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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Gangs in the southern region emerged after the 1970s and continue to grow today (Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 12). In 1995, southern states began to see an increase of gang activity and “the Southern region led the nation in the number of new gang cities, a 32 percent increase, versus increases of 26 percent in the Midwest, 6 percent in the Northeast, and 3 percent in the West” (Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 12). By 1998, the south had become the top-ranking region of states with the largest number of gang counties. Georgia with 61 came second to Texas which had 82.

In metro Atlanta, gang violence and the number of gangs are growing, according to District Attorney Paul Howard. Mr. Howard in a recent interview seemed to agree with previous research stating that “young people are being recruited into gang life for protection or a sense of belonging” (Shuggs, 2011).

Similarly, in an article titled "Understanding the Gang Phenomenon Through the Voices of Youth: The Gang Defined," others also believe that people join gangs to obtain the love, attention and other basic needs that is lacking at home. Lafontaine, Acoose, and Schissel (2009) thought it would be helpful to find sources of information on how to define the term gang from a community and/or member-base perspective and the results were very clear. The respondents agreed that the decision to join a gang is not based on individual risk or delinquency, but on very real and rational decisions about
power, protection, belonging and access to resources (Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations, 2003).

According to Thompson (1998) childhood physical and sexual abuse are predictors of gang involvement. Thompson concluded that “being maltreated is a much more robust correlate of gang involvement than the level of support, communication, educational interest, and supervision youth receive from their parents” (Thompson, 1998, p. 328). One of the basic goals of conventional gang research is to identify the risk factors associated with the decision to join a gang” and based on previous research child maltreatment is a risk factor for gang membership (Davis, 2009, p. 38).

Statement of the Problem

According to the National Gang Intelligence Center (NGIC), “gangs are expanding, evolving, and posing an increasing threat to U.S. communities” (National Gang Intelligence Center, 2011). The latest gang threat assessment prepared by the NGIC revealed that

there are approximately 1.4 million active street, prison, and outlaw motorcycle gang members in more than 33,000 gangs operating in all 50 states; Gangs are responsible for an average of 48 percent of violent crime in most jurisdictions and up to 90 percent in several others. Gangs are increasingly engaging in non-traditional gang-related crimes like alien smuggling, human trafficking, and prostitution, as well as white-collar crimes like counterfeiting, identity theft, and mortgage fraud...primarily due to the high profitability and much lower visibility and risk of detection and punishment than drug and weapons trafficking. Gang
members are acquiring high-powered, military-style weapons and equipment, which poses a significant threat because of the potential to engage in lethal encounters with law enforcement and citizens alike. Gangs are becoming increasingly adaptable and sophisticated, employing new and advanced technology—including social networking websites—to carry out criminal activity discreetly and connect with other gang members, criminal organizations, and potential recruits around the country and around the world (National Gang Intelligence Center, 2011).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between child maltreatment and gang affiliation, explain how these two variables correlate to one another, and identify if child maltreatment is a major risk factor for gang membership. Second, this study aims to lower the number of adolescents who join gangs and participate in gang-related activity.

Research Questions

The research questions of the study were as follows:

1. Is there a statistically significant relationship between child maltreatment and gang affiliation?
2. Is child maltreatment a statistically significant risk factor for gang affiliation?
3. Which type of child maltreatment is most likely to lead to gang affiliation?

Hypothesis
The null hypotheses of the study were as follows:

1. There is no statistically significant relationship between child maltreatment and gang affiliation.
2. Child maltreatment is not a statistically significant risk factor for gang affiliation.
3. There is no type of child maltreatment that is more likely to lead to gang affiliation.

Significance of the Study

In another article addressing the presence of gangs in Georgia titled *Not in My Town: A Study of the Existence of Youth Gangs in One State: Georgia*, the author conducted a study to find out how police agencies in the state view the presence of gangs in rural areas. In this study, “the entire membership of the Georgia Association of Chiefs of Police was used for the sample and a survey was mailed to each of the 146 members” (Tracy, 2011, p. 3). The author concluded that there is some level of gang activity in the rural areas of Georgia and that highly organized gangs were more prevalent in the suburban and small cities rather than in the rural areas of Georgia (Tracy, 2011, p. 5). The presence of gangs in Metro Atlanta has been established, however, there is not much research on the risk factors for gang membership.

This study provides an opportunity to deepen the understanding of the risk factors for gang affiliation, specifically child maltreatment. Discussions on alternative ways of addressing and identifying child maltreatment for social workers and other professionals
who work with children can begin. In addition, this study hopes to reduce the number of gang members who come into contact with law enforcement officials and reduce the amount of gang-related crime and activity.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter discusses the historical perspective of gangs in the United States by presenting a brief history of the four major regions (North, South, East and West) with the highest prevalence of gang activity. This chapter also includes descriptions of child maltreatment, gang affiliation, and prior research on the relationship between these two variables.

Historical Perspective

The emergence of gangs in the United States began on the East Coast around 1783 according to the National Gang Center’s 2010 report; however street gangs most likely did not appear until the early part of the nineteenth century (Santé, 1991, as cited in Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 1). In the Northeast and Midwest, immigration and poverty fueled the start of gangs, with two waves of poor white families from Europe seeking a better life (Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 1). According to the report, “both groups largely consisted of low-skilled, low-wage laborers. Not unexpectedly, the second wave on top of the first one overwhelmed the housing and welfare capacity of the young Northeast and Midwest cities, contributing directly to slum conditions and the accompanying crime problems, gangs included” (Riis, 1902/1969, as cited in Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 1).

Dissimilarly, in the West gangs grew out of the pre-existing Mexican culture and large migrations into El Paso, Albuquerque, and Los Angeles. These areas were
overpopulated with immigrants from Mexico and continue to grow today. A second wave made up of African-American immigrants who migrated from the Deep South would inundate states in the Northeast, Midwest, and the West. Additionally, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, and Latin American gang mixtures would populate the gang landscape (Miller, 2001, p. 43). “Native American gangs also would emerge, but much later” (Conway, 1998 as cited in Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 2). “The internal migration of the blacks mainly fueled the emergence of another distinct wave of gang activity. The end result was a mixture of predominantly white, Mexican, and black gangs—with varying degrees of influence” (Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 2).

As stated earlier, the emergence of gangs in the U.S. began on the East Coast, and they developed in three phases (Adamson, 1998; Santé, 1991, as cited in Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 2). The first phase occurred immediately after the American Revolution, with youth fighting over local turf. A few years later would be the beginning of more serious gang development due to large-scale immigration. The third phase developed in the 1950s and 1960s when Latino and African-American populations arrived all at once (Howell & Moore, 2010). The earliest gangs of New York were not criminal groups and many street gang members were employed mostly as common laborers; Santé, 1991). Some were bouncers in saloons or longshoremen, apprentice butchers, carpenters, sail-makers, and shipbuilders who affianced in violence. “Violence was a normal part of their always contested environment and turf warfare was a condition of the neighborhood...Gangs formed the basic unit of social life among the young males in New York in the nineteenth century” (Santé, 1991, p. 198).
Gang emergence in the Midwest, in contrast to that on the East Coast, grew tremendously due to the labor force created by the Industrial Revolution. Street gangs in Chicago grew mainly from the same immigrant groups as those on the East Coast (Finestone, 1976, p. 6, as cited in Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 5). "By the early 20th century, Polish and Italian gangs were the most numerous in Chicago. Only 7 percent were black. Much like the early New York scene, gangs of mixed rationalities were common; in fact, ethnically mixed gangs represented almost 40 percent of all gangs in Chicago by 1925" (Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 5). During this time, the types of gangs that arose were controlled by corrupt politicians, including Cook County Commissioner Frank Ragen, who ran "Ragen's Colts" gang (Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 5).

The gang disguised itself as an athletic club but controlled and protected its turf, especially from blacks who worked in the area or traveled through on their way to and from work (Arrendondo, 2004, p. 406). The club had members ranging from age 17 to 30, and they vowed to provide policing service for the community. Other athletic clubs hosted gangs, and assisted union leaders and factory workers in the protection of their interests (Spergel, 1995). During the "Roaring Twenties," organized crime mobs were prevalent, and violence among warring gangs was a frequent occurrence in Chicago (Block, 1977). The most notable crime mob was the Al Capone gang, and gangs were said to "prosper in the very shadow of these institutions" (McKay, 1949, p. 36).

