

Gangs and Other Problems in American Jails Today: A Special Report of the NGCRC

by the

National Gang Crime Research Center

Principal Investigator: George W. Knox, Ph.D.

Abstract

Recognizing the need to update previous research about how the issues like gangs and security threat groups (STG's) are affecting the climate of jails in America today, the National Gang Crime Research Center (NGCRC) undertook a national survey of jails in 2019. Reported here are the statistical results of that anonymous national survey. Gangs and STG's continue to be a major problem is what emerged from the statistical analysis and indeed there is evidence of certain escalated threats. Findings about other problems impacting on the jails in American society today are also discussed. Replicating survey items from the 1993 jail survey allowed for addressing how some factors have changed over time in the last 25 years regarding the gang and other problems. The problems of trauma and stress from gang and related problems in jails today are not showing any signs of abatement and rather suggest an increase in the overall threat conditions faced by jail staff.

Chapter 1: Introduction

INTRODUCTION

Why do we have jails in America? Jails exist to provide several functions, the main function of which is to guarantee that a defendant who is accused of a crime will personally appear in court when required to for purposes of trial and sentencing. From this standpoint the main function of jails is to detain persons awaiting trial. Jails have other functions, such as a place of detention for those who have been sentenced for crimes carrying a penalty of less than a year in confinement. Jails are additionally used for a temporary holding center for persons convicted of felony crimes awaiting transfer to a state correctional facility. Jails are used as well to detain

persons who have been on probation or parole and who may have violated the terms and conditions of their release and need to be detained awaiting a probation or parole revocation hearing. Jails have been used under contract with federal agencies to detain persons they have authority over, this includes the Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP) and the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE).

Jails serve the primary function of providing a temporary or short-term type of detention. If convicted of a misdemeanor crime that carries a sentence of less than a full year of confinement, a criminal court judge will typically sentence the convicted misdemeanor offender to serve that sentence in the local county jail. Jails are a type of “total institution” just like their counterparts for long term incarceration: such as prisons, adult state correctional institutions, penitentiaries where the inmates are serving sentences for longer than a one-year period (Goffman, 1961).

TYPES OF JAILS IN AMERICA

The modern American jail is typically administered and funded by the county level of government, but all levels and variations of government authority have their respective types of jails. Moreover there are “federal jails” that exist called “Metropolitan Correctional Centers” that hold inmates who are being tried in federal courts. There are likewise city jails, typically found in the police or public safety building, sometimes a larger city will have several different police lock ups, where criminal suspects are held by police until the arrestee can be transferred to the county jail.

There are additionally what are called Tribal jails that exist on larger Native American Indian reservations. The analysis by Minton (2014) suggests there are at least 79 correctional facilities operated by tribal governments or the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and in 2013 held a total of 2,287 inmates.

A “regional jail” may serve as the jail that accepts inmate intakes from two or more counties. It would operate as a shared cost adventure between the county governments. Each county would pay its fair share proportional to their usage.

The Uniform Code of Military Justice covers all branches of the U.S. military and there are many types of “military laws” the violation of which can result in short-term or long-term detention or confinement. There are temporary confinement facilities on most military installations. In all branches of the American armed forces there are examples of temporary confinement facilities — what might look and sound a lot like jails. In the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard jails are called “Brigs”. In the Army the facility used for jail would be called the “Stockade”. In the Air Force, it is simply called “confinement”. The long term correctional facility or prison in the Army is called the Disciplinary Barracks — for example, Delta Bravo Fort Leavenworth, the only one with a death row.

Just as military jails are unique in many ways it is also fair to say that jails on Native American Indian reservations and those operated by the Bureau of Indian

Affairs (BIA) likewise have their own unique laws under which to operate. As one example, a tribal jail under current law can detain a convicted person for up to a maximum of three (3) years on each offense — it might be possible to “stack” the sentences. In some tribal jails, if bail is set at say for sake of argument \$5,000, the tribal law could be that no bond is accepted, and rather the defendant may have to put up a full cash-only bail amount. This kind of jail that can detain someone for a 3-year period is really a kind of hybrid jail — a kind of combination of short and long-term detention functions.

It would be wrong to assume that tribal jails are more abusive or more punitive-oriented than say local county jails. Tribal criminal justice in the USA can be very progressive. For example, the very name of the jail in the Puyallup Tribal Government - - - located near Tacoma, Washington - - - does not include the word “jail” at all, it is officially called the “Tribal Restorative Correctional Facility” (TRCF). Thus, the very name of the jail facility carries the intentional implication of a philosophy of restorative justice. The word “jail” survives in the informal sense: if someone is describing in casual conversation that they visited someone at the Puyallup TRCF, it may not be unusual for that person to say they visited someone at the Puyallup jail. We can change the names of facilities but as Griffin (1999) reminds us, jails are still coercive organizations where the use of force or the threat of using force rises above everything and remains a constant reminder.

Finally, another type of jail is the “pay to stay” jail. In the State of California, this is an avant guard innovation where inmates who have been sentenced for a period of a year or less, and who can afford a private attorney, and afford to pay for their own costs of confinement, are allowed in Los Angeles and Orange counties, in California, to stay at any one of 26 different city jails under the terms and conditions negotiated by the attorney and the sentencing judge. Costs per night are comparable to hotel rooms. In the example from southern California, the “pay to stay” jails are a way for the defendant to avoid having to serve the sentence in county jail. The “pay-to-stay” jails in California are therefore a way for a person convicted of a misdemeanor to serve their time and be released during the day as well to go to work, returning at night to the jail to serve their sentence. Again, these are kind of hybrid jails, as they are city jails converted to serve the function of a county jail.

The term “pay to stay” jail has a different meaning in the State of Michigan. In Michigan, under law, county jails can require anyone confined there to “pay” for their confinement. The county jail typically sends an invoice to the inmate for their stay where the cost billed to the inmate ranges from \$20 to \$60 per day. Therefore with an average cost of \$40 per day, someone serving a six month sentence would in this example receive a bill for \$7,200 dollars. The inmate would be responsible for eventually paying this bill after their release.

THE MEGA-JAIL

What is a Mega-Jail? As used by jail experts, a megal jail is any jail holding more than 1,000 inmates. If your jail has 998 inmates on Thursday, it is not a mega jail. If it has 1,001 inmates on Friday, it is a mega jail. The idea is that the mega jail is a larger jail, and a thousand inmates averaged over time. Mega jails have earned more than their fair share of civil law suits as well as bad press or negative mass media coverage. These are basically jails in large metropolitan and urban areas. For example, jails in larger cities (New York, Miami, Chicago, Los Angeles, etc) are typically mega jails.

In some respects the phrase “mega-jail” is just shop talk for referring to the largest jails in the USA as measured by the size of the inmate population count taken daily. It is therefore, conceptually, arbitrary and capricious in terms of what population size to use as the cut-off point to differentiate “mega jails” from all other jails. Carried to its logical analytical extreme, if there are “mega-jails”, then there are also “mini-jails” — perhaps something like that found in a small town. In fact, we had a few as respondents in this survey.

The origin of the term “mega-jail” is not from the mass media or film producers. The origin is from the American Jail Association (AJA) which is the single leading professional organization in the world dealing exclusively with all issues pertaining to the operation of jails. The AJA defines a mega-jail as any jail that has 1,000 or more inmates for their average daily population.

THE *DEJURE* VERSUS THE *DEFACTO* FUNCTION OF JAILS

Should jails have a judicial function other than that of guaranteeing that a defendant appear at trial and sentencing? Here is the issue — the vast majority of felony offenders confined in American jails today never go to “trial” in the literal sense of the word. That is, there are two types of trial: (1) trial by jury, very expensive, and (2) trial by judge, called a “bench trial”, which is a lot cheaper, but still a large expense. Restricting our analysis to the typical county jail (i.e., the largest segment of jails), the vast majority of felony offenders confined in American jails today never go to trial, instead they simply plead guilty usually to a lesser charge. They engage, more often than not, in “plea bargaining”, a very cost-effective way to dispose of felony court cases. It helps the judicial system function efficiently.

So logically, if we can name a local short term detention facility by its legal function, its *dejure* function, then the *defacto* name would have to be something like “judicial plea bargaining facility” — defendants go there with the right to a costly jury trial, but a very high percentage quickly grow tired of the limited creature comforts found in a jail and plead guilty to get it over with and go to an actual prison. In the jail they may not have the right to have what are called “contact visits” (being able to shake the hand of a visitor friend, kiss your spouse, hug your child, etc). But contact visits are often allowed once they arrive at the prison after their case has been

fully adjudicated. The research by May, et al (2004) of N = 588 probationers and parolees in Kentucky showed they would prefer prison to serving jail time, that is from the offenders point of view they simply view the Spartan conditions of jail life as too punitive. There are many things they cannot do in a jail environment that they can do in an actual state prison environment. For example, no jail anywhere in America allows what are called “extended family visits”, also known as “conjugal visits”, but there are four states that allow conjugal visiting between prisoners and their legal spouses — the most famous of which is the State of Mississippi (Hopper, 1969).

The *dejure* function of the American jail is to guarantee the defendant shows up at scheduled court dates, while the *defacto* function of the jail could be construed as guaranteeing greater efficiency and cost-effectiveness in court administration — encouraging the confined defendants to plead guilty through the plea bargaining process. This is, however, a debate far beyond the scope of the present research which seeks to focus on the nuts and bolts of very practical policy issues.

DEFINITION OF SECURITY THREAT GROUP (STG)

A gang is any group of three or more persons who are recurrently committing crimes (Knox, 2006). Gangs typically have a number of other superficial features: a name, colors or identifiers or symbols, special rules, secretive organization, etc. A security threat group (STG) is any group of three (3) or more persons with recurring threatening or disruptive behavior (i.e., violations of the disciplinary rules where said violations were openly known or conferred benefit upon the group would suffice for a prison environment), including but not limited to gang crime or gang violence (i.e., crime of any sort would automatically make the group a gang, and as a gang in custody it would logically be an STG). In some jurisdictions the Security Threat Group is also called a “Disruptive Group”. STG’s or disruptive groups would include any group of three or more inmates who were members of the same street gang, or prison gang, or the same extremist political or ideological group where such extremist ideology is potentially a security problem in the correctional setting (i.e., could inflame attitudes, exacerbate racial tensions, and spread hate, etc).

Almost all gangs that exist as an identity on the street can probably be found to exist as an STG inside a correctional facility. Gangs get “imported” into the prison or correctional system for the most part (Jacobs, 1974, 1977) when their members come to the attention of law enforcement and they are prosecuted, found guilty, and have to complete a sentence of confinement. Sometimes they arise inside the correctional facility. Vice Lords first grew out of a self-protection group inside an Illinois juvenile correctional institution (Knox and Papachristos, 2002). The Aryan Brotherhood and Black Guerilla Family are said to have originated inside prison, a more modern example would be the Ghost Face Gangsters. But it is important to note that all prison gangs commit crimes outside the prison as well, on the street, or they

try to.

Definitions of STG's do exist which are more liberal and allow for any group of "two or more persons" to define an STG and this apparently became the ACA (American Correctional Association) definition over a decade ago ("two or more inmates, acting together, who pose a threat to the security or safety of staff/inmates, and/or are disruptive to programs and/or to the orderly management of the facility/system", see ACA quote in Allen, Simonsen, Latessa, 2004: p. 196). The problem with two is that this is only a social dyad at best. The social dyad is not capable of the primordial act of any organization: delegation, as can occur in a true social group (which must have three or more persons in it). The definition advanced here is more consistent with the larger literature, and American law, on the definition of "gang".

The definition of an STG in the Arizona Department of Corrections is typical of those definitions which emphasize certain issues and ignore others, let us examine it here:

"What is a Security Threat Group? Any organization, club, association or group of individuals, formal or informal (including traditional prison gangs), that may have a common name, identifying sign or symbol, and whose members engage in activities that would include, but are not limited to planning, organizing, threatening, financing, soliciting, committing, or attempting to commit unlawful acts or an act that would violate the departments written instructions, which would detract from the safe orderly operations of prisons" (Arizona Dept. Of Corrections, 2004).

Note that size of the group is not important, but that the STG "may have" a common name or symbol; the list of "may have's" could be very extensive. Just as the list of behavior's could be prohibitively long: it may be sufficient to say "any crime, deviance, or rule breaking".

A prison gang, correctly defined, is any gang (where a gang is a group of three or more persons who recurrently commit crime, and where the crime is openly known to the group) that operates in prison. However, a tradition has developed "in practice" within the context of applied ideas about prison gangs, where the correctional practitioner defines a prison gang exclusively as "a gang that originated in the prison". Thus, gangs like the Aryan Brotherhood and the Black Guerilla Family and the Melanics (Knox, 2002) would be "pure prison gangs" in this respect, because these were not street gangs imported into the prison system, these are gangs that originated within the prison system itself. The Lyman (1989) definition of prison gang centers around the commission of crime, without the crime a prison group could violate rules and regulations and still be a security threat group.

Can there be a disruptive group that is not necessarily a gang? Yes, of course, if the collective identity of the group is such that it seeks to challenge the legitimacy of the correctional system itself. In Texas, for example, the pre-service and in-service "gang/STG training" includes information about a group called the "Self Defense Family (SDF)". The SDF is mostly Black with one white inmate, but objectively it is

a group that just likes to file law suits against the prison system, the members of the SDF are “prison lawyers”: not real lawyers, self-taught inmates who have become very adept at frivolous law suits. The SDF may not qualify as a “gang”, because after all what they are doing is “lawful”, but they are a “threat” to the Institutional Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice.

“Stigged” to “STG’d” means to the process by which any group of inmates is determined to be and becomes officially labeled as a Security Threat Group. This often goes according to official policy and procedure for declaring an inmate group a STG, there are written guidelines and there usually exists a burden of proof requirement — such as the need to show a pattern of abuses or documenting offenses (disciplinary rules, assaults, violence, etc) over time in a time series approach. Typically, this process begins at the institutional level where the group is a problem, and the central administration reviews the recommendation, and then if the evidence is sufficient, the inmate group becomes classified as a Security Threat Group statewide, i.e., throughout the entire prison system.

“Validated” refers to the validation process, a process by which an inmate is determined, usually after continuing to be a gang banger in prison, to be a “security threat group member” by the prison officials. In California, most gang members behind bars are not “validated”, the stigma of “validated” means the inmate would have had a continued career of conspicuous gang banging violence behind bars. Thus, officially for decades, California’s prison system has reported to researchers that it has a “low gang density”, because these estimates of gang density (the percentage of inmates who are gang/STG members) are based upon “validated gang/STG members”. The way “validated” has worked in some jurisdictions like California is that it refers to a process where after posting many warnings and cautioning inmates against engaging in crime or violence on behalf of their gang, after of course being put in prison for the same thing, the inmate continues to be caught for gang violence behind bars, and the correctional system has no other recourse than to say “we’ve had enough, now you are a validated gang member”. Validated gang members can be given special security levels and more restricted housing environments.

Gang denial is a social policy whereby the entity involved — the city, the facility, the company, the school, or the entire state corrections agency — denies there is a gang problem or reports a significantly lower gang problem than actually exists. Sometimes called the “Ostrich phenomenon”, it means ignoring the problem, hoping it will go away on its own. In some jurisdictions, it is politically imposed because awareness could have implications for the local tourism trade. Or more typically, there is an assumption that if the entity reports a gang problem, it attracts further “bad news”. It is hard to attract new employees to low paying high turnover jobs in corrections when the newspapers are reporting gang fights behind bars. It usually takes a serious crisis or a local news media investigation to reverse a “gang

denial policy”.

The term “validation process” as used in California was their innovative way of dealing with a high gang density rate: it is reasonable to believe that California’s prison system, as a producer of gangs, that is as a major national epicenter of gangs, is probably comparable to Illinois with regard to gang density. In Illinois, approximately 80 to 90 percent of the inmates coming into the prison system were gang members on the streets. Gang inmates are told to behave, and if they do not, they face the risk of being a “validated gang member”.

Thus, when the California state prison system reports to a prison researcher that “six percent of our inmates are STG/prison gang members” they are couching this unbelievably low statistic in the magical language of “validated gang members”: those who within the inmate population continued to be gang bangers and we caught them doing it in very serious offenses after being incarcerated. One might ask, of course, is this policy of obscuring the gang problem the way it is reported to the public — a variation on the “gang denial” theme — a policy that could actually encourage a greater personal safety threat to the correctional officers who work there?

For decades, researchers and criminologists believed that California’s state prison system did not have much of a gang problem because the only national research at the time was the limited Camp and Camp (1985) study which reported that only three percent of California’s state prison inmates were gang members, and the report by the American Correctional Association (Baugh, 1993) raised it to six percent.

There are many political dimensions of the gang/STG problem in American corrections and a number of these issues were addressed in the survey. Getting prison wardens and STG coordinators to participate in a gang/STG survey like that conducted and reported herein faces a major obstacle of “prison politics”. Many prisons have formidable obstacles to overcome before representatives of the prison system are allowed to complete surveys.

Some states “hamstring” the wardens and do not allow them to answer any surveys that are not approved by the central office of the state’s director. Many states are facing negative press and some facing lawsuits pertaining to gang/STG issues and as a matter of policy they are not going to talk about gang/STG issues to anyone outside of their agency.

For many years, states like California reported in official reports that they had a gang density rate of 6.0 percent or lower, they would fudge the statistics to make it appear California’s adult corrections agency did not have a gang/STG problem. Actually, when the feds came knocking California reported only 3 percent as a gang density rate (Camp and Camp, 1985), and when ACA came knocking it went up a little to 6 percent (Baugh, 1993) when all along it was probably equivalent to the density rates in Illinois. For many years, the State of Virginia’s state correctional system was in complete gang denial, they even threatened legal action against the

NGCRC if we did not cease and desist from trying to collect data from their state prison staff and state correctional programs. Politics in criminal justice is never good but sometimes it has unfortunately reared its ugly head.

Gang density means the percentage of inmates who are members of a street or prison gang. Gang members rarely give up their gang upon being incarcerated, they continue their gang involvement in most cases. Gangs are the dominant subculture in the entire American correctional system today (jails, juvenile and adult correctional facilities, public and private).

Some practitioners in their writing like to make a distinction between traditional prison gangs and untraditional prison gangs, where what they really mean is that the traditional prison gangs were those first on the scene (Aryan Brotherhood, Black Guerilla Family, etc). Under this schema any untraditional or non-traditional prison gang would therefore be “anything else”, that is anyone other than gangs that had their origin within the correctional system rather than being imported into the correctional system. This is not a particularly useful distinction when it is known that some gangs considered “traditional prison gangs” have long ago made the transition to the street. A better, more analytically sound, distinction would be to classify these prison gangs in terms of the level of their organizational threat: are they in a national gang alliance system, do they have a national impact, is there a recognized national leadership in the gang, and a large number of empirical measurements that can be taken on gang groups and gang organizations in terms of the features of their social organization (Knox, 2000).

Examining a Headline in Closer Detail: “Four Charged With “Gang Assault” On Inmate at the Attica State Prison in New York”

This is what might appear in a newspaper, but it is a misleading use of the term. This is not what is meant in the present report for what constitutes a “gang assault” in a prison or correctional environment. This does not involve a well known street or prison gang and its members attacking a rival gang member or neutron. This is the sad story of four correctional officers under indictment for felony charges of gang assault, conspiracy and tampering with evidence.

In mid-December, 2011, four correctional officers (Keith Swack, 37; Sean Warner, 37; Matthew Raddemacher, 29; and Erik Hibsich, 28) were arrested after being indicted on the felony charges. The gang assault charge carries a 5 to 25 year sentence if convicted. The four correctional officers, all of whom worked at the Attica prison, bonded out at \$25,000 each.

The alleged victim is an inmate named George Williams, 29, who suffered broken bones and fractures in an attack on August 9, 2011. The alleged attack was associated with shakedowns for weapons and drugs going on or about the same time frame.

Under New York state law “a person is guilty of gang assault in the second degree when, with intent to cause physical injury to another person and when aided by two or more persons actually present, he causes serious physical injury to such person or to a third person. Gang assault in the second degree is a class C felony” (New York Penal law 120.06). If the intent was to “cause serious physical injury”, then it rises to a class B felony (New York Penal Law 120.07).

These laws were passed to fight against gangs and STG’s, they were not likely designed to be used against correctional officers. Because they are very general, they have been interpreted as allowing for the prosecution of anyone, including correctional officers, regardless of “gang membership”, regardless of gang or STG affiliation by any of the assailants.

The way to make it a gang/STG law would be to use the kind of language like this that specifically targets gangs/STG’s: “A person is guilty of gang assault in the first degree when, with intent to cause physical injury to another person and when aided by two or more persons who are members of the same gang or security threat group, he causes serious physical injury to such person or to a third person”. New York state policy makers did not do that though. They left the law intentionally vague and ambiguous with regard to actual gang status of the assailants.

OUTLINE OF THIS RESEARCH REPORT

In chapter 2 we will review the previous literature on American jails. The goal is to review the major issues facing American jails today. The chapter will therefore address: (1) Gangs in Jails, (2) Riots and Disturbances in Jails, (3) Educational Programs for Jail Inmates, (4) Visiting Issues, (5) Jail Work and Industry Programs, (6) Drug Treatment in Jail, and (7) Suicide Among Jail Inmate.

