reasonable exception of mean age of suspects) rather than to attempt differential weighting. One might also simplify such an index by omitting variables with consistently low rankings.

Before leaving this issue of generalizability, there is one additional result to be considered, but we will approach it by a rather circuitous route. Looking back at Table 7, we need to point out that the last column, reporting Valeton/Bergton standardized coefficients, employs the LAPD <u>function</u>. This means

that the variables with which the coefficients are associated in the last column were derived from our LAPD analyses. Thus it is not too surprising to find a number of variables from the total list which did not appear in the Valeton/Bergton discriminant analysis. But what is not evident is that some other variables might appear in an independent discriminant analysis of the Valeton/Bergton data that did not relate to the LAPD variables. It seems worthwhile, then, to undertake such a final discriminant analysis.

However, a circuitous route is required so that we might first look more closely at the similarities and differences in operating variables between the Los Angeles jurisdictions and those in the other five cities in our Phase III analysis. There are three sets of data to describe; bivariate gang/non-gang comparisons in Valeton/Bergton, univariate data in all five smaller cities, and the "cultural" variables commonly associated with gang incidents which we noted earlier were less commonly found in the investigation files of our five cities than in the LASD and LAPD files.

a. Bivariate Comparisons: Gang/non-gang differences in the LASD non-homicide sample were compared with those in Valeton and Bergton, combined. The three variables with the strongest differences in the LASD data were also the strongest in the Valeton/Bergton data, namely (1) mean age of suspects, (2) the number of participants on the suspect's side, and (3) total number of participants. However, this similarity stopped with

the first three variables as nonsignificant differences and widely divergent rank-ordering of variables appeared thereafter in the Valeton/Bergton data. Of 20 variables yielding significant gang/non-gang differences in the LASD data, only 9 did so in the Valeton/Bergton data, while 5 significant differences emerged on variables in the latter which did not in the former. Clearly then, a new sense of caution must be entered in our search for external validity.

b. Univariate Comparisons: In the simplest of comparisons, how do LASD gang non-homicide data compare to those from all five nonLos Angeles cities?[12] The picture is mixed. On a number of variables the LASD and five-city data are virtually indistinguishable. This includes:

Mean age of suspects

Number of participants

Time of day

Location

Cases with injuries

---

12. In addition to Valeton and Bergton, these include "Seaside," a large urban center, "Salton," a smaller but well-known urban center, and "Solaris," an inland city less well-known nationally but prominent in the California scene. All three of these additional jurisdictions contain large minority communities and a broad mix of demographic and occupational status. They have gang details in units of from two to ten persons, initiated in the late 1970s and early 1980s in response to gangs appearing a few years earlier in each case. Designations of gang-related crimes in all three are limited to violence--mostly assaults and robberies. In one case, gang-related incidents are defined by a suspect's gang membership, while in the other two, either suspect or victim may be sufficient. None of these operational definitions are as broad as those used in Los Angeles.

Cases with unknown suspects

Proportion of male suspects

On other variables, there are substantial differences:

Relationship between suspect and victim

Auto involvement

Number of associated offenses

Number of weapons

Presence of firearms

Presence of other weapons

Somewhat surprisingly, one discernible pattern is that the five-city data suggest more violent incidents--more guns, more other weapons, with more conflict involving autos, involving suspects and victims known to each other. This is the pattern associated with gang homicides in Los Angeles. This may reflect characteristics of small city gangs, but it may also reflect more restrictive gang definitions and gang designation practices in these jurisdictions. In either case, the data add yet another caution to claims of direct external validity.

c. Cultural Indicators: We noted earlier, with respect to the application of the LAPD and LASD discriminant functions to the Valeton/Bergton data, that the cultural items appeared less frequently in the smaller cities and reduced the classification success of these functions. This raises the question of whether or not to include the cultural items in the Valeton/Bergton discriminant analysis. The question was asked of "motive" items (retaliation, previous conflict, territoriality, etc.),

"behavioral" items (gang name calling, drive-bys, location in gang areas, cruising, etc.) and "gang culture" items (tatoos, distinctive clothing items, use of gang argot, other physical evidence, etc.).

In the gang/non-gang comparisons in Valeton and Bergton, only 5 out of 43 measured items attained statistical significance. The mean number of incidents in which each of the 43 appeared in the investigation was just under eleven per cent, i.e., any item, on the average, appeared in the file less than 11 percent of the time, with the range being from zero to 39 per cent. Clearly these items, which had proved useful in Los Angeles, are relatively uncommon in these two smaller cities.

The correlation between these rates of appearance in Valeton and Bergton with those for the other three cities combined was a relatively strong +.73. Thus, had we collected gang/non-gang comparisons in those three as well, the chances seem quite good that a similar absence of significant differences would have emerged. The mean percentage of appearance was exactly 11 per cent, virtually identical to that in Valeton and Bergton.

The upshot of all this is, first, to reinforce the cautions about generalizing from Los Angeles to small cities and, second, to make it quite clear that the cultural items should not be included in the discriminant analysis to be applied to the Valeton/Bergton data. The possibility that new cultural items would appear and be important in these cities was dispelled by the data collection process; few new items appeared, and none

appeared frequently. Thus we can now proceed to the issue of a final discriminant analysis.

Valeton/Bergton Discriminant Analysis

The perceptive reader may already have foreseen the contents of this section. Referring back to Table 7 and the discussion following it, it may be recalled that the LAPD Homicide variables are exactly the same as those emerging from the bivariate analyses of the Valeton/Bergton data with the exception of the no-prior-contact variable. Table 7 already reports the use of the Valeton/Bergton weights on these variables. Further, we have noted the non-utility of the gang culture items in the Valeton/Bergton data, so there are no new variables to be entered into an independent discriminant analysis.

What we have found, then, is that to all intents and purposes the final column in Table 7 actually represents an "independent" discriminant analysis of the Valeton/Bergton data. The discriminant function consists of the variables for which a standardized coefficient is listed in the last column of Table 7. The classification success is roughly 76%, as depicted in Table 6. There is, as it happens, no point in undertaking a separate discriminant analysis. The results are already in hand, however inadvertently.

Phase III

In our report of the earlier project (Klein, Maxson, and Gordon, 1984), we reported some analyses relating gang unit involvement to investigative thoroughness and arrest rates. In

the Sheriff's Department, the data suggested that homicide cases directly involving the gang unit received somewhat more thorough investigations and somewhat higher proportions of suspect arrests. The non-homicide cases did not present as clear a picture. More importantly, the Los Angeles Police Department data failed to show the same evidence relating unit involvement to investigative outcome. Since the two departments had gang units with both structural and functional differences of some note, Phase III of the current project was designed to look further into this issue.