Later during the mid-1970s, two major alliances were formed among Latino, Black, and White gangs, called the "People" and the "Folk." It was said that they were formed in the penitentiary system by gang members seeking protection. Until recently,
these alliances were respectfully maintained; however, law enforcement agencies all seem to agree that the alliances mean very little (Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 8).

“Nevertheless, the Chicago style of gangsterism stretches to Gary, Indiana, and Milwaukee, Wisconsin, where alliances are fragile enough to promote interracial mistrust and solid enough to fuel feuds lasting for decades” (Cureton, 2009, p. 354, as cited in Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 8). Today, it is reported that the largest gangs in Chicago are “the Gangster Disciple Nation, Black Gangsters/New Breeds, Latin Kings (LKs), Black P. Stone Nation, Vice Lords (VLs), the Four Corner Hustlers and the Maniac Latin Disciples (MLDs)” (Chicago Crime Commission, 2009, p. 11, as cited in Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 9).

Unlike in Chicago, there are no reports of alliances in the West, where gangs first began to appear as early as the 1890s (Redfield, 1941, 1993, p. 95, as cited in Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 10). Much like it was on the East Coast, gangs were started by immigrants, except in this case, it was Mexican immigrants instead of Europeans. Another major difference is that on the East Coast, gangs were formed by immigrants who were looking for a better life and created a network for one another for support. On the West Coast however, “Mexican immigrants were culturally marginalized between their society of origin and the dominant American culture to which they had migrated. Cholo youth, the poorest of the poor, could not fully assimilate into Anglo culture or develop a unique identity” (Vigil, 1988, p. 42, 1998). These street youth shaped their own subculture because being Cholo allowed them to assert a Latino identity, take pride in it, and deny being embachedado (Anglicized) (Vigil, 1998).
Second-generation children of Mexican Americans created gangs that emerged out of barrios; they were youth with little emotional and psychological support and who saw very little to aspire to in their parents (Vigil, 1993, p. 96, as cited in Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 10).

“The Latino gangs in the barrios (neighborhoods) of East Los Angeles typically formed in adolescent friendship groups as ‘boy gangs.’ Each day, ‘conflict with rival gangs provided an arena for the demonstration of street-learned skills, values, and loyalties’ (Vigil, 1993, p. 98). Territorial-based conflict became institutionalized behavior distinguished by ‘defense of the barrio and fighting for one’s ‘homeboys,’” for the honor of both (p. 96). ‘Mi barrio’ (my neighborhood) became synonymous with “my gang” (Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 10). The development of black gangs in Los Angeles differs significantly from that of Latinos. “Racial intimidation, school and residential segregation, extreme marginalization, and racial exclusion from mainstream Los Angeles” played a significant role in black gang formation during the 1970s (Alonso, 2004, p. 659, as cited in Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 11). Blacks from the South migrated west, looking for a better life and in hopes of finding employment in what was considered the land of opportunity. However, instead of opportunity, blacks were faced with “institutional inequality (in housing, education, and employment), and restrictive housing covenants legalized in the 1920s rendered much of Los Angeles off-limits to most minorities” (Alonso, 2004; Cureton, 2009, as cited in Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 11). In addition to discrimination, blacks feared attacks from whites, which led to the “formation of Black social street clubs aimed at protecting Black youths against persistent White
violence directed at the Black community” (Cureton, 2009, p. 664, as cited in Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 11).

“As white clubs began to fade from the scene, eventually the black clubs, which were first organized as protectors of the community, began to engage in conflicts with other black clubs. ‘Black gang activity [soon] represented a significant proportion of gang incidents’ across Los Angeles” (Cureton, 2009, p. 665, as cited in Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 11). “Black Los Angeles youth searching for a new identity began to mobilize as street groups. This process also widened the base of black gangs into two camps, Crips and Bloods. Crips wore blue clothing; the Bloods chose red” (Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 12). Marking territory by using graffiti began with the Crips. They claimed certain areas as their own and listed some of their core members. They also developed a mantra, “Crips don’t die, they multiply” (Vigil, 2002, p. 77). Both the Bloods and Crips grew enormously throughout Los Angeles public housing projects, particularly in “Watts in the 1950s—in Jordan Downs, William Nickerson, Jr. Gardens, and Imperial Courts—and blacks made up nearly 95 percent of these two gangs” (Vigil, 2002, p. 76).

Reportedly, “by 1972, there were 18 Crips and Bloods gangs in Los Angeles, and these were the largest of the more than 500 active gangs in the city in the 1970s” (Vigil, 2002, p. 76, as cited in Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 12). “Many of the Bloods and Crips gangs regarded one another as mortal enemies and engaged in a continuing blood feud.” In the years that followed, “hundreds of gangs in the Southwest and also in other parts of the United States have adopted the Bloods and Crips names” (Valdez, 2007, p. 189). In
the present day, West Coast black street gangs identify themselves as either Bloods or Crips (Valdez, 2007).

On the contrary, gangs in the southern region emerged much later than those in the East, Midwest, and West. “For one thing, it lacked a central large city within which early gang activity was concentrated. The early immigrant groups were dispersed across the area. Moreover, gang activity likely did not emerge in the southern states prior to the 1970s” (Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 12). It was not until 1995 that southern states began to see an increase of gang activity. “From the 1970s through 1995, the Southern region led the nation in the number of new gang cities, a 32 percent increase, versus increases of 26 percent in the Midwest, 6 percent in the Northeast, and 3 percent in the West” (Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 12).

By 1998, the states with the largest number of gang-problem cities were California (363), Illinois (261), Texas (156), and Florida (125) (Miller, 2001, p. 60). Of these, only two, California and Illinois, reported large numbers of cities with gang problems in the 1970s. The states with the largest number of gang counties in 1998 were Texas (82), Georgia (61), California (50), Illinois (42), and Florida (40), with the South replacing the Northeast as the region with the most top-ranking states (p. 63). Hence, the South region appeared to catch up with other regions in the prevalence of gang activity just before the turn of the century (Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 12).

In conclusion, the history of gangs in the four major regions differed in how they each emerged and grew. On the East coast and in the Midwest, “gangs arose in concert
with external migration of European origins—The Western gang history contrasts sharply” (Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 19) due to its history deriving largely from gangs of Mexican descent. In New York City and Chicago, street gangs were mostly made up of adult men engaged in criminal activity who were volunteer firemen, laborers and bar room brawlers. Each of the four regions also saw a distinct second wave of black gang expansion as a result of internal migration. Markedly, black gangs that formed in combination with this migration do not appear to have gained the foothold in New York City that they gained in the Midwest and West. “Mobsters and shady political operators, mixed with adult criminal groups, controlled the streets” in both New York and Chicago. In contrast, street gangs in the West appear to have emerged from aggressive groups of young Mexican men” (Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 20).

Gang Affiliation: Definitions and Prevalence

Now that the history of gangs has been discussed, there will be a discussion of the prevalence of gang activity in metro Atlanta as well as an explanation of how researchers define what a gang is and how it works. Also, the author will present some basic characteristics of gangs and gang members, different types of gangs, and some opinions on gangs from a youth’s perspective.

In metro Atlanta, gang violence and the number of gangs are growing, according to District Attorney Paul Howard. Mr. Howard stated in a recent interview that “young people are being recruited into gang life for protection or a sense of belonging and something has to be done” (Shuiggs, 2011). According to the author of the article who
interviewed the district attorney, a lieutenant in Atlanta’s police department stated that even though gangs are primarily concentrated in metro Atlanta, their crimes are not. “There has been a recent increase in ‘smash and grabs,’ the stealing of whatever is within arm’s” and “there have been plenty of arrests but that doesn’t seem to have slowed the crime rate much” (Shuggs, 2011, p. 1) “Lt. Meadow’s points out that gangs are operating more intelligently than ever before. Despite the best efforts of the police department and District Attorney, gang member recruitment is in full swing throughout the penitentiary system” (Shuggs, 2011, p.1). Young men are looking to start their own ‘sets’ and are joining gangs inside jail to adapt better to street life. Additionally, there has been a flood of gangs coming into Georgia from various states in the South, and even from as far away as California and Chicago (Shuggs, 2011).