Chapter 3 describes the research methodology and provides the descriptive statistical analysis of primary research findings.

Chapter 4 more closely examines, by way of crosstabulation analysis, four major issues: (1) Gang members assaulting jail staff, (2) how inmate gangs have significantly affected the jail environment, (3) how inmate gangs have tended to result in more improvised weapons production, and (4) how jail staff have received serious injuries in fights and confrontations with jail inmates.

Finally, Chapter 5 provides an executive summary of major findings. Moreover it provides a summary of changes over time, comparing the 1993 findings with these 2019 findings. A summary of the conclusions on the major security problems like gang violence in jail is also provided.

Chapter 2: Major Issues Facing American Jails Today

INTRODUCTION

A myriad of jail safety issues exist when dealing with American jails today. These arise from the challenging nature of administering a jail. These are dangers and threats that must be managed to prevent injury and loss of life to inmates, staff and visitor to the jail facility. Gang violence among inmates, escape attempts, assaults on staff, riots, suicide prevention, and fires set by inmates are typical examples of major jail safety issues.

1. Gangs in Jails

One report that appeared in the professional literature about gangs in the jail environment seemed to claim gang violence could be stopped by a computer. It was the idea from the New York City Department of Corrections that by creating a gang database they could vastly reduce gang violence among its jail inmates (Nadel, 1997). Admittedly, a gang database is essential to any effort to collect gang intelligence and to responsibly try to manage some of the problems caused by gangs. Recall as well that New York City has the largest jail system in the United States, with at the time of the publication an average daily population of 20,000 inmates. It clearly has a significant gang problem in its city overall and of course among its many inmates.

It is not a believable claim in light of the fact that there is no baseline data on gang violence in New York City jails and no longitudinal data was reported showing how gang violence has increased or decreased over time. It would be essential to show reductions in improvised weapons production, improved race relations, reduced gang control over the “inmate rackets” (e.g., drug and contraband sales inside the jail, protection), reduced attacks on rival gangs, reduced attacks on inmates and staff. The thing about gangs is they are violent to their own members — it is a ritual deeply embedded into their belief system and no computer software or database can remove it.

The research on gang members in jail by Alarid (2000) involved a self-report survey of N = 802 jail inmates. It made a valuable contribution to the literature by analyzing the factor of race relations in relationship to understanding gang problems in the jail environment. It also helped to explain how less gang violence is being reported among female inmates.

The research by Ruddell, Decker, and Egley (2006) was based on a survey of N = 134 jail staff in 39 states. It found that inmates are vulnerable to gang recruitment, that gang members are more likely to be involved in jail violence, and more likely to assault other inmates. It was concluded that the single most effective method of controlling gangs was the collection and sharing of gang intelligence. It is true that

in the last three decades jails and prisons have created a new kind of occupational specialization — that of the gang intelligence officer, also called the gang and security threat group (STG) coordinator. These are full time staff who specialize in the collection of gang intelligence. In addition they spend a lot of time acting on and using that intelligence, mostly for purposes of criminal prosecution and to support other ongoing federal, state, and local criminal investigations that may overlap with their jurisdiction. Obviously, smaller jails are at a staffing and organizational disadvantage in not being able to cost-justify this kind of position. One of the unique findings reported by these authors was a national gang estimate of 13 percent for gang density in the jail populations at the time of their study. The gang density level reported in the present research tends to corroborate the findings of Ruddell, Decker and Egley (2006).

The report by Stinchcomb and McCampbell (2008) showed how the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) identified the most important policy issues facing jails. They held two meetings bringing together 45 practitioners (sheriff’s and/or jail administrators) to brainstorm about problems facing jails. They wanted things like evidence-based approaches and better ways to educate the public and elected officials about jail issues. A primary concern was how to effectively provide medical and mental health services.

The research by Knox (2012) analyzed both adult state prisons and county jail staff, where the mail survey was sent to the warden or the STG Coordinator at the prison or the Jail Director or Gang Investigator at the jails. The research concluded that gangs have the ability to exert illegitimate social control in the jail environments — basically controlling many aspects of inmate life. One major finding was that corrections staff were very pessimistic about the future in terms of any ability to control the gang problem. The research did outline methods used by prisons and jails to control and manage gangs. The study showed how other management issues in adult correctional environments (inmate religion, racial conflicts, various money-making rackets gangs control, and drug importation) were completely intertwined with the gang/STG problem.

One very interesting research finding about gang members in jails comes from the research by Fox, Lane, and Akers (2013). Their research method relied on self-report surveys of N - 2,414 Florida inmates and they compared gang members and non-gang members on crime victimization and self-control. They found that inmates who were gang affiliated (members of a gang) were more likely to be victims of personal and property crimes than when compared to non-gang member inmates. Some of our gang exit strategy programs need to use this kind of research finding to point out to gang members the objective material “benefits” of gang membership include some unseen and generally unknown high costs of joining a gang — in this case a greater guarantee of being a crime victim. Their 2010 study based on the same data had also reported that gang members are significantly more likely to be

offenders and victims of property and personal crimes (Fox, Lane, and Akers, 2010).

2. Riots and Disturbances in Jails

Most riots and disturbances in jails today are gang-related or gang-motivated. Only gangs of inmates or inmates affiliated with a security threat group (STG) have the capability of self-defense and acting in concert for defensive or offensive purposes. It is the ordinary non-gang affiliated inmate who faces the most risk — the neutron. A neutron is an inmate who is “neutral” on gang affiliation, he or she is not yet affiliated with a gang. A neutron has no group to hang out with, no group for protection to rely on.

Many persons have a conception of a jail riot that is based on what they have seen on the television or movie screen. For example, “jail house rock”, or some situation where the inmates are collectively fighting against the authorities, for example, food strikes or some kind of inmate protest.

Today there is a new dynamic that surrounds security issues in American jails today — gang affiliation. Inmates who come into the jail with a pre-existing gang affiliation, and those inmates who affiliate with a gang for the first time while in jail, are those who can be expected to be listed in a gang/STG database. Both the actual members of the gang and the associates of the gang are likely to be listed in a gang/STG database. Gang associates are those who hang out with the gang, and through this association they gain certain benefits (e.g., protection). In some gangs, like motorcycle gangs, before a person can become a “member” of the gang, they have to serve in some kind of “associate” capacity.

An example of a mini-riot at the Allegheny County Jail. This example comes from news coverage reported by Bradbury (2019). About six inmates, on August 21, 2019 were involved in this “melee” or fight that was quickly put down by jail staff. No serious injuries resulted from the fighting, no one was hospitalized, and no staff were harmed. The primary weapon used is a typical “improvised weapon” for jail and prison inmates: the “loaded sock”. Anything hard can be loaded into a sock, for example, “lock in a sock”, or rocks, or a hard block of soap. In this fashion, the sock is swung in a way to generate blunt force as the end of the sock hits a blow.

3. Educational Programs for Jail Inmates

One of the most beneficial programs a jail can offer to inmates is that of literacy and educational education and GED/High School Equivalency Test preparation. A number of such programs have operated in U.S. jails that are noteworthy of mentioning here. The program described by Smith and Silverman (1994) involved computer-assisted literacy training for jail inmates in Hillsborough County, Florida where in a six week long program the inmates gained 2.4 grade levels. Tewksbury (1994) described a literacy improvement program for inmates in Jefferson County, Kentucky that was also focused on improving the employability of

the inmates, it was called Real Opportunity Behind Bars for Employment (ROBBE). Finn (1997) reviewed one of the largest adult basic education programs known to exist in the Orange County, Florida jails where 70 full-time instructors also focused on a wide array of rehabilitative services.

The Friends of Island Academy (FOIA) GED program operated at the Rikers Island jail in New York City and was also focused on inmate re-entry services (Lisante and Navon, 2000). Similarly, the research by Gee (2006) showed a GED program could also be coupled with other program needs such a drug rehabilitation and substance abuse support groups. The study by Nelson and Olcott (2006) analyzed the Incarcerated Education Program (IEP) in Onondaga County, New York where about 250 inmates at a time participated in either day or evening adult basic education and vocational training classes. In Chicago, certainly the PACE Institute at the Cook County Jail must be regarded as an exemplary program simply because it has such a long history of successful service in educational upgrading for jail inmates — and, of course, it is operated by an umbrella organization that is the Nation's premier program for re-entry services and job placement.

These inmate education programs can be large programs or small-scale initiatives. Shaw and Berg (2009) described an educational program for inmates that involved one simple component — spelling ability — that could be easily implemented in any jail as a short two-week training program for inmates.

4. Visiting and Correspondence Issues

A study of jail inmate visitation by Sturges (2002) showed what a lot of jail managers already knew — jail officials are mostly concerned about security and visitors are more concerned about whether the jail staff are being courteous and respectful. Visitors to jails must submit to the existing security procedures — which inevitably will mean a search of your person to make sure you are not concealing anything that would be considered contraband. Almost anything can be considered contraband in a jail. Sturges spent time in a jail visiting room, interviewed 34 jail visitors, and concluded that jails do need increased security. Most jails require visitors to be approved in advance and to go through a background check (Perroncello, 2000). Video-visiting is one technological innovation used by some jails to overcome the security issue of outsiders physically entering the secure jail facility — they can do it digitally.

It was interesting to observe that in reviewing the previous research literature on jail work and industry programs, that one of the things offered to jail inmates in lieu of actual salary, was that of more visiting time. In fact, it was not uncommon for the inmates performing supportive tasks such as cleaning, laundry, and food service to receive contact visits when all other inmates could not have such forms of visitation.

If the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King had been in a kind of “Birmingham City Jail” today somewhere in the United States where a more restrictive kind of inmate correspondence policy is in effect called the “post-card only option”, we may have never seen his now famous “Letter from Birmingham Jail” — written April 16, 1962. The reason: you cannot write that kind of lengthy essay on a post card. So the postcard only policy that began in 2007, and which is being used in jails in 18 states, is somewhat controversial (Sakala, 2013).

5. Jail Work and Industry Programs

The phrase “jail work program” is somewhat of a misnomer but again it can be argued that whatever we call it, it probably has a valuable function in the jail. Some jails allow inmates to work for the jail itself and historically this has meant creating a special social status for the inmate — such as “trustee”, or “jail worker”, or “food service worker”, etc. They may wear a distinctive easy to identify at a distance work uniform. But they are still inmates, not employees of the Sheriff’s Department. A federal study of work by jail inmates (CRS, Inc, 1994) showed the inmates do menial labor such as cleaning, laundry, food service, even grounds work to beautify the outside of the jail complex. Sometimes the inmates are paid a small “stipend”, but not a real “wage”, not a prevailing wage, more like a prison wage — the average wage was only \$4.00 per day per inmate. Some jails (62%) paid their inmates in a “time off” their sentence scheme. Some jails paid their inmates with commissary items, extra food, extra visiting time, extra jail privileges (e.g., more television viewing time), basic amenities making it easier to do time in a jail.

A lot of jails have something along the lines of a work program where the inmates are able to perform work tasks on behalf of the jail itself. But the concept of a “jail work program” in this context should not be confused with what is called a “work release program”. A work release program or study release program (going to school full time or some combination of both school and work) is clearly beneficial for inmates and larger society and are often regulated by law. Work release means the inmate will leave the jail to go to work at a real job somewhere and be paid a real wage, and then returns to the jail after work. This scheme allows the inmate to earn a living to pay off child support, or court costs, or traffic fines and still provides a sanction because the inmate spends non-work time in the jail.

If a jail has inmates working in any industry that generates profit, it has a jail industry. Jacobsen (1992) showed that the State of Minnesota had some interesting examples of jail industry programs. For example, Hennipenn County jail in Minnesota has one of the oldest continuously operating jail industry programs in the USA. It was called the Hennipenn County Work House, but officially it is the Hennipenn County Adult Corrections Facility Industries program. This is real “jail industry”, it uses inmates to produce things, factory style, and employs over 10 percent of the sentenced inmates, and “provides light assembly and packaging

services to Minnesota-based private-sector companies” (Jacobsen, 1992). A similar but small program exists in the Winona County, Minnesota jail. In the Fillmore County, Minnesota jail the jail industry program consists of a wood-working shop—producing carved wood products, desk name plates, custom cabinets, even carved wood miniatures—but only for 2 or 3 inmates who earn \$5.00 an hour.

An example of a diversified jail industry program would be the York Street Industries in the Hampden County Jail (Trevathan, 2000). About 50 inmates participate on a yearly basis, earning 50 cents to \$1.00 an hour; making and repairing furniture; silk screening t-shirts; manufacturing uniforms, mattresses, and mattress covers; and custom wood restoration, upholstery, and assembling hygiene kits (Miller and Trevathan, 2003).

The definitive guide to jail industry programs by Quirk and Miller (2002) provides a jail director all the information needed to start such a program. It defines a jail industry as “any activity that rewards inmates with pay, privileges, or other benefits to create a product or service having value for a public or private client” (Quirk and Miller, 2002). The website for the National Jail Work and Industry Center provides a great deal of useful information about these two topics.

6. Drug Treatment in Jail

Detoxification is the default for helping inmates cope with their drug addiction. In fact, research by Fiscella, et al (2005) showed that only one percent of American jails use methadone or other opiate based medications for helping newly arriving inmates cope with their addiction.

The belief that drug maintenance for addicts is the best form of drug treatment is simply a viewpoint that does not enjoy universal support among jail administrators. Inmates would presumably like to have more drug maintenance services in jails. But as aptly described by Schwatzapfel (2019):

“Most jails and prisons around the country forbid methadone and a newer addiction medication buprenorphine, even when legitimately prescribed, on the grounds that they pose safety and security concerns. The drugs are frequently smuggled into facilities and sold or traded among prisoners” (Schwartzapfel, 2019: p. 2).

There are other variations in what constitutes drug treatment services. Certainly, a modified therapeutic community or a drug abuse support group like AA or NA or a 12 step program would count in that regard. The therapeutic value of interactive journaling has in fact been used as an intervention for inmates who met DSM-IV-TR criteria for “substance dependence”. In one test of interactive journaling those addicts who journaled in the jail had a significantly lower recidivism rate than those inmates who did not journal (Proctor, Hoffman, and Allison, 2012).

Clearly, much research recommends the use of substance-abuse treatment for inmates (Linhorst, Dirks-Kinhorst, and Groom, 2012). In fact, some research has

shown that in a comparison of buprenorphine and methadone as drug maintenance medications, a randomized clinical trial showed that the buprenorphine group was significantly more likely to continue with their post-release treatment (Magura, et al, 2009).

The evidence is strongly supportive of the idea that jail-based drug and alcohol treatment programs for inmates reduces recidivism (Turley, et al, 2004). For example, in a drug treatment program in the Monroe County, New York jail, three consecutive and separate cohorts of drug treatment clients showed substantially lower recidivism rates (Turley, et al, 2004).

7. Suicide Among Jail Inmates

Suicide is a leading cause of death among jail inmates in the United States (Blasko, Jeglic, and Malkin, 2008). There is a growing body of literature devoted to the many things a jail administrator can do to reduce the risks of inmate suicides. It is possible that a review of this richly detailed literature allows for the development of a detailed social-psychological profile for understanding which inmates are at the highest risk for suicide in jail.

First it is important to keep in perspective the difference that emerges in comparing suicide rates in jail and those found in prisons. It has been argued in this paper that jails can be considered in some respects “harder time” than confinement in prison. For example, the research by Mumola (2005) showed that suicide rates in jails are three times higher than suicide rates found in prisons.

Other “suicide risk” background factors of the profile include:

*** Mean age of 29.2, single, under the influence of alcohol at time of arrest (Winter, 2003).

*** Most likely to occur within the first 24 to 48 hours after being admitted to jail (Tartaro, 2003).

*** Typical day for suicide is a Monday in January; 97.1% of the time a male inmate; 97.1% of the time uses hanging as a suicide method (Winter, 2000).

*** Not to challenge the research finding by Winter about the risk being mostly a male inmate status, but one piece of research has suggested that women in jail have a higher incidence of some risk factors for suicide than men (Charles, et al, 2003)..

*** Solitary confinement will increase the likelihood of suicide and self-harm (Kaba, et al, 2014).

*** Suicides are more likely to occur in jails with a higher level of inmate-inmate assaults (Tartaro and Levy, 2008).

*** Suicide risk is increased if there is shame from being jailed and where there is fear of the unknown and fear of other inmates (U.S. Marshals Service, 2012).

SUMMARY

Only two prior national estimates exist for any insight into what the national gang density rates are for jail inmates in the United States. The 1993 NGCRC research showed that 5.09 percent of jail inmates were gang members. The study by Ruddell, Decker, and Egley (2006) was based on a survey of N = 134 jails in 39 states and showed that 13 percent of jail inmates were gang members. We will see a comparison with the 2019 gang density rate in the next chapter.

Some of the other issues reviewed in this chapter that are addressed in the next chapter with reference to actual empirical findings include these topics: inmate visiting, jail industry, drug treatment, and inmate suicide — all of which will be examined through the lense of fresh new data from the 2019 survey research findings in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 3: DESCRIPTIVE RESEARCH FINDINGS FROM THE 2019 JAIL SURVEY

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to briefly explain the research methodology and to make a presentation of the descriptive statistical research findings from the NGCRC's 2019 Jail Survey. As the 2019 survey instrument contains survey questions that were directly replicated from the NGCRC's 1993 survey, where appropriate in this chapter, we will additionally note the difference if any in comparing the results from these two time periods.

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

A pool of survey items for this research project was developed primarily around a straight forward replication of the NGCRC's 1993 survey of jails in America. A variety of gang experts were consulted on new items to include in the 2019 NGCRC jail survey. This study is based on survey research methodology involving the use of an anonymous mail questionnaire sent to all known county jails in the United States.

A mail questionnaire survey methodology was used here. There are approximately 3,000 county jails in the United States. The NGCRC sent a cover letter and a copy of the 4-page printed booklet questionnaire, containing approximately 80 survey questions, mostly forced choice items but some opened ended items. A copy of the survey instrument is provided in Appendix A. A prepaid postage Business Reply Mail (BRM) #9 envelope was also enclosed with the cover letter and survey instrument.

A small pretest of the survey helped to eliminate, or refine, or revise some survey items. A pretest of the questionnaire was used to identify questions or survey items

that needed to be modified, edited, expanded in scope, or dropped entirely. The pretest involved contacting persons known to the NGCRC who through our conference training lists, our other corrections-related mailing list, our journal subscription list and asking them to review the survey instrument and return it to us with any concerns or suggestions. We are grateful to a number of persons for their assistance in this regard at the early stages of the research process.

The surveys were mailed out on July 15, 2019. Incoming survey data was cut-off after two months. At which time a total national sample of $N = 276$ existed representing 41 states or more. We were able to ascertain a conservative estimate of how many states responded from a simple count of the addresses of respondents who requested a free copy of the final report. Not everyone wanted a copy of the report. We allowed totally anonymous responses. Respondents who wanted a copy of the final report were able to request it and were the first ones mailed a copy of the final report seen here.

Any survey responses received after September, 2019 were not used in the research, but we automatically made sure even late respondents were included on the “priority” dissemination list for a free copy of the full report.

DESCRIPTIVE SURVEY RESULTS

1. Background Factors About American Jails in this Sample

RATED CAPACITY OF THE JAILS

The survey asked, “what is your rated capacity for inmates”. The results showed a range from a low of three to a high of 2,006. By the standard of rated capacity, some 6 percent of the sample would be considered mega-jails, having the rated capacity to hold 1,000 or more inmates. The arithmetic mean for this variable was 247 inmates as the average rated capacity. The sum total in terms of jail capacity represented in this sample is 66,300.

JAILS ARE MOSTLY MEDIUM TO HIGH SECURITY FACILITIES

The survey asked, “what level of security is your facility”. The results showed that only 18.8 percent ($N = 36$) considered themselves minimum security facilities. Some 47.6 percent ($N = 91$) self-rated as medium secure and a third (33.5%, $N = 64$) rated their facility as being a high security level. Basically, 81.2 percent of the jails are classified as either medium or high security.

YEAR THE JAIL’S PHYSICAL PLANT WAS FIRST CONSTRUCTED

The survey asked, “in what year was your physical plant first constructed”. The results showed a range in values between the oldest being built in 1897 to the newest being built in 2019. A fourth of the jails (25.6%) were built before 1980. The mean

value was 1988, meaning the average jail in the USA was built in 1988 and is now over thirty years old.

INMATE COUNTS BY GENDER AND AGE RANGE

The survey asked the jail respondents to report the separate inmate counts by male and female inmates. The counts for male inmates ranged from a low of zero to a high of 1,544. The counts for female inmates ranged from a low of zero to a high of 366. The mean scores were 162 males and 34 females for the overall sample.

The survey asked “what is the age range of the inmates in your facility today”. The youngest inmate age range was from 13 to 39 with a mean of 18.7 years of age. The oldest inmate age range was from 31 to 99 years old with a mean of 64.6 years of age.