The five smaller jurisdictions were selected, in part, to represent a wide range of approaches to gang unit structure and function. With arrest rates and prosecution filing rates collected in all five, as well as investigative variables collected in four of the five,[13] we positioned ourselves to assess the effects of amount and type of gang unit involvement on the outcome of gang-related cases. Clearly, there would be important policy implications of findings relating kind or volume of unit involvement to arrests and filing rates. Differences in investigative thoroughness would presumably help to explain such relationships.

We provide below brief sketches of the five units so the reader may get some feeling for their contrasting approaches.

---

13. Bergton, due to some changes in research methodology during the project, did not have investigative variables extracted from its files. It had not originally been planned to include it in the Phase III analyses.

1. Bergton: The unit varies in size from eight to twelve part-time officers; gangs are one of several assignments. These are both uniformed and plain clothes officers serving under the Patrol Division. Their functions involve intelligence and surveillance, but not investigation (thus the absence of investigative variable collection in Bergton is not of much importance).

2. Valeton: There are two plain clothes officers in the unit. One is full-time, devoted to intelligence functions only, while the other has a supervisory role -- supposedly full-time in gang affairs, but in practice less than that. The unit is lodged in the Juvenile Division.

3. Salton: The unit consists of a Sergeant and two full-time gang officers. They are plain clothes detectives, not in Juvenile. They serve all three functions of intelligence, surveillance, and case investigation.

4. Seaside: The unit varies in size from eight to ten plain clothes investigators, located outside of Juvenile. They are all full-time gang officers serving all three functions of intelligence, surveillance, and investigation.

5. Solaris: The unit consists of from one to three plain clothes officers, with size being rather cyclical depending upon other pressures. It is not uncommon for these officers to be assigned to other duties, leaving gaps in both service and recording of gang matters. They serve under the Patrol Division, doing principally intelligence and surveillance functions.

Table 8 summarizes the placement of the five units on dimensions of importance to our concerns. As can be seen, the five jurisdictions have both common and unique features.

Table 8: Five Gang Units Compared

	Bergton	Valeton	Salton	Seaside	Solaris
Size	Large	Small	Small	Large	Small
Placement	Patrol	Juvenile	Detective	Detective	Patrol
Full-time Gang	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Intelligence	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Surveillance	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Investigation	No	No	Yes	Yes	No

There should be some interesting contrasts here. For instance, Bergton and Solaris are identical except for size. Valeton and Salton are similar except for their functional assignments. Salton and Seaside are the only units with clear investigation mandates, and should therefore yield more thorough investigating and, presumably, higher arrest and filing rates. The reader will see other patterns as well.

To investigate our Phase III interests, data were gathered from a target number of 40 gang cases in each jurisdiction; the actual numbers, as displayed in the tables below, varied as a function of case peculiarities, log/file charge discrepancies, missing information, low numbers of cases (Solaris), and underestimates (Salton). Our analytic intention was to undertake a multiple regression analysis with gang unit type as the independent variable, indices of investigative thoroughness as intervening variables, and arrest and filing rates as dependent variables. The "ganginess" of the cases was anticipated as a control variable, depending upon the outcome of the Phase II analyses.

Comparative Data

Our hopes for the Phase III analyses have not been realized for the most part. The expectation that different organizational forms -- types of gang units -- would result in manifestly different outcomes is not supported by the data. Table 9 reports the results for arrest rates, and Tables 10 and 11 for prosecution filing rates.

Table 9: Gang Case Arrest Rates in Five Cities

	Bergton	Valeton	Salton	Seaside	Solaris
Open or Inactive*	8	17	15	12	14
Arrest or Charges Filed	30(79)**	21(55)**	26(63)**	25(68)**	20(59)**
Missing	0	0	6	1	0
TOTAL	38	38	47	38	34

* Investigation continuing; insufficient information; uncooperative victims.
** Percentages represent cases with arrests or charges filed over the total cases minus those missing.

Table 10: Gang Case Prosecution Rates in Five Cities

	Bergton	Valeton	Salton	Seaside	Solaris
No filing	14	18	18	14	19
Charges filed	18(56)*	16(47)*	14(44)*	21(60)*	12(39)*
Missing data	6	4	15	3	3
TOTAL	38	38	47	38	34

* Percentages represent cases with one or more filings over the total cases minus those missing.

Table 11: Gang Case Prosecution Rates Among Cases with Arrests or Charges Filed (from Table 9)

Bergton	Valeton	Salton	Seaside	Solaris
60%	76%	54%	84%	60%

We note two general features of these tables. First, there is not as much variance in these outcome variables as we had hoped to see, leaving not much room for differential effects of gang unit

involvement. Second, discerning any consistent pattern among the five cities is very difficult. For instance:

1. The two largest units, Bergton and Seaside, have the highest arrest rates but only Seaside has a high filing ratio (Table 11).

2. Those with the highest filing ratios, Valeton and Seaside, seem to have nothing in common organizationally.

3. The units which engage in investigative functions, Salton and Seaside, have the highest and the lowest filing rates and only middle-range arrest rates.

4. The three units with commitments of full-time gang officers -- Valeton, Salton, and Seaside -- show no consistent patterns of arrests or filing ratios.

In sum, there is not all that much to be said about widely varying outcome rates nor about differential relationships to the organizational dimensions we have used to characterize the units. Another approach to the issue is to compare cases which were handled by the gang units with those which were not. Our data collection procedure included this information in each set of files. However, once again the data present us with a problem, as seen in Table 12.

Table 12: Gang Unit Involvement in Gang Cases

Level of Involvement	Bergton	Valeton	Salton	Seaside	Solaris
No mention	*	30	11	2	12
Copies sent to G. U.	*	1	0	0	13
G.U. used as resource	*	1	8	0	2
Active G.U. involvement	*	6	28	36	7
	*	38	47	38	34

* Data not collected, but Bergton officers are part-time and not detailed to act as investigators in any case.

Comparing unit-involved to non-unit-involved cases within Bergton cannot be done, and within Valeton and Seaside also is fruitless

because there is so little variance. The distributions in the table for Salton and Solaris, however, do hold some promise, so analyses were undertaken within those two departments. Taken separately, neither presents a clear picture of the relationship between gang unit involvement and case outcome; the numbers are too small. When one combines the data from Salton and Solaris, the data in Tables 13 and 14 emerge.