In another article addressing the presence of gangs in Georgia titled Not in My Town: A Study of the Existence of Youth Gangs in One State: Georgia; Tracy (2011) conducted a study to find out how police agencies in the state view the presence of gangs in rural areas. In this study, “the entire membership of the Georgia Association of Chiefs of Police was used for the sample and a survey was mailed to each of the 146 members” (Tracy, 2011, p. 3). Responses were received from three counties, which included Cobb, DeKalb, and Gwinnett. In addition, surveys were received from Savannah and Macon counties. The findings are as follows:

Graffiti was present in 50% of the rural and suburban communities; 38% reported that existent graffiti had been crossed out, often an indicator that gangs are in the area. Youth in 48% of the rural communities wore colors, jewelry, and clothing,
flashed hand signs or displayed other behaviors that might be gang related. Nearly 60% of the respondents reported that drugs were available in or near each of the rural, suburban and small city areas; marijuana, cocaine and methamphetamines being the most frequently cited. There was a significant increase in the number of physical confrontations among youth over the past 12 months (2006-2007) in 23% of the rural areas. There was also an increasing presence of weapons in 35% of all communities. The same percentage of communities indicated occurrences of “show-bys” (a display of weapons) and 38% had from one to 25 occurrences of “drive-by” shootings. Arrests of youth ranged from zero to 350 in 2006 to one-900 in 2007 in all reporting communities and 35% of all these arrests were gang- or pseudo-gang-related. (Tracy, 2011, p. 3)

The author concluded that there is some level of gang activity in the rural areas of Georgia and that highly organized gangs were more prevalent in the suburban and small cities rather than in the rural areas of Georgia (Tracy, 2011, p. 5).

Next, this research will look at different types of gangs and how they are defined by most gang researchers. According to the author of an article titled "The Basic Definition of a Gang or Graffiti Crew":

In addition to the basic terms of a youth gang and street gang, gang researchers will utilize other common terms such as a super gang, gang nation, locality-based group, hybrid group or modern gangs. In brief, super gangs maintain larger membership, along with subset structures; their criminal and social activities will encumber regional or national territories (Spergel, 1993). Gang nations only
describe group alliances, not actually the gang itself. The most common gang nations are called People Nation and Folk Nation; two separate alliances that originated in Chicago, IL (STIU, 2004). Locality-based groups will maintain smaller membership; their group’s name is generally acquired from their claimed turf (Miller, 2001). Hybrid groups, or modern gangs, describe those groups with integrated race, ethnicity or gender. In addition to these characteristics, they generally function with unclear roles, and disregard traditional roles or codes of conduct. (Starbuck, Howell, & Lindquist, 2001, as cited in Davis, 2008, p. 5).

For the purpose of this study, the author will focus on street gangs, hybrid gangs, and super gangs. These groups may have members across the nation and even in other countries and may engage in protecting their “turf” and criminal activity. Also, these types of gangs identify themselves with certain colors, logos, gang signs, etc. Some basic characteristics of these types of gangs are as follows. “Members are initiated into the gang through a ritual called beating, in which prospective members are beaten by current members for at least thirteen seconds. Often times they are beaten by three older members” (Carranza 2004, p. 1). Sexual rituals are used for females, such as having sex with gang members. However, females may also have the option to be beaten instead. New gang members undergo an initiation process in which prospective members participate in gang activities and hang out with current members. Recruits come from middle and high school as well as juvenile detention centers (National Geographic, 2006). “The goal is to get the youngest members possible so that as they get older, their commitment to the gang is cemented for their whole lives” (Carranza, 2004, p. 1).
According to the *Journal of Gang Research*, there are several definitions of what a street, super, or hybrid “gang” is, and how it is defined depends on what agency, entity, or person is creating the definition. One gang specialist defined a gang as an organized group with a recognized leader and lieutenants with less power below. The group remains together during peaceful conflicts and shows unity in obvious ways, such as wearing the same colors or speaking a special language. “Finally its activities are either criminal or somehow threatening to the larger, dominant part of society” (Haskins, 1974).

Another definition also given by a gang researcher, and the definition that will be used for the purposes of this study, is the following: “A gang is a group of recurrently associating individuals with identifiable leadership and internal organization, identifying with or claiming control over territory in the community, and engaging either individually or collectively in violent or other forms of illegal behavior” (Lafontaine, Acoose, & Schissel, 2009, p. 30).

Although the definition of what a gang is, used for this study, was created by a gang researcher, the author also believes that “research rightfully needs to orient itself to how gangs function from an internal, community-context, member-base perspective to avoid the politics of definition” (Lafontaine et al., 2009, p. 30). Therefore, the author thought it would be helpful to find sources of information on how to define the term *gang* from a community and/or member-base perspective. The following was taken from an article in the *Journal of Research* called "Understanding the Gang Phenomenon Through the Voices of Youth: The Gang Defined":

Of the thirty children and youth, interviewed for this study, each individual had a basic understanding of the term “gang” and most often these understandings were derived from direct experience with gangs or individual gang members. The respondents provided the following surprisingly consistent definitions of gangs: “...people wanting to belong to a family, and feel safe with these people and protect me stuff like that, that’s what I think it is” (Participant 6, age 18) “People that get beat up and everything” (Participant 12, age 12). “A group of people wanting to be more active and more involved with people and more loved by someone” (Participant 18, age 14). “I would say a gang is a group of people that doesn’t have any structure, they don’t, their moms and dads are there but they’re not, they are drinking or drugs and they don’t care and they don’t give enough attention. I think it is attention a lot of that has to do with attention” (Participant 32, age 19). “I think they are just people trying to cry out for help I think” (Participant 24, age 18). “It’s just like doing something for somebody else that doesn’t give you anything back” (Participant 32, age 19). “A group of people I would call family” (Participant 34, age 18, former gang member). “Lots of kids, I believe, are joining gangs because they are looking for that family atmosphere” (Participant 30, age 20). “Lack of attention as a child, they just want attention, that’s how they do it, when a kid goes through a surviving stage” (Participant 26, age 19). “They just go to the gang because they want much love that was not at home” (Participant 18, age 14). (Lafontaine et al., 2009, p. 37)
Based on the above comments, it appears that these youth believe people join gangs not because they are forced to, but for some other reason altogether. According to the author of the above mentioned study, “One of the basic goals of conventional gang research is to identify the risk factors associated with the decision to join a gang” (Davis, 2009, p. 38). It is very clear that the respondents agree that the decision to join a gang is not based on individual risk or delinquency, but on very real and rational decisions about power, protection, belonging, and access to resources (Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations, 2003).

It appears that “the words of these youth echo strong messages of pain, helplessness, and the struggle to belong as key features. These youth define a gang through strong often emotionally painful descriptors of human suffering and struggles to belong” (Lafontaine et al., 2009, p. 38). This suggests that child maltreatment in the form of emotional neglect may be a risk factor for joining a gang. Before we examine previous research on the correlation between child maltreatment and gang affiliation, let us first define and explain child maltreatment.

Child Maltreatment: Definitions and Prevalence

Child maltreatment is one of many severe issues that exist throughout the United States. However, the definitions of what constitutes child maltreatment differ from state to state and, in some cases, from county to county. The U. S. Department of Health and Human Services is a federal agency that is the governing body over Child Protective Services (CPS), and this organization is tasked with setting definitions, standards, policies, and laws from which each state and local CPS agency is to adapt its own policy.
and procedures. According to the federal government, the basic definition of child maltreatment, at minimum, is “Any recent act or failure to act on the part of a parent or caretaker which results in death, serious physical or emotional harm, sexual abuse or exploitation; or an act or failure to act which presents an imminent risk of serious harm” (Gateway, 2008). The act in this definition is considered child maltreatment if committed on a child who is 18 years or younger. Under the category of child maltreatment are types which include abuse, neglect, abandonment, and exploitation. Under the abuse and neglect types are subtypes, which are physical, emotional, sexual, medical, and educational.

In the abuse category there are three subtypes—physical abuse, which is non-accidental physical injury to a child and which includes minor or major bruising, burns, fractures, or death (Gateway, 2008); emotional abuse, which is impairment of a child’s emotional development and self-worth by threats, criticism, rejection, and/or withholding love, support, and guidance (Gateway, 2008); and sexual abuse, which is “fondling a child’s genitals, penetration, incest, rape, sodomy, and indecent exposure” (Gateway, 2008).

