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The pattern of inmate involvement in violent misconduct is established in the early years of imprisonment, yet few studies have looked at the predictors of violent misconduct during the first months or years of imprisonment, and none have studied the effects of gang affiliation during this time period. This study of 2,158 male inmates who were confined for at least 3 years in a southwestern state prison system finds that gang affiliation has an effect on violent misconduct among inmates beyond the individual risk factors generally attributed to youth and prior criminal history. These findings suggest the need for additional research to clarify the linkage between gang affiliation and inmate violence, with implications for current efforts to supervise gang-affiliated inmates.
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Violent misconduct among prison inmates is of great importance to prison management (Cullen, Latessa, Burton, & Lombardo, 1993). Violent misconduct threatens the safety of both inmates and staff; it affects the housing, work, and program assignments of inmates; and disciplinary responses to violent misconducts are estimated to cost nearly $1,000 per incident (Lovell & Jemelka, 1996). Violent misconduct among prison inmates also is of importance to the ongoing discussion of the effectiveness of formal and informal social controls within prisons and to the differential adjustment to prison by inmates, typically framed in terms of those factors most likely to increase an inmate’s risk-taking behaviors. For these reasons, recent efforts have tried to identify those factors that predict the likelihood that an inmate will engage in violent misconduct.

The earliest research focused on the individual characteristics of inmates, and these studies reported that violent misconduct was more likely among those who were younger, were male, were members of a racial or ethnic minority, had a prior history of incarceration, and had a history of violent behavior (Adams, 1992; Finn, 1995; Flanagan, 1983; Gendreau, Goggin, & Law, 1997; Harer & Langan, 2001; Petersilia & Honig, 1980). More recently, research has begun to examine the emergence and structure of both street gangs and prison gangs and how affiliation with these gangs reduces the influence of formal social controls in the prison (Fleisher & Decker, 2001; Kalnich & Stojkovic, 1985; Ralph, 1997). There is some evidence that gang affiliation is positively associated with violent misconduct (G. M. Camp & Camp, 1985; Gaes, Wallace, Gilman, Klain-Saffran, & Suppa, 2002; Huebner, 2003), but the extant research is limited in its scope and methods.

This study examined the independent and additive effects of gang affiliation on violent misconduct among a sample of male inmates during the first 3 years of incarceration. The major contributions of this study are that (a) it specifically targets the violent misconduct that occurs during the inmates’ early adjustment to prison life, (b) it observes their adjustment for a period of 3 years, and (c) it examines the effects of gang affiliation on each of four specific types of major violent misconduct, as well as on a constructed composite measure of violent misconduct.
INDIVIDUAL RISK FACTORS AND VIOLENT MISCONDUCT

Early studies focused attention on the prisonization and importation models of inmate misconduct. According to the prisonization model of misconduct (Sykes, 1958), rule infractions reflect the inmate's inability to adjust to, or to cope with, the physical and social deprivations of confinement, the rules and procedures of prison authorities, and the stress of living and working with other inmates (see, e.g., Barak-Glantz, 1983; Bottoms, 1999; Gendreau & Keyes, 2001; Kalnich & Stojkovic, 1985). The "pains of imprisonment" are exacerbated or ameliorated by variations in security level, inmate programs, staff-to-inmate ratio, staff training and turnover, overcrowding, prison gangs, and other measures of administrative control and management. In contrast, the importation model (Irwin, 1981; Irwin & Cressey, 1962) asserts that inmate misconduct is explained by the attitudes, values, and prior experiences that each inmate brings into the prison. After some debate (Goodstein & Wright, 1989; Jiang & Fisher-Giorlando, 2002; McCorkle, Miethe, & Drass, 1995; Thomas, 1977), it now appears that elements of both prisonization and importation affect the level of violent misconduct among inmates. Violent misconduct is calculated risk taking; it is a means of self-help, self-defense, or social control by which inmates seek to establish social status, maintain public identities, or gain economic benefits (see, e.g., Adams, 1992; Bottoms, 1999; Ekland-Olson, 1986; Silberman, 1995; Toch & Adams, 1989; Wright, 1991). This calculated risk-taking behavior is most likely among young predatory inmates who take advantage of opportunities to use violence for personal gain or problem solving (Toch, 1977).