Table 13: Gang Unit Involvement and Case Clearance by Arrest, Salton plus Solaris

	Missing	Not Cleared	Uncooperative Victim	Cleared by Arrest
No unit Involvement	0	3	6	14
Passive Involvement*	1	8	2	13
Active Involvement*	5	5	5	19

* Passive involvement means the unit received report copies, or was used for identifications, or unit supervisors signed off on reports. Active involvement means that unit officers were directly involved in case investigation.

The data in Table 13 show no particular pattern, and no strong support for the efficacy of active unit involvement. One can attempt to increase the Ns by collapsing columns, or collapsing rows, but these procedures do not help. Not surprisingly, then, the prosecution's filing rates are similarly unimpressive, as seen in Table 14.

Table 14: Gang Unit Involvement and Prosecution Filings, Salton plus Solaris

	Missing	Not Filed	Accepted or Filed
No Unit Involvement	4	12	7
Passive Involvement	4	13	7
Active Involvement	10	12	12

In sum, then, the data suggest that neither organizational form (as represented by the five departments) nor level of gang unit involvement in case investigation relates meaningfully to case outcome as measured in this project. For policy purposes, this is of course a discouraging finding. Explaining it is difficult. Perhaps the cases are not so difficult that special expertise is needed. Perhaps the available gang expertise and intelligence does not add appreciably to normal investigative processes. Perhaps smaller city gangs do not differ from non-gang perpetrators enough to warrant special attention, although our prior data seem to suggest otherwise.

The only additional light we might bring to bear on this question is the data on inter-city differences on case information variables. We can ascertain whether the five stations and their contrasting approaches to gang matters are associated with differences on variables related to investigative thoroughness. We will display two sets of variables, those for which the case files yielded evidence for presence of the item (Table 15) and those for which the case files yielded measurable levels of presence (Table 16).

Table 15: Presence of Investigative Items

	Bergton	Valeton	Salton	Seaside	Solaris
a. Was a Search Warrant Obtained?	n.a.	0%	0%	3%	6%
b. Was there Analysis of Physical Evidence?	n.a.	11%	40%	21%	26%
c. Was There a Described Suspect?	n.a.	97%	87%	82%	85%
d. Was There a Named Suspect?	n.a.	45%	79%	47%	59%
e. Was There an Available Suspect Location?	n.a.	42%	72%	47%	62%
f. Can the Suspect be Identified?	n.a.	61%	83%	55%	71%
g. Is There Evidence of D.A. Involvement in the Investigation?*	n.a.	0%	9%	8%	12%

* Each of the five cities was in a county with an "Operation Hardcore," a special vertical prosecution unit in the D.A.s office assigned to gang cases.

Table 16: Means on Five Investigative Items

	Bergton	Valeton	Salton	Seaside	Solaris
h. Total Number of Interviews	n.a.	10.08	9.60	9.50	9.62
i. Number of Informant Interviews	n.a.	4.03	4.09	2.05	4.44
j. Pages of Investigation	n.a.	12.53	24.36	17.50	15.79
k. Number of Designated Victims	1.45	1.34	1.30	1.58	1.03
l. Number of Designated Suspects	2.84	2.92	2.04	2.74	2.55

Tables 15 and 16 again present us with data distribution problems. Some variables, for example a. and g., simply are too low for any utility. Others, such as c., h., and l. have such low variance that they too are of little use. All of the variables in Table 16 have such large standard errors (not shown) that even the occasional outstanding differences are of little value (for example, the Salton pages of investigation and the Solaris designated victims).

One station seems to stand out on several of the variables. Salton is higher on physical evidence analyzed, named and located and identified suspects, and pages of investigation. This should lead to higher arrest and filing rates -- Salton, it will be recalled, had a gang unit located in the detective division and served all three functions of intelligence, surveillance, and investigation. Yet Tables 9, 10, and 11 reveal that Salton does not show the expected superiority in arrest or filing rates. Further, Seaside, the city which seemed highest on the case outcome variables and had all of Salton's advantages plus a large gang unit, fails to stand out in any way in the investigative variables. In short, whatever may be the reasons for the absence of relationship between gang unit involvement and case outcome, the case for the investigative procedures as an intervening variable cannot be made.

Summary and Conclusion

This project has fulfilled most of our desires for learning more about the generalizability of data from traditional big city gangs to gangs in smaller cities now facing up to gang problems. We have cross-validated the gang descriptors across big city jurisdictions, and found them applicable to a significant degree in the smaller cities.

However, a practical aim of the project cannot be achieved, namely the development of useful training materials for officers in these smaller cities. Our data suggest that the sorts of distinctive cultural indicators of gang cases found in Los Angeles are generally not found in the smaller cities. Officers cannot be trained to be sensitive to non-existent discriminators. Further, the variables which emerge from the discriminant analysis (see Table 7) are, with the exception of mean age of suspects, not very effective discriminators, yielding in all a classification success between gang and non-gang cases about halfway between perfection and pure chance (see Table 6). Little special training is needed to tell officers, "Watch for a larger number of younger suspects and victims with firearms and a car."

Perhaps this limited sort of guideline is precisely what explains the failure of gang unit involvement to result in better case outcomes; we may have statistically significant differences that are insignificant for practical purposes. If gang units cannot make a difference in these smaller cities, including those that are actively involved in case investigations, there is little reason to think that specialized gang training for patrol officers can yield much of practical value to their departments.

In making these statements, we do not wish to imply that the smaller city gangs are not "real" gangs. Analysis of the incidents recorded by the five police departments confirms the existence and seriousness of these groups. A most valuable future research enterprise would be a field study of smaller city gangs to establish similarities and differences in gang structure compared to big city gangs. If the structures are similar and the level of gang-related crime serious, then a legitimate question could be raised about the utility of maintaining specialized gang units in the forms we have described in this report. Our Los Angeles experience has made us proponents of gang specialization in such a traditional gang area; our data in the current project do not allow us, as yet, to be equally sanguine about such specialization in smaller gang cities.

References

Klein, Malcolm W., Margaret A. Gordon, and Cheryl L. Maxson, "The impact of police investigations on police-reported rates of gang and non-gang homicdes." Criminology, 1986, 4: 489-512.

Klein, Malcolm W., Cheryl L. Maxson, and Margaret A. Gordon, Evaluation in an Imported Gang Violence Deterrence Program: Final Report. University of Southern California, 1984 (mimeo).

Stapleton, William Vaughn and Jerome A. Needle. Police Handling of Youth Gangs. Sacramento: American Justice Institute, 1982.