There are four subtypes under the neglect category, which are physical neglect—not providing for a child’s basic needs including food, shelter, and/or appropriate supervision; medical neglect, which is withholding necessary medical, dental, or mental health treatment; emotional neglect, which is similar to emotional abuse except that neglect of a child’s emotional health involves failure to prevent the child from engaging in risky behavior. (e.g., using drugs, promiscuity, etc.); and educational neglect, which is
defined as “failure to educate a child or attend to special education needs” (Gateway, 2008). The last two remaining types of child maltreatment do not have any subtypes and are as follows: abandonment occurs when the whereabouts or identity of the primary caretaker is unknown. Exploitation is defined as prostitution or the production of pornographic materials of children (Gateway, 2008). It is important to remember that these various definitions and situations are not always considered abuse/neglect, due to cultural values, community standards, religion, and the prevalence of poverty. In some cases, there is no presence of neglect but a lack of information and resources. Although poverty alone is not a direct indication that a child is at a higher risk of being maltreated, it is definitely a contributing factor when combined with other causes of child maltreatment.

Risk factors or causes that contribute to child maltreatment can be categorized into four groups, which are parent or caregiver factors, child factors, environmental factors, and family factors (Office on Child Abuse and Neglect (HHS), 2003). Caregiver factors are broken down into five groups: (1) Personality characteristics and psychological wellbeing, including low self-esteem, poor self control, depression, anxiety, and other mental health and personality disorders; (2) History of abuse, which is explained as follows: “Individuals with poor parental role models or those who did not have their own needs met may find it very difficult to meet the needs of their children” (Office on Child Abuse and Neglect (HHS), 2003); (3) Substance abuse, which can interfere with the caretaker’s mental functioning, judgment, inhibitions, and protective capacity (Office on Child Abuse and Neglect (HHS), 2003); (4) Negative attitudes and
inaccurate knowledge about child behavior, which can also lead to child maltreatment;

(5) Age, which is not a direct factor but in some cases “mothers who were younger at the
birth of their child exhibited higher rates of child abuse than did older mothers” (Office
on Child Abuse and Neglect (HHS), 2003). Parental factors are the most prevalent in all
contributing factors of child maltreatment; however, the other four factors will be briefly
explored.

Family factors include family structure, stress, martial conflict and domestic
violence, and parent-child interaction. Child factors include age of the child, disabilities,
attention deficits, difficult temperaments, and behavior problems. Environmental factors
include poverty and unemployment, social isolation, lack of social support, and violent
communities (Office on Child Abuse and Neglect (HHS), 2003). As stated earlier, child
maltreatment is a severe social problem in the United States, and due to the recent
economic crisis, many of the above mentioned factors are more widespread than ever
before. Now that families are in crisis more than usual, one would guess that child
maltreatment rates would increase. According to the 2009 Child Maltreatment report,

For FFY 2009, more than 3.6 million (duplicate) children were subjects of
at least one report and received one or more dispositions. One-fifth of
these children were found to be victims with dispositions of substantiated
(19.5%), indicated (1.0%), and alternative response victim (0.5%). The
remaining four-fifths of the children were found to be nonvictims of
maltreatment. The nonvictim dispositions with the three highest
percentages are unsubstantiated (58.8%), no alleged maltreatment (9.3%),
and alternative response nonvictim (8.1%). (Children's Bureau, 2009)

Previous research on gangs and risk factors for gang membership has not included
child maltreatment. The following section will briefly present previous research on the
relationship between child maltreatment and gang affiliation.

Child Maltreatment and Gang Affiliation

In a study titled "Affiliation to Youth Gangs During Adolescence: The Interaction
Between Childhood Psychopathic Tendencies and Neighborhood Disadvantage," the
author found that "adolescents with preexisting psychopathic tendencies appeared
especially vulnerable mainly if they were raised in residentially unstable neighborhoods."
In this study, "Psychopathic tendencies (i.e., a combination of high hyperactivity, low
anxiety, and low sociality as compared to national norms) were assessed through parent
reports, while neighborhood characteristics (i.e., concentrated economic disadvantage and
residential instability)" were derived from a subset of 3522 adolescent Canadian youth.
The results revealed that neighborhood residential instability, but not neighborhood
concentrated economic disadvantage, interacted with individual propensity to predict
youth gang membership (Dupere, Lacourse, Willms, Vitaro, & Tremblay, 2007).

In another study titled "Loss Among Former Gang Members: A Risk Factor for
Gang Membership," the author found a direct correlation between gang membership and
loss, which is described in three parts as being parental divorce, abandonment (an
identified type of child maltreatment) parental incarceration, and/or parental death.
Interviews were conducted with 18 former gang members who were predominately Hispanic and ranged in age from 18 to 37 years. The majority of respondents experienced several significant events that involved loss during their childhood prior to having joined a gang. When including respondents experiencing the death of their father during childhood with abandonment by father, the majority (77.8%) of respondents grew up without a father. Other events included being homeless (55.6%), being in placement (44.4%), and being in juvenile hall (88.9%). In this study, the majority of respondents had experienced the death of a family member during their childhood. Many of these deaths occurred prior to the respondents having joined a gang. In regard to the loss of friends, two thirds (66.7%) of respondents had experienced the death of a friend; the majority of these deaths occurred after respondents had joined a gang. In conclusion, this study showed the gang members had experienced a variety of significant losses prior to joining a gang and then experienced further significant losses after joining a gang. (Placencio, 2010, p. 71)

Similarly, in another study it was found that childhood physical and sexual abuse were predictors of gang involvement. The author of the study titled "Youth Maltreatment and Gang Involvement" concluded that “being maltreated is a much more robust correlate of gang involvement than the level of support; communication, educational interest, and supervision youth receive from their parents” (Thompson, 1998).

"The Effects of Maltreatment and Family Structure on Minor and Serious Delinquency" is a study that examined the “influence of maltreatment on serious violent
and property delinquency as well as on minor misbehavior offenses among a sample of White male delinquents" (Heck & Walsh, 2000). The researcher found that in every case, "maltreatment was found to account for significant independent variance. It was also found that delinquents from homes broken by desertion were the most maltreated and the most delinquent" (Heck & Walsh, 2000).

"The Effects of Child Maltreatment on Violent Offending Among Institutionalized Youth" explored "whether the effects of child maltreatment on the frequency of violent offending are mediated by other social processes, as developmental models of aggression and violence would suggest" (Grover, 2002, p. 665). The findings of self-reported data collected from 3,694 juveniles confined in 48 correctional facilities revealed that "the relationship between child maltreatment and the frequency of violent offending was mediated by social risk factors" (Grover, 2002).

Finally, a study titled "Juvenile Delinquency and Family Structure" examined the effects of family structure on juvenile delinquency and found the following:

[T]he least amount of structure the family provides the more likely the child will be driven to committing delinquent activities. Children, regardless of whether they are a product of a single parent or dual parent household, are more likely to become juvenile delinquents if there is a minimum amount of quality time spent with the guardians. (Doggett, n.d)

Afro-centric Perspective
Clark Atlanta University’s Whitney M. Young, Jr., School of Social Work created the Afro-centric Perspective, which focuses on the plight of oppressed groups of people. Initially, the focus was on the struggles of African-Americans; however, scholars soon realized that the principles of this particular perspective can be applied to all oppressed or “out” groups. This perspective acknowledges that “all human beings have both a universal experience as well as a unique ethnic and cultural experience, and to recognize one’s own individual experience enables one to recognize and value persons from other various backgrounds” (Hill, 1970). The basic values that make up Afro-centric Perspective are

(1) Autonomous Practice where there is a complete freedom of self and action to undermine racial oppression and eliminate human oppression, (2) humanistic values where the emphasis is placed on eliminating human oppression and enhancing human potential, and (3) the strengths perspective where we identify group characteristics that can be conceived favorably and as a source of resiliency and human advancement. (Whitney M. Young Jr., School of Social Work, n.d., as cited in Graves, 2010, p. 21)

The majority of those who join gangs in the U.S come from minority groups (African-American and Latinos). Oppressed people in the context of the Afro-centric Perspective use “a mechanism to battle racism and oppressive environments by taking care of each other and sharing the trauma of painful experiences” (Graves, 2010, p. 21). A gang, for many of its members, is a new family and a group with which one can feel safe, secure, and loved. Gang members look out for one another and exhibit a great deal
of loyalty as well as the idea that there is strength in numbers. These mechanisms are in line with the above mentioned principles of the Afro-centric Perspective in that gangs are comprised of oppressed people who form a bond and engage in what they believe will advance their lives monetarily as well as socially and emotionally by having a second family of people who support them and care for them.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework provides a lens through which to conceptualize the problem or issues being presented and studied. In this case, social systems theory and the ecological perspective are appropriate. “Both social systems and ecological perspectives recognize that adaptation sometimes involves altering the environment. Living organisms adapt by actively changing their environment so that it meets their needs” (Schriver, 2011, p. 114).