TOTAL INMATE POPULATION COUNTS

The survey asked, “what is the total inmate population count for your facility as of today”. The survey was completed during the summer of 2019. The results show a range from a low of zero to a high of 1895. Three jails had no inmates that day. Most of these jails are smaller jails, for example nearly half of the sample 50.9 percent had less than 100 inmates in their count. Only 2.9 percent of the sample were “mega-jails”, having 1,000 or more inmates in custody. The arithmetic mean for this variable was 217 inmates as the average inmate population count. The sum total of inmates by population count in this sample is 59,815.

OVER HALF OF AMERICAN JAILS HAVE A WEBSITE WHERE THE PUBLIC CAN VIEW PICTURES AND ARREST INFORMATION ON INMATES DETAINED IN THEIR JAIL

The survey asked, “does your jail provide a website available to the general public to view the pictures and arrest information on inmates detained in your jail”. Just over half of the jails in the United States today (54.6%, N = 148) now report that their jail website offers pictures and arrest information on the inmates they detain for public viewing. Some 45.4 percent (N = 123) of American jails do not yet offer this website feature.

TYPES OF OUTSIDE JAIL ACCREDITATION

There are at least three (3) different professional organizations that provide outside evaluation and assessment services and standards for the accreditation of jails in America. These are the American Correctional Association (ACA), the American Jail Association (AJA), and the National Sheriff’s Association (NSA). The survey asked if their jail facility was accredited by any of these three major accreditation organizations.

Table 1 provides the findings from these three questions on the survey. Table 1

shows that the real news here is the lack of accreditation by most jails in America. Typically, over three-fourths of American jails lack accreditation from any of the major three outside accrediting organizations. The accreditation percentages range from 15.5% (ACA), to 21 percent (21.1%, AJA; 21.6% NSA).

We did notice N = 26 patterns of being accredited by two or more of the three accrediting organizations. There were N = 9 accredited by all three. There were N = 7 accredited by ACA and AJA. And there were 10 accredited by AJA and the NSA.

In theory, accreditation of a jail should be very important, and where the jail has achieved outside accreditation, it seems reasonable to hypothesize that it is a facility more deserving of increased public funding. But that is not actually how it works for the typical jail in America. And perhaps that could explain why jails are not aggressively seeking such accreditation. Why bother when in the end it is pure politics as to whether their agency does or does not get sufficient funding? It may very well be that cynicism like this explains why jails as modern service organizations are not seeking outside accreditation and review. It sorely deserves more additional research and inquiry.

Table 1: Are the Jails Accredited by Any of These Organizations?

	NO		YES	
	N	%	N	%
American Correctional Association (ACA)?	164	84.5	30	15.5
American Jail Association (AJA)?	157	78.9	42	21.1
National Sheriff’s Association (NSA)?	163	78.4	45	21.6

The ACA results are similar to those reported in the 1993 jail survey (18.3%).

2. JAIL STAFFING AND MANAGEMENT ISSUES

VAST MAJORITY OF JAILS FEEL THEIR AGENCY IS UNDERFUNDED

The survey asked, “do you feel your agency receives adequate funding”. The survey results show showed that the vast majority (N = 222, 82.8%) felt “no”, that their agency does not receive adequate funding. Less than a fifth (17.2%) reported that their agency receives adequate funding.

A second follow-up question asked, “what percentage increase in your budget would be necessary to assure no overcrowding, adequate staff, training, and services”. The resulting responses to that open-ended question showed a range of values between a low “zero” and a high of “1000 percent”. A mean score of a 42.5 percent budget increase would be necessary to achieve these goals is the finding here. This finding is remarkably similar to that found originally in the 1993 jail survey

were a mean score of 42.2 percent budget increase would be necessary.

MOST JAILS IN AMERICA DO NOT OFFER TUITION REIMBURSEMENT FOR COLLEGE CLASSES TO THEIR CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS

The employer that invests in the human capital of its employees is one that earns higher retention, higher morale, and less turnover. The survey asked, “do your correctional officers receive tuition reimbursement for college classes”. The results show that the vast majority of jails in America, $N = 219$ (81.7%) do not offer tuition reimbursement for college courses to jail staff. Only 18.3 percent of the jails in this survey indicated that jail staff can receive this kind of employment benefit. It would seem that this is an area deserving of immediate legislative action to spur more professional growth in staff who take the kind of risks they do to provide such an important protection for their society.

The 1993 jail survey results were similar, only 22.9% of jails reported providing tuition reimbursement.

JAIL STAFFING: ONLY A FOURTH OF JAIL STAFF ARE CONSIDERED SWORN DEPUTIES WITH ARREST POWERS

The survey asked, “are the detention officers who work in your jail considered commissioned deputies with arrest powers”. Only about a fourth (26%, $N = 70$) indicated “yes”, that their jail staff are considered sworn deputies with arrest powers. In most cases in American jails today, this shows that three-fourths (74%, $N = 199$) of the jails have detention officers who work in the jail who are not considered deputies with arrest powers. Inmates in any jail in America are quick to pick up on the not so subtle status difference here between a sworn “deputy sheriff” and a “correctional officer” who does not even have the authority to carry a sidearm off work. Inmates have a variety of terms of derision for these non-sworn personnel, they call them “hacks”, “turn keys” (implying they have limited powers, only the power to turn a key in a lock), “jailer”, etc.

MOST CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS RECEIVE ONGOING IN-SERVICE TRAINING IN AMERICAN JAILS TODAY

The survey asked, “do your correctional officers receive ongoing in-service training”. The survey showed that 82.7 percent ($N = 225$) of the jails do in fact provide this valuable on-going in-service training to their jail staff. Only 17.3 percent ($N = 47$) of the jails reported no such ongoing in-service training for their staff.

A follow-up question in this regard asked “how many hours” of ongoing in-service training per month. The mean, or arithmetic average, was 6.35 hours per month of ongoing in-service training.

Has this situation of staff training changed dramatically in the last 25 years? Not dramatically, but there is a slight improvement when comparing these 2019 findings to the original 1993 jail survey results. In the 1993 survey, some 20.9% of jails did not provide ongoing in-service training, and where they did, it has a mean value of 3.45 hours per month. Thus, the comparison with the benchmark for the original 1993 jail survey findings would suggest some small improvements have been made in terms of investing in staff by means of in-service training.

AVERAGE JAIL IN AMERICA HAS AN ASSAULT ON STAFF FROM AN INMATE ONCE EVERY THREE MONTHS

The survey asked the jails to “please estimate the total number of assaults by inmates against your correctional personnel in the last twelve months”. The results showed a range from a low of zero or none — no inmate assaults on staff — to a high of 107 such assaults during the last one-year time period. The mean, or arithmetic average, was 4.14 such assaults on staff for the typical jail in the USA today. That means that on average, a jail in America has at least one assault against a staff member every three months. In other words, in your budget plan for one or more assaults on staff from inmates each quarter. It is a predictable and ongoing risk to jail staff.

In the 1993 survey, 43.8 percent of the jails reported zero such assaults on staff from inmates during the last one-year period. In the 2019 jail survey replicating the same survey item, 33.2 percent of the respondents indicated “zero” such assaults. The trend seems to be an increasing incidence of assaults on staff.

ONE IN FIVE JAILS REPORT SERIOUS STAFF INJURIES FROM ATTACKS/CONFRONTATIONS WITH INMATES IN THE LAST YEAR

The survey asked, “have any of your staff received serious injuries from attacks or confrontations with inmates within the last twelve months”. The results show that 21.5 percent (N = 58) of the jails report having staff injuries from attacks or confrontations with inmates during the last year. In most cases (N = 212, 78.5%) jails report no such staff receiving serious injuries from attacks or confrontations with inmates during the last one-year time frame.

There is a slight upward trend in this problem is what emerges when comparing this 2019 survey result to the 1993 original jail survey. In the 1993 survey, the same question showed only 13.4% of jails reported such serious staff injuries from inmate attacks. This is frankly a kind of occupational risk that can bring about post-traumatic stress. It would appear from the findings here that this problem is creeping upwards as an occupational risk for jail staff.

3. INMATE PROGRAM AND REHABILITATION/TREATMENT ISSUES

CONTACT VISITS IN JAILS ARE THE EXCEPTION TO THE RULE

The study by Sturges (2002) showed among other things that the persons visiting the inmates at the jail really wanted to have contact visits. For security reasons, contact visits in American jails today are the exception to the rule. The survey asked, “are contact visits allowed for inmates in your facility”. Only about a fifth of the jails in the United States today actually permit inmates to have what are called contact visits. A contact visit allows for an inmate to hug or hold his child, or to hug and kiss his wife, or to shake the hand of a clergy person visiting the inmate. Only 22.3 percent (N = 61) of the jails in this survey indicated that they allow such contact visits. Thus, the vast majority of American jails (77.7%, N = 212) do not allow contact visits.

OVERWHELMING VAST MAJORITY OF JAILS BELIEVE CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS SHOULD BE COMPASSIONATE

The survey asked, “do you believe correctional officers who work in the jail should be trained to calm inmates’ emotional distress”. Almost all respondents (N = 263, 96.7%) indicated “yes” that correctional officers in jail should be trained to calm an inmate’s emotional distress. Only 3.3 percent (N = 9) of the respondents did not feel correctional officers needed to have this kind of compassionate care training.

The original 1993 jail survey had similar high responses — 99.2% of jail staff should be trained to calm inmate distress,

THREE FOURTHS OF JAIL RESPONDENTS BELIEVE THE SUPREME COURT HAS GONE TOO FAR ON RULING IN FAVOR OF THE RIGHTS OF INMATES

The survey asked, “in general, do you believe the Supreme Court has gone too far on ruling in favor of inmate rights”. Three fourths of the sample (75.9%, N = 198) agreed with the statement that in general the Supreme Court has gone too far on ruling in favor of inmate rights. Only a fourth (24.1%, N = 63) disagreed with this notion.

Results from the 1993 jail survey were similarly high for believing the Supreme Court had gone too far in ruling in favor of inmate rights (83.5%).

DURATION OF VISITING HOURS IN AMERICAN JAILS

There appears to be no standardization of the duration of visiting hour for jail inmates. The survey asked, “what is the maximum number of visiting hours an inmate can receive on a weekly basis in your facility”. The major finding for this factor of visiting time from the survey is this: the mode visiting time, most common length of visiting time, for American jails would be one or two hours per week. The

mean amount of visiting time is 2.35 hours per week. But the range of visiting time on a weekly basis varied from a low of “minutes” to a high of 50 hours.

Video visiting is probably the future way of visiting jail inmates. Remember that from the point of view of jail officials, it is a security issue to have people enter the jail environment even for visiting. In this way, Swager (2000) showed how video visiting was being used in the Falkenburg Road jail in Hillsborough County, Florida; simple enough, visitors and inmates talk to each other over a video monitor. It could probably be done via an app on a smart phone as well. Video visiting in the Falkenburg Road jail began in 2017 to use video visiting by internet and an inmate can have three visits per week.

CODE FOR CONJUGAL VISITING: PRIVATE CONTACT VISITS WITH SPOUSES

It is probably not something a jail would want to advertise, as it would draw the wrong kind of public attention and mass media coverage could be very damaging. But it does happen, it does exist. But on any large scale is what this research shows.

The survey asked, “are private contact visits allowed for spouses under special arrangements for deserving inmates”. Only 6.2 percent (N = 17) of the jails indicated this was a possibility. The vast majority of jails represented in this research (93.8%, N = 258) report that their jails would not offer this kind of visiting arrangement. Still the idea is somewhat mind boggling from the viewpoint of wealthier defendants who could afford to ask for or negotiate with federal agencies for a placement in such a jail. This research has clearly shown there are some jails where if you did have to be in jail, these would be great jails to be locked up in (e.g., ones where you could have visiting daily for 8 hours for 6 days a week, that offer contact visiting, in a low gang problem jail facility that also provides internet access).

DIVISIVE ISSUE ABOUT AMERICAN JAILS: BELIEFS ABOUT INMATE REHABILITATION

The survey asked, “do you feel society wants to help inmates be rehabilitated”. There is just no consensus on this issue among those who actually work in jails. Respondents are evenly divided on this matter. About half (48.5%, N = 131) do in fact believe that society wants to help inmates be rehabilitated. Yet, on the other hand, the other half (51.5%, N = 139) do not believe that society really wants to help inmates be rehabilitated.

The 1993 jail survey results on this same question showed more conservative views: 25.8 percent “yes” society wants to help inmates be rehabilitated, 74.2% “no”, society does not want to help inmates be rehabilitated.

HALF BELIEVE ELECTRONIC MONITORING COULD BE MORE COST-EFFECTIVE THAN LOCAL DETENTION

The survey asked, “do you believe electronic monitoring could be more cost-effective than local detention while awaiting trial”. The results are evenly divided on this issue. About half (48.9%, N = 128) believe that yes — electronic monitoring could in fact be more cost-effective than local detention. And the other half (51.1%, N = 134) do not believe that electronic monitoring could be more cost-effective than local detention.

The results from the 1993 jail survey on this same survey item were almost identical: some 48.4 percent said “yes”, electronic monitoring could be more cost-effective.

Still it is clear that electronic monitoring is an alternative to local detention. County Boards and taxpayers alike should be happy to hear that half of the jails themselves believe it could be more cost-effective to use electronic monitoring.

BELIEFS ABOUT PUNISHMENT AND REHABILITATION

The survey asked, “in your opinion, which of the following correctional goals/philosophies is most effective in reducing recidivism, punishment or rehabilitation”. The issue of what works the best in comparing punishment and rehabilitation is shown here to still be somewhat of a philosophical debate. But if it was a vote, rehabilitation would win the election here. Just over half of the jail respondents (57.1%, N = 144) stated that rehabilitation was the most effective. Some 42.9 percent (N = 108) indicated that punishment was most effective. The jail respondents are just being very candid in their survey responses is what this data shows.

The 1993 jail survey reported 55.9 percent for punishment, 44.1 percent for rehabilitation.

INTERNET ACCESS FOR AMERICAN JAIL INMATES STILL RARELY AVAILABLE

The survey asked, “do inmates have access to computers or the internet to access their email”. The way this works in practice, where it does exist, is that just as a phone can be passed from cell to cell to call home, in some jails inmates can have access to a think pad device that is passed from cell to cell. In this way the inmates can access their emails. While inmates may love this kind of thing, it is rarely available in American jails according to the findings from this jail research. Only 15.6 percent of the jails (N = 43) reported that they give inmates internet access to respond to emails. Thus, 84.4 percent (N = 232) of the jails did not allow internet access for their inmates.

JAIL INDUSTRY PROGRAMS FOR JAIL INMATES: NOT WIDELY AVAILABLE IN THE USA

The survey included the question “does your jail have any kind of jail industry program? (A jail industry is any activity that rewards inmates with pay, privileges, or other benefits to create a product or service having value for a public or private client)”. The results show that only about a fifth of American jails (N = 53, 19.4%) offer any kind of jail industry program. Most American jails (80.6%, N = 220) do not offer any kind of jail industry program.

RARE FOR JAILS TO EMPLOY OMBUDSMEN OR ADVOCATES FOR INMATES

The survey included the question “does your facility have any full-time staff employed as ombudsmen or advocates for inmates”. Less than one out of ten of the jail respondents (9.6%, N = 26) reported that their jail had such full-time advocates for their inmates. Thus, the vast majority (90.4%, N = 246) of the jails did not have such social workers for the inmates.

The 1993 jail survey produced similar low results for this variable, only 5.4% reported any full-time staff employed in the role of an ombudsman.

THE POSTCARD ONLY OPTION FOR INMATE CORRESPONDENCE

The survey asked, “does your jail use some version of the “postcard-only” option (in your jail, is incoming or outgoing mail to inmates limited to post-cards and not letters with envelopes)”. The results show that 14.7 percent (N = 40) of the jail respondents are reporting that they currently use some version of this more restrictive inmate correspondence policy. Most jails (85.3%, N = 232) do not use this kind of “post-card only” inmate correspondence policy.

We wondered if the inmates were just in some kind of “Green” environmentally friendly jail that wanted to discourage the destruction of trees, and to do this they would give inmates internet access, so that on the internet an inmate can write and send as much narrative information or letters as desired. In other words, will we find a significant difference comparing inmates in jails providing inmates internet access and jails using the postcard only policy? Yes, is the answer. Among inmates who were provided internet access in their jail, 27.9 percent faced the postcard only writing policy; while inmates provided with no internet access showed only 11.4% faced the postcard only problem (Chi-square = 817, p .004).

IS LITERACY A PROBLEM AMONG INMATES?

The survey asked, “do you believe illiteracy is a problem among the offenders in your facility?”. About half of the respondents (N = 132, 48.7%) answered yes. The other half (51.3%) did not believe illiteracy is a problem among the offenders in their jail facility.

ALMOST HALF THE JAILS IN AMERICA OFFER A GED PROGRAM FOR INMATES

The survey asked, “does your jail have a GED program for inmates?”. The results show that 46.9 percent (N = 128) of the jails nationwide do in fact report that their jail has a GED program for inmates. It may not be called specifically a “G.E.D.” or General Equivalency Diploma, it may have a variety of names similar in meaning (e.g., High School Equivalency Diploma). Still, about half of the jails (53.1 percent, N = 145) report that they do not have such an educational upgrading program for inmates.

A legislative proposal that would seem to have great merit would be to provide small levels of funding to jails directly from the National Institute of Corrections within the U.S. Department of Justice in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Education to establish new GED programs for inmates nationwide.

A MAJORITY OF AMERICAN JAILS DO NOT HAVE A DRUG TREATMENT PROGRAM TODAY

The survey asked, “does your facility have a drug treatment program?”. The results showed that 58.3 percent (N = 155) of the jails did not have a drug treatment program. About two-fifths of the jails in the USA (N = 111, 41.7%) do report that they have a drug treatment program.

Not much has changed in the last 25 years about drug treatment behind bars. The 1993 jail survey showed that 47.3% of the jails reported having a drug treatment program.

A follow-up question asked the jails to rate the effectiveness of their drug treatment program on a scale from a low of “1” (for not effective) to a high of “10” (for highly effective). The results showed a full range from 1 thru 10, and a mean score of 4.53.

TWO-THIRDS OF AMERICAN JAILS FORBID THE USE OF METHADONE AND BUPRENORPHINE FOR INMATES WITH ADDICTIONS

The survey posed the following true/false question to the jail respondents: “our jail forbids methadone (and a newer addiction medication - buprenorphine) for inmates even when legitimately prescribed, on the grounds that these drugs pose safety and security concerns”. The results show that just over two-thirds of the jails (69.6%, N = 179) currently forbid methadone and buprenorphine for inmates even when legitimately prescribed, on the grounds that these drugs pose safety and security concerns. One of the security grounds is that addicts routinely sell their supplies of methadone to other addicts and in theory could sell it to another inmate. On the other hand, one of the most common forms of the methadone drug is a liquid form, and that would be very hard to sell once it is swallowed by an inmate. Some 30.4 percent (N = 78) of the jails indicated that they do not forbid methadone or

buprenorphine for addicts.

ESTIMATES OF THE NEED FOR DRUG ADDICTION COUNSELING

The survey asked the jails to “estimate what percentage of your inmate population need drug addiction counseling services”. The results showed a true range from zero to a high of 100 percent. The mean score was 60 percent for the entire national sample. As a needs assessment, clearly there is justification for the development and implementation of sorely needed services of this kind in the modern American jail environment.

A THIRD OF THE JAILS REPORT THEY OFTEN FIND ILLICIT DRUGS WHEN THEY HAVE A “SHAKE DOWN”

The survey asked, “do you often find illicit drugs when you have a shake-down in your facility?”. The results showed that about a third (N = 91, 33.8%) reported “yes”, that they do find illicit drugs when they have a shake-down. Still, about two-thirds of the jails report that they are not finding illicit drugs when they have a shake down. Drugs are, after all, considered the number one type of “contraband” sought after by inmates.

This question, like others in the 2019 jail survey, is a direct replication of the previous study of jails made by the NGCRC in 1993. In 1993, only 16.8 percent of the jails reported finding illicit drugs in shakedown. This problem appears to have doubled in the last 25 years.

4. GANG AND SECURITY THREAT GROUP (STG) ISSUES

ESTIMATES FOR GANG DENSITY IN AMERICAN JAILS TODAY

The survey asked the responding jails to provide gang density estimates for both male and female inmates. The survey asked specifically “Among staff who know about gang members, what is the current estimate of what percentage gang members are of the total inmate population”, with separate estimates for males and females. For male jail inmates the results ranged from a low of zero percent to a high of 90.0 percent. For female jail inmates the results ranged from a low of zero percent to a high of 70.0 percent. The arithmetic mean scores showed that overall in American jails today, about 15.5 percent of male inmates and 3.9 percent of female inmates were gang members. This would be the national gang density estimate for jail inmates. It appears to have not dramatically increased since the gang density level of 13 percent reported by Ruddell, Decker and Egley (2006). But the 1993 NGCRC study of gangs in jails, basically the first analysis of its kind for the jail environment, had reported a mean of 5.09 percent for males and 2.2 percent for females. From this historical viewpoint the gang problem is increasing slowly in the jail environment.