Risk taking is related to age (Bonta & Gendreau, 1990; Ellis, 1984), and age is a consistent and strong predictor of violent misconduct. A meta-analysis by Gendreau et al. (1997) of 39 studies of prison misconduct conducted from 1940 to 1995 found that younger inmates had a higher rate of misconduct. More recently, age has been found to be inversely related to the likelihood of serious infractions (Fernandez & Neiman, 1998; Wooldredge, Griffin, & Pratt, 2001), the likelihood of violent misconducts (Gaes et al., 2002; Harer & Steffensmeier, 1996), and the likelihood of assaults on staff (Huebner, 2003). Although the evidence is not
unequivocal (see S. D. Camp, Gaes, Langan, & Saylor, 2002), prison misconduct also is more likely among those inmates who are members of minority groups (Gendreau et al., 1997). Most of the attention to date has focused on African American inmates, and studies report that they are significantly more likely than White inmates to commit disruptive misconducts (Ramirez, 1983), violent misconducts (Gaes et al., 2002; Harer & Steffensmeier, 1996), assaults (Fernandez & Neiman, 1998), and assaults on staff (Huebner, 2003).

Violent misconduct also is predicted by a prior incarceration in prison and a history of violent behavior. Wright (1991) concluded that inmates with prior institutional experience are more likely than those with no prior incarceration to use violence to solve problems and to acquire scarce goods, and prior incarceration has been found to be associated with greater levels of both assaultive and nonassaultive misconduct (S. D. Camp et al., 2002; Gendreau et al., 1997), violent misconducts (Harer & Langan, 2001; Harer & Steffensmeier, 1996), and assaults on staff (Huebner, 2003). It is not surprising that preinstitutional violence is a predictor of violent misconduct while incarcerated (Adams, 1992; Bottoms, 1999). Flanagan (1983) noted that inmates who were imprisoned for homicide actually were less likely than other inmates to violate prison rules, but the meta-analysis of 39 studies conducted by Gendreau et al. (1997) found that a violent offense history had a significant effect on both assaultive and nonassaultive misconducts. In addition, Harer and Langan (2001) reported that conviction for a violent offense was a predictor of the likelihood of violent misconduct during the 1st year of incarceration.

In summary, an inmate’s age, race and ethnicity, prior incarceration experience, and history of prior violence are predictors of violent misconduct when the situational and structural effects of the prison are controlled (Bottoms, 1999; Ellis, 1984; Gendreau et al., 1997; Harer & Steffensmeier, 1996; Wooldredge et al., 2001). Each of these individual-level factors is an easily observed surrogate measure of the likelihood that the inmate is importing into the prison a set of attitudes, values, and personal experiences that will amplify the degree of risk-taking and aggressive behaviors that will occur in response to the deprivations of incarceration and the opportunities for personal gain.
GANG AFFILIATION AND VIOLENT MISCONDUCT

More recently, attention has focused on gang affiliation in prison as an individual-level predictor of risk-taking behaviors and violent misconduct. Many inmates import the values, norms, and experiences acquired as members of street gangs; still other inmates become affiliated with gangs only after incarceration. Gang affiliation is rewarded with social support, social status, personal security, and access to contraband (Kalnic & Stojkovic, 1985; Ralph, 1997; Scott, 2001). There is some indication that inmates who affiliate with gangs are violence-prone persons (Davis & Flannery, 2001; Ralph & Marquart, 1991; Shelden, 1991; Toch, 1985), and it is very likely that gang affiliation reduces the ability of the formal rules and procedures to control inmate misconduct (Fleisher & Decker, 2001). G. M. Camp and Camp (1985) surveyed prison officials in 33 states and concluded that prison gang members, composing only 3% of the prison population, were responsible for 50% or more of the prison violence. Since then, estimates of the number of gang-affiliated inmates have increased substantially (Baugh, 1993; Knox, 2000; Knox & Tromanhauser, 1991; Montgomery & Crews, 1998), and prison officials continue to attribute a disproportionate amount of prison violence to gang-affiliated inmates (Carlson, 2001; Ralph, 1997; Scott, 2001).

Despite this growing concern about prison gangs and the effect of gang affiliation on prison violence, there are few published studies of the effect of gang affiliation on inmate violence. Shelden (1991) compared the institutional records of a sample of 60 inmates confirmed by the prison administration to be gang members to the records of 60 inmates who were not (known to be) gang members; each of the 120 inmates were male, were non-White, were younger than the age of 25, and imprisoned in a small, medium-security institution in Nevada. Compared to the nongang sample, gang members had a higher frequency of disciplinary offenses and a greater likelihood of drug offenses and fighting offenses. Without controls for individual-level risk factors and the length of time incarcerated, however, these findings are only suggestive.