The theory is important because it identifies patterns and causal relationships among beliefs, attitudes, and actions. An established framework is necessary to develop and implement interventions that can facilitate positive behavior change. Theories also help explain actions and behavior changes at the individual, group, community, and systemic levels. In systems theory a person's behavior happens within, is influenced by, and influences the environmental context of the person's family. (Why Theory Matters, n.d., as cited in Graves, p. 24)

As noted earlier by the responses of youth to gangs, in some instances people who join gangs are unhappy with their lives, either socially or emotionally, or the physical environment and they choose to join a gang to make a change in their lives. These people
either wanted some attention that they were not receiving at home or they wanted to have a sense of belonging or protection. In each situation, the person’s environment was missing something, which caused the person to make changes to re-adapt or create a new habitat.

Two concepts of ecological theory that are especially relevant to social workers are habitat and niche. Habitat refers to the places where organisms live and, in the case of humans, consists of the physical and social settings within particular cultural contexts. When habitats are rich in the resources required for growth and development, people tend to thrive. When habitats are deficient in vital resources, physical, social, and emotional development and ongoing functioning may be adversely affected. For example, a substantial body of research indicates that supportive social networks of friends, relatives, neighbors, work and church associates, and pets mitigate the damaging effects of painful life stresses. By contrast, people with deficient social networks may respond to life stresses by becoming severely depressed, resorting to abuse of drugs or alcohol, engaging in violent behavior, or coping in other dysfunctional ways. (Hepworth, Rooney, Rooney, Strom-Gottfried, & Larsen, 2010, p. 15)

Within this framework, it is hoped that the results of the study could be used to specifically (1) identify if there is a causal relationship between child maltreatment and gang affiliation and (2) identify effective ways to prevent severe child maltreatment, and/or lower the number of children who join and participate in gang-related activity. Last, the goal is to identify child maltreatment as a risk factor for joining a gang and to
begin discussing preventative services and techniques that will systematically slow, reduce, and address the rate and spread of gang activity.
Chapter III includes a discussion of the methodological procedures used in producing the finalized statistical data used to analyze the data in this study. Also within this chapter are discussions on the research design; a description of the study site, research samples, and population, as well as the treatment of the date; and the limitations of the study.

Research Design

The descriptive design was used in this study. The researcher chose this design because it describes the relationship between child maltreatment and gang affiliation, explains how child maltreatment is a risk factor for gang affiliation, and identifies which type of maltreatment is most likely to lead to gang affiliation. In order to accurately assess the relationship among these variables, the researcher collected information regarding exposure to childhood maltreatment of persons who identify themselves as being members or affiliates of a gang.

Description of the Site

The sites used for this study were two local county jails, Fulton County Jail and DeKalb County Jail, as well as Hope House, a transitional housing facility for men in recovery. Fulton County Jail is comprised of two towers with a maximum capacity of
2400 inmates. The facility houses male and female prisoners, of which 204 are female. There are also two distinct populations, which are maximum security and general population. The questionnaires were disseminated to 60 inmates that were classified as being gang members; 29 completed questionnaires were returned, on which only 12 inmates answered yes to being a member or ex-member of a gang. DeKalb County Jail consists of four towers that accommodate over 2400 inmates of both sexes. The researcher was only able to obtain 9 completed questionnaires from DeKalb County Jail none of which identified themselves as gang members. Hope House is a two-story building that accommodates 70 men. The researcher obtained 20 completed surveys from Hope House and only 2 people identified themselves as gang members.

Sample and Population

The type of sampling used for this study was convenience sampling. The sample used in this research was gathered from a specific population of male inmates at Fulton County Jail identified as current or former gang members as well as inmates at DeKalb County jail who are receiving substance abuse treatment and lastly from homeless persons suffering from substances abuse. The sample included data from all racial groups. The data was gathered in house at Fulton County Jail from inmates in both maximum security and general populations; however, no female inmates from this facility participated. The data gathered from DeKalb County jail was from male and female inmates from all racial groups. Finally, the data gathered from Hope House was from males only from all racial groups.
Instrumentation

A survey questionnaire was used as a method of capturing data. The survey form was titled, "Child Maltreatment and Gang Affiliation Questionnaire." The survey was comprised of 22 questions. The researcher developed the survey using definitions of child maltreatment obtained from The Department of Health and Human Services. The survey proved to be valid as it successfully measured the participant's exposure to childhood maltreatment. To ensure the reliability of the survey, the researcher gathered information at different times to make certain of its consistency and quality. The first section of the survey assessed demographic information in the following areas: gang affiliation, relative gang affiliation, gender, race, age, parent household composition, parent education level, participant education level, and household income during childhood. The second section assessed participants' exposure to child maltreatment. The questions were as follows:

1. Were you physically abused under the age of 18?
2. Were you sexually abused under the age of 18?
3. Were you emotionally abused under the age of 18?
4. Were you neglected by your Parent/Guardian(s) under the age of 18? If yes, in what ways? Please check all that apply.
5. Did your mother drink alcohol or use drugs while pregnant with you?
6. Did your Parent/Guardian(s) make or sell drugs in front of you?
7. Did your Parent/Guardian(s) use drugs or alcohol that impaired their ability to adequately care for you when you were under the age of 18?

8. Were you ever locked away or isolated in a room, cage, or confined area under the age of 18?

9. Do you feel that you were abandoned before age 18? Abandonment is when you do not know where your Parent/Guardian(s) is, or you have been left alone with no contact or support from your Parent/Guardian(s).

All of this information was used in measuring the relationships regarding the research questions and the hypotheses.

Treatment of the Data

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data gathered for this study. The analysis used descriptive statistics, which included frequency distributions, cross tabulations, and measures of association. The test statistics used for this study were the Chi-square and Phi (Φ). Frequency distribution was used to analyze each of the variables of the study in order to summarize the basic measurements. A frequency distribution of independent variables was used to develop a demographic profile and to gain insight about the respondents of the study.

Cross-tabulations were used to explore and to demonstrate any statistical relationships between the independent variables and dependent variables of the study. Cross-tabulations were computed among the following variables: respondent’s gang affiliation neglect, emotional neglect, caregiver’s who used drugs/alcohol that seriously impaired their ability to provide appropriate supervision, and respondent’s feelings of
abandonment by the caregiver under age 18. Two test statistics were used. The first test was Phi (\( \Phi \)), which is a symmetric measure of association that is used to demonstrate the strength of relationship between two or more variables (Knoke & Bohrnstedt, 1995). The following are the values associated with phi (\( \Phi \)):

- .00 to .24: “no relationship”
- .25 to .49: “weak relationship”
- .50 to .74: “moderate relationship”
- .75 to 1.00: “strong relationship”

The second test statistic used in this study was chi square. Chi-Square was used to test whether there was a statistical significance at the .05 level of probability among the variables in the study.

Limitations of the Study

There are several limitations to this study. The first limitation is the dearth of previous research on the relationship between the two variables being studied, as well as previous research identifying child maltreatment as a major risk factor for gang membership. The second limitation was the difficulty in gaining access to current and former gang members willing to participate in the study. In the state of Georgia under the Street Gang Terrorism and Prevention Act, persons who are identified as members of street gangs or engaged in criminal gang activity will be charged with violation of the Georgia Criminal Street Gang Terrorism and Prevention Act and may be sentenced to probation and, for those already incarcerated, an extra charge may be added to their criminal charges. The third limitation was that all persons who were surveyed were males.
who are currently incarcerated at Fulton County Jail. The researcher was unable to gain access to females as well as those who are gang members that are not involved in or had previously been involved in criminal activity. Last, the researcher was unable to acquire an ample sample population size. The researcher tried to gain access to gang members from three county police stations, two local jails, and the FBI. Out of these, only two agencies agreed to allow this researcher to survey inmates. Additionally, the researcher obtained willing participants at Hope House, which is a transitional living facility for men in recovery. The clients in this program are referred through many different sources, including those who have recently been released from jail. The researcher surveyed this population in hopes of obtaining completed surveys from persons who were current or former gang members. However, of this population, only two persons identified themselves as a current or ex-member of a gang.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The purpose of this chapter is to present the findings and the outcome of the data analysis and to describe and explain the relationship between child maltreatment and gang affiliation. The researcher has analyzed the results of the Child Maltreatment and Gang Affiliation questionnaire. The findings of the study are presented in two sections: demographic data and research questions and hypotheses.