Gang Density in U.S. Jails Over Time		
1993	2006	2019
5.09%	13%	15.5%

THREE-FOURTHS OF JAILS TAKE GANG MEMBERSHIP INTO ACCOUNT IN THEIR INMATE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

A correctional facility has to use a classification system for the proper management of a jail as a formal organization. The survey asked, “does your classification system take gang membership into account”. While the good news is that most of the jails (75.4%, N = 202) do in fact take gang membership into account in their classification system, a fourth (24.6%, N = 66) clearly do not. Thus, in a fourth of American jails an inmates gang status would not be considered in the

classification system being used. One of the many great values of an effective inmate classification system is the management of known risks. Gang membership is a clearly known risk.

The 1993 jail survey reported that only 42.6 percent take gang membership into account in their inmate classification system. The increase to 75.4 percent in 2019 would appear to be a natural progression.

GANG MEMBERS INVOLVED IN ARSON

The survey asked, “have gang members in your jurisdiction been involved in the crime of arson”. This is an area of gang crime that has enjoyed scant previous research. It is of interest that 18.7 percent of the respondents (N = 46) are reporting this unique type of crime pattern. Some 81.3 percent (N = 200) of the jails report no gang involvement in arson crimes.

ABOUT A FOURTH OF AMERICAN JAILS REPORT THEIR STAFF RECEIVE FORMAL TRAINING IN DEALING WITH THE GANG PROBLEM

The survey asked, “do your staff receive formalized training in dealing with the gang problem”. Only about a fourth of the jails (N = 73, 27.4%) responding to this survey indicated an affirmative answer that “yes”, the staff in their jails receive formal training in dealing with the gang problem. So, basically the majority of jails (N = 193, 72.6%) report that their staff do not receive formal training in dealing with the gang problem. Not much has changed in 25 years in American jails apparently, as we found the same thing in 1993 — the 1993 jail survey showed 26.1% of the jails provided training on the gang issue.

A follow-up question on this issue asked, “if yes, how many hours is the gang training session”. The results showed a range of values between a low of zero to a high of 40 hours. The arithmetic mean score was 5.3 hours nationwide.

In the United States today, most jails do not provide their staff with gang training, and when they do it is not very intensive.

Under the doctrine of pessimism, one could speculate that the reason jail staff do not get training on how to deal with gangs and security threat groups (STGs) is that maybe in the opinion of the staff who actually work in jails it would not help anyhow. But no, that is apparently not the case, because an additional follow-up question addressed this very issue. The survey asked, “in your opinion, could your staff benefit from professional outside training dealing with gangs”, and here the results showed an overwhelming majority (81.7%, N = 219) felt “yes”, that such training would in fact be beneficial.

What we know can be more precisely stated as follows: while the vast majority of American jails would welcome it as beneficial for the job of working in a jail, overall in the United States today, most jails do not provide their staff with gang training and when they do it is not very intensive. And yet the gang problem figures prominently in one of the clusters of jail problems that can be a source of trauma and stress for those who work there.

WHEN DID GANGS FIRST APPEAR AS A PROBLEM IN THE JAILS?

The survey asked, “in what year did gang problems among inmates first become recognized in your facility”. The results showed a range from an earliest time frame of 1973 to as recently as 2019 for when the gang problem was first noticed among inmates in their jail facilities. The mean score here was 2004. Some 53.1 percent of the jails discovered the gang problem on or before 2006. About ten percent (10.2%) of the jails in America first discovered the inmate gang problem during the last three-year time period (2017-2019).

PREVALENCE OF MILITARY-TRAINED GANG MEMBERS

This is an important area of research that has basically been totally ignored by the federal government. Similarly, no private foundations have ever yet sponsored research in this focal area as well. The “Los Zeta’s” gang in various areas of Mexico is one of the most well-known gangs that has risen to prominence because of the prior military training of their members. Fortunately, as of this date, no single gang of that nature has arisen or been imported into the United States yet. The issue here is the prevalence of military-trained gang members.

The survey included the question “have you had inmates who could be considered military-trained gang members?”. The results showed that nearly one out of five of the jails, some 20.4 percent (N = 48), reported that yes in fact they have had inmates who could be considered military-trained gang members. And, most (79.6%, N = 187) have not yet seen this phenomenon or are not geared up enough to identify it.

NAMES OF THE MAJOR WHITE RACIST EXTREMIST GANGS OR HATE GROUPS AS REPORTED BY RESPONDING JAILS

Table 2 Provides the alphabetical listing of names of the major white racist extremist gangs or hate groups reported by jails today. We are seeing some proliferation in this problem and a number of new names for new groups and new entities.

But the names of those who appear in the Top Five largest white racist extremist gangs (see Table 3) are not surprises: these are long standing and persistent over a long period of American history. The top five being: the Aryan Brotherhood (67 citations), the Ku Klux Klan (19 citations), Peckerwoods (18 citations), Aryan Nation (16 citations), and various Skinhead factions (13 citations).

Table 2: Alphabetical Listing of Names of the Major White Racist Extremist Gangs or Hate Groups Reported by Jails Today

211 Crew
 ABT (2 citations)
 American Freedom Party
 Aryan Brotherhood (67 citations)
 Aryan Brotherhood of Texas (2 citations)
 Aryan Circle (4 citations)
 Aryan Kings (AK’s)
 Aryan Knights
 Aryan Nation (16 citations)
 Aryan Royals (2 citations)
 Atomwaffer Division
 Bound For Glory
 BOWW
 BPM
 Crazy White Boys (4 citations)
 Dirty White Boys (2 citations)
 DMI
 Family Values (2 citations)
 Firm 22
 Folk Nation
 Gay Lords
 General Skinheads
 GFG

Table 2: Continued --- Alphabetical Listing of Names of the Major White Racist Extremist Gangs or Hate Groups

Ghost Face (4 citations)
 Imperial Klansmen of America
 ISA
 Keystone United
 Ku Klux Klan (18 citations)
 KSS (K State Skinheads)
 KU Keystone United
 Midwest Honky
 N.A.E.
 National Alliance (2 citations)
 Nazi Lowriders
 Neo-Nazi
 New Aryan Empire
 Peckerwoods (18 citations)
 Posse Comitatus
 Prison Motorcycle Brotherhood (2 citations)
 Proud boys
 Racial Nationalist Party of America
 Rebel Cause
 River Bottom Boys
 Saxon Knights (6 citations)
 Skinheads (13 citations)
 Southern Brotherhood (2 citations)
 Southwest Honkeys
 Sovereign Citizen (3 citations)
 Susanville White Boys
 SWS (2 citations)
 Texas Syndicate
 The Hated
 The Right Stuff (white Natl.)
 W.A.R. (3 citations)
 We the People
 West Boro Baptist Church (Anti LGBT) in Topeka, KS
 White Boy Family
 White Knights (2 citations)
 White Pride
 White Supremacist (8 citations)

Table 3: Rank Ordering of the Top Five Major White Racist Extremist Gangs Reported in the Jail Survey

Aryan Brotherhood (67 citations)
 Ku Klux Klan (19 citations)
 Peckerwoods (18 citations)
 Aryan Nation (16 citations)
 Skinheads (13 citations)

GANG MEMBERS ARE NOT A PROBLEM IN TERMS OF ASSAULTS ON JAIL STAFF IN MOST JURISDICTIONS

The survey asked, “have gang members been a problem in terms of assaults on your staff”, and the results showed that only 18.3 percent of the jails in the USA today (N = 49) reported that gang members have been a problem in terms of assaults on jail staff. Thus, in most areas of the USA today (N = 219, 81.7%) gangs are not a problem in terms of assault on jail staff.

Still, this finding shows a trend towards increasing severity when compared to the 1993 jail survey. In the 1993 jail survey only 3% of the jails reported that gang members were a problem in terms of assaults on staff. The present research shows that there has been a substantial increase in this problem of assaults on staff in the last 25 year time period. Jails are not becoming friendlier places to work.

A separate question addressed the lower threshold of this same risk factor, that is the survey asked if gang members have been a problem in terms of threats on staff. Here we find that N = 94 jails or 37.6 percent of the respondents currently report that gang members have been a problem in terms of threats against jail staff. The 1993 jail survey showed 26.2% of the jails reported gang members were a problem in terms of threats against staff. So, here again, we see a trend towards increased gang problems in American jails.

VERY COMMON TO FIND THAT WHITE INMATES HAVE A SEPARATE GANG IN AMERICAN JAILS TODAY

The survey asked, “do whites have a separate gang?”. The results showed that 42.5 percent (N = 111) of the jails reported “yes”, that white inmates have a separate gang in their jail. A slight majority of the jails report that white inmates do not have a separate gang in their jail (N = 150, 57.5%).

Consistent with other measures suggesting an upward trend in racial conflict in the jail environment in the last 25 years, it is important to recall that the 1993 jail survey reported only 19.7 percent of the jails reported having white gangs. There has been nearly a three-fold increase in this problem is what jails are currently reporting.

NAMES OF WHITE GANGS

Table 4 provides a complete alphabetical listing of all of the names of white gangs that emerged from the 2019 survey.

Table 4. Distribution of the Names of White Gangs Among Jail Inmates

211 Crew
 A/B-Skinheads
 Albanian Boys Inc
 Aryan Brotherhood (52 citations)
 Aryan Brotherhood of Texas
 Aryan Circle (6 citations)
 Aryan Kings
 Aryan Knights
 Aryan Skins
 Bound for Glory (2 citations)
 Brothers of White Warriors
 California Wood
 Cincinnati White Boys (3 citations)
 Dead Man Incorporated
 Dirty White Boys (5 citations)
 Family Values (3 citations)
 Gaylords (2 citations)

Table 4 Continued --- Names of White Gangs Among Jail Inmates

Gaylord Saxon Knights
 Ghost Face (5 citations)
 Hell Raisers
 Hells Angels (2 citations)
 Hog Pound
 ICMC
 Independent Peckerwoods
 Indian Skinhead Coalition
 Joplin Honkeys (3 citations)
 Juggalo
 Klu Klux Klan (2 citations)
 Nazi Low Riders (3 citations)
 New Aryan Empire
 Outlaw Motorcycle Gang (OMG)
 Pagans
 Peckerwoods (12 citations)
 Piney River Bottom Boys (PRBB)
 Rebel Cause (2 citations)
 Saxon Knights (3 citations)
 Simon City Royals (5 citations)
 Skinheads (3 citations)
 Solid White Soldiers (SWS)
 Southdale
 Southern Brotherhood (2 citations, 2)
 Southwest Honkeys
 Susanville White Boys
 TDA
 The Hated
 TM
 Tre Tre
 Van Order
 Westside Mafia
 White Aryan Resistance (5 citations)
 White Boy Family
 White Devils
 White Knights
 White Pride
 White Supremacy (5 citations)

Table 5. The Top Ten White Gangs Among American Jail Inmates: Rank Ordered by Number of Different Jails With These Kind of Gang Members

Aryan Brotherhood (52 citations)
 Peckerwoods (12 citations)
 Aryan Circle (6 citations)
 Dirty White Boys (5 citations)
 Ghost Face (5 citations)
 Simon City Royals (5 citations)
 White Aryan Resistance (5 citations)
 White Supremacy (5 citations)
 Skinheads (4 citations)
 Nazi Low Riders (3)

A SIMPLE MAJORITY OF JAILS DO NOT REJECT THE IDEA OF NEGOTIATING WITH INMATE GANG LEADERS

Generally, conveying authority to one inmate over another could be construed as a human rights issue dating back to the United Nations standards on the treatment of prisoners. The idea of using inmates to control other inmates — called “Building Tenders” in the Texas penal system — was the basis of prison inmate management in the State of Texas for many years until courts got involved. The idea is not unlike that of using trustees as a supplemental security force or force multiplier, such as in the former prison system of Mississippi. The idea of negotiating with inmate gang leaders can be similar in its effect — giving extra power and authority to specific inmates in the hope that they will use it to keep the peace.

The survey asked, “in your opinion, is giving staff recognition to inmate gang leaders similar to negotiating with terrorists”. Just over half of the jails (N = 150, 57.5%) felt that giving staff recognition to inmate gang leaders is not similar to negotiating with terrorists. Still, a sizable number of jails, N = 111 or 42.5 percent, felt that “yes”: negotiating with inmate gang leaders is similar to negotiating with terrorists. So it would appear that this matter remains a divisive issue for American jails today. As a rule of thumb, building “goodwill” is essential for correctional staff anywhere and from a practical point of view, gang leaders do exert a lot of control over their members. The other side of this controversy is that there could be substantial liability and significant “blowback” associated with negotiating with inmate gang leaders.

In the 1993 jail survey 53% of the jails felt that giving staff recognition to inmate gang leaders is similar to negotiating with terrorists.

NAMES OF THE MAJOR GANGS IN AMERICAN JAILS TODAY

The survey asked the responding jails to print the names of the major gangs represented among inmates in their jail facility. Table 6 provides the distribution of these results in terms of alphabetical order of the name of the major gangs. Table 6 is loaded with a number of major traditional gangs as well as a lot of new hybrid gangs. A few things stand out in reviewing this list. It is significant that Native American gangs are appearing very prominently on this list: AIC, Native Gangster Disciples, Native Latin Kings, Native Mob, Native Nation, and Native Style — their presence was not that conspicuous in the 1993 jail survey results..

Table 6: Alphabetical Order of Major Gangs Represented Among Jail Inmates Today

- 606
- 107 Hoover Criminal Gangsta Crip
- 108 Avenue Piru Gangster Bloods
- 25ers
- 29th St Bloods
- 300 block crips
- 4 Corner Hustlers
- 40th St Crips
- 513’s
- 59 Brim
- 812’s
- 9 Tre Bloods
- A.G.
- Aryan Brotherhood (48 citations)
- Australian Brotherhood ABH
- Aryan Brotherhood of Texas (3 citations)
- American Indian Clique (A.I.C.)

Table 6 Continued --- Alphabetical Order of Major Gangs Represented Among Jail Inmates Today

- Aryan Circle (4 citations)
- Aryan Nation (12 citations)
- Banditos
- Barrio Azteca (2 citations)
- Bikers
- Black Guerilla Family (BGF) (3 citations)
- Black P Stones
- Black P-Stone Nation
- Bloods (62 citations)
- Bloods (Nine-Trey, SMM, DGF)
- Boss Players
- Bound for Glory
- BOWW
- Burquenos
- C.G. (Cam-gang)
- Chuco Tango
- Cincinnati White Boys
- Cobra Nation
- Country Boy Crips
- Crazy Town Roswell (CTR)
- Crips (44 citations)
- Crip (Grape Street)
- Crips (Eight-Trey)
- Curces Boys
- Conservative Vice Lords
- CWB Cincinnati White Boys (2 citations)
- Dead Man Incorporated (3 citations)
- Diablos
- Dirty White Boys (4 citations)
- Disciples
- DMI
- Family Values (4 citations)
- Florencia 13 (2 citations)
- Folk Nation (10 citations)
- Gangster Disciples (44 citations)
- Gangsters (2 citations)
- Gaylords (3 citations)
- Ghost Face (6 citations)
- Greenlighters
- Hell Kill Syndicate
- Hell Raisers (2 citations)
- Hells Angels
- Hog Pound
- Hoover Crips
- IBH (2 citations)
- Insane Gangster Disciples
- Irish MOB
- Iron Horseman
- Joplin Honky
- KSS Keystone State Skinheads
- La Familia

Table 6: Alphabetical Order of Major Gangs Represented Among Jail Inmates Today

Lake Rats
 Latin Kings (26 citations)
 LOE
 Menace of Destruction
 Mexican Mafia (6 citations)
 Mickey Cobras
 Mid West Honkys
 MOB
 Modern Outlaws
 Money World
 Mongols Motorcycle Gang
 MS 13 (14 citations)
 N.F.A. (Never fight again)
 Native Gangs
 Native Gangster Disciples
 Native Latin Kings
 Native Mob (4 citations)
 Native Nation
 Native Style
 Netas
 New Aryan Empire
 Nortenos (12 citations)
 Northside Varrio (NSV) Norteno
 OMG (5 citations)
 Pagans (2 citations)
 Peckerwoods (4 citations)
 People Nation
 Piney River Bottom Boys
 Pistoleros
 Playboy Sorenos (PBS) Sureno
 Prison Motorcycle Gang
 Puro Tango Blast
 Rated R
 Rattlers
 Rebel Cause
 Rollin 60's Crips
 Savage Boys
 Saxon Knights (4 citations)
 Simon City Royals (8 citations)
 Six Nine Mafia
 Small Town White Boys
 SoCo
 South Dale
 South Side Players (SSP) Sureno
 Southern Brotherhood (2 citations)
 Southern Hispanics
 Southerners
 Southside Boys
 Southwest Honkeys
 Sovereign Citizen (2 citations)
 SSG
 Sunny Side Gorge

Table 6: Alphabetical Order of Major Gangs Represented Among Jail Inmates Today

- Surenos (17 citations)
- Susanville White Boys
- SWS
- Tango (3 citations)
- Tango Blast (3 citations)
- Texas Chicano Brotherhood
- Texas Dynasty
- Texas Syndicate (2 citations)
- The OG's
- The Penetrators
- Tri-City Bombers
- Traveling Vice Lord/Off Shoot Junk Yard Dawgs
- TRE TRE
- Tree City Com Posse
- Trip Set
- True Somali Blood
- United Blood Nation (2 citations)
- Vice Lords (19 citations)
- White Aryan Resistance (2 citations)
- West Side Mafia
- West Side Piru Bloods
- West Texas (2 citations)
- West Texas Tango Blast (2)
- White Boy Family
- White Supremacist (8 citations)
- ZMF (2 citations)

Table 7 shows the reduced sized list that contains the names of the major gangs represented among jail inmates today, rank ordered in terms of the frequency they are found in the jails. The MS-13 gang is the only newly added name to the list of the top ten gangs. All the other names of major gangs in Table 5 have been around for many years.

Table 7: Names of the Top Major Gangs Represented Among Jail Inmates: Rank Ordered by Frequency.

- Bloods (62 citations)
- Aryan Brotherhood (48 citations)
- Gangster Disciples (44 citations)
- Crips (44 citations)
- Latin Kings (26 citations)
- Vice Lords (19 citations)
- Surenos (17 citations)
- MS-13 (14 citations)
- Nortenos (12 citations)
- Aryan Nation (12 citations)

BIG DIFFERENCE EMERGES IN COMPARING JAILS AND PRISONS: SIGNIFICANTLY LOWER RATE FOR ISLAMIC INMATES HAVING A SEPARATE GANG

The only explanation we can offer is that jails tend to hold mostly persons awaiting trial, and that maybe this is something they might be motivated to conceal

until after they are transferred to an adult prison. But the fact remains that there is only a small percentage of jails in America that are reporting that Islamic inmates have a separate gang. When we ask the same question of adult state prisons, we find that from a piece of research in 2004 that 44.4 percent of American prisons are reporting that Islamic inmates had a separate gang. But only 5.3 percent of jails in 2019 report this same phenomenon. Basically, the vast majority of jails in America (94.7%) report that Islamic inmates do not have a separate gang.

There were few names of the Islamic gangs, but on that list are: Vice Lords (5 citations), El Rukns, Nation of Islam, Black P. Stones, and True Somali Bloods.

MAJOR FINDING: HIGH PERCENTAGE OF JAILS REPORT INMATES WITH A SOVEREIGN CITIZEN BACKGROUND

The survey asked, “in the last year, has your jail held any inmates who were associated with the Sovereign Citizen’s Movement”. This is a newer problem in American law enforcement and corrections and represents the first time this question has appeared in any of the NGCRC surveys of American criminal justice organizations (municipal police, county sheriffs, county jails, county juvenile detention centers, county prosecutors, state prisons, etc) that began in the 1990’s. It is not new to the gang specialist community, as this aspect of security threat group (STG) analysis has been a feature of NGCRC gang/STG training in recent years.

As a rule of thumb, the conclusion about this movement is that it is “growing....on the rise”.

It is therefore interesting to find from this survey research that about half of the jails in America are reporting that they have recently had inmates involved in the Sovereign Citizen’s Movement. Some 51.8 percent of the responding jails (N = 141) indicated “yes” that in the last one-year time frame they have encountered inmates from this political extremist movement. And, about half (48.2%, N = 131) report not having such inmates in their custody during the last one-year time period.

SHOULD JAIL ACCREDITING ORGANIZATIONS ESTABLISH STANDARDS ON CONTROLLING INMATE GANGS?

The survey asked, “in your opinion, should the American Correctional Association (ACA) establish Standards for controlling inmate gangs”. The majority of jails in America today do in fact want to see such standards established is the finding of this research. Some 69.1 percent (N = 172) of the jails felt that the American Correctional Association (ACA) should establish standards for controlling inmate gang. A similar question asked, “should the American Jail Association (AJA) establish such standards”, and here again, 70.7 percent (N = 174) felt “yes”, that the American Jail Association (AJA) should establish these kind of standards. These findings imply that jail staff are hungry for policy and procedure guidance on what is the right thing to do, what is the “best practice” for the safety and security of the jail facility regarding handling gang problems. This guidance is sorely lacking at present.