Gaes et al. (2002) relied on official data obtained for a sample of 82,504 male inmates housed within a variety of federal prisons
to study the effects of gang affiliation on prison violence. Gang affiliation was defined by the formal criteria used by the Federal Bureau of Prisons, and violent misconduct was determined on the basis of a finding of guilt in an administrative hearing during a 12-month observation period. Controlling for the effect of the individual at-risk characteristics of the inmates, gang affiliation was found to increase the likelihood of violent (and other) misconduct. In addition, the level of violence among the inmates sampled was affected by the degree of gang embeddedness: Core members of gangs were more likely than peripheral affiliates of gangs to commit violent misconduct. The affiliates, in turn, were more likely to commit violent misconduct than were inmates who had no affiliation with gangs.

In another large-scale study, Huebner (2003) used a sample of 4,168 male inmates from 185 state prisons, which was a subset of the 1991 Survey of Inmates of State Correctional Facilities (U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1993), to examine the determinants of inmate violence. Relying on interview data, Huebner (2003, p. 110) constructed a measure of gang affiliation based on the inmate’s self-reported prior membership in a street or prison group comprising members from the same area with a shared turf or territory and with both a formal membership and a known leader. Inmate violence was defined as the self-reported frequency with which the inmate had been found guilty of an assault on staff or an assault on an inmate since his admission to the prison. When the effects of individual-level risk variables and the length of time incarcerated were controlled, Huebner reported that gang membership was a significant predictor of the frequency of assaults on both staff and inmates.

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Currently, there is strong evidence that age, gender, ethnicity/race, prior incarceration, and history of violent behavior have significant effects on the inmate’s violent misconduct, and two recent studies suggest that gang affiliation also is a predictor of violent misconduct. For the most part, these findings are based on studies that relied on a cross-sectional sample of inmates. The most common sampling
framework has been to identify a sample of inmates at a given date and then to record their misconduct during a predetermined study period. The length of observation has varied considerably, from as little as 3 months (Hewitt, Poole, & Regoli, 1984; Wooldredge, 1991), 4 months (Ellis, Grasmick, & Gilman, 1974), 6 months (Jiang & Fisher-Giorlando, 2002), 9 months (Ramirez, 1983), or 12 months (Gaes et al., 2002) to as long as 18 months (Harer & Steffensmeier, 1996) or 3 years (Wooldredge et al., 2001; Wright, 1991), but all cross-sectional studies share two limitations. First, findings from cross-sectional samples during a limited observation period may underestimate the amount of misconduct and the relationship of misconduct to its hypothesized predictors. This occurs when there are no controls for the unknown and inevitable amount of attrition from the sample as inmates are released or transferred during the observation period; the longer the observation period, the greater the likelihood of attrition.

Second, cross-sectional samples consider only a portion of each inmate's sentence, and the proportion of the total term that is considered will vary inversely with the length of sentence. A one-shot cross-sectional sampling design is more likely to include inmates serving longer sentences rather than inmates serving shorter sentences, each of whom is less likely to be in the early phase of the newly admitted inmate or the final phase of the soon-to-be-released inmate and more likely to be in the much longer phase of the mid-sentence inmate. There is some evidence (Adams, 1992; Bottoms, 1999; Flanagan, 1980; Gendreau et al., 1997) that the frequency and type of misconduct varies by the length of the original sentence, the length of time incarcerated, and the phase of the inmate's sentence, however, and these variations may be undetected in a cross-sectional sample of inmates.

Although there is consistent evidence to suggest that violent misconduct is more likely to occur during the first months and years of commitment than in later stages of confinement, the reason for this pattern is unclear. Bottoms (1999) suggested that the higher likelihood of violence during the early phase of the sentence may be due to either a process by which entering inmates learn to adjust to the prison environment with time or to the fact that formal controls are a less effective deterrent among inmates with a distant release.
date. Flanagan (1980) observed higher rates of misconduct during the early years of incarceration, but he also noted that rates of misconduct in the early years of the sentence were significantly lower among inmates serving sentences of 5 years or more than among inmates serving shorter sentences:

These data show that the overall pattern of involvement in institutional misconduct for the time-served groups is established in the early years of the sentence. For each of the first three years of confinement, the long-term prisoner group shows a significantly lower rate of misconduct than the short-term inmate group. (p. 361)

Flanagan concluded that there was a differential adjustment process among short-term and long-term prisoners such that long-term prisoners are doing a sentence qualitatively different from that of short-term prisoners. Bottoms (1999) suggested that the higher likelihood of violence during the early phase of the sentence may be due to a process by which entering inmates learn to adjust to the prison environment. Contrary to Flanagan’s findings, however, Bottoms observed a greater likelihood of violence among inmates with longer sentences than among inmates with shorter sentences, leading him to suggest that formal controls may be a less effective deterrent among inmates with a distant release date.