APPENDIX: DATA COLLECTION/CODING INSTRUMENTS AND MANUALS

Violent Incident Data Collection Form

Violent Incident Data Collection Manual

Group Indicators Coding Form

Group Indicators Coding Manual

Project I.D. _____

VIOLENT INCIDENT DATA COLLECTION FORM

1. Project ID# | | | | | |

2. Station | | |

3. Site (if not station) |

4. Collection date | | | | | | |

5. Data collector | | |

6. File location information: _____

_____

_____

_____

7. Date of incident | | | | | | |

8. Prior gang designation |

9. Incident setting,
if other (3), specify: _____ |

_____

10. Time of incident: _____ |

11. Amount of property loss | | | | |

Project I.D. _____

12. Auto involvement
if involved (1), specify: _____ [ ]

_____

13. Number firearms [ ][ ]

14. Number other weapons
Specify type and number: _____ [ ][ ]

_____

15. Victim/Offender relationship
if other (2), specify: _____ [ ]

_____

16. Case offenses (number of each type)

a) Homicide (PC 187) [ ][ ]

b) Assaults [ ][ ]
Attempted murder (PC 217, 664/187)
Conspiracy to commit murder (PC 182/187)
Assault with deadly weapon (PC 245)
Assault with intent to commit felony (PC 220-222)
Other felonious assaults (Mayhem - PC 203;
administering poison - PC 216; caustic
chemicals - PC 244; spousal assault - PC 273.5;
assault and battery - PC 240-243)

c) Robbery (PC 211) [ ][ ]

d) Shooting into inhabited dwelling (PC 246) [ ][ ]

e) Sexual assaults [ ][ ]
Rape (PC 261-264)
Sodomy (PC 286)

f) Weapons possession (PC 417, PC 12020-12034 [ ][ ]

g) Drug possession or sale
Specify drug type and offense (including H & S code):

_____

_____

h) Other including kidnapping (PC 207-210), other sexual assaults (PC 288-289), burglary (PC 459), vehicle code violations, etc. Specify type and offense, including code: _____

_____

_____

_____

17. Number victims injured

18. Most serious victim injury

19. Number participants on suspect side

20. Number participants on victim side

21. a) Retaliation motive

b) Gang
if "1", quote _____

22. a) Previous conflict motive

b) Gang
if "1", quote _____

Project I.D. _____

23. a) Property motive ☐

b) Gang ☐
if "1", quote _____

24. a) Territory motive ☐

b) Gang ☐
if "1", quote _____

25. a) Identity challenge ☐

b) Gang ☐
if "1", quote _____

26. a) Sexual motive ☐

b) Gang ☐
if "1", quote _____

27. a) Other motive ☐
if "1", quote: _____
_____

b) Gang ☐
if "1", quote _____

28. a) Altercation ☐
if "1", quote _____
_____

b) Gang ☐
if "1", quote _____

Project I.D. _____

2. a) Witness/victim intimidation
if "1", specify: _____ ☐

_____

b) Gang
if "1", qucte _____ ☐

3. Police clearance status ☐

3. Prosecution clearance status ☐

Project I.D. _____

GROUP INDICATORS

Quote or describe all references that indicate, or possibly indicate, group involvement in incident. Document source and object of statement.

Group label/form of address (e.g., cholo; homeboy/homie; cuz; blood; veterano, vato; lowrider)

Slang/behavior terms (e.g., group declarations of "where are you from?" shouted during incident; drive-by; gang-banger(ing); hoorahing; cruising; flying colors; handsignals; backup; partner; hangout/turf/hood)

Costume/physical evidence (e.g., bandana/handkerchief/headband/rag; describe any tatoo; pendleton; beanie/ watchcap; describe any group names on clothes or personal property; hairnet)

Group affiliations (participants or non-participants)

Denial of group affiliations

Physical setting (e.g., incident occurred in known group area; previous group activity in area; individuals linked to group areas/hangouts; graffitti in area)

Other group indications (e.g., information about specific gangs--territorial boundaries, characteristic criminal activity, rivalry or lack of with other groups-- or gangs in general; other group-related conflicts previous or subsequent to the incident)

Project I.D. _____

40. Total interviews/contacts [ ][ ]

41. Informant interviews/contacts [ ][ ]

42. Total pages of investigation [ ][ ][ ]

43. Gang unit involved: _____ Level: [ ]

44. Search warrant [ ]

45. Evidence analyzed [ ]

46. Suspect described [ ]

47. Suspect named [ ]

48. Suspect location [ ]

49. Suspect identified [ ]

50. D.A. involved [ ]

Project I.D. _____

51. Investigation efforts: _____

Project I.D. _____

Designated Participant Information

	Initials	32 Designation	33 Age	34 Gender	35 Ethnicity	36 Affiliation, specify	37 Arrested	38 Charged
1								
2								
3								
4								
5								
6								
9								
10								
11								
12								

VIOLENT INCIDENT DATA COLLECTION MANUAL
(Phase 2 and 3)

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS: Always write clearly. Check any unclear situations or problems with data collector supervisor and carefully document problems along with any decisions made with supervisor in field. When specifying "other", give clear and complete description. Unless otherwise stated, use "0" code only for specific mention of "none"; use "9" or "99" if information is missing or not mentioned. Consult supervisor if there is ambiguity in determining our incident or if multiple incidents are included in file. Beware the following distinctions:

a) Designated participants - Labels of "victim" or "suspect" by police, if designation between victims and suspects is not clear or consistent, consult supervisor.

b) Participants/non-participants - distinction made during collection. This refers to people on scene of crime and may include designated participants, witnesses, and others. Factors of temporal sequence and physical proximity are considered. It is necessary to determine sides, i.e., participants on suspect's side and participants on victim side. Consult supervisor for helping in deciding whether to call individuals participants, and on which side.

1. Project ID#	Assigned by supervisor
2. Station	Assigned by supervisor
3. Site (if not in station)	Assigned by supervisor
4. Collection date	List collection date by month, day, and year.
5. Data collector	To be assigned to each data collector.
6. File location information	List file identification number(s) and other information used to locate file (e.g., victim's name). Note related case file numbers where relevant. Always include logged offense.
7. Date of incident	List date incident occurred by month, day, and year. If exact date is unknown, use date reported and indicate as such on coding form. Do not use date of death as incident date, unless they are the same.
8. Prior gang designation	(Completed in office by supervisor) 0 = Non-gang 1 = Gang
9. Incident setting	Code setting of victim at time of receiving injury, or if not known, consult supervisor. 1 = Street (includes car setting, if car is (on street) 2 = Residence, includes yard & driveway, as well as sidewalk or curb if the house is meaningful to the situation, apartment. 3 = Other, specify 9 = Missing; information not available

10. Time of incident

Code time incident occurred.
If time of report or discovery is given, but you can deduce the incident time from reports, etc., use that figure.
Record military time.