The 1993 jail survey results were similar: 71.1% felt ACA should establish such standards, and 73.5 percent felt AJA should establish such standards.

FINDINGS CONSISTENT WITH THE VIEWPOINTS FROM MOST CRIMINOLOGICAL RESEARCH: JAIL RESPONDENTS BELIEVE THAT GANG AFFILIATION INCREASES RECIDIVISM

The survey asked, “do you believe that gang affiliation tends to increase recidivism”. The finding here is that the vast majority of the respondents (N = 218, 81.6%) believed that “yes”, gang membership increases the risk of recidivism. Only 18.4 percent (N = 49) of the respondents expressed the belief that gang affiliation does not increase inmate recidivism. It would seem reasonable to conclude that jail

respondents in this survey tend to express the same conclusion as most criminological researchers on gang issues — that yes, gang affiliation would tend to be a factor of increased risk for recidivism.

The 1993 jail survey reported that 43.9 percent of the jails believed “yes” that gang membership increases recidivism. Actual empirical research shows gang membership is a factor that increases the likelihood of individual relapse.

ESTIMATES OF THE PERCENTAGE OF DRUGS BROUGHT INTO THE JAILS BY INMATE GANG MEMBERS

The survey asked, “in your opinion, what percentage of all illicit drugs are brought into your facility by inmate gang members”. The results showed a range from a low of zero percent to a high of 100 percent. The mean or arithmetic average was 19.1 percent nationwide.

INMATE GANGS AND IMPROVISED WEAPONS PRODUCTION

The survey asked the question “in your opinion, have inmate gangs tended to result in more improvised weapons production (e.g., shanks) among inmates in your facility”. If there is a gang presence, and gang rivalries exist between the various security threat groups, then as in the prison context it is reasonable to assume a motivation exists for the ongoing production of improvised weapons. But only a third of the jails (N = 87, 33.6%) indicated that inmate gangs have tended to result in more improvised weapons production. Thus, two-thirds of American jails (66.4%, N = 172) are claiming the gang problem is not severe enough to noticeably increase weapons production among inmates.

The 1993 survey found that only 19.5 percent reported inmate gangs have tended to result in more improvised weapons.

STRONG SUPPORT EXISTS: TOUGHER LAWS ARE NEEDED TO CONTROL THE GANG PROBLEM AMONG INMATES

The survey asked, “do you feel we need tougher laws to control the gang problem among inmates”. There are lots of possibilities for this: ideas such as criminalizing gang recruitment of other inmates while in jail custody, or establishing sanctions for gang behaviors behind bars, etc.

Some 82.3 percent (N = 214) of the jails reported that they felt tougher laws are needed to control the gang problem among inmates. Only 17.7 percent (N = 46) disagreed with the “get tough” approach to gang legislation.

The 1993 survey showed that 75.9 percent felt we needed tougher law to control the gang problem among inmates.

NAMES OF THE MAJOR MOTORCYCLE GANGS NATIONWIDE AS REPORTED FROM COUNTY JAIL RESPONDENTS

The survey asked, “what are the names of the top motorcycle gangs in your jurisdiction or area”. Table 8 provides the names of the major motorcycle gangs reported by the respondents to this jail survey. What is clear here is that outlaw motorcycle gangs (OMG’s) are flourishing in the United States today, and apparently have a lot of room for expansion.

When we break down the list to the Top Ten major motorcycle gangs, as seen in Table 9, there really are no surprises, these are very stable gang enterprises that have been able to maintain their hegemony in the gang world for a long time.

Table 8: Names of the Major Motorcycle Gangs Represented Among Jail Inmates Today

1% Percenters (2 citations)
 Aryan Brotherhood
 Avengers
 Bandidos (34 citations)
 Barbarians
 Beast
 Black Jacks
 Black Panthers
 Black Pistons (4 citations)
 Blues
 Booze Fighters (2 citations)
 BPM (Blood Pussy Money)
 Brother Speed (2 citations)
 Brotherhood
 Bulldog Motorcycle Gang
 Bush pilots
 Bushmasters
 Clique Riders
 Deviates
 Diablos (3 citations)
 Dirty White Boys
 Disciples MC
 Disconoudos MC
 El Fonastero
 El Foresterds
 Escorts MC
 Fallen Kings
 Flying Wheels
 Forsaken
 Freedom Seekers
 Galloping Goose (3 citations)
 Gypsy Jokers (2 citations)
 Heathens
 Hell Raisers
 Hells Angels (53 citations)
 Hells lovers
 Hermanos
 High Riders
 Highway Men
 Homeboys
 Horseman
 Invaders
 Iron Coffins
 Iron Horsemen (5 citations)
 Iron Order (3 citations)
 Jokers
 KCMR
 Kingsman (2 citations)

Table 8: Names of the Major Motorcycle Gangs Among Jail Inmates Today

- LCMC
- Midwest Drifters (3 citations)
- Misguided Brotherhood
- Mongols (15 citations)
- Moonshine Cowboys RC
- Motorcycle
- Motorcycle family
- Mountain men
- New Breed
- Nomads
- Northwest Drifters
- Outcast
- Outlaw ML
- Outlaws (49 citations)
- Pagans (15 citations)
- PAMC Pysch Active mc
- Pistolero's
- Prison Motorcycle Brotherhood
- Prison Motorcycle Gang
- Rebels
- Red Devils (2 citations)
- Road Dogs MC
- Rogues
- Rough necks
- S.O.S.
- Saddle Tramps
- Sadistic Souls MC
- Saints
- Scorpions
- Silent Creed
- Sin City
- Sinland
- SMC
- Sons of Liberty
- Sons of Satan
- Sons of Silence (14 citations)
- Steel Horseman
- Sundowners
- The Family
- The Harley Crew
- The Remaining Few
- Thunderbirds
- Thunderguards
- Titans
- Vagos
- Warlocks (5 citations)
- Wheels of Soul (2 citations)
- Wild Wheels
- Zodiacs

Table 9: Rank Ordering of the Top Ten Motorcycle Gangs Reported by American Jails

Hells Angels (53 citations)
Outlaws (49 citations)
Bandidos (34 citations)
Mongols (15 citations)
Pagans (15 citations)
Sons of Silence (14 citations)
Warlocks (5 citations)
Iron Horsemen (5 citations)
Black Pistons (4 citations)
Iron Order (3 citations)

HAVE GANGS SIGNIFICANTLY AFFECTED THE JAIL ENVIRONMENT?

The survey asked, “do you believe that the inmate gangs have significantly affected your correctional environment”. By way of comparison, the exact identical question when used in a survey of state prisons in a 2004 NGCRC research report showed 63.6 percent of the prisons in America reported that gangs have significantly affected their correctional environment. Only 36.1 percent (N = 96) of the jails in 2019 are reporting that gangs have significantly affected the jail environment. Over half, and nearly two thirds, of the jails in 2019 are reporting that gangs have not significantly affected the jail environment.

The 1993 survey of jails showed that 11.2 percent report “yes” that gangs had significantly affected their environment.

COMPARING NGCRC AND NIJ ON DISSEMINATING GANG INFORMATION TO JAILS

The survey included several questions about the dissemination of gang information to American jails. The first question was “have you read 1993 NGCRC gang research on American jails or other on-line reports or periodicals about gangs from the NGCRC”. The 1993 study of gangs in American jails was one of the first of its kind national surveys of gang problems in the jail environment. The NGCRC website also includes a “Gang Risk Classification System for Jails” that was validated on a large national sample of actual gang members. This is the kind of “evidence-based approach” that jails are widely interested in adopting along with best practices for responding to the gang problem. The NGCRC “on-line” reports are offered free to the general public and include a variety of other studies dealing with adult corrections and juvenile corrections. The results show that 20.3 percent (N = 55) of the responding jails indicated they have read the 1993 NGCRC gangs in jail research or other on-line reports or periodicals about gangs from the NGCRC. Some 79.7 percent indicated they had not read the 1993 NGCRC gangs in jail report.

By way of comparison, the survey in addition asked, “has your facility been able to make use of any of the research reports about gangs available from the National Institute of Justice (NIJ)”. Only 15.5 percent (N = 40) of the responding jails indicated their facility has been able to make use of any of the research reports about gangs available from the National Institute of Justice. Thus, the vast majority (84.5%, N = 218) of the jail respondents indicated they have not been able to make use of any of the research reports about gangs from the National Institute of Justice.

By way of comparison, over time, in the 1993 jail survey some 45.2% reported making use of the reports from NIJ.

The NGCRC sends out free reports to all respondents in its research projects. The NGCRC also publishes the *Journal of Gang Research*, now in its 27th year as a professional quarterly journal. And the NGCRC likewise publishes a free newspaper it mails out to thousands of agencies (police, prosecutors, adult and juvenile corrections, jails, probation, etc) free of charge, called *The Gang Specialist*.

Also of interest, the survey included a third question about the NGCRC's ability to disseminate information about gangs, the survey asked, "has your facility ever received the free newspaper publication from the NGCRC called "*The Gang Specialist*". The results show that about a fourth of all jails in the United States (26.9%, N = 70) do in fact report that they have received the NGCRC's newspaper called *The Gang Specialist*. Still, some 73.1 percent (N = 190) indicated they had not received the publication.

The NGCRC considers it an important goal to find more effective ways to disseminate useful information for jails.

TUITION SUPPORT FOR JAIL STAFF AS A WAY TO HELP RESPOND TO THE INMATE GANG PROBLEM

The theory here is the entire history of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) policy impact — once there was an incentive for police to attend college classes, a major push forward occurred to professionalize law enforcement in America. Could it help for jail staff too? Yes, would be our hypothesis. It would definitely not do any harm.

The survey asked, "do you believe that providing tuition support for staff could help control the inmate gang problem". Only 39.8 percent (N = 105) of the jails in this sample expressed the belief that this would have any positive effect. Most (N = 159, 60.2%) did not believe tuition support for jail staff would help them respond to the inmate gang problem.

The results from the 1993 jail survey were almost identical, some 37.6% felt tuition support would help to respond to the inmate gang problem.

NO ONE IS BUYING THE IDEA THAT CONJUGAL VISITING COULD BE USED AS A REWARD TO CONTROL GANG PROBLEMS IN JAIL

The survey asked, "in your view, could conjugal visiting be used as a reward to control gang problems in jail". Only a small fraction of the responding jails indicated an affirmative response to this question. Only 2.9 percent (N = 8) of the jails indicated that they believed this. The overwhelming vast majority of American jails (N = 264, 97.1%) indicated "no", that they did not believe conjugal visiting could be used as a reward to control the gang problem.

SPREAD OF THE MS-13 GANG IN AMERICA: MORAL PANIC OR GENUINE THREAT?

The survey included the question "have you ever identified any of your inmates as being a member of the MS-13 gang". Certainly, persons attuned to the gang problem in America are familiar with a strong presence of the MS-13 gang in southern California, and in areas of the east coast, because of the kind of news coverage that has surface over the last decade. Sadly, it is clear from this jail research that the Mara Salvatrucha 13 (MS-13) gang problem is not an artifact of negative mass media coverage or any moral panic. Rather, we were surprised as anyone to learn that 42.3 percent (N = 115) of American jails are now reporting that they have

identified inmates as belonging to that gang. Just over half of American jails (57.7%, N = 157) report that they have not yet identified any inmates as belong to the MS-13 gang. Clearly, while it may not be the largest gang in the United States, the present researchers would still regard it as a genuine threat to public safety.

THE SET-OFF METHOD: AN EXAMPLE OF WHERE STANDARDS AND MORE GUIDANCE MIGHT HELP JAILS DEAL WITH GANG PROBLEMS

The survey posed the following scenario and question “some correctional facilities seek to control gangs by the “set off” method, it involves balancing the number of rival gang members” in a living unit/cellhouse/etc, in your opinion, is this an effective way to control inmate gangs”. What this means in practice is this: if the jail unit has 20 single jail cells in it, using the set-off method you would put in 8 Crips, 8 Bloods, and 4 neutrons. The logic used here to justify this gang management strategy is that no single gang will be large enough in numbers to control the entire jail unit. In other words, the strategy is to keep the gangs at approximately equivalent force strength levels.

Another way to define the set-off strategy is to use gang membership in the inmate classification system in a formula where you can achieve a relative numerical balance in the number of rivals living in the same unit. It is actually a somewhat popular method today still used in the gang/STG management plans.

The one problem with this strategy is that some have claimed that it may lend itself to the promotion of gang conflict.

The findings of this survey show that 56.1 percent (N = 134) of the responding jails felt that the set-off method is an effective way to control inmate gangs. Thus, 43.9 percent (N = 105) did not believe the set-off method is an effective way to control inmate gangs. There is not strong consensus on this matter among jail staff.

The 1993 survey on the same question reported only 40 percent felt the self-off method was effective.

MOST POPULAR STRATEGIES USED TO CONTROL GANGS IN AMERICAN JAILS TODAY

The survey included a checklist of fifteen (15) different strategies recognized in the previous research literature as ways in which jails and prisons seek to control gang in their correctional environments. The survey asked the jails to identify which of these strategies it actually uses to control gangs. The results of this inquiry are provided in Table 10.

As seen in Table 10, the most popular strategy for controlling gangs in jails was that of “case by case dealings”. The problem here is that it really is not a strategy at all, it is a lack of any strategy, and basically saying “we will deal with that problem on a case by case basis as it arises”. A workplace deals with everything and every issue on a case-by-case basis. Another expression that would work here is to call it a “due consideration” strategy: if the gangs mess up the living unit, the jail will give due consideration to all things and all factors when it happens. It might sound good, like a “due process” strategy would sound really good, but its meaning is pretty ambiguous. As seen in Table 10, “case by case” dealings is the single most popular gang control strategy reported by American jails today — some N = 143 jails reported using this “strategy”.

Regardless of what they want to call it as a “strategy”, perhaps some of the most pragmatic advice is to always keep an open line of communication with gang members and gang leaders --- a kind of human relations strategy.

Table 10: Rank Ordering of Gang Control Strategies Reported in Use by American Jails

Gang Control Strategy	Number of Jails
Case by case dealings	143
Segregation	133
Transfers	101
Lock downs	95
Interrupting communications	75
Use of informers	65
Balance the number of rivals living in the same unit	59
Prosecution	48
Isolating leaders	47
Displacing members	43
Meeting with gang leaders	21
Ignoring their existence	7
Infiltration	4
Coopting gangs	3
Joint gang meetings	2

The real strategies begin with segregation in the list from Table 10, which most jails are capable of doing in some regard. Transfers work if you have some place to transfer them to, and this option was reported by N = 101 jails. The other problem with transferring them is that prison inmates long ago called this “diesel treatment” — and it has a known blowback that is common when this strategy is used — the reverse intended effect can be achieved whereby the gang is able to “spread” its message and influence to any new place, location, or facility you transfer the gang member to.

Lock downs work to send a message to inmates that gangs do not control the jail, the jail staff control the jail. In Table 10, some 95 jails indicated that they use lock downs as a strategy to control gangs. For example, if there is a “gang fight” or disturbance in a jail living unit, the entire unit would go on lock down. A lockdown in response to a gang riot would restrict their movement and activities. It tightens security on the inmates, depriving them of some of their limited pleasures (watching television, playing cards, etc).

The gang control strategy of interrupting communications means to intercept and report written (mail and email) and phone conversations with other gang members. Sometimes this information can be used against them in court to enhance the penalty for a conviction. Sometimes it leads to new gang investigations. As seen in Table 10, N = 75 jails report using some variation of this strategy.

The strategy called “use of informers” means exactly what it implies: encouraging inmates to snitch on each other. This works really good for non-gang inmates. But when you are dealing with gangs there is a new complication. And a major kind of blow back. Gangs do not consider it “snitching” to provide information on a rival gang member. It would be considered snitching to rat out one of your own gang members. But providing information about a rival gang member is considered “doing good work for your gang nation” by weakening a rival gang organization. The fact is there can be a tendency for gangs to make false complaints - - - even “set up” rival gangs by planting evidence - - - to achieve this kind of unique

form of revenge. Still the use of informers emerges in Table 10 as one of the top five strategies used in jails, nationwide (N = 65).

As seen in Table 10, the “set-off” method is the sixth most common technique used for dealing with gang problems in American jails today. It is defined as balancing the number of rival gang members living in the same unit. Some N = 59 jails reported using the set-off technique. Three other somewhat common strategies are shown to be prosecution, isolating leaders, and displacing members. The last five strategies listed in Table 10 besides being the least commonly found in jails are actually strategies that carry some potential liability. The strategy of meeting with gang leaders might bring some potential criticism. But the last four techniques are not used widely in jails it appears, and probably for good reason: ignoring their existence, infiltration, coopting gangs, joint meetings with gang leaders.

In Table 10, another name for the “Infiltration” method of controlling inmate gangs is also called the “Perkins technique”, aptly named after the case of *Illinois v. Perkins* (1990), which involved an undercover police officer posing as a cellmate to gather information.

5. OTHER PROBLEMS BEHIND BARS IN AMERICAN JAILS TODAY

MALES PROFILE AS MOST LIKELY TO ATTEMPT SUICIDE IN JAIL

The survey asked, “which inmates are more likely to attempt suicide in your facility” and the response mode was either males or females. The vast majority of American jails are identifying male inmates (N = 238, 90.5%) as the most likely to attempt suicide while in jail. Only 9.5 percent (N = 25) indicated female inmates are more likely to attempt suicide in jail.

JAIL SUICIDE ATTEMPTS MOST LIKELY AT EARLY STAGES OF ADJUDICATION

The survey asked, “what is the highest risk period for jail suicide attempts” and then gave five different response modes corresponding to the “stage” of the jail stay (intake, pretrial, during trial, before sentencing, after sentencing). Intake reflects the early point of entry during the stages of a jail incarceration experience, and was the single most likely time period or stage or incarceration for jail suicide attempts — some 45.5% (N = 96) of the jails reported this to be the highest risk period. Another 33.2 percent (N = 70) of the jails reported that pretrial was the highest risk period. Less than one percent (.9%, N = 2) reported the actual time of trial as the highest suicide risk period. Only 6.2 percent (N = 13) of the jails reported “before sentencing” as the highest risk period. And finally, some 14.2 percent (N = 30) believed that after sentencing was the highest risk period for jail suicides.

MOST COMMON METHOD OF SUICIDE ATTEMPTS IN JAILS

The survey asked, “which is the single most common method of suicide attempts in your facility’s history” and the response modes included: lacerations, inserting head into toilet, hanging/suffocation, chemical poisoning, other self-inflicted trauma. The results show that hanging and lacerations account for nearly 95 percent of all jail suicide attempts. Some 9.2 percent (N = 22) of the jails indicated that lacerations were the most common method of jail suicide attempts. The single largest risk area was hanging/suffocation which accounted for 86.2 percent (N = 206) of the suicide attempts — the lion’s share of this problem. Inserting head into toilet accounted for less than one percent (.4%, N = 1) of the attempts. Chemical poisoning accounted for 1.3 percent (N = 3) of the suicide attempts. And finally, the method of

“other self-inflicted trauma” (e.g., head injuries) accounted for 2.9 percent (N = 7) of the suicide attempts.

JAIL OVERCROWDING IS A PROBLEM

The survey asked, “generally, is overcrowding a problem in your facility”. The results showed that 44.7 percent (N = 122) of the jails admitted that, yes indeed, overcrowding is a problem. And there is the finding that just over half of the national sample (55.3%, N = 151) declare that overcrowding is not a problem in their jail. There are two tales in American jails today, about equal in their overall scope nationwide, such that jails are almost equally likely to report a problem or not report a problem with overcrowding.

The 1993 jail survey results were basically identical: some 49.6 percent reported “yes” that overcrowding is a problem in their jail.

RACIAL CONFLICTS AMONG JAIL INMATES VERY COMMON IN THE USA TODAY

The survey asked, “are racial conflicts a problem among the offenders in your facility” in a format where the response modes were “yes” or “no”. The results from the survey showed that 42.4 percent of the responding jails (N = 115) reported that racial conflicts are a problem among inmates. Just over half of American jails (57.6%, N = 156) report that racial conflicts are not a problem among jail inmates.

In the 1993 jail survey, 41.8% of the jails reported that racial conflicts were a problem. Once again, not much has changed in this regard during the last 25 years. Racial conflicts, for the record, can similarly be a surrogate measure of a gang problem as well. When the inmates are racially polarized and broken into gangs and STG’s that are homogeneous with respect to race, it is difficult to categorize it as a race riot or a gang riot.

SERIOUS RISKS LIKE FINDING GUNS BEHIND BARS ARE FORTUNATELY VERY SMALL RISKS ACCORDING TO THE SURVEY RESULTS

Escape and taking hostages are of course some of the higher level risks that have to be addressed in any correctional facility. At a similar level of “peril” or risk faced by jail staff would be the situation of confiscating a firearm from an inmate or finding one in a shakedown. The survey asked, “were any firearms confiscated from inmates or secure areas within the last twelve months”. The results show that only 4 percent of the jails (N = 11) reported confiscating a firearm in the last one-year time frame. Thus, the overwhelming majority of American jails (N = 265, 96%) report that no firearms were confiscated in the last year.