Only two studies have focused attention on violent misconduct among inmates during the first months of imprisonment. Memory, Guo, Parker, and Sutton (1999) compared the adjustment to incarceration by inmates serving determinate and indeterminate sentences in North Carolina during the first 7 months of confinement and concluded that much inmate violence during this time was instrumental and “therefore subject to being deterred by relatively certain and quick adverse consequences” (p. 68). Hagar and Langan (2001) studied the level of violent misconduct among a large sample of male and female federal prisoners during the 1st year of incarceration. They concluded that although women commit less violence and less serious violence than men during this 1st year, the effects of age, criminal history, and other factors on the likelihood of violence do not differ by gender. To date, no study has examined the effect of gang affiliation on inmate violence, with controls for the effects of other risk factors, during the early months or years of incarceration.
If, as Flanagan (1980) suggested, the pattern of involvement in institutional misconduct is established in the early years of the sentence, then it is important to examine the effect of gang affiliation on inmates during this time of adjustment to prison life. If violent misconduct occurs among newly admitted inmates as they seek to adjust to the prison environment, to establish or defend identities and status, and to seek personal security and profit, then to what extent is gang affiliation a predictor of that misconduct during the early years of confinement? Gaes et al. (2002) found that length of time affiliated with a gang decreased the likelihood of violent misconduct. This finding may indicate that long-time gang affiliates have assumed a leadership position in which they are less involved in the actual exercise of violence, and/or it may reflect the fact that the level of violent misconduct is necessarily greater among newer members who must use violence to establish themselves in the gangs.

Guided by the conclusions of prior research, this study sought to isolate the effects of gang affiliation on violent misconduct during only the first 3 years following commitment to prison and to identify those effects only among inmates serving sentences longer than 3 years. If, as Flanagan (1980), Adams (1992), Bottoms (1999), and others have suggested, the early years of confinement are qualitatively different from later years, especially among those inmates serving longer sentences, then it is important to identify the extent to which gang affiliation affects violent misconduct. If, as Davis and Flannery (2001), Ralph and Marquart (1991), Shelden (1991), Toch (1985), and others have suggested, inmates who affiliate with gangs are violence prone and predatory, then gang affiliation will be a significant predictor of violent misconduct among inmates during the early years of confinement, when other individual-level risk factors are controlled.

METHOD

PARTICIPANTS

The sample consisted of 2,158 male inmates admitted during 1996 to the Arizona Department of Corrections by way of commitment from the court (i.e., excluding those returned for violations of
the conditions of their release) who subsequently were confined for at least 3 years on that particular commitment. The analysis examined the record of disciplinary infractions for each inmate during the first 36 months immediately following the date of commitment.