Demographic Data

The demographic section provides a profile of the study respondents. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the client’s gang affiliation, gender, age group, race, education level, household composition during childhood, parental figure’s education level, and household income during childhood.

The analyzed population for the research was comprised of 58 persons including inmates from two county jails in metro Atlanta and residents at a transitional housing facility for men in recovery. There were 29 respondents from Fulton County Jail, 9 respondents from DeKalb County Jail, and 20 respondents from Hope House.

Table 1 is a profile of the typical respondent in this study. The table portrays the frequency distribution of the analyzed demographic variables used in the study.
Table 1

_Demographic Profile of Child Maltreatment and Gang Affiliation Questionnaire (N=58)_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gang member</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relative who is gang member</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Relative</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to determine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 &amp; over</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Childhood household composition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-parent</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent-mother</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent-father</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandparent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foster care-adoption</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s education level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED-Diploma</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA-BS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA-MS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to determine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant’s education level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED-Diploma</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA-BS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA-MS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to determine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood household income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0-$15,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$16,000-$20,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000-$35,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000-$50,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$75,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 &amp; above</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to determine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total
As illustrated in Table 1, the typical respondent (TR) is a non-gang member who also does not have a relative that is a gang member. The TR is an African-American male between the ages of 35-45 who is a high school dropout. The typical respondent was raised by a single mother who completed some high school and whose income was between $0-$15,000/yr.

Table 2 is a frequency distribution of respondents indicating their exposure to emotion abuse during childhood.

Table 2

Q12: Were You Emotionally Abused Under the Age of 18? (N=58)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being “put down” by caregiver</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats by caregiver</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection by caregiver</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver withheld love</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of guidance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 2, 46.6%, or 27 of those surveyed, reported experiencing some form of emotional abuse during childhood. About 22.4%, or 13 respondents, reported being “put down” by a caregiver during childhood; 6.9%, or 4 respondents, received threats by a caregiver; 3.4%, or 2 respondents, stated that they felt rejection from their caregiver; 3.4%, or 2 respondents, stated that their caregiver withheld love; and 10.4%, or 6 respondents, reported lack of support or guidance from their caregiver.
Table 3 is a frequency distribution of respondents indicating their exposure to neglect by their caregiver during childhood.

Table 3

**Q13: Were You Neglected by Your Parent-guardian Under the Age of 18? (N=58)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 3, 53.4%, or 31 respondents, reported experiencing some form of neglect during childhood, and 46.6%, or 27, reported that they were not neglected during childhood.

Table 4 is a frequency distribution of respondents indicating their exposure to physical neglect during childhood.

Table 4

**Q14: Physically Neglected (N=23)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failure to provide necessary food</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to proved shelter</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left alone at a young age</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cared for by someone unfit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 4, 23 respondents reported experiencing some form of physical neglect during childhood. Of those, 57.1% reported being left alone at a young age to care for them.

Table 5 is a frequency distribution of respondents indicating their exposure to medical neglect during childhood.

Table 5

Q15: Medically Neglected (N=14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver did not take you to doctor/dentist regularly or once a year</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 5, 14 respondents reported experiencing medical neglect, which entails inconsistent or missed regularly scheduled visits to the dentist and/or doctor during childhood.

Table 6 is a frequency distribution of respondents indicating their exposure to educational neglect during childhood.

Table 6

Q16: Educationally neglected (N=21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver failed to educate you</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not required to attend school regularly</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver did not assist with homework</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 6, 21 respondents reported experiencing some form of educational neglect. Out of these 21, 43.5% reported not being required to attend school regularly, which would account for the high number of high school dropouts among all respondents.

Table 7 is a frequency distribution of respondents indicating their exposure to emotion neglect during childhood.

Table 7

Q17: Emotionally Neglected (N=27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver ignored or paid little attention to your emotional needs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You were unable to go to caregiver w/problems</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver failed to proved psychological care</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver showed lack of concern</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 7, 27 respondents (which were almost half of the total number of respondents) reported experiencing some form of emotional neglect; 44.4% reported that their caregiver ignored or paid little attention to their emotional needs.

Table 8 is a frequency distribution of respondents indicating their exposure if their caregiver made or sold drugs in front of them during childhood.

Table 8

Q19: Did Your Parent-guardians Make or Sell Drugs in Front of You? (N=57)
Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 8, 24.6%, or 14 respondents, reported that their caregiver made or sold drugs in front of them.

Table 9 is a frequency distribution of respondents indicating if their caregiver(s) used drugs or alcohol that impaired the caregiver's ability to adequately provide supervision to children during the respondent's childhood.

Table 9

Q20: Did Your Parent-guardians Use Drugs or Alcohol That Impaired Their Ability to Adequately Care for You When You Were Under the Age of 18? (N=55)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 9, 27.3% or 15 respondents reported that their caregivers used drugs or alcohol that impaired their ability to adequately care for them during childhood.

Table 10 is a frequency distribution of respondents indicating if they were ever locked away or isolated in a room, cage, or confined are during childhood.
Table 10

Q21: Were You Ever Locked Away or Isolated in a Room, Cage, or Confined Area Under the Age of 18? (N=51)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 10, 31.4% or 16 respondents reported being locked away or isolated in a room, cage, or confined area during childhood.

Table 11 is a frequency distribution of respondents indicating if they felt that they were abandoned by their caregiver during childhood.

Table 11

Q22: Do You Feel That You Were Abandoned Before the Age of 18? (N=56)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 11, 27.6%, or 16 respondents, reported feelings of abandonment by their caregiver(s) under the age of 18.

Research Questions and Hypothesis

RQ1. Is there a statistically significant relationship between child maltreatment and gang affiliation?
HO1. There is no statistically significant relationship between child maltreatment and gang affiliation.

Table 12 is a cross-tabulation of respondents' gang affiliation by whether or not they were neglected by their caregiver during childhood.

Table 12

Cross-Tabulation of the Computed Variable GANGMEM by Computed Variable NEGLECT (N= 58)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you a member or ex-member or a gang?</th>
<th>Were you neglected by your caregiver under the age of 18?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \Phi = .419 \quad \text{df} = 1 \quad \rho = .001 \]

As shown in Table 12, of the 58 respondents, 53.4% reported that they experienced some form of neglect during childhood. Please note that 29 of the total respondents were classified by the correctional facility as being gang members. Of the 13 respondents who reported that they were members of a gang, 12 reported that they experienced neglectful treatment from their caregiver during childhood. The statistical
measurement phi (Φ) was used to test for the strength of association between the respondents’ gang affiliation and childhood neglect. As indicated, there was a weak relationship (Φ = .419) between the variables; however, the data shows that the two variables are correlated. When the chi-square statistical test for significance was applied, the null hypothesis was not rejected (ρ = .001), indicating that there is a statistically significant relationship between the two variables at the .05 level of probability.

RQ2. Is child maltreatment a statistically significant risk factor for gang affiliation?
HO2. Child maltreatment is not a statistically significant risk factor for gang affiliation.

Table 13 is a cross-tabulation of respondent’s gang affiliation by whether or not their caregiver used drugs or alcohol, which impaired the caregiver’s ability to adequately provide appropriate care to the respondent during childhood. More than half of the respondents (8) who identified as members of a gang reported that their caregiver used drugs and/or alcohol, which impaired the caregiver’s ability to properly care for the respondents during childhood. This finding may also suggest that some of the respondents were exposed to and perhaps allowed to use drugs and/or alcohol before turning 18.
Table 13
Cross-tabulation of Computed Variable GANGMEM by Computed Variable PARINTOX (N=55)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you a member or ex-member or a gang?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Φ = .428 df – 1 ρ = .002

As shown in table 13, there was a weak relationship (Φ = .428) between the variables. When the chi-square statistical test for significance was applied, the null hypothesis was not rejected (ρ = .002), indicating that there is a statistically significant relationship between the two variables at the .05 level of probability.