Not much has changed in the reported seizure firearms in jails since the 1993 survey. In the 1993 survey, only 2.3 percent of the jails reported having confiscated firearms.

IMPROVISED WEAPONS AND INMATE VIOLENCE

A series of questions in the jail survey focused on improvised weapons in relationship to inmate violence. The survey asked, “please estimate how many edged weapons were confiscated from inmate shakedowns within the last twelve months”. The results showed a range of scores from a low of zero to a high of 170. The mean average was 4.36 edged weapons being confiscated during the last one-year period. What this means is that on the average a jail shakedown will turn up at least one “shank” (aka “shiv”) or improvised edged weapon every three months.

A more serious aspect of this problem involves the use of these improvised weapons against other inmates or staff. The survey asked, “how many assaults were committed with edged weapons among inmates within the last twelve months”. The results showed a range from a low of zero to a high of 20. The mean score was .36 assaults per year. Some 88.2 percent of the jails reported zero assaults of this kind in the last year.

The survey also asked, “how many assaults on staff were committed with weapons of any kind by inmates within the last twelve months”. The results showed a range from a low of zero to a high of 16. Basically, 90.8 percent of the jails reported zero such assaults with weapons against staff during the last year. The mean score was .29 assaults against staff with weapons of any kind in the last year.

RESPONDENTS EQUALLY DIVIDED ON THE URBAN MYTH OF BELIEF IN THE FULL MOON THEORY

The survey included a question about the “full moon” theory of human behavior. It is considered an urban myth, a kind of mysticism bar tenders often believe in. The survey asked specifically “some line staff believe that offenders are more assaultive when there is a full moon, do you believe there is any basis to this”. The survey respondents were evenly divided on their beliefs in this respect. About half believed in the full moon theory, and about half did not believe there is any basis to it. Some 49.6 percent (N = 134) believed in the full moon theory, and 50.4% (N = 136) did not.

In the 1993 original jail survey some 46.2 percent said “yes”, that offenders were more assaultive when there was a full moon.

ATTEMPTED JAIL ESCAPES

The survey asked, “how many escape attempts occurred at your facility within the last twelve months”. The results showed a range of scores between a low of zero to a high of 8. Basically, three-fourths of American jails (74.4%, N = 201) are reporting no such attempted jail escapes during the last one-year period. The mean score was .44, meaning that on average a typical jail will have about one escape attempt every two years. The mean score from the 1993 survey was .95 escapes.

ARSON INCIDENTS IN JAILS DURING THE LAST YEAR

The survey asked, “how many incidents of fire-setting occurred within your facility during the last twelve months”. The results ranged from a low of zero to a high of 10. Most jails (N = 225, 82.7%) reported no such fire-setting events during the last year. The mean score was .43 meaning that again, the typical jail is going to see a fire-setting event about once every two years or so. The mean score from the 1993 jail survey was higher (.73).

We can review a couple of the common techniques used by inmates to set fires while in jail. The classic method is to set a bed mattress on fire, typically as an inmate protest. One of the easiest ways to set a fire in jail is to simply take some clothing and place it against an existing light source, if the light casing is hot, the trapped heat may result in combustion and the fabric setting on fire. Any electrical outlet that may exist for use in powering a television or microwave is easily used to create a fire — inmates simply “short out” the electrical circuit by sticking anything that will conduct electricity (e.g., aluminum foil) into the outlet and using toilet paper to get fire from the resulting sparks. One arson investigator explained, “jail inmates can cause a flame and smoke damage by simply putting their flip flops into the microwave and turning it on”.

ILLICIT DRUG SEIZURES DURING THE LAST YEAR

Jail can be involved in the seizure of illicit drugs in several different ways. One major way happens during booking, when an inmate may have narcotics concealed upon their body. Another way is through visitors and volunteers who have access to the jail. And, of course, individual inmate body searches and cell shake downs are common ways for jail staff to seize illicit drugs and contraband such as tobacco.

The survey asked, “please estimate how many incidents of illicit drug seizures occurred within your facility during the last twelve months”. The results showed a range from a low of zero to a high of 700. Basically, a little less than a third (31.3%, N = 84) reported zero such drug seizures. The mean, or arithmetic average, was 9.05 such drug seizures during the last one-year time frame.

CELL PHONES CONFISCATED IN AMERICAN JAILS

The survey asked, “has your facility confiscated any cell phones in the past year”. The results show that over a fourth of American jails are reporting this phenomenon of confiscating cell phones from inmates inside the jail. Some 29.8 percent (N = 81) of the jails in this survey are reporting that they have confiscated a cell phone in the past year. Some 70.2 percent (N = 191) report confiscating no phones in the last one-year period.

A follow-up question asked how many cell phones were seized, and the results showed a range of scores as high as 60 during the last year. The mean or average number of phones confiscated was 4.44 phones during the last year — or, on average, approximately 12,000 phones as an estimate of a national yearly total. Which means that if they were smart phones they would in all likelihood contain a lot of criminal intelligence that most agencies are probably not geared up sufficiently to exploit for public safety purposes (e.g., investigating human trafficking, etc).

USE OF DRONES AND REMOTE CONTROL VEHICLES IN CRIME

A series of questions focused on different aspects of a new type of crime in which the criminal offender uses drones and other types of remotely controlled vehicles.

The survey asked, “do you have inmates in your facility whose crimes involved the use of any of these remotely controlled or piloted vehicles/robots”. Only 1.9 percent (N = 5) of the jail respondents indicated that “yes” they are holding inmates in their jail whose crimes involved the use of remotely controlled or piloted vehicles/robots. So, the vast majority of respondents (98.1%, N = 252) report no such inmates now in custody for these kinds of new high-tech crimes.

Among the few inmates being held for such crimes, N = 3 used air/aircraft and balloon vehicles that were remote controlled. Some N = 5 used ground/wheeled, tracked and/or leg vehicles. Only one case involved the use of a water/floating or submersible vehicle.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In this chapter we have reviewed the specific research methodology undertaken in this study of American jails. The methodology used was identical to the original 1993 jail survey undertaken and previously reported by the NGCRC. A useable sample size of N = 276 sent in their survey instruments before the cut-off date of the end of September, 2019. This chapter presented the frequencies, the number and percentages, and where appropriate the arithmetic means for all variables.

It is possible that additional and further analysis may be undertaken on this rich data environment.

CHAPTER 4: OTHER JAIL FINDINGS FROM A BIVARIATE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to go into a little bit deeper analysis of the research findings from this 2019 survey of American jails. Specifically, here we can go beyond the level of descriptive statistics such as percentage statistics or arithmetic means for single variables. Here we will examine how some background factors or independent variables are possibly able to explain or account for differences in conditions of interest - - - dependent variables.

To begin this inquiry we can ask ourselves what would explain a very serious situation facing American jails today — the situation where gang members have been a problem in terms of assaults on jail staff. Are there factors that would seem to significantly differentiate this kind of variable of gang violence and help us to better understand it, and better yet perhaps get a handle on what other factors help us to identify what may increase or decrease the likelihood of this kind of risk of harm to jail staff? That is where we can begin — what factors are associated with gang member assaults on jail staff?

1. FACTORS SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENTIATING GANG MEMBERS ASSAULTING JAIL STAFF

Here we examine the results from the analysis that was directed at understanding gang member assaults on jail staff. The kinds of variables that we have identified as factors that significantly differentiate high and low “yes” conditions of this dependent variable are shown for eleven different variables.

Table 11 shows eleven factors that can significantly differentiate whether gang members have been a problem in terms of assaults on jail staff. Very clearly, the single strongest factor differentiating assaults on staff by gang members is the factor of whether gang members have been a problem in terms of threats against staff. Here we see a very high Chi-square value (Chi-square = 57.9, $p < .001$). The higher the Chi-square statistic value, and where we see that it is significant in terms of the probability level being less than .05 ($p < .05$), the more certain we can be that these two variables are not independent. In other words, “something is going on” here, knowing one background variable such as threats against staff helps us to significantly differentiate the dependent variable of whether gang members have been problem in terms of actual assaults on jail staff.

As seen in Table 11, knowing whether gang members have been a problem in terms of threats against staff shows one of the strongest differences in terms of staff members ever being assaulted by a gang member. Only 2.5 percent of jail staff are assaulted by gang members in jails where there has not been a kind of “warning”, in other words that gang members have not made threats against staff. This compares with 39.3 percent of jails reporting an assault on where there has also been a threat from a gang member.

Another factor that is shown to significantly differentiate whether gang members assault jail staff is the variable of whether white inmates have a separate gang. As seen in this table where white inmates do not have a separate gang, only 3.3 percent of staff are assaulted by a gang member. This incidence skyrockets tenfold to 32.4 percent when we know the jail has the situation where white inmates have a separate gang. This has a high Chi-square value, and a probability level of $p < .001$ - - - meaning we could find this statistical relationship less than one time out of 1,000 by

chance alone. Another way to illustrate this is, imagine you had your chance to pick which jail to work in, and you could ask one question, this question “do the white inmates have a separate gang” would help you pick the 3.3% jail that is ten times safer in terms of the risk of being assaulted by an inmate gang member.

The third variable in Table 11 That significantly differentiates gang members assaulting jail staff is the factor of whether the jail has had inmates who could be considered military-trained gang members. It is a difference between 8.0 percent and 43.7 percent in whether th jail reports a problem of gang members assaulting jail staff. Again, a very high Chi-square statistic emerges here (Chi-square = 37.5, $p < .001$).

Some other factors that are shown in Table 11 that significantly differentiate whether gang members have been a problem in terms of assaults on jail staff include: (1) knowing any staff have received serious injuries from attacks by inmates within the last year, (2) believing that gang members have significantly affected the jail environment, (3) whether inmate gangs have tended to result in more improvised weapons production, (4) whether Islamic inmates have a separate gang, (5) whether the jail has had inmates who were associated with the Sovereign Citizens Movement, (6) whether the jail has had any inmates who were members of the MS-13 gang, (7) whether illicit drugs are often fund in their jail shake downs, and (8) whether their jail has confiscated any cell phones from their inmates. Higher rates of having gang members being a problem in terms of assaults on staff are associated with these background variables.

2. FACTORS SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENTIATING WHETHER INMATE GANGS HAVE SIGNIFICANTLY AFFECTED THE JAIL ENVIRONMENT

Our analysis of background factors that impact on high and low conditions of whether inmate gangs have significantly affected the jail environment are shown in Table 12 to consist of nine different variables. These factors where we are seeing higher levels of whether gangs have affected the jail environment are: (1) whether white inmates have a separate gang, (2) whether gang members have threatened staff, (3) whether the jail has had any inmates who could be considered to be military-trained gang members, (4) whether gang members have been a problem in terms of assaults on staff, (5) whether the jail has held any inmates who are associated with the Sovereign Citizens Movement, (6) whether inmate gangs have tended to result in more improvised weapons production, (7) whether racial conflicts are a problem among the jail inmates, (8) whether jail staff have received any serious injuries in confrontations with inmates, and (9) whether the jail often finds illicit drugs in its shakedowns. All of these factors are shown to be statistically significant by the Chi-square distribution ($p < .05$).

Table 11: Factors Significantly Differentiating Whether Jails Responding to the Survey Report Gang Members Have Been a Problem in Terms of Assaults on Staff.

		Have Gang Members Been a Problem in Terms of Assaults on Your Jail Staff?		
		No (N)	Yes (N)	% Yes
Have Gang Members Been A Problem in Terms of Threats Against Staff?	NO	152	4	2.5
	YES	57	37	39.3
		Chi-square = 57.9, p < .001		
Do Whites Have a Separate Gang?	NO	144	5	3.3
	YES	75	36	32.4
		Chi-square = 40.4, p < .001		
Has Your Facility Had Any Inmates Who Could Be Considered Military-Trained Gang Members?	NO	172	15	8.0
	YES	27	21	43.7
		Chi-Square = 37.5, p < .001		
Have Any of Your Staff Received Serious Injuries From Attacks From Inmates Within the Last 12 Months?	NO	192	19	9.0
	YES	35	23	39.6
		Chi-square = 32.4, p < .001		
Do You Believe That Gang Members Have Significantly Affected Your Environment?	NO	157	13	7.6
	YES	66	29	30.5
		Chi-square = 23.9, p < .001		
Have Inmate Gangs Tended to Result in More Improvised Weapons Production (e.g., Shanks, etc) in Your Jail?	NO	158	14	8.1
	YES	59	27	31.3
		Chi-square = 23.1, p < .001		
Do Islamic Inmates Have A Separate Gang?	NO	199	31	13.4
	YES	5	7	58.3
		Chi-square = 17.3, p < .001		
Has Your Facility Had Any Inmates Associated With The Sovereign Citizens in The Last Year?	NO	120	11	8.3
	YES	109	31	22.1
		Chi-square = 9.76, p = .002		
Has Your Facility Had Any Inmates Who Are Members of the MS-13 GANG?	NO	142	15	9.5
	YES	88	26	22.8
		Chi-square = 9.03, p = .003		
Do You Often Find Illicit Drugs When You have a Shake-Down in Your Jail?	NO	158	19	10.7
	YES	69	22	24.1
		Chi-square = 8.38, p .004		
Has Your Facility Confiscated Any Cell Phones in the Past Year?	NO	167	23	12.1
	YES	62	19	23.4
		Chi-square = 5.58, p = .018		

Table 12: Factors Significantly Differentiating Whether Jails Responding to the Survey Report Inmate Gangs Have Significantly Affected their Correctional Environment

		Do You Believe That The Inmate Gangs Have Significantly Affected Your Correctional Climate?		
		No	Yes	% Yes
Do White Inmates Have a Separate Gang?	NO	115	28	19.5
	YES	45	65	59.0
Chi-square = 41.7, p < .001				
Have Gang Members Been A Problem in Terms of Threats on Your Staff?	NO	117	31	20.9
	YES	36	57	61.2
Chi-square = 40.1, p < .001				
Have You Had Inmates Who Could Be Considered Military Trained Gang Members?	NO	130	50	27.7
	YES	15	33	68.7
Chi-square = 27.4, p < .001				
Have Gang Members Been a Problem in Terms of Assaults on Your Staff?	NO	157	66	29.5
	YES	13	29	69.0
Chi-square = 23.9, p < .001				
Held Any Inmates Who Are Associated With the Sovereign Citizens Movement?	NO	98	27	21.6
	YES	71	67	48.5
Chi-square = 20.7, p < .001				
Have Inmate Gangs Tended to Increase Improvised Weapons Production?	NO	124	45	26.6
	YES	38	47	55.2
Chi-square = 20.1, p < .001				
Are Racial Conflicts a Problem Among Your Inmates?	NO	114	37	24.5
	YES	55	55	50.0
Chi-square = 18.1, p < .001				
Have Any of Your Staff Received Serious Injuries From Conflicts With Inmates in Last Year?	NO	142	62	30.3
	YES	26	30	53.5
Chi-square = 10.3, p = .001				
Do You Often Find Illicit Drugs in Jail Shake Downs?	NO	120	51	29.8
	YES	46	42	47.7
Chi-square = 8.09, p = .004				

3. FACTORS SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENTIATING WHETHER INMATE GANGS HAVE TENDED TO RESULT IN MORE IMPROVISED WEAPONS PRODUCTION IN THE JAIL

Table 13 shows the factors significantly differentiating the dependent variable of whether inmate gangs have tended to result in more improvised weapons production among inmates in the jail. Here we see eleven factors that reveal significant differences: (1) whether white inmates have a separate gang, (2) whether gang members have been a problem in terms of assaults on staff, (3) whether gangs have significantly affected the jail environment, (4) whether gangs have been a problem in terms of threats on staff, (5) whether there are racial conflicts among the jail inmates, (6) whether any of the inmates could be considered military-trained gang members, (7) whether they often find illicit drugs during routine jail shake downs, (8) whether any of the inmates have been identified as members of the MS-13 gang, (9) whether any jail staff have received serious injuries during fights/confrontations with jail inmates, (10) whether Islamic inmates have a separate gang, and (11) whether overcrowding is a problem in the jail.

4. FACTORS SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENTIATING WHETHER JAIL STAFF HAVE RECEIVED ANY SERIOUS INJURIES IN FIGHTS/ CONFRONTATIONS WITH INMATES

Table 14 shows the factors significantly differentiating the dependent variable of whether any jail staff have received serious injuries from fights or confrontations with inmates in the last one-year time period.. Here we see eleven factors that reveal significant differences. For example, knowing whether gang members have been a problem in terms of assaults on staff increases the incidence of serious injuries to staff three fold — from 15.4 percent where gang members have not been a problem in terms of assaults on staff, to 54.7 percent where gang members have been a problem in terms of assaults on staff.

The other ten factors significantly differentiating serious injuries to staff from fights or confrontations with inmates include: (1) whether there have been any inmate in the jail associated with the Sovereign Citizens Movement, (2) whether white inmates have a separate gang, (3) whether the jail often finds illicit drugs during shakedowns, (4) whether gangs have significantly affected the jail environment, (5) whether gang members have been a problem in terms of threats against jail staff, (6) whether the jail has held any inmates from the MS-13 gang, (7) whether the jail has held any inmates who could be considered military-trained gang members, (8) whether racial conflicts are a problem among jail inmates, (9) whether any cell phones have been confiscated in the jail in the last year, and (10) the belief that inmate gangs have tended to result in more improvised weapons production.

Table 13: Factors Significantly Differentiating Whether Jails Responding to the Survey Report Inmate Gangs Have Tended to Result in More Improvised Weapons Production.

		Have Inmate Gangs Tended to Result in More Improvised Weapons Production?		% Yes
		No	Yes	
Do White Inmates Have a Separate Gang?	NO	113	29	20.4
	YES	51	57	52.7
Chi-square = 28.4, p < .001				
Have Gang Members Been A Problem in Terms of Assaults on Your Staff?	NO	158	59	27.1
	YES	14	27	65.8
Chi-square = 23.1, p < .001				
Do You Believe That the Inmate Gangs Have Significantly Affected Your Correctional Environment?	NO	124	38	23.4
	YES	45	47	51.0
Chi-square = 20.1, p < .001				
Have Gang Members Been A Problem in Terms of Threats on Your Staff?	NO	106	36	25.3
	YES	45	48	51.6
Chi-square = 16.8, p < .001				
Are Racial Conflicts a Problem Among the Jail Inmates?	NO	110	34	23.6
	YES	58	53	47.7
Chi-square = 16.2, p < .001				
Have You Had Any Inmates Who Could Be Considered Military-Trained Gang Members?	NO	125	49	28.1
	YES	20	28	58.3
Chi-square = 15.1, p < .001				
Do You Often Find Illicit Drugs in Jail Shake Downs?	NO	121	45	27.1
	YES	45	41	47.6
Chi-square = 10.6, p = .001				
Have You Identified Any of Your Inmates as Members of the MS-13?	NO	107	37	25.6
	YES	63	50	44.2
Chi-square = 9.73, p = .002				
Have Any of Your Staff Received Serious Injuries From Inmate Attacks?	NO	139	56	28.7
	YES	31	27	46.5
Chi-square = 6.45, p = .01				
Do Islamic Inmates Have A Separate Gang?	NO	152	70	31.5
	YES	4	8	66.6
Chi-square = 6.32, p = .01				
Generally, is Overcrowding A Problem in Your Jail?	NO	102	37	26.6
	YES	67	50	42.7
Chi-square = 7.35, p = .007				

Table 14: Factors Significantly Differentiating Whether Jail Staff Have Received Any Serious Injuries in Fights/Confrontations With Inmates in the Last Year

		Have Jail Staff Received Serious Injuries In Fights/Confrontations with Jail Inmates?		% Yes
		No	Yes	
Have Gang Members Been a Problem in Terms of Assaults On Jail Staff Members?	NO	192	35	15.4
	YES	19	23	54.7
Chi-square = 32.4, p < .001				
Has Your Jail Held Any Inmates Associated With The Sovereign Citizens?	NO	114	15	11.6
	YES	95	43	31.1
Chi-square = 14.9, p < .001				
Do White Inmates Have a Separate Gang?	NO	125	21	14.3
	YES	74	35	32.1
Chi-square = 11.4, p = .001				
Do You Often Find Illicit Drugs During Shake Downs?	NO	148	27	15.4
	YES	59	29	32.9
Chi-square = 10.7, p = .001				
Do You Believe That Gangs Have Significantly Affected Your Jail Environment?	NO	142	26	15.4
	YES	62	30	32.6
Chi-square = 10.3, p = .001				
Have Gang Members Been a Problem in Terms of Threats on Jail Staff?	NO	127	24	15.8
	YES	63	30	32.2
Chi-square = 8.94, p = .003				
Have You Ever Identified Any of Your Inmates as Members of the MS-13?	NO	130	24	15.5
	YES	78	34	30.3
Chi-square = 8.29, p = .004				
Have You Had Inmates Who Could Be Considered Military-Trained Gang Members?	NO	149	34	18.5
	YES	30	18	37.5
Chi-square = 7.80, p = .005				
Are Racial Conflicts a Problem Among Inmates?	NO	131	24	15.4
	YES	79	31	28.1
Chi-square = 6.30, p = .01				
Has Your Jail Confiscated Any Cell Phones in the Last Year?	NO	155	32	17.1
	YES	55	25	31.2
Chi-square = 6.67, p = .01				
Have Inmate Gangs Tended To Result in More Improvised Weapons Production?	NO	139	31	18.2
	YES	56	27	32.5
Chi-square = 6.45, p = .01				

CORRELATION ANALYSIS OF FACTORS OF HIGH RISK FOR JAIL STAFF

It was useful to examine how some of these survey variables representing high risk events for jail staff may correlate with each other. The Pearson correlation coefficient is used here in Table 15 to examine these relationships. As seen in Table 15, gang density (the percentage of male inmates who are gang members) has its strongest correlation with the number of inmate assaults against jail staff ($r = .23, p < .001$). In fact the number of knife attacks on jail staff has an $r = .22 (p < .01)$. And the number of shanks found in shakedowns likewise shows a significant correlation here, $r = .18 (p < .01)$.