MEASURES

Table 1 presents descriptive information for each of the variables employed in this analysis. Consistent with the findings of previous research, the inmate’s age, race/ethnicity, violent offense at commitment, and prior incarceration are included as independent variables. The inmates sampled had an average age at entry to prison of 30.24 years, with ages ranging from 14 to 69 years (SD = 9.8 years). According to prison records, non-Hispanic White inmates compose the single largest group (42.1%) of inmates in the sample, with large numbers of Mexican American, Mexican National, and African American inmates. The distinction between Mexican Americans and Mexican Nationals is relevant to the discussion of gang structures operating on the streets and in the prisons of Arizona, and this distinction was retained in the analysis. Native American inmates accounted for less than 4% of the sample, but these 82 cases were retained in the analysis for two reasons. One reason to justify the inclusion of Native Americans as a distinctive grouping in the analysis is simply that there currently are no studies of the behavior of incarcerated Native Americans and the level of their violent misbehavior. Because the small number of cases in this analysis creates less confidence in the generalizability of the findings regarding Native Americans, however, the findings may more properly be considered as exploratory. The second reason to create a distinctive grouping for Native Americans is that there existed within the prisons a gang (the Warrior Society) whose membership was restricted to Native Americans, thereby creating an opportunity for Native Americans to become involved in gang-affiliated behaviors. As evident in Table 1, race/ethnicity was measured in terms of four dichotomous groupings: African American, Mexican American, Mexican National, and Native American. Non-Hispanic Whites were the reference category against which the effects of each of the four distinctive ethnic groupings were assessed.
TABLE 1: Select Characteristics of Inmates Sampled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age at entry (range 14 – 69)</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>30.24</td>
<td>9.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American (0.1)</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>30.24</td>
<td>9.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American (0.1)</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>30.24</td>
<td>9.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American (0.1)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>30.24</td>
<td>9.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent offense (0.1)</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>30.24</td>
<td>9.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior incarceration (0.1)</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>30.24</td>
<td>9.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence length (3 to 50)</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security level (2 to 6)</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang affiliation (0.1)</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The nature of the instant crime for which the inmate was sentenced to prison was coded (0 or 1) to reflect either a nonviolent offense (e.g., burglary, drug trafficking, and auto theft) or a violent offense (e.g., robbery, rape, or manslaughter), respectively. Prior incarceration was measured simply in terms of the inmate's record of a prior incarceration (no = 0, yes = 1) in Arizona.

Additionally, sentence length was included in the analysis as a control variable because it often is cited as a factor in the inmate's degree of deprivation (Adams, 1992) and because it has been found to be associated with inmate misconduct (Flanagan, 1980; Gendreau et al., 1997). Sentence length varied from a 3-year sentence being served by 44 inmates to a 50-year sentence being served by 8 inmates; the mean sentence for the sample was 8.26 years (SD = 5.89), with a median sentence of 6 years. A second control variable was security level, which reflected the distribution of inmates across the range of secure facilities at the time of admission. To the extent that security level affected the level of inmate supervision and restraints (see Harer & Langan, 2001; McCorkle et al., 1995), its possible effects were controlled in this analysis. In Arizona, the security levels of facilities...
ranged from a low of two (minimum security) to a high of six (special housing unit).

*Gang affiliation* was determined on the basis of formal records that were available for each inmate at the end of the 3-year observation period. For those with a prior prison commitment and those who self-proclaimed their gang affiliation during reception and classification, street gang and prison gang affiliation would have been known at the time of commitment to prison. In other cases, gang affiliations may not have been noted until some time during confinement. The Department followed a formal process based on that used by the Federal Bureau of Prisons to identify inmates as suspected members or certified members of prison gangs. Using a number of membership criteria and a formal hearing process, inmates who were found to meet any one of the criteria were considered to be suspected members, and members who met two or more criteria were considered to be certified members.

Based on these formal records, gang affiliation includes those inmates whose only known gang affiliation was as a member of a street gang (8.3% of the sample) and those inmates, with or without a street gang affiliation prior to the time of imprisonment, who were suspected or certified members of a prison gang (8.4% of the sample). The remaining 83.3% of the sampled inmates were not (known to be) affiliated with any gang. This distribution of nongang, street gang, and prison gang members within the sample compares favorably with the reported distribution of nongang, street gang, and prison gang inmates in the general population of Arizona’s prisons: 13.3% of the inmates confined between July 1994 and December 2000 were officially recognized as street (6.4%) or prison (6.9%) gang members (Arizona Department of Corrections, 2001, p. 19). It also compares favorably with the finding reported by Gaes et al. (2002) that 9% of their sample of federal prison inmates were affiliated with a prison gang and by Krienert and Fleisher (2001) that 12% of a sample of new commitments to Nebraska’s prisons were gang affiliated.