Table 14 is a cross-tabulation of respondents' gang affiliation by their feelings of abandonment during childhood. Table 14 displays 9 of 13 self-identified gang members reporting that they experienced feelings of abandonment by their caregiver during childhood.
Table 14

*Cross-tabulation of Computed Variable GANGMEM by Computed Variable ABANDON (N=56)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you a member or ex-member or a gang?</th>
<th>Do you feel that you were abandoned before age 18?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \Phi = .495 \quad df = 1 \quad \rho = .000 \]

As shown in Table 14, there was a weak relationship (\( \Phi = .495 \)) between the variables. When the chi-square statistical test for significance was applied, the null hypothesis was not rejected (\( \rho = .000 \)), indicating that there is a statistically significant relationship between the two variables at the .05 level of probability.

RQ3. Which type of child maltreatment is most likely to lead to gang affiliation?

HO3. There is no type of child maltreatment that is more likely to lead to gang affiliation.

Table 15 is a cross-tabulation of respondents' gang affiliation by whether or not they were emotionally neglected during childhood.
Table 15

Cross-tabulation of the Computed Variable GANGMEM by Computed Variable EMONEG (N=27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you a member or ex-member of a gang?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your caregiver ignored or paid little attention to your emotional needs</td>
<td>Count 6</td>
<td>Count 6</td>
<td>Count 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You were unable to go to your caregiver with problems</td>
<td>Count 2</td>
<td>Count 2</td>
<td>Count 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your caregiver showed a lack of concern regarding your failures</td>
<td>Count 1</td>
<td>Count 6</td>
<td>Count 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your caregiver failed to provide psychological care</td>
<td>Count 3</td>
<td>Count 1</td>
<td>Count 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count 12</td>
<td>Count 15</td>
<td>Count 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Φ = .399  df = 3  p = .232

As shown in Table 15, there was a weak relationship (Φ = .399) between the variables. When the chi-square statistical test for significance was applied, the null
hypothesis was rejected ($\rho = .232$), indicating that there is no statistically significant relationship between the two variables at the .05 level of probability.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

This study was designed to describe the relationship between child maltreatment and gang affiliation. The intent of this research was to assess the respondent population’s experience with child maltreatment and how those experiences impact one’s decision to join a gang. Additionally, this research was designed to identify child maltreatment as a risk factor for gang membership, in order to help law enforcement, social workers, and other professionals who work in gang prevention and intervention. By identifying a relationship between the two variables, preventative measures can be taken for early adolescents and with families to prevent the spread of the major types of child maltreatment that lead to gang involvement.

Summary of the Study

This chapter includes conclusions of this research study, a summarization of each research question, and the implications for social work.

RQ1: Is there a statistically significant relationship between child maltreatment and gang affiliation?

RQ2: Is child maltreatment a statistically significant risk factor for gang affiliation?

RQ3: Which type of child maltreatment is most likely to lead to gang affiliation?
In order to determine if a statistical relationship exists between the two variables, to determine if child maltreatment is a risk factor for gang membership, and to identify which type of child maltreatment is most likely to lead to gang membership, several cross-tabulations were conducted. The analysis indicated that out of 13 self-identified gang members, 12 reported experiencing some form of neglect during childhood. The major types of neglect that were identified were abandonment and lack of supervision by the caregiver due to drug or alcohol use. These findings coincide with those of other researchers, who found that a large percentage of adolescents join gangs to obtain a sense of belonging or to be a part of a family. Persons who have experienced some form of loss (e.g., parental divorce, abandonment, parental incarceration, etc.) are at a higher risk of joining a gang to replace the loss, according to prior research.

Recommendations

As a result of the findings of this study, the researcher recommends the following:

1. Additional social work research should be done to further review the population of this study with regard to how child maltreatment impacts the decision to join a gang. This will enhance social workers’ ability to more appropriately target and provide preventative services to this population.

2. Early adolescent after-school programs should be mandatory and include access to a mentor. This will provide those children suffering from loss and abandonment with the emotional support needed to avoid engaging in gang-related activity.
3. The Department of Family and Children Services should collaborate with law enforcement officials to provide assistance, education, and support in prevention and intervention efforts for adolescents experiencing neglect or abandonment and those involved in gang-related activity.

Implications for Social Work Practice

Previous research indicates that there is a relationship between child maltreatment and gang affiliation, and the results of this study affirm past research. Given that all three research hypotheses have been supported, social work organizations such as the National Association of Social Workers, as well as law enforcement agencies such as Fulton County and DeKalb County police, should take a political stand to support legislation that provides programs aimed at preventing child maltreatment and gang affiliation. In the past, social workers have advocated for programs that exhibit the ability to be effective in addressing the needs of the under-served; this specific issue is no different.
APPENDIX A

Child Maltreatment and Gang Affiliation Questionnaire

Section I: Background

Instructions: Place a mark (X) next to the appropriate answer. Please choose only one answer for questions 1-9.

1. Are you a member or ex-member of a gang? □ Yes □ No

2. Do you have relatives who are members or ex-members of a gang? □ Yes □ No
   If yes, please specify.
   □ Caregiver
   □ Sibling
   □ Other Relative

3. Gender: □ Male □ Female

4. Race/ethnicity:
   □ African American/Black
   □ White
   □ Hispanic
   □ Other

5. Age group:
   □ 18-25
   □ 26-35
   □ 36-55
   □ 55 over

6. Who cared for you as a child?
   □ Two-parent (mother & father)
   □ Single parent-mother
   □ Single parent-Father
   □ Grandparent(s)

7. Parent/Guardian(s) education level:
   (Check one for each caregiver)
   □ Some high school
   □ GED/Diploma
   □ Some college
   □ AA
8. My highest education level:
- [ ] Some high school
- [ ] GED/Diploma
- [ ] Some college
- [ ] AA
- [ ] BA/BS
- [ ] MA/MS
- [ ] Other

9. Yearly household income during childhood:
- [ ] $0-$15,000
- [ ] $16,000-$20,000
- [ ] $20,000-$35,000
- [ ] $35,000-$50,000
- [ ] $50,000-$75,000
- [ ] $75,000 & above
- [ ] Other relative
- [ ] Foster care/adoption
- [ ] Other

**Section II: Instrument** - The following questions are designed to evaluate your exposure with child maltreatment in relation to gang affiliation.

**Abuse:** Physical abuse is non-accidental physical injury (ranging from minor bruises to severe fractures) that is inflicted by a parent, caregiver, or other person who has responsibility for the child.

10. Were you *physically abused* under the age of 18? [ ] Yes [ ] No
   If yes, please check all that apply.
   - [ ] Punching
   - [ ] Beating
   - [ ] Kicking
   - [ ] Biting
   - [ ] Shaking
   - [ ] Throwing
   - [ ] Stabbing
   - [ ] Choking
   - [ ] Hitting (with a hand, stick, strap, or other object)
11. Were you *sexually abused* under the age of 18? □ Yes □ No
   If yes, please check all that apply.
   □ Fondling your genitals or private parts
   □ Penetration
   □ Incest
   □ Rape
   □ Sodomy (anal, oral, fingering)
   □ Indecent exposure
   □ Exploitation through prostitution
   □ Production of pornographic materials (child porn)

*Emotional abuse* (or psychological abuse) is a pattern of behavior that impairs a child's emotional development or sense of self-worth.

12. Were you *emotionally abused* under the age of 18? □ Yes □ No
   If yes, please check all that apply.
   □ Being “put down” by your Parent/Guardian(s)
   □ Threats by your Parent/Guardian(s)
   □ Rejection by your Parent/Guardian(s)
   □ Your Parent/Guardian(s) withheld love
   □ Lack of support
   □ Lack of guidance

*Neglect* is when a parent, guardian, or other caregiver does not provide for your basic needs.