1 = 12:00 (midnight) - 2:59 a.m.
2 = 3:00 - 5:59 a.m.
3 = 6:00 - 8:59 a.m.
4 = 9:00 - 11:59 a.m.
5 = 12:00 (noon) - 2:59 p.m.
6 = 3:00 - 5:59 p.m.
7 = 6:00 - 8:59 p.m.
8 = 9:00 - 11:59 p.m.
9 = Missing; information not available

11. Amount of property loss

Code the total dollar amount specified.
Do not include damage to property. Do not estimate loss if unspecified. Round to nearest whole dollar. Code "0"s if no property was taken during incident; code "9"s if there's reason to believe that property was taken, but amount is not specified.

12. Automobile involvement

If auto (or other motorized vehicle) mentioned in incident, code "1" and describe nature of involvement (shooting occurred from car; vehicle part of incident setting; means of arrival or escape; an element of precipitating situation, etc.).

0 = Statement of no involvement
1 = Auto involvement, specify
9 = None mentioned

13. Number firearms

Code number of firearms present or used in incident. If none mentioned, code "00 except if injury indicates presence, code "99".

14. Number other weapons

Code total number of other (than firearms) weapons present or used in incident. Excludes body parts, but in case of non-weapon cause of injury, note on form but do not count. Specify type and number of each type if known; where number is unknown, count one for each weapon type, or two if reference is plural (e.g., "rocks"). If number of some weapons is known and others not, count those known and add one for each unknown type. Specify accompanying number of each type in parenthesis.
If no other (than firearms) weapons mentioned code "00" except if injury indicates presence, code "99".

15. Victim/Offender relationship

Code prior, personal relationship between primary (injured) victim and offender (not necessarily designated participants). If absent, but a relationship can be established between any other opposing participants, code other ("2") and specify. Minimal familiarity such as visual or identity recognition only; minimal prior contact (e.g., previous incident); or prior contact that only immediately precedes incident should be coded as other ("2") and specified.

0 = Stated lack of prior relationship; stranger
1 = Clear prior relationship; personal connection; relationship exists by virtue of time duration or degree of contact; contact beyond minimal familiarity
2 = Other, specify
3 = If not "0", clear grounds for assuming no prior contact
9 = Missing; information not available

16. Case offenses (number of each type)

Case offenses describe discrete offenses occurring during the incident. For each offense type that occurs code the number of such offenses in the box for the appropriate offense category. The report heading is the most common source for determining what the police consider to be case offenses. Additional case offenses may be derived from narratives of police (not D.A.) charges against suspects (see warrants, booking forms, arrest reports, etc.). However, suspect charges are not the same as case offenses. For example, suspect charges may be for offenses unrelated to our incident, for offenses already included, by definition, in the report heading offense (e.g., Armed Robbery includes carrying weapon), or for offenses that, in effect, replace the report heading offense(s) (e.g., a suspect in an ADW case charged for discharging firearm instead of ADW). In general, suspect charges different from report heading offense(s) are questionable unless they are in addition to the case offense. Check with a supervisor.

If no mention of type, code "0" for that type. For categories with multiple offenses (i.e., assaults, sexual assaults, weapons, drugs, & other), count the number of separate offenses (within the category) that are case offenses, and circle or note each offense on form. For example, one incident could include both ADW and attempted murder as discrete offenses (but not on the same victim); code "02" for assault category and circle ADW and attempt murder.

17. Number victims injured

Count the number of designated victims injured. Consult supervisor for ambiguous injury cases. Code "0" if you determine that no victims were injured.

18. Most serious victim injury

Code the most serious injury sustained or medical treatment required (in addition to death, if homicide).

0 = No victims injured (see #17)
1 = Injury, but no medical attention received or extent received unknown
2 = Obtained medical attention but no hospital treatment
3 = Hospital treatment, no hospitalization
4 = Hospital treatment, unclear whether hospitalization
6 = Death
5 = Hospitalization
9 = Missing; information not available

In coding Participant Variables, it is necessary to establish side and degree of involvement in incident. Factors of temporal sequence and physical proximity are considered in this process. Beware of cases where designation between suspects and victims is not clear. Refer these to supervisor.

19. Number of participants on suspect side

Count the number of participants (includes designated suspects if on scene and those clearly allied with suspects) on suspect side. Use all reports for best estimate. If range is given, take average, or if necessary, lowest. Suspects on two sides should be pointed out to supervisor.

20. Number of participants on victim side

Count the number of participants (includes designated victims if on scene and those clearly allied with victims) on victim side. Use all reports for best estimate. If range is given, take average, or if necessary, lowest. Victims on two sides should be pointed out to supervisor. Institutions are not included in victim count.

Determine the motive(s) leading to the crime. While more than one motive is possible, multiple motives should represent separate and distinct pieces of information. For motives that are obvious, clearly stated or most primary code "1". Code "2" for possible motives, motives that are ambiguously related to the incident, or motives that are secondary (e.g., not between the principal participants, or background or history to our incident, except where retaliation or previous conflict is the primary motive). Retaliation motives should be clearly stated as such (e.g., "this incident is in retaliation for—or in response to—a prior shooting," etc.). Previous conflict should not be coded with retaliation motive unless distinct. Altercation should not be coded unless none of the other motive categories apply or they are secondary or ambiguous. Specify altercation. Write notes on form to provide clarification; if conflicting or ambiguous information, consult supervisor.

21.	a)	Retaliation motive	Code "1" if retaliation for a specific prior (separate from our incident) event is stated as motive. Code "2" if retaliation is stated but ambiguously linked to our incident. Code "9" for no mention.
	b)	Gang	If nature of retaliation motive is clearly specified as gang-related, code "1" and quote statement; else code "9" for no mention.
22.	a)	Previous conflict motive	If retaliation not stated as motive, code "1" if there is a history of previous violence or conflict (i.e., feud, rivalry, chronic conflict) that provides a motive for this incident. Code "2" if previous conflict is ambiguous as a motive or is a secondary motive. Code "9" if no mention.
	b)	Gang	If nature of previous conflict is clearly specified as gang-related, code "1" and quote statement; else code "9" for no mention.
23.	a)	Property motive	Code "1" if property acquisition or defense is the motive. Code "2" if ambiguous or secondary. Property is distinguished from territorial motives in that property will usually involve objects, money, etc. Code "9" for no mention.
	b)	Gang	If nature of property motive is clearly specified as gang-related, code "1" and quote statement; else code "9" for no mention.
24.	a)	Territory motive	Code "1" if territory (e.g., acquisition or defense of perceived turf or neighborhood) is the motive. Code "2" if ambiguous or secondary; else code "9" for no mention. Beware overlap with identity challenges; consult supervisor.
	b)	Gang	If nature of territory motive is clearly specified as gang-related, code "1" and quote statement; else code "9" for no mention.