The dependent variable, *violent misconduct*, was based on official records of all disciplinary actions taken against an inmate for a major infraction for assault, fighting, threats, and/or possession of a weapon. Official records of inmate misconduct are subject to
measurement error, as is evident in the observed discrepancies between self-reported and officially recorded rule violations (Hewitt et al., 1984; Howard, Winfree, Mays, Stohr, & Clason, 1994; Light, 1990; Poole & Regoli, 1980). Furthermore, the use of official records raises the possibility that systematic biases may arise if there are differential levels of inmate supervision and response by staff based on personal characteristics of the offender (Poole & Regoli, 1980; Silberman, 1995). Although this has been widely acknowledged as a potential issue in the use of official misconduct reports (Bottoms, 1999; Flanagan, 1983; Gaes et al., 2002; Gendreau et al., 1997), the likelihood of systematic bias is reduced when (a) the focus is on the most serious offenses, for which an officer has less discretion not to report the incident, and when (b) the misconduct is defined on the basis of a finding of guilt following review by an established fact-finding committee or board, which will have the effect of eliminating reports filed without cause (see Gaes et al., 2002; Harer & Langan, 2001; Memory et al., 1999). In this study, the inclusion of only those major violent misconducts that resulted in a review committee’s finding of guilt created a conservative measure that minimized the possibility of a selection bias on the basis of age, ethnicity, gang affiliation, or other characteristics of the inmate.

The measures of assault, fights, threats, and weapons were dichotomous indicators of the absence (0) or presence (1) of a finding of guilt for each type of violent misconduct during the 3-year observation period since commitment. As is evident in Table 1, few inmates were found guilty of a major misconduct for assault (9.4%), fighting (10.3%), threats (6.9%), or weapons (10.8%), and far fewer were guilty of two or more of each type of violent misconduct. Finally, a summary measure was created to note the absence (0) or presence (1) of a finding of guilt for any violent misconduct, as measured by a finding of guilty for a major assault, fighting, threat, or weapon misconduct during the early years of confinement.

**Statistical Analysis**

Although the 2,158 inmates selected for study may be viewed as a population (all males with a minimum 3-year sentence who entered prison during the year), they were treated as a sample for
which tests of statistical significance permit estimates of the likelihood of similar findings in similar samples drawn at different times or from other jurisdictions. The bivariate analysis incorporated both Pearson correlation coefficients and one-way analysis of variance, with post hoc contrasts, to examine the correlates of violent misconduct, and the multivariate analysis relied on multiple regression models to identify the independent and additive effects of gang affiliation on violent misconducts when the effects of the other factors were simultaneously controlled. Logit regression procedures were used because the prediction models used a dichotomous dependent variable. The regression analysis reported the chi-square statistic for the model and the resultant log likelihood statistics, which reflect the degree to which the final model represented an improvement over the intercept-only, or baseline, model. The Nagelkerke (1991) pseudo-$R^2$ statistic is a measure of the overall goodness of fit of the model. In the case of a logistic regression model, the $R^2$ is based on the likelihood ratio and provides an estimate of the coefficient of determination.

RESULTS

THE CORRELATES OF VIOLENT MISCONDUCT

The bivariate correlation coefficients reported in Table 2 indicate that age was significantly associated with violent misconduct among inmates during the first 3 years of imprisonment. Younger inmates were more likely than older inmates to be found guilty of a major misconduct for assault, fighting, threats, and weapons violations. Ethnicity was not associated with fighting or weapons violations, but Native Americans were somewhat more likely than non-Native Americans to be guilty of an assault, and both African Americans and Mexican Nationals were somewhat more likely than other inmates to be guilty of threats. The data reported in Table 2 also indicate that those inmates who were committed to prison for a violent offense were significantly more likely than inmates who were committed for a nonviolent offense to be found guilty of a major misconduct for assault, fighting, and weapons violations. Prior incarceration and
sentence length were weakly associated with only a threat misconduct, but security level was associated with receipt of a major misconduct for assault, fighting, and weapon possession.

The finding that only age was associated with each of the four types of violent misconduct underscores the admonition by S. D. Camp et al. (2002) that analyses of prison misconduct should look at the relationships for each type of misconduct. Further evidence of the need for offense-specific analyses is provided by examining the association of the independent variables with the summary measure, violent misconduct. There was no relationship between African American ethnicity and violent misconduct, but the coefficients reported in Table 2 indicate that violent misconduct was greater among Mexican Americans and Native Americans and lower among Mexican Nationals. Also, those inmates who were committed to prison for a violent offense and those inmates assigned to more secure facilities were more likely than their counterparts to be guilty of a violent misconduct.

Gang affiliation was positively associated with each of the measures of violent misconduct. Inmates with a gang affiliation were more likely than other inmates to be guilty of a major misconduct for
assault, for fighting, for threats, and for weapons possession. Consequently, there was a significant positive correlation of gang affiliation to the summary index measure of any violent misconduct.