13. Were you *neglected* by your Parent/Guardian(s) under the age of 18?
   □ Yes □ No
   If yes, in what ways? Please check all that apply.
14. Physically
   □ Failure to provide necessary food by your Parent/Guardian(s)
   □ Failure to provide necessary shelter by your Parent/Guardian(s)
   □ At a young age you were left alone to care for yourself or your siblings
   □ You were cared for by someone who is considered unfit? (E.g. someone who is intoxicated or too young age 13 & below)
15. Medically
   □ Your Parent/Guardian(s) did not take you to the doctor and/or dentist at least once a year.
16. Educationally
Your Parent/Guardian(s) failed to educate you or attend to your special education needs
☐ You were not required to attend school regularly
☐ Your Parent/Guardian(s) did not provide assistance with homework

17. Emotionally
☐ Your Parent/Guardian(s) ignored or paid little attention to your emotional needs
☐ You were unable to go to your Parent/Guardian(s) with problems.
☐ Your Parent/Guardian(s) showed a lack of concern regarding your failures
☐ Your Parent/Guardian(s) failed to provide psychological care, or permitted the use alcohol or other drugs

18. Did your mother drink alcohol or use drugs while pregnant with you? ☐ Yes ☐ No
☐ Unknown

19. Did your Parent/Guardian(s) make or sell drugs in front of you? ☐ Yes ☐ No

20. Did your Parent/Guardian(s) use drugs or alcohol that impaired their ability to adequately care for you when you were under the age of 18? ☐ Yes ☐ No

21. Were you ever locked away or isolated in a room, cage, or confined area under the age of 18? ☐ Yes ☐ No

22. Do you feel that you were abandoned before age 18? Abandonment is when you do not know where your Parent/Guardian(s) is, or you have been left alone with no contact or support from your Parent/Guardian(s) ☐ Yes ☐ No

Disclaimer: This information is being collected for research purposes only. All information collected will be kept confidential. To protect your identity, please DO NOT write your name or any other identifiable information on this form.
APPENDIX B

SPSS Program Analysis

TITLE 'CHILD MALTREATMENT AND GANG AFFILIATION QUESTIONNAIRE'.

DATA LIST FIXED/
ID 1-3
GANGMEM 4
GANGREL 5
GENDER 6
RACE 7
AGEGRP 8
PARENT 9
PAREDU 10
EDUCAT 11
PARINCO 12
PHYABU 13-14
SEXABU 15
EMOABU 16
NEGLECT 17
PHYNeg 18
MEDNEG 19
EDUNEG 20
EMONEG 21
MODRINK 22
SELLDRUG 23
PARINTOX 24
ISOLATE 25
ABANDON 26.

VARIABLE LABELS
ID 'CASE'
GANGMEM 'Q1 Are you member or ex-member of a gang'
GANGREL 'Q2 Do you have relatives who are members of ex-members of a gang'
GENDER 'Q3 My gender'
RACE 'Q4 My race'
AGEGRP 'Q5 My age group'
PARENT 'Q6 Who cared for you as a child'
PAREDU 'Q7 Parent-guardian’s education level'
EDUCAT 'Q8 My highest education level'
PARINCO 'Q9 Yearly household income during childhood'
PHYABU 'Q10 Were you physically abused under the age of 18'
SEXABU 'Q11 Were you sexually abused under the age of 18'
EMOABU 'Q12 Were you emotionally abused under the age of 18'

58
NEGLECT  'Q13 Were you neglected by you parent-guardian under the age of 18'
PHYNEG  'Q14 Physically neglected'
MEDNEG  'Q15 Medically neglected'
EDUNEG  'Q16 Educationally neglected'
EMONEG  'Q17 Emotionally neglected'
MODRINK  'Q18 Did your mother drink alcohol or use drugs while pregnant with you'
SELLDRUG  'Q19 Did your parent-guardians make or sell drugs in front of you'
PARIINTOX  'Q20 Did your parent-guardians use drugs or alcohol that impaired'
ISOLATE  'Q21 Were you ever locked away or isolated in a room'
ABANDON  'Q22 Do you feel that you were abandoned before age 18'.
VALUE LABELS
GANGMEM
1 ‘Yes’
2 ‘No’/
GANGREL
1 ‘No’
2 ‘Caregiver’
3 ‘Sibling’
4 ‘Other relative’/
GENDER
1 ‘Male’
2 ‘Female’/
RACE
1 ‘African American-Black’
2 ‘White’
3 ‘Hispanic’
4 ‘Other’/
AGEGRP
1 ’18 – 25’
2 ’26 – 35’
3 ’35 – 55’
4 ’55 & over’/
PARENT
1 ’Two-parent’
2 ’Single parent-mother’
3 ’Single parent-father’
4 ’Grandparent’
5 ’Other relative’
6 ’Foster care-adoption’
7 ’Other’/
PAREDU
1 ’Some high school’
2 ’GED-Diploma’
3 ’Some college’
EDUCAT
1 'Some high school'
2 'GED-Diploma'
3 'Some college'
4 'AA'
5 'BA-BS'
6 'MA-MS'
7 'Other'

PARINCO
1 '$0-$15,000'
2 '$16,000-$20,000'
3 '$20,000-$35,000'
4 '$35,000-$50,000'
5 '$50,000-$75,000'
6 '$75,000 & above'

PHYABU
01 'No'
02 'Punching'
03 'Beating'
04 'Kicking'
05 'Biting'
06 'Shaking'
07 'Throwing'
08 'Stabbing'
09 'Choking'
10 'Hitting'
11 'Burning'

SEXABU
1 'No'
2 'Fondling your genitals or private parts'
3 'Penetration'
4 'Incest'
5 'Rape'
6 'Sodomy'
7 'Indecent exposure'
8 'Exploitation through prostitution'
9 'Production of pornographic materials'

EMOABU
1 'No'
2 'Being “put down” by your Parent-Guardian'
3 'Threats by your Parent-Guardian'
4 'Rejection by your Parent-Guardian'
5 'Your Parent-Guardian withheld love'
6 'Lack of support'
7 'Lack of guidance'/

NEGLECT
1 'Yes'
2 'No'/

PHYNEG
1 'Failure to provide necessary food by your Parent-Guardian'
2 'Failure to provide necessary shelter by your Parent-Guardian'
3 'At a young age you were left alone to care for yourself or your siblings'
4 'You were cared for by someone who is considered unfit'/

MEDNEG
1 'Your Parent-Guardian did not take you to the doctor'/

EDUNEG
1 'Your Parent-Guardian failed to educate you'
2 'You were not required to attend school regularly'
3 'Your Parent-Guardian did not provide assistance with homework'/

EMONEG
1 'Your Parent-Guardian ignored or paid little attention to your emotional'
2 'You were unable to go to your Parent-Guardian with problems'
3 'Your Parent-Guardian showed a lack of concern regarding your failures'
4 'Your Parent-Guardian failed to provide psychological care, or permitted'/

MODRINK
1 'Yes'
2 'No'
3 'Unknown'/

SELLDRUG
1 'Yes'
2 'No'/

PARINTOX
1 'Yes'
2 'No'/

ISOLATE
1 'Yes'
2 'No'/

ABANDON
1 'Yes'
2 'No'/.

MISSING VALUES
GANGMEM GANGREL GENDER RACE AGE GRP PARENT PAREDU EDUCAT PARINCO PHYABU SEXABU EMABU ABU NEGLECT PHYNEG MEDNEG EDUNEG EMONEG MODRINK SELLDUG
PARINTOX ISOLATE ABANDON (0).
BEGIN DATA
0012111165601111000022222
00223112422401161003411112
00322111670205131302011221
004211112111011112000032222
0052110122221221403321122
0061311161120234121111111
00712131511101671311131101
0082113211402411011112222
0092111227501112000022222
01021113211103121301022211
01113111211120116113311121
0121214666611221412122111
0131311251160352121211111
01414121611301151202431111
0151411237201112000022222
0161311221301111402321222
01724112241110271112211121
0182111431301112000022202
019211221326026310121111
02021122143601112000022202
021112422301111311132222
0222311342220111313322212
0231213221130112120221101
02414112211101111000411122
0252113122201112000022222
02612112777101721302211221
0272311113150213200000000
02821112233501112000022222
0292411312501112000022202
03021223123510522000022222
031211313201212000022222
0322123164601112000022222
0331421453102221303122211
0342411433201012000022222
0352123263401112000022222
0362123155501112000022222
0372121126102223011220111
0382123212101112000022222
039212341101111211322222
040211322301112000022222
0412122432210271002332220
04224114133301112000022222
FREQUENCIES /VARIABLES 
GANGMEM GANGREL GENDER RACE AGEGRP PARENT PAREDU EDUCAT PARINC PHYABU SEXABU EMOABU NEGLECT PHYNEG MEDNEG EDUNEG EMONEG MODRINK SELLDUG PARINTOXT ISOLATE ABANDON /
/STATISTICS = DEFAULT.
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