25. a)	Identity challenge	Code "1" if identity challenge (e.g., "where are you from?"), or participant's group affiliation(s) (e.g., group names yelled during incident) is the motive. Code "2" if challenge or affiliation is ambiguous as a motive or a secondary motive. Code "9" for no mention. Beware overlap with territory motive; consult supervisor.
b)	Gang	If nature of identity challenge or group affiliation motive is clearly specified as gang-related, code "1" and quote statement; else code "9" for no mention.
26. a)	Sexual motives	Code "1" if sexual (between two genders; rape or sexual assaults) motive. Code "2" if ambiguous or secondary. Code "9" for no mention.
b)	Gang	If nature of sexual motive is clearly specified as gang-related, code "1" and quote statement; else code "9" for no mention.
27. a)	Other motive	If motive is stated to be other than 21-26 and excludes a situational altercation, (e.g., drugs, girl/boy friend), code "1" and specify. Code "2" for ambiguous or secondary other motives. Code "9" for no mention.
b)	Gang	If nature of other motive is clearly specified as gang-related, code "1" and quote statement; else code "9" for no mention.
28. a)	Altercation	If none of the above (21-27) motive categories apply and incident results from situational altercation (e.g., immediate physical and/or verbal conflict, with no prior history of violence; escalation of counteraggressive acts; physical responses to personal insults or affronts; intervention into ongoing conflict), code "1". Code "2" if the altercation is ambiguous as a motive for our incident or is a secondary motive. Code "9" for no mention.
b)		If altercation is clearly specified as gang-related, code "1" and quote statement; else code "9" for no mention.

29. a) Witness/Victim intimidation

Describe any indication of witness or victim intimidation (e.g., hesitancy or refusal to testify or co-operate through expressed fear of retaliation). Describe any threats made against participants or witnesses including actual attempts at intimidation or retaliation. Code "1" for any indication of intimidation/threat/attempt. Code "9" for no mention.

b) Gang

If nature of intimidation is clearly specified as gang-related, code "1" and quote statement; else code "9" for no mention.

30. Police clearance status

0 = No arrests of suspects and no attempt to file charges; investigation still active; investigation inactive due to lack of investigative information (excludes uncooperative victim, See Code 2).

1 = Any suspect arrested for incident without charges dropped or if no arrest, indication that police filed charges with D.A.; D.A. filed charges.
2 = Charges dropped or no further investigation required due to victim unwillingness to prosecute or cooperate (i.e., provide information).
3 = Other, specify.
9 = Missing; information not available.

31. Prosecution clearance status

0 = Police did not attempt to file charges or D.A. rejected charges. Specify reasons for reject.
1 = D.A. accepted case for prosecution or any suspect tried or convicted for our incident.
9 = Missing; information not available.

If there is information pertaining to conviction, note on form.

Group Indicators: Group indicators can be taken from any report, booking forms, arrest checks, interview transcripts or anything else in file. Include description (preferably quotes) of all references, even if redundant with other items in the same category. Placement of references in categories is less important then recording it somewhere on this page. References need not be to gangs, only, but may apply to any group (e.g., Boy Scouts, Hari Krishna). If in doubt, write it down anyway. Examples are provided by category to draw your attention to certain references or terms; they are not inclusive of all appropriate references. Provide information as to source of reference (e.g., police witness X, suspect Y, victim Z) and object (e.g., suspect A, victim B) of reference. May refer to or originate from non-participants; if reference does not concern the incident or subsequent investigation, note this also.

Beware of clothing descriptions (particularly anything in red or blue). Descriptions obtained that would not apply to incident (suspects arrested day(s) after incident) should be indicated. Note also Geri curls, pierced ears or earrings, tatoos of smiling/crying faces.

Designated Participant Information is coded for all individuals designated by police as victim or suspect (not necessarily participant in incident) for our incident. Write initials of each name identified individual beside number in first column. Order of entry is arbitrary (whatever is easiest).

32. Designation

Code law enforcement designation. Consult supervisor if designation is unclear or changes between suspect and victim during investigation. Note "NP" by designation code if individual is clearly not a participant (i.e., not at scene of crime).

1 = Suspect
2 = "Possible" suspect
3 = "Unknown" suspect, never identified by name
4 = Victim (Institutions are not included as designated victims)

33. Age

Code age at the date of incident in years. Should be consistent with date of birth. Check inconsistencies with supervisor. Under 1 year old is coded "00". If range is given, take average (round down). Code missing ("99") for information not available.

34. Gender

1 = Male
2 = Female

35. Ethnicity

1 = Black
2 = Hispanic
3 = Asian
4 = White
5 = Other, specify

36. Group affiliation

Note the group affiliation or possible affiliation of all designated participants. If no indication, code "9".

37. Arrested?

Determine whether suspect was arrested for our incident (beware of including arrests for similar incidents and/or related cases stemming from our incident; code "2" if not clear). Arrests are indicated by a specific statement as such or booking information. In-custody charging for our incident is counted as an arrest.

0 = Clearly not arrested
1 = Clearly arrested
2 = Possibly arrested, but information ambiguous (consult supervisor).
8 = Not applicable for unknown suspects and designated victims
9 = Missing; information not available

38. Charged?

Include charges relative to our incident only. Can be derived from arrest listings, narrative booking slips, warrants (in the absence of an arrest), other forms (e.g. juvenile petition requests). Note changes in police charging and disposition information as available.

0 = Clearly not charged
1 = Clearly charged
2 = Possibly charged, but information ambiguous (consult supervisor).
8 = Not applicable for unknown suspects and designated victims
9 = Missing; information not available

39. Incident description

Write a brief description of the main components of the incident (i.e., what happened and how). Include the sequence and location of events, relationship between participants, indications of mutual combat, and victim or third party provocation. Note any mention of drugs or drug use; clarify type of drug if indicated. Include information on which coding of motive is based.

In coding Interviews/Contacts, be aware that police officers often use the term "witness" for what we would call informants. Witnesses are (1) involved in incident regardless of extent of what was seen, (2) watching from nearby, or (3) in rare cases may be involved throughout incident except at moment of violence and are able to give extensive information regarding the event. Informants are (1) those not on scene, or (2) those in general area of incident but removed from the immediate situation and who may have heard something or seen something prior or subsequent. If you have difficulty categorizing, consult supervisor.