The relationship between gang affiliation and violent misconduct is further explored by examining differences in the likelihood of a violent misconduct between inmates with no gang affiliation, inmates affiliated with street gangs, and inmates affiliated with prison gangs. As illustrated clearly in Figure 1, inmates with no gang affiliation were significantly less likely than those with either street gang affiliation or prison gang affiliation to have been guilty of a violent misconduct during the first 3 years of confinement. An assault was significantly less likely to occur ($F = 26.825, df = 2, p < .001$) among nonaffiliated inmates (7.4%) than among either those inmates affiliated with street gangs (16.1%) or those inmates affiliated with prison gangs (22.1%). One-way analysis of variance tests and Scheffe's statistic for post hoc contrasts also revealed significant differences between the three groups in the likelihood of a major misconduct for fighting ($F = 10.463, df = 2, p < .001$) and for threats ($F = 11.883, df = 2, p < .001$) but not for weapons violations ($F = 2.222, df = 2, p > .05$). Specifically, nonaffiliated inmates were significantly ($p < .001$) less likely to receive a misconduct report for fighting (9.1%) than were inmates affiliated with prison gangs (19.3%), but their likelihood was not statistically different ($p > .05$) than that of inmates affiliated with street gangs (13.3%). Similarly, nonaffiliated inmates were significantly ($p < .001$) less likely to be guilty of a misconduct for threats (5.7%) than were inmates affiliated with street gangs (14.4%), but the likelihood of threats by prison gangs (10.5%) did not differ significantly ($p > .05$) from that of either nonaffiliated inmates or inmates affiliated with street gangs.

The analysis of the likelihood of violent misconduct by gang affiliation is instructive. First, it indicates that despite the absence of significant differences in the likelihood of a weapons misconduct, there was a significant difference ($F = 31.855, df = 2, p < .001$) between the three groups in the likelihood that inmates committed any one of the four violent offenses: 24.9% of the nonaffiliated inmates, 41.1% of the inmates affiliated with street gangs, and 47.5% of the inmates affiliated with prison gangs were guilty of at least one of the four types of violent offense during the first 3 years of imprisonment.
Figure 1: Frequency of Violent Misconducts by Gang Affiliation, by Type of Violent Misconduct
Second, the finding that there was no significant difference (p > .05) between street gang and prison gang affiliates in the likelihood of any of the measures of violent behavior suggests that these two groups can be combined into a single group, those who are gang affiliated. This may not be a completely homogeneous grouping, but the combination of all gang-affiliated inmates into a single grouping irrespective of whether they were affiliated with street gangs or prison gangs was justified on the basis of these findings of no differences.

THE EFFECT OF GANG AFFILIATION ON VIOLENT MISCONDUCT

The effects of the independent and additive effects of the independent variables on each of the four types of violent misconduct are presented in Tables 3 and 4. In each table, gang affiliation was excluded from Model 1 and included in Model 2 as a means to identify the independent and additive effect of gang affiliation on assault misconducts when the effects of age, ethnicity, violent offense of commitment, prior incarceration, sentence length, and security level were simultaneously controlled. The regression of assault misconducts on the independent variables in Model 1 of Table 3 indicates that age and ethnicity were predictors of the likelihood of an assault misconduct: Assault misconduct was significantly more likely to occur among younger inmates and among White inmates. Compared to White inmates, African American inmates, Mexican American inmates, and inmates who were Mexican Nationals were significantly less likely to be guilty of a major misconduct for assault. Native American inmates, in contrast, were no more or less likely than White inmates to commit an assault. When gang affiliation was added to the model (Model 2), age, ethnicity, and gang affiliation were significant predictors of a major misconduct for assault. These data indicate that gang-affiliated inmates are more than twice as likely as nonaffiliated inmates to commit an assault during the first 3 years of confinement, controlling for age, ethnicity, commitment offense, prior incarceration, sentence length, and security level. Furthermore, the summary measures indicate that the combined effects in Model 1 were significant predictors of assault and that the addition of gang affiliation to Model 2 provided a significant (p < .001) change in the −2 log likelihood statistic.
### TABLE 3: Effects of Gang Membership on Receipt of a Major Misconduct for Assault and for Fighting: Logistic Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assault: Model 1</th>
<th>Assault: Model 2</th>
<th>Fighting: Model 1</th>
<th>Fighting: Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Exp(B)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.107***</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>-.096***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>-.762**</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>-.828***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>-.529**</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>-.670***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican National</td>
<td>-.719**</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>0.487</td>
<td>-.873***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>1.477</td>
<td>.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent offense</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>1.122</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior incarceration</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>1.346</td>
<td>.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence length</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security level</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>1.099</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang affiliation</td>
<td>.734***</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>2.084</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square    | 132.447*** | 148.465*** | 73.208*** | 76.208***
-2 log likelihood | 1,208.968  | 192.930**  | 1,356.426 | 1,353.899
Nagelkerke $R^2$ | .129     | .144        | .069      | .072      

*With the inclusion of gang affiliation in the Model, the change in the -2 log likelihood is significant at $p < .001$.