The factor called number of shanks found in shakedowns comes from the question on the survey “please estimate how many edged weapons were confiscated from inmate shakedowns within the last twelve months”. As seen in Table 15, the number of shanks found has a very strong positive correlation with number of inmate assaults on staff ($r = .51, p < .001$). This variable of the number of inmate assaults on staff comes from the question “please estimate the total number of assaults by inmates against your correctional personnel in the last twelve months”. In fact, the strongest correlation in Table 15 is $r = .52 (p < .001)$ which is between the two variables for number of shanks found in shakedowns and number of knife attacks on staff.

Table 15: Correlation Matrix of Gang Density and High Risk Factors for Jail Staff

	Male Gang Density	# of Inmate Asslt. Staff	# of Shanks Found	# of Knife Attacks on Staff	# of Weapon Attacks on Staff	# of Escape Attempts
Male Gang Density	1.0	.23**	.18**	.22**	.04	.05
# of Inmate Assaults on Staff	.23**	1.0	.51***	.28**	.33***	.24**
# of Shanks Found in Shakedowns	.18**	.51***	1.0	.52***	.14*	.13*
# of Knife Attacks on Jail Staff	.22**	.28**	.52***	1.0	.25**	.09
# of weapon attacks on Jail Staff	.04	.33**	.14*	.25**	1.0	.32***
# of escape Attempts in Last Year	.05	.24**	.13*	.09	.32**	1.0

** = Significant at $p = .01$ level
 *** = Significant at $p < .001$ level

There is also the interesting findings on jail house escape attempts. This factor comes from the survey question “how many escape attempts occurred at your facility within the last twelve months”. The number of escape attempts has an $r = .24$ ($p < .01$) with the number of inmate assaults on staff, and in fact, a somewhat stronger correlation emerges ($r = .32$, $p < .01$) with the number of assaults on staff that were committed with weapons of any kind by inmates within the last twelve months.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In this chapter we have examined bivariate relationships between variables from the jail survey. This included crosstabs, or statistical tables, as well as Pearson correlation analysis. We have been able to identify some of the stronger variables that significantly differentiate various conditions in the jail. We have also been able to examine how some of these variables correlated with each other in strong and significant ways.

CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**INTRODUCTION**

The purpose of this chapter is (1) to provide a summary of the major findings from the 2019 survey of jails, (2) provide a summary of how things have changed over time in comparing the 1993 NGCRC survey of jails with the 2019 results, (3) provide a summary of major conclusions on what factors significantly differentiate major jail security problems like gang violence, and (4) provide recommendations.

1. SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS FROM THE 2019 REPORT

The findings from this research on American jails include the following categories: Special Risks to Jail Staff, Inmate Service Issues, Gangs and Related Problems.

SPECIAL RISKS TO JAIL STAFF:

- *** Most jails (82.8%) do not feel their agency receives adequate funding.
- *** Most jails (81.7%) do not provide college tuition reimbursement to their officers.
- *** Only 1/4 of jail staff are considered sworn deputies with arrest powers.
- *** Some 44.7% report jail overcrowding is a problem.
- *** Average jail has an assault on staff from an inmate once every three months.
- *** About 1/5 of jails (21.5%) report staff injuries from inmate attacks in the last year.
- *** A third (33.8%) often find illicit drugs during routine shake downs.
- *** Only 4% report finding a gun in shakedowns in the last year.
- *** A fourth (25.6%) report one or more escape attempts in the last year.
- *** 17.3% report one or more incidents of fire setting in the last year.
- *** A fourth (29.8%) report confiscating cell phones in the last year.

INMATE SERVICE ISSUES:

- *** 3/4 (77.7%) of the jails do not allow contact visits.
- *** Half (48.5%) believe society wants to help inmates be rehabilitated.
- *** Half (48.9%) believe electronic monitoring would be more cost-effective.
- *** Half (57.1%) believe rehabilitation is more effective than punishment.
- *** Most jails (80.6%) do not offer any kind of jail industry program.
- *** Few jails (9.6%) have full time staff employed as ombudsmen for inmates.
- *** The post-card only correspondence policy is used in 14.7% of jails.
- *** Half (48.7%) believe inmate illiteracy is a problem.
- *** Half (46.9%) of jails offer a GED program for inmates.
- *** Half (58.3%) of jails do not have a drug treatment program.
- *** Two-thirds (69.6%) forbid the use of methadone.

GANGS AND RELATED PROBLEMS:

- *** Gang density (% of inmates who are gang members): 15.5% males, 3.9% females.
- *** 3/4 of jails (75.4%) take gang membership into account in their classification system.
- *** Some 18.7% report gang members involved in arson.
- *** A fourth (27.4%) of jails provide staff training in dealing with gang problems.
- *** Some 20.4% of jails have had inmates considered military-trained gang

members.

- *** Some 18.3% report gang members assaulting staff in the last one-year.
- *** Some 37.6% report gang members threatening staff in the last one-year.
- *** Some 42.5% of jails report white inmates have a separate gang. Top three: Aryan Brotherhood, Peckerwoods, Aryan Circle.
- *** Biggest gangs among jails in rank order: Bloods, Aryan Brotherhood, Gangster Disciples, Crips, Latin Kings.
- *** A large number of different White Racist Extremist Gangs and Hate Groups were found. The top five: Aryan Brotherhood, Ku Klux Klan, Peckerwoods, Aryan Nation, Skinheads.
- *** A long list of OMG names surfaced from the jail survey. Top are all established 1%er gangs: Hells Angels, Outlaws M.C., Bandidos, Mongols, Pagans, Sons of Silence.
- *** 42.5% of jails believe that negotiating with gang leaders is a bad idea.
- *** Half (51.8%) have had inmates from the Sovereign Citizens Movement.
- *** Many jails (42.3%) have identified inmates as members of the MS-13 gang.
- *** Most jails (81.6%) believe gang membership increases inmate recidivism.
- *** A Third (33.6%) report gangs have resulted in more homemade weapons production.
- *** 42.4% report racial conflicts are a problem among the inmates.
- *** A third (36.1%) report that gangs have significantly affected their environment.
- *** Most popular gang control strategies: case by case basis, segregation, transfers, lock downs, interrupting communications, use of informers.

2. SUMMARY OF CHANGES OVER TIME: 1993 to 2019

Here is an executive summary of the observed changes over time comparing the 1993 and the 2019 NGCRC jail surveys:

- *** Gang density (e.g., the percentage of inmates who are members of a gang) increased three fold from 5.09% in 1993 to 15.5% in 2019.
- *** Jails are three times more likely today to report that inmate gangs have significantly affected their correctional environment; this increased from 11.2% in 1993 to 36.1% in 2019.
- *** A major increase was observed in jails reporting that gang members have been a problem in terms of assaults on staff. In 1993, 3%, rose to 18.3% in 2019. Similarly, the problem of threats from gang members against staff increased in the same time period, from 26.2% in 1993 to 37.6% in 2019.
- *** The percentage of jails reporting that white inmates have a separate gang has doubled from 1993 to the 2019 survey, with 19.7% in 1993, compared to 42.5% in 2019.
- *** Upward increase in whether the jails report that inmate gangs have tended to result in more improvised weapons production; from 19.3% in 1993 to 33.6% in 2019.
- *** A small increase was observed for in-service training for jail officers.
- *** An change in the number of assaults by inmates against jail staff in the last year. In 1993 43.8 percent had none, this reduced to 33.2% in 2019. Meaning, in 2019 a larger percentage of jails had one or more such assaults by inmates against staff.
- *** Slight upward tick in serious injuries to jail staff resulting from attacks or confrontations with inmates was reported; 13.4% in 1993, 21.5% in

2019.

- *** Slight tendency for greater support of concept of rehabilitation; in 1993 about a fourth, in 2019 about half, felt society wants to help inmates be rehabilitated. Slightly more likely to employ ombudsman for jail inmates.
- *** Slightly more likely today for jails to find illicit drugs during routine shakedowns.
- *** Now something new: 15.6% of jails provide internet access to jail inmates.
- *** Now something new: 14.7% allow “post-card only” as the form of correspondence for inmates.
- *** Now, jails seeing new management challenges — half the jails are reporting inmates from Sovereign Citizens Movement; and other problems like MS-13 gang members (42.3%), finding cell phones during jail shakedowns (29.8%), and having inmates who committed crimes using drones in their offense of record.

What has not changed over time from 1993 to 2019?

Well, for one, training jail staff to be able to more effectively manage inmate gang problems has not kept pace with the rising gang membership among jail inmates; we saw 26.1% in 1993, and found 27.4% in 2019. About the same level of investment in staff over the past 25 years. Whether or not the jails were ACA accredited did not change significantly. Whether jails provide tuition reimbursement to staff for college classes did not show an upward trend. Whether the jails were overcrowded did not change appreciably from 1993 to 2019. The levels of racial conflict among inmates did not change, with 41.8% in 1993 and 42.4% in 2019. The names of the major gangs have not basically changed, there are some new ones though.

3. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS ON THE MAJOR SECURITY PROBLEMS LIKE GANG VIOLENCE IN JAIL

In chapter 4, we reported the results from crosstab analysis, and the findings can be summarized in terms of four areas of concern.

- *** Assaults by gang members on staff — the top three significant variables were gang threats against staff, whites having a separate gang, and reporting inmates who could be considered military-trained gang members.
- *** Whether gangs have significantly affected the jail environment — the top three significant variables were whether whites have a separate gang, gang member threats on staff, and having inmates who could be considered military-trained gang members.
- *** Whether gangs have resulted in more improvised weapons production — the top three significant variables are white inmates having a separate gang, gang members assaulting staff, and whether gangs have significantly affected the jail environment.
- *** Whether jail staff receive serious injuries in the last year from inmate fights — the top three significant variables are: gang members assaulting staff, having inmates associated with the Sovereign Citizens Movement, and whether whites have a separate gang.

The analysis identified seven variables as having statistical significance in terms of differentiating various jail threat conditions. This helped us to understand how the incidence of such variables can dramatically increase or decrease the intensity of various jail threat conditions. Therefore it is useful here to look at how these seven variables are inter-related. To do this a correlation analysis was undertaken using a one-tailed test of significance.

A correlation matrix, reflecting the Pearson correlation coefficient, is provided in Table 16. Here we see all have a statistically significant ($p < .05$) correlation with each other. Further, the strength of some of these relationships is at the .001 level (basically any correlation value of .23 or higher will have a $p < .001$ value). How strong are these factors? The correlation is $r = .48$ between gang threats against staff and gang assault against staff. That’s a pretty clearcut etiological sequence to first have the threat and then the actual violence against staff from gang members behind bars. Almost as strong of relationship emerged in Table 16 for the Pearson correlation coefficient between whether the jail has inmates who could be considered to be military-trained gang members and the variable of assaults on staff (Pearson $r = .40$, $p < .001$).

Table 16: Pearson Correlation Matrix of Significant Gang Variables

	Sover. Citizen Inmates	Ser. Staff Injury	Gangs Affect Jail Environ.	Military Trained Members	Gangs Assault Staff	Gang Thrt. Staff	Whites Separate Gang
Sov. Cit. Movement	1.0	.23	.28	.21	.19	.29	.19
Serious Staff Injury	.23	1.0	.19	.18	.34	.19	.21
Gangs Significantly Affect Jail Environ.	.28	.19	1.0	.34	.30	.40	.40
Military-Trained Gang Members	.21	.18	.34	1.0	.40	.44	.33
Gang Assaults On Jail Staff	.19	.34	.30	.40	1.0	.48	.39
Gang Threats On Jail Staff	.29	.19	.40	.44	.39	1.0	.37
White Inmates Have Separate Gang	.19	.21	.40	.33	.39	.37	1.0

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

The NGCRC would recommend, first of all, that future research on gangs in jail consider adding a strong component of qualitative staff interviewing such as the method used by Knox (2002) in interviewing staff who were gang violence victims in Michigan. This might provide useful additional insight into what has to be a very complicated world — working in the modern American jail environment. What is also striking from the findings of this research is how we can find scant material in the previous literature providing any discussion of the impact of trauma on jail correctional staff. And if there is any single conclusion to be drawn from this research, then it is clearly the issue of trauma and violence faced by jail staff, in particular from gangs, gang members, and extremist groups.

We would recommend that future jail research also include an analysis of the types of trauma and stress experienced by correctional staff who work in jails. The idea of doing exploratory research on the dimensions of post-traumatic stress in relationship to jail work is justified on the basis of the kinds of routine threats faced

in the jail environment: gang disturbances, assaults and attacks from gang and non-gang inmates alike, the constant process of dealing with inmates who seek to manufacture improvised weapons — and use them against other inmates and staff, and of course the never ending risk of those who seek to escape from jails.

The working conditions faced by American jail staff, when viewed in the aggregate, seem to paint a picture that is less than ideal for jail staff recruiting. Let us review some of the research findings from this national jail survey that help us to better understand what people who work in American jails have to look forward to on a daily basis:

*** Most American jails (75%+) are not accredited by any of the outside professional organizations (American Correctional Association, American Jail Association, and the National Sheriff's Association).

*** Most (82.8%) feel their agency is underfunded.

*** Most (81.7%) are types of employers that do not offer tuition reimbursement.

*** Most (74%) of the staff who work in jails are not considered sworn personnel with arrest powers.

*** American jails average 4.14 assaults per year by inmates against staff.

*** In 21.5 percent of the jails there have been staff who received serious injuries from attacks or confrontations with inmates in the last year.

*** In 18.3 percent of the jails in America, gang members have been a problem in terms of assaults on staff.

*** And, of course, the common problems of overcrowding (44.7%) among inmates in jails and the persistent problem of racial conflicts among jail inmates (42.4%). We want to add to this point the obvious exacerbation that changes over time in comparing the gang problem in American jails suggests an uptick in severity. What we are seeing over time — as observed in comparing the 1993 results with the 2019 results — is increased gang density, increased threats and assaults, and increased gang threat conditions generally.

It seems reasonable to recommend that future research on jails include new measurements for salary and benefits information, average tenure on the job, and a variety of issues about the occupation of the jail correctional officer. Finally, it is also our view that county governments with budgetary control over county jails in America need the input from American citizens and criminal justice organizations that jails become a priority for enhanced funding.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thank Vicky Ganieany for all the help with mailing, data entry, transcription, and editing provided during the course of this project. I also want to thank other NGCRC friends and colleagues, specifically James Anderson, Gregg Etter, William Loescher, and Robert Mulvaney, for sharing information and ideas to help with this project. I am also grateful for NGCRC staff who serve on the NGCRC Gang Training Conference Planning Committee for valuable input and advise throughout the research process.

REFERENCES

Alarid, Leanne F. 2000. "Along Racial and Gender Lines: Jail Subcultures in the Midst of Racial Disproportionality", *Corrections Management Quarterly*, Volume 4, Issue 1: pp. 8-19.

Arizona Department of Corrections. 2004 "S.T.G., Security Threat Groups — Frequently Asked Questions". (See: <http://www.adc.state.az.us/STG/faq.htm>).

Baird, L.H. 1986 "Prison Gangs: Texas", *Corrections Today* (18)(July): 22.

Baugh, D.G. 1993 *Gangs in Correctional Facilities: A National Assessment*. April 12, 1993, American Correctional Association, Laurel, MD.

Blasko, Brandy L.; Elizabeth L. Jeglic; Stanley Malkin. 2008. "Suicide Risk Assessment in Jails", *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice*, Volume 8, Issue 1: pp. 67-76.

Blazak, Randy. 2002 "American Jihad: Odinism, Prison Gangs and the Threat of Racial Holy War", paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology.

Bobrowski, Lawrence J. 1988 "Collecting, Organizing and Reporting Street Gang Crime", paper presented at the 40th Annual Meeting of The American Society of Criminology.

Bonner, Roger H. 2004 "The Brotherhoods: The Rise and Fall of a White-Supremacist Gang Inside a Kansas Prison", chapter 17, pp. 391-406 in *Gang Profiles: An Anthology*, Peotone, IL: New Chicago School Press.

Bradbury, Shelly. 2019. "Half-Dozen Allegheny County Jail Inmates Involved in Fight", *Pittsburgh Post - Gazette*.

Butterfield, Fox. 2004 "Inmates Use Smuggled Cellphones to Maintain a Foot on the Outside", *New York Times*, June 21, 2004.

Camp, George and Camille Graham Camp. 1985 *Prison Gangs: Their Extent, Nature and Impact on Prisons*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Charles, Devon R.; Karen M. Abram; Gary M. McClelland; and Linda A. Teplin. 2003. "Suicidal Ideation and Behavior Among Women in Jail", *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, Volume 19, Issue 1, (Feb.): pp. 65-81.

CNN. 2003 "Police Track White Supremacist Prison Gangs", April 20, 2003. See: <http://www.cnn.com/2003/US/West/04/20/racist.paroolees.ap/>

Corbiscello, G.V. 2004 "A Nation of Gods: The Five Percent Nation of Islam", chapter 8, pp. 183-194 in *Gang Profiles: An Anthology*, Peotone, IL: New Chicago School Press.

Conrad, J.P. 1979 "Who's in Charge? The Control of Gang Violence in California Prisons", in *Corrections Facility Planning* Robert Montilla and Nora Marlow (eds.), pp.135-147, Lexington, Mass: D.C. Heath.

Cox, V. 1986 "Prison Gangs - Inmates Battle for Control", *Corrections Compendium* (10)(9)(Apr): 1,6-9.

CRS, Inc. 1994. "Work in America's Jails: NIJ Provides First National Profile". National Institute of Justice (NIJ). Washington, D.C.

Daniels, S. 1987 "Prison Gangs: Confronting the Threat", *Corrections Today*. (29)(2)(Apr): 66,126,162.

Dodd, David J., and Damon Pearson. 2004 "Black Gods in Red Bank: The Five Percent Nation in

Central New Jersey”, chapter 9, pp. 195-204 in *Gang Profiles: An Anthology*, Peotone, IL: New Chicago School Press.

Earley, Pete. 1992 *The Hot House: Life Inside Leavenworth Prison*. New York: Bantam.

Etter, Gregg W., Sr. 2004 “Security Threat Groups: The Threat Posed by White Supremacist Organizations”, chapter 16, pp. 367-390 in *Gang Profiles: An Anthology*, Peotone, IL: New Chicago School Press.

----. 2004 “Skinheads: Manifestations of the Warrior Culture of the New Urban Tribes”, chapter 18, pp. 407-420 in *Gang Profiles: An Anthology*, Peotone, IL: New Chicago School Press.

Fiscella, Kevin, M.D.; Adrew Moore; Judith Engerman; Sean Meldrum. 2005. “Management of Opiate Detoxification in Jails”. *Journal of Addictive Diseases*. Volume 24, Issue 1: pp. 61-71.

Fong, Robert S. 1987 *A Comparative Study of the Organizational Aspects of Two Texas Prison Gangs: Texas Syndicate and Mexican Mafia*. Ph.D. dissertation, Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas.

----. 1990 “The Organizational Structure of Prison Gangs: A Texas Case Study”, *Federal Probation* (54)(1)(Mar): 36-43.

Fong, Robert S. and Salvador Buentello. 1991 “The Management of Prison Gangs: An Empirical Assessment”, paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Nashville, Tennessee.

Fong, Robert S.; Ron Vogel; and Robert Little. 1991 “Behind Prison Walls: Racially Based Gangs and Their Level of Violence”, paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Nashville, Tennessee.

Fox, Kathleen A.; Jodi Lane; and Ronald L. Akers. 2010. “Do Perceptions of Neighborhood Disorganization Predict Crime or Victimization? An Examination of Gang Members Versus Non-Gang Member Jail Inmates”. *Journal of Criminal Justice*. Volume 38. Issue 4. July/August: pp. 720-729.

----. 2013. “Understanding Gang Membership and Crime Victimization Among Jail Inmates Testing the Effects of Self-Control”, *Crime and Delinquency*, Volume 59, Issue 5, August: pp. 764-767.