Arbitrary codes:

2 = People, persons, or others
3 = various or some
4 = several, numerous, or many

Testing alone doesn't count, nor do attempts to locate someone. Look for investigative contacts, where information is deliberately sought or volunteered. This excludes physical contacts where no information is deliberately sought or volunteered (e.g., transporting to

station, gaining permissions, etc.) but includes phone contacts if information is sought or volunteered.

Reinterviews are counted if sufficiently separate to represent two interviews. Consult supervisor if ambiguous.

Contacts between law enforcement personnel or with the justice system or governmental agencies (e.g., probation, FBI, etc.) are usually not counted as they tend to be procedural. Exception would be when officials have unofficial involvement in incident (e.g., witness to crime) or knowledge of participants through personal or professional relationship (e.g., Housing Authority Officers, military personnel, etc.). Private security officers do not count as law enforcement.

40. Total interviews/contacts

Code the total number of interviews/contacts (includes victims, suspects, witnesses, and informants) mentioned in file.

99 = Missing; information not available

41. Informant interviews/contacts

Code the number of interviews/contacts with informants only mentioned in file.

99 = Missing; information not available.

42. Total Number of Pages of Investigation

Count everything in the file that pertains to case investigaton (i.e., forms and reports that represent information seeking or giving). Include justice system forms that pertain to body processing (i.e., booking slips, juvenile petition requests, warrants, receipts, permissions, and photos of crime scene or victims). Exclude reports for other incidents even if related) unless they are investigating our incident as well.

Exclude obvious duplications. Round up. Count back of sheets. Count typewritten versions instead of handwritten versions. Loose field investigation cards are counted two equals one investigative page. Six loose mug shots or other photos count as one page.

43. Level of Gang Unit Involvement

List any specialized unit (or individual gang expert) mentioned in file. Consult supervisor if more than one.

0 = None mentioned
1 = Copies sent, "Special Request Distribution," or "unit notified" only.
2 = Unit contacted for specific information, use of mug books, files, etc., but no other investigative involvement.
3 = Active investigative involvement or case assigned to unit.
4 = Other, specify
9 = Unit mentioned but no information regarding extent of involvement.

44.	Search warrant	Code "1" if you can determine that a search warrant was issued (related to the sampled incident). If not, code "9".
45.	Evidence analyzed	Code "1" if you can determine that physical evidence from the incident was technically (e.g., laboratory) analyzed. Laboratory reports are one source (e.g. fingerprints, blood samples, powder burns, weapons, etc.). If not, code "9", even if there appears to be no physical evidence.

Items 46 through 49 are derived from the intial report only.

46.	Suspect described	Code "1" if there are at least three pieces of descriptive information (e.g. age, race, gender, height, hair/eye color, etc.) on any designated suspect. If not, code "9".
47.	Suspect named	Code "1" if ~~any~~ any designated suspect is named (nicknames and first names only excluded). If not, code "9".
48.	Suspect location	Code "1" if there is information from which any designated suspect can be located. If not, code "9".
49.	Suspect identified	Code "1" if any one claims they can "identify" (separate from descriptive information above) any designated suspect. If not, code "9".
50.	D.A. involved	Code "1" and specify nature if there is mention of D.A. involvement in the investigation. Excludes charge acceptance/rejection. If not, code "9".

51. List, in chronological order as possible, all discrete acts representing investigative effort beyond the initial report.

Group Indicators Coding Form

I. GROUP INVOLVEMENT SPECIFIC IDENTIFICATION

- VICTIM/COMPANIONS ☐
- SUSPECTS ☐
- NON-PARTICIPANTS ☐

BEHAVIORAL/PHYSICAL EVIDENCE

- VICTIMS/COMPANIONS ☐
- SUSPECTS ☐
- NON-PARTICIPANTS ☐

II. PHYSICAL SETTING

- KNOWN GROUP/ GANG AREA ☐
- LINK TO GROUP/ GANG AREA ☐
- OTHER PHYSICAL REFERENCE ☐

III. MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION ☐

IV. TERMINOLOGY/BEHAVIORAL INDICATORS

- CHOLOS ☐
- HOMEBOYS ☐
- CRUISING ☐
- HOORAHING ☐
- GANG BANGING ☐
- VATOS ☐
- CUZZ ☐
- BLOOD ☐
- DRIVE-BY ☐
- WHERE FROM? ☐
- NAMES YELLED ☐
- OTHER Terms/ Behavior ☐

V. PHYSICAL EVIDENCE

- TATOOS ☐
- TEARDROP ☐
- LAUGHING/ CRYING ☐
- NAMES ☐
- BANDANA ☐
- PENDLETONS ☐
- BEANIE CAP ☐
- HAIRNET ☐
- DRESS COLOR ☐
- SHOELACES ☐
- OTHER PHYSICAL EVIDENCE ☐

VI. OTHER INDICATIONS ☐

Case ID Number

"Other Group Indications Specified Sheet

IIc. Other Physical Setting:_____

_____

_____

III. Miscellaneous Group Information:_____

_____

_____

IV. Other Terms/Behavioral Indicators:_____

_____

_____

V. Other Physical Evidence:_____

_____

_____

VI. Other Group Indicators:_____

_____

_____

Use of same reference in 2/more categories:_____

_____

_____

_____

GROUP INDICATORS CODING MANUAL

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS: Note the appearance of any of the following indications of group involvement by coding "1" in the appropriate box. Information from anywhere on the case data collection form should be included. Lack of mention is coded "0". Specify all "others" on an "Other Group Indications Specified Sheet" and attach to the Group Indicators Coding Form. Use other codes only as a last resort. If more than one reference is included in an "Other" category, code the number of references unless they do not provide unique information (e.g., 2 references to gang writing in the area of the incident would be coded 1 for "Other Physical Setting," but references to gang writing and to previous gang activity in the area would be coded as 2; mention of terms having distinct meaning would be counted separately ("lowrider" and "vato"), but terms having the same meaning would be counted only once ("turf" and "hood")). Note briefly on the "Other Group Indications Specified Sheet" use of the same reference to code more than one category (i.e., categories not mutually exclusive). Refer to prior gang indicators coding decisions. Be sure to list references to previously included terminology and physical evidence items (i.e., veterano, lowrider, flying colors, hand signals, back-up, partner, territory or weapons terms, pachuco) under most appropriate "Other" category. If there are NO group indicators on data collection form, mark "NONE" on station list; do not complete a Group Indicators Coding Form.