Gaes, Gerald G; Susan Wallace; Evan Gilman; Jody Klein-Saffran; and Sharon Suppa 2001 “The Influence of Prison Gang Affiliation on Violence and Other Prison Misconduct”, Bureau of Prisons, U.S. Dept. Of Justice, Washington, D.C.

Gaston, A. 1996 “Controlling Gangs Through Teamwork and Technology”, *Large Jail Network Bulletin*, Annual Issue, pp. 7-10.

Gee, Jeremiah. 2006. “Education in Rural County Jails: Need Versus Opportunity”, *Journal of Correctional Education*, Volume 57, Issue 4 (December): pp. 312-325.

Geniella, Mike. 2001 “Links Found to Seven Santa Rosa Slayings”, *The Press Democrat*, April 21, 2001, California.

----. 2001 “Pelican Bay Inmates Communicated Via Underground Mail”, *The Press Democrat*, April 22, 2001.

Goffman, Erving. 1961. *Asylums*. Double Day Anchor Books.

Goodwin, Cory. 1999 *Gangs in Prison: How to Set Up a Security-Threat Group Intelligence Unit*. LRP Publications, Dartnell Corporation, Palm Beach Gardens, FL.

Gratton, Robert “Huerito”. 2003 *The Rise and Fall of the Nuestra Familia*. (See: www.knowgangs.com).

Griffin, Marie L. 1999. “Influence of Organizational Climate on Detention Officers’ Readiness to Use

Force in a County Jail”. *Criminal Justice Review*. Volume 24, Issue 1. (Spring): pp. 1-26.

Harris, Kathleen. 2012 “Rise in Prison Gangs Fueling Violence, Drug Trade”, CBS News, Oct. 24, 2012.

Haysom, Nicholas. 1981 *Towards an Understanding of Prison Gangs*. Institute of Criminology, University of Cape Town, South Africa.

Hopper, Columbus B. 1969 *Sex in Prison: The Mississippi Experiment with Conjugal Visiting*. Louisiana State University Press.

Jacobs, James. 1974 “Street Gangs Behind Bars”, *Social Problems* (21)(3): 395-408.
1977 *Stateville*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jacobsen, V. 1992. “Minnesota Jails Continue to “Break Ground” With Inmate Work Programs”, *Detention Reporter*, Issue 99 (Jan.): pp. 5-8.

Kaba, Fatos; Andrea Lewis; Sarah Glowa-Kollisch; James Hadler; David Lee; Howard Alper; Daniel Selling; Ross MacDonald; Angela Solimo; Amanda Parsons; Homer Venters. 2014. “Solitary Confinement and Risk of Self-harm Among Jail Inmates”, *American Journal of Public Health*, Volume 104, Issue 3 (March): pp. 442-447.

Knox, George W. 2002. “The Melanics - A Gang Profile Analysis”. *Journal of Gang Research*. Volume 9, Number 3, Spring, 2002.

----- 2006 *An Introduction to Gangs*. 6th revised and expanded edition. Peotone, IL: New Chicago School Press.

----- 2012. “The Problem of Gangs and Security Threat Groups (STG’s) in American Prisons and Jails Today: Recent Findings from the 2012 NGCRC National Gang/STG Survey”, *Journal of Gang Research*, Volume 20, Issue 1 (Fall): pp. 51-76.

Knox, George W., and Andrew Papachristos. 2002 *Vice Lords: A Gang Profile*. Peotone, IL: New Chicago School Press.

Knox, George W., and Curtis Robinson. 2004 *Gang Profiles: An Anthology*. Peotone, IL: New Chicago School Press.

Knox, George W., and Edward Tromanhauser. 1991 “Gangs and Their Control in Adult Correctional Institutions”, *The Prison Journal*, (71): 15-22.

Krajick, K.. 1990 “The Menace of Supergangs”, *Corrections Today* (June): 11-14.

Lane, Michael. 1989 “Inmate Gangs”, *Corrections Today* (51)(4)(July): 98-99, 126-128.

LeDuff, Charlie. 2004 “A Jail Tour in Los Angeles Offers a Peek Into 5 Killings Behind Bars”, *New York Times*, May 23, 2004, p. 14.

Legger, Robert G. 1988 “Perception of Crowding, Racial Antagonism, and Aggression in a Custodial Prison”, *Journal of Criminal Justice* (16)(3): 167-181.

Linhorst, Donald M.; P. Ann Dirks-Linhorst; and Ralph Groom. 2012. “Rearrest and Probation Violation Outcomes Among Probationers Participating in a Jail-Based Substance Abuse Treatment Used as an Intermediate Sanction”, *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, Volume 51, Issue 8, (Nov./Dec.): pp. 519-540.

Lisante, Timothy F.; and Beth Navon. 2000. “New York City Jail-Community Re-Entry Collaboration”, *Journal of Correctional Education*, Volume 51, Issue 2 (June): pp. 237-240.

Lonzo, Gary M. 1994 “Gangs in Prisons and Jails: An AFSCME Resolution”, president and delegate, 31st International AFSCME Convention, Resolution No. 65, June 27-July 1, 1994, San Diego, CA (See: <http://www.afscme.org/about/resolute/1994/r31-066.html>).

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. © Copyright 2020. No portion of the contents of the *Journal of Gang Research* may be copied, reproduced, or distributed in any form whatsoever without the prior written permission of the National Gang Crime Research Center.

Lotter, J.M. 1988 "Prison Gangs in South Africa: A Description", *The South African Journal of Sociology*(19)(2)(May): 67-75.

Lyman, Michael D. 1989 *Gangland: Drug Trafficking by Organized Criminals*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Magura, Stephen; Joshua D. Lee; Jason Hershberger; Herman Joseph; Lisa Marsch; Carol Shropshire; and Andrew Rosenblum. 2009. "Buprenorphine and Methadone Maintenance in Jail and Post-Release: A Randomized Clinical Trial". *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. Volume 99, Issue 1-3 (Jan.): pp. 222-230.

Martinez, Pila. 1999 "Novel Attempt to Curb Prison Gang Violence", *Christian Science Monitor*, July 21, 1999.

May, David C.; Kevin I. Minor; Peter B. Wood; Jennifer L. Mooney. 2004. "Kentucky Probationers' and Parolees' Perceptions of the Severity of Prison Versus County Jail and Probation". *Kentucky Justice and Safety Research Bulletin*. Volume 6, Issue 4 (Winter): pp. 1-11.

Miller, Lisa. 1999 "Inside the Competitive New World of Prison Ministries", *The Wall Street Journal*, September 7, 1999, p. B1.

Miller, Rod; and Joseph Trevathan. 2003. "Productive Jails Benefit Many". *Corrections Today*. (April): pp. 96-98.

Minton, Todd B. 2014. "Jails in Indian Country 2013". Bureau of Justice Statistics. Office of Justice Programs. U.S. Department of Justice.

Mumola, Christopher J. 2005. "Suicide and Homicide in State Prisons and Local Jails", Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Reports, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

Nadel, B.A. 1997. "Slashing Gang Violence, Not Victims: New York City Department of Corrections Reduces Violent Jail Incidents Through Computerized Gang Tracking Data Base", *Corrections Compendium*, Volume 22, Issue 10 (October): pp. 20-22.

NDIC. 2003 Rhode Island Drug Threat Assessment. July. National Drug Intelligence Center. <http://www.usdoj.gov/ndic/pubs3/3979/overview.htm>

Nelson, Signe; and Lynn Olcott. 2006. "Jail Time is Learning Time". *Corrections Today*, Volume 58, Issue 1 (February): pp. 26, 27-37.

Perroncello, Peter E. 2000. "Do You Know Who Really Visits Your Jail?", *American Jails*, Volume 14, Issue 5 (Nov./Dec.): pp. 19-21.

Pfeifer, Paul E. 2002 "The Lucasville Prison Riot", Justice Paul E. Pfeifer's Weekly Column, July 31, 2002, Supreme Court, State of Ohio.

Proctor, Steven L.; Norman G. Hoffman; and Steve Allison. 2012. "Effectiveness of Interactive Journaling in Reducing Recidivism Among Substance Dependent Jail Inmates". *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. Volume 56, Issue 2. (April): pp. 317-332.

Quirk, Thom; and Rod Miller. 2002. *Business Planning Guide for Jail Industries*. Community Resource Services, Inc.

Ralph, Paige H.; James W. Marquart; and Ben M. Crouch 1990 "Prisoner Gangs in Texas", paper presented at the 1990 Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Baltimore, MD.

Riggs, Robert. 2004 "State Offers Way Out for Violent Prison Gang Members", CBS-11 News, July 26, 2004. (See: http://cbs11tv.com/investigations/local_story_208180734.html).

Ruddell, Rick; Scott H. Decker; and Arlen Egley Jr. 2006. Gang Interventions in Jails: A National Analysis. *Criminal Justice Review*. Volume 31, Issue 1 (March): pp. 33-46.

Sakala, Leah. 2013. "Return to Sender: Postcard-Only Mail Policies in Jail", Prison Policy Initiative, Northampton, MA.

Schwartzapfel, Beth. 2019. "When Going to Jail Means Giving Up the Meds That Saved Your Life". Accessed Sept. 24, 2019 at: www.themrshallproject.org

Shaw, Donita Massengill; and Margaret A. Berg. 2009. "Jail Participants Actively Study Words". *Journal of Correctional Education*. Volume 60, Issue 2 (June): pp. 100-119.

Smith, L.G. and M. Silverman. 1994. "Functional Literacy Education for Jail Inmates: An Examination of the Hillsborough County Jail Education Program", *Prison Journal*, Volume 74, Issue 4, (Dec.): pp. 414-432.

Stinchcomb, Jeanne B.; Susan W. McCampbell. 2008. "American Jails: Raising the Research Profile". *Corrections Today*. Volume 70, Issue 1 (Feb.): pp. 72-74.

Stone, Sandra S. 2000 *Contemporary Gang Issues: An Insides View*. Peotone, IL: New Chicago School Press.

Sturges, Judith E. 2002. "Visitation at County Jails: Potential Policy Implications", *Criminal Justice Policy Review*. Volume 13, Issue 1 (March): pp. 32-45.

Sturges, Judith E. 2005. "Survey of Pennsylvania Jail Wardens: An Examination of Visitation Policies Within the Context of Ecosystem Theory". *Criminal Justice Review*. Volume 30, Issue 2 (Sept.): pp. 141-154.

Swager, Brent. 2000. "Visitorless Jails: Our Future is Arriving", *Corrections Technology and Management*, Volume 4, Issue 1 (Jan./Feb.): pp. 26-29.

Tartaro,Christine. 2003. "Suicide and the Jail Environment: An Evaluation of Three Types of Institutions". *Environment & Behavior*. Volume 35, Issue 5. (Sept.): pp. 605-620.

Tartaro, Christine; and Marissa P. Levy. 2008. "Predictors of Suicide in New Generation Jails", *Justice Research and Policy*, Volume 10, Issue 1: pp. 21-37.

Tewksbury, R. 1994. "Literacy Programming for Jail Inmates: Reflections and Recommendations From One Program", *Prison Journal*, Volume 74, Issue 4 (December): pp. 398-413.

Thompson, Don. 2004(a) "U.S. Attorney Says No Abuses After 2002 Folsom Prison Riot", Associated Press, June 17, 2004.

Thompson, Ginger. 2004(b) "Shuttling Between Nations, Latino Gangs Confound the Law", *New York Times*, p. 1, 14-15.

Toller, W., and B. Tsagaris. 1996 "Managing Institutional Gangs: A Practical Approach Combining Security and Human Services", *Corrections Today* (58): 100-111.

Trevathan, Joseph T. 2000. "Jail Industries: Real Work, Real Value", *Sheriff*, Volume 52, Issue 6 (Nov./Dec.): pp. 10-12.

Trout, Gregory C.. 2004 "DRC Wins Major Victory: Sixth Circuit Strikes Down the Portion of the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act (RLUIPA) That Applies to Inmates", *The Docket*, Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction.

Turley, Alan; Tim Thornton; Craig Johnson; and Sue Azzolino. 2004. "Jail Drug and Alcohol

Treatment Program Reduces Recidivism in Nonviolent Offenders: A Longitudinal Study of Monroe County, New York's Jail Treatment Drug and Alcohol Program". *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. Volume 48, Issue 6. (Dec.): pp. 721-728.

U.S. Marshals Service. 2012. "Basics and Beyond: Suicide Prevention in Jails". U.S. Marshals Service, Washington, DC.

Washington Post. 2012 "Mexican Officials Negotiating With Vigilantes Who Seized Control of Town After Killing by Gang", *The Americas*, November 2, 2012.

Wilkinson, Reginald A., and Tessa Unwin. 1999 "Intolerance in Prison: A Recipe for Disaster", *Corrections Today*, June, 1999.

Winter, Melinda M. 2000. "County Jail Suicides in a Midwestern State: A Description of the "Typical" Suicidal Act from 1980 through mid-1998", *Corrections Compendium*, Volume 25, Issue 1 (January): pp. 8-23.

----. 2003. "County Jail Suicides in a Midwestern State: Moving Beyond they Use of Profiles", *The Prison Journal*, Volume 83, Issue 2. (June): pp. 130-148.

www.taclease.state.tx 2004 "Disruptive Groups". See: <http://www.tcleose.state.tx.us/Guidelines/HTML/1007/22.%20Disruptive@20Groups.html>

Yancey, George A. 1996 *Beyond Black and White: Reflections on Racial Reconciliation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.

15. Please estimate the total number of assaults by inmates against your correctional personnel in the last twelve months. _____inmate assaults on staff
16. Were any firearms confiscated from inmates or secure areas within the last twelve months? ___Yes ___No
17. Please estimate how many edged weapons were confiscated from inmate shakedowns within the last twelve months. _____
18. How many assaults were committed with edged weapons among inmates within the last twelve months? _____
19. How many assaults on staff were committed with weapons of any kind by inmates within the last twelve months?_____
20. Have any of your staff received serious injuries from attacks or confrontations with inmates within the last twelve months? ___Yes ___No
21. Do your correctional officers receive ongoing in-service training?
___Yes ___No
IF YES, how many hours per month _____Hours
22. How many escape attempts occurred at your facility within the last twelve months? _____
23. How many incidents of fire-setting occurred within your facility during the last twelve months? _____times in the last 12 months
24. Please estimate how many incidents of illicit drug seizures occurred within your facility during the last twelve months?_____
25. How many lock-downs occurred at your facility during the last twelve months?

26. Has your facility confiscated any cell phones in the past year? ___Yes ___No
#Seized_____
27. Do you believe correctional officers who work in the jail should be trained to calm inmates' emotional distress? ___Yes ___No
28. Which inmates are more likely to attempt suicide in your facility?
___Males ___Females
29. What is the highest risk period for jail suicide attempts?
___Intake ___Pretrial ___During trial ___Before Sentencing ___After sentencing
30. Which is the single most common method of suicide attempts in your facility's history.
___Lacerations ___Inserting head into toilet ___Hanging/suffocation
___Chemical Poisoning ___Other self-inflicted trauma

31. Is your facility accredited by any of these?
 American Correctional Association (ACA)? Yes No
 American Jail Association (AJA)? Yes No
 National Sheriff's Association (NSA)? Yes No
32. Do Islamic inmates have a separate gang? Yes No
 If yes, what is it called?

33. Do your correctional officers receive tuition reimbursement for college classes?
 Yes No
34. In the last year, has your jail held any inmates who were associated with the
 Sovereign Citizen's Movement? Yes No
35. Do you believe that gang affiliation tends to increase recidivism? Yes No
36. Are private contact visits allowed for spouses under special arrangements for
 deserving inmates? Yes No
37. Are contact visits allowed for inmates in your facility? Yes No
38. What is the maximum number of visiting hours an inmate can receive on a
 weekly basis in your facility? _____ Hours per week
39. In what year did gang problems among inmates first become recognized in your
 facility? 19_____ or 20_____
40. Do you feel society wants to help inmates be rehabilitated? Yes No
41. In your view, could conjugal visiting be used as a reward to control gang
 problems in jail? Yes No
42. In your opinion, have inmate gangs tended to result in more improvised weapons
 production (e.g., shanks, etc) among inmates in your facility? Yes No
43. Do you feel we need tougher laws to control the gang problem among inmates?
 Yes No
44. What are the names of the top two motorcycle gangs in your jurisdiction or area?
 1. _____
 2. _____
45. Are the detention officers who work in your jail considered commissioned
 deputies with arrest powers. Yes No
46. (a) In your opinion, should the American Correctional Association (ACA)
 establish Standards for controlling inmate gangs? Yes No
 (b) Should the American Jail Association (AJA) establish such standards?
 Yes No

47. Some correctional facilities seek to control gangs by the “set off” method. It involves “balancing the number of rival gang members” in a living unit/cellhouse/etc. In your opinion, is this an effective way to control inmate gangs? ___Yes ___No
48. Some line staff believe that offenders are more assaultive when there is a “full moon”, do you believe there is any basis to this? ___Yes ___No
- 49a. What is the total inmate population (count) for your facility as of today? _____
- 49b. What is your rated capacity for inmates? _____
50. What level of security is your facility?
 ___Minimum security ___Medium security ___High security
51. Do inmates have access to computers or the internet to access their email?
 ___Yes ___No
52. Do you believe that providing tuition support for staff could help control the inmate gang problem? ___Yes ___No
53. In what year was your physical plant first constructed? _____
54. Have you ever identified any of your inmates as being a member of the MS-13 gang? ___Yes ___No
55. Does your jail have any kind of jail industry program? (A jail industry is “any activity that rewards inmates with pay, privileges, or other benefits to create a product or service having value for a public or private client”). ___Yes ___No
56. Does your facility have any full-time staff employed as ombudsmen or advocates for inmates?
 ___Yes ___No
57. In general, do you believe the Supreme Court has gone too far on ruling in favor of inmate rights? ___Yes ___No
58. What are the names of the top two white racist extremist gangs or hate groups in your area?
 1. _____
 2. _____
59. Estimate what percentage of your inmate population need drug addiction counseling services. _____%
60. Does your classification system take gang membership into account?
 ___Yes ___No
61. Generally, is overcrowding a problem in your facility? ___Yes ___No
62. Does your jail have a GED program for inmates? ___Yes ___No
63. What strategies does your facility use to control gangs? (check all those that apply)
 ___transfers ___ Use of informers ___ Segregation ___ Isolating leaders
 ___lockdown ___ prosecution ___ interrupting communications ___ case by
 case dealings ___ ignoring their existence ___ infiltration
 ___ displacing members to different facilities ___ coopting of prisoners to control
 gangs
 ___ meeting with gang leaders on “as needed” basis ___ joint meetings between
 various gang leaders
 ___ balance the number of rivals living in the same unit
 ___ other: _____

64. How many felony crimes committed by inmates in your facility were court prosecuted during the last year? _____
65. Does your jail provide a website available to the general public to view the pictures and arrest information on inmates detained in your jail? ___Yes ___No
66. Have gang members in your jurisdiction been involved in the crime of arson? ___Yes ___No
67. In your opinion, which of the following correctional goals/philosophies is most effective in reducing recidivism (Check one only):
___Punishment ___Rehabilitation
68. Does your jail use some version of the “postcard-only” option (in your jail, is incoming or outgoing mail to inmates limited to post-cards and not letters with envelopes)? ___Yes ___No
69. Our jail forbids methadone (and a newer addiction medication - buprenorphine) for inmates even when legitimately prescribed, on the grounds that these drugs pose safety and security concerns. ___True ___False
70. What is the MOST INNOVATIVE way you have ever heard of for controlling gang activity in jail?

71. Do you believe that the inmate gangs have significantly affected your correctional environment? ___Yes ___No
72. What is your total inmate count as of today?
_____ male inmates _____ female inmates
73. What is the age range of the inmates in your facility today.
Youngest is _____years old Oldest is _____ years old
74. Have you read 1993 NGCRC gang research on American jails or other on-line reports or periodicals about gangs from the NGCRC? ___Yes ___No
75. Has your facility been able to make use of any of the research reports about gangs available from the National Institute of Justice? ___Yes ___No
76. Has your facility ever received the free newspaper publication from the NGCRC called “*The Gang Specialist*”. ___Yes ___No
77. In your opinion, what percentage of all illicit drugs are brought into your facility by inmate gang members? _____%
78. Do you believe electronic monitoring could be more cost-effective than local detention while awaiting trial? ___Yes ___No
79. Do you have inmates in your facility whose crimes involved the use of any of these remotely controlled or piloted vehicles/robots? ___Yes ___No
If Yes, please answer questions a, b, and c.
a. Air/aircraft and balloons ___Yes ___No
b. Ground/wheeled, tracked and leg ___Yes ___No
c. Water / floating and submersibles ___Yes ___No
80. Have you had inmates who could be considered military-trained gang members? ___Yes ___No

Mail this survey to:

Fax it to: (708) 258-9546

NGCRC, PO Box 990, Peotone, IL 60468

Email it to: gangcrime@aol.com

Want a free copy of the 2019 Jail Survey Report? Staple a business card here.