I. INDICATIONS OF GROUP INVOLVEMENT BASED ON GROUP AFFILIATION OR POSSIBLE GROUP AFFILIATION OF PARTICIPANTS AND NON-PARTICIPANTS INVOLVED IN THE INVESTIGATION

A. Specific identification of particpants or non-particpants involved in the investigation as having group affiliations or possible group affiliations (includes clear self identifications):

INSTRUCTIONS: Include specific statements (by law enforcement or other government agency, participants, witnesses or informants) identifying participants or non-particpants involved in the investigation as having group affiliations (e.g., "Investigators referred to 'Kitchen Crips' as a possible affiliation of the suspect", "Witness said 'Lote' gang did the shooting", "Victim stated he felt he was shot by a member of his own gang by accident"). Also include information on group affiliations obtained from law enforcement or

other official records. Include gang or group names yelled durng the incident and gang response to "Where are you from?" (if a gang name is mentioned).

1. Identification of victim or victim's companions.

2. Identification of suspects participating in the incident or of designated and described suspects.

3. Identification of non-participants involved in the investigation (this includes witnesses, friends or families of the participants).

B. Reference to behavioral or physical evidence suggesting group affiliations for participants or non-participants involved in the investigation:

INSTRUCTIONS: Include information obtained from a description of the incident (e.g., asking "Where are you from?" as well as "Nowhere" response, identification of suspects' vehicle or victims' vehicle as belonging to members of a named gang/group), physical evidence (e.g., gang/group tattoos (excluding ambiguous gang tattoos), gang/group names on personal property, hand signals, "Cholo" description, or other evidence of group affiliation (SPECIFY). Do not include costume indicators unless costume is described as linking individual to group. Use of the terms homeboy, homegirl, or homies are behavioral evidence for the person using the term but does not apply to the person referred to in the statement.

1. Identification of victim or victim's companions.

2. Identification of suspects participating in the incident or of designated and described suspects.

3. Identification of non-participants involved in the investigation (this includes: witnesses, informants, friends, or families of the participants).

II. INDICATIONS OF GROUP INVOLVEMENT BASED ON REFERENCE TO PHYSICAL SETTING, LOCATION, TERRITORY OR NEIGBORHOOD

INSTRUCTIONS: Include statements and other information or evidence concerning the area in which the incident occurred that indicate or suggest group involvement. Also include statements and other information or evidence concerning areas to which participants and non-participants involved in the investigation are linked that indicate or suggest group involvement. Excludes statements and other information or evidence indicating area, territory or neighborhood as the motive or possible motive for the incident.

A. Information or evidence indicating or suggesting that the incident took place in an area known to be associated with a group/gang (i.e., "the shooting took place in Bassett area"). Subsumes "linked to group/gang area" as part of incident .

B. Information or evidence linking participants or non-participants involved in the investigation to group/gang areas or neighborhoods (e.g., reference to a person's residence; reference to "gang hangouts"; "Victims live in Jardin area and attend Vial H.S. with VNE members"). This indicator refers to any group/gang area; not only for suspect(s) and victim(s) areas. Excludes links based on identification of incident location as a group/ gang area and links based on responses to "Where are you from?" or group/gang names yelled during incident. It is uncommon to code "known group/gang area" (above) and this category from the same or similar statements.

C. Other reference to physical setting or location, including:

1. Reference to previous or on-going group activity in the area of the incident (i.e., "It should be noted that there have been numerous incidents of gang activity in recent weeks at the location").

2. Reference to group/gang writing on walls, sidewalks, etc. (i.e., "the whole area was spray painted with numerous nicknames and graffitti consistent with members of the Lil Watts gang"). Includes reference to the location of the incident and references to other areas linked to the

investigation. Excludes references to writing graffitti as motive or possible motive for incident. Also excludes references to group/gang writing on personal property.

3. Other information or evidence concerning physical setting, location, territory or neighborhood indicating or suggesting group involvement, that is not included above. Specify.

SPECIFY any 1 to 3 above, on attached sheet.

III. MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION PERTAINING TO GROUP INVOLVEMENT

INSTRUCTIONS: Include statements and other information or evidence concerning any of the following:

A. Presence of information on the case file that pertains to groups in general (e.g., reference to terms associated with group culture).

B. Other group-related incidents - excluded from other incident coding because 1) stated conflict (previous or subsequent) did not relate to our incident or 2) did not involve 2 groups or affiliation of one side ambiguous. Statements of previous conflict as incident motive where affiliation of participants is unclear may be coded here.

C. Specific information about particular groups (not necessarily involved in our incident). Examples are statements about subgroup's territorial boundaries, characteristic criminal activity, and lack of rivaly with other groups. Excludes elaboration of terminology/ physical evidence such as exlanation of graffitti.

SPECIFY any A to C above, on attached sheet.

IV. INDICATIONS OF GROUP INVOLVEMENT BASED ON TERMINOLOGY/ BEHAVIORAL INDICATORS

INSTRUCTIONS: Including any reference to or use of the terms listed below and any reference to the behaviors listed below.

CHOLOS
HOMEBOYS/HOMEGIRLS/HOMIES
CRUISING
HOORAHING
GANG-BANGING
VATOS
CUZZ - includes "Cous" and other Crips argot
BLOOD - includes Pirus argot, e.g., "Rue Boys"
DRIVE-BY or shooting occurred out of a vehicle in drive-by fashion
WHERE ARE YOU FROM?
GROUP/GANG NAMES YELLED
OTHER Terms/Behavior - SPECIFY on attached sheet

V. INDICATIONS OF GROUP INVOLVEMENT BASED ON PHYSICAL EVIDENCE

INSTRUCTIONS: Include any reference to the items listed below:

TATOOS of group/gang names or initials
TEARDROP tatoo
Tatoo of LAUGHING/CRYING faces
GROUP/GANG NAMES on clothes or personal property
BANDANA/headband/hankerchief/rag/flag
PENDLETONS
BEANIE cap/watch cap
HAIRNET
DRESS COLOR possibly indicating group/gang affiliation (especially red or blue)
COLORED SHOELACES
OTHER physical evidence - SPECIFY on attached sheet

VI. OTHER INDICATIONS OF GROUP INVOLVEMENT

INSTRUCTIONS: Include any other indication of group involvement or possible group involvement, not elsewhere included. Examples: group/gang names yelled during incident which cannot be sorted or aligned to victim or suspect, and statements where group-relatedness is ambiguous.

SPECIFY on attached sheet.