*p ≤ .05, **p ≥ .01, ***p ≤ .001.
Although neither model explained more than 15% of the variation in assault misconduct, the inclusion of gang affiliation significantly increased the amount of variation explained.

The regression of a fighting misconduct on these same independent variables produced substantially different results. As is evident in Table 3, age continues to be a significant predictor of violent misconduct: Younger inmates are more likely than older inmates to be guilty of a misconduct for fighting. Among the other independent variables, however, only security level is a significant predictor of receipt of a fighting misconduct: Inmates assigned to more secure facilities were more likely than inmates at less secure facilities to be guilty of a major misconduct for fighting. There were no observed effects by ethnicity, violent offense, prior incarceration, or sentence length. More interesting, the effect of gang affiliation on receipt of a major misconduct for fighting was not significant, and the inclusion of gang affiliation in Model 2 did not significantly increase Model 2’s ability, relative to Model 1, to explain this form of violent misconduct.

The findings for the regression of both threats misconducts and weapons misconducts are presented in Table 4. In Model 1, the receipt of a major misconduct for threats was significantly predicted by age, prior incarceration, and sentence length. That is, a misconduct for threats was more likely to have been received by inmates who were younger, who had been previously incarcerated, and who were serving a shorter sentence. Ethnicity, violent offense of commitment, and security level did not have a significant direct effect on the likelihood of a misconduct for threats, however. The summary statistics for Model 1 indicate that the combined effect of all the independent variables on the likelihood of a threat misconduct were statistically significant. The inclusion of gang affiliation, in Model 2, did not substantially alter the effects of the other independent variables on a threat misconduct. Age, prior incarceration, and sentence length continued to be significant predictors of a threat misconduct when gang affiliation was controlled, and gang affiliation was found to be a significant predictor of threat misconduct when each of the other independent variables was controlled. Although the combined effect of the independent variables in Model 2 explained only 7.5% of the variation in the likelihood of a threat misconduct, there was a
### TABLE 4: Effects of Gang Membership on Receipt of a Major Misconduct for Threats and for Weapons: Logistic Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Threats: Model 1</th>
<th>Threats: Model 2</th>
<th>Weapons: Model 1</th>
<th>Weapons: Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Exp(B)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>-.050***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>1.411</td>
<td>.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>0.974</td>
<td>-.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican National</td>
<td>-.481</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td>-.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior incarceration</td>
<td>.560**</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>1.750</td>
<td>.509**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence length</td>
<td>-.055*</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>-.055*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security level</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>1.015</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang affiliation</td>
<td>.581**</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>1.788</td>
<td>.581**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Chi-square** = 56.588***, 64.227***, 68.957***, 70.042***
- **-2 log likelihood** = 1,022,220, 1,014,581a, 1,402,969, 1,402,884
- **Nagelkerke $R^2$** = .066, .075, .064, .065

---

*With the inclusion of gang affiliation in the model, the change in the $-2$ log likelihood is significant at $p < .005$.

* $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$. *** $p \leq .001$. 

---
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significant change in the -2 log likelihood of Model 1 with the inclusion of gang affiliation in Model 2. It is evident from these findings that gang affiliation had a significant and independent effect on the likelihood that an inmate was guilty of a major misconduct for threats.

In contrast, gang affiliation did not have an effect on a misconduct for a weapons violation. The results presented in Table 4 indicate that only age and prior incarceration predicted the likelihood of a weapons misconduct. In both Model 1 and Model 2, the likelihood of a weapons misconduct decreased with the inmate's age but increased if the inmate had been incarcerated previously. Ethnicity, violent offense of commitment, sentence length, and security level were not significant predictors of a weapons misconduct. The total effect of all the independent variables in Model 1 was statistically significant, because of the effects of age and prior incarceration, but the combined effect of these independent variables explained only a small amount of the variation in the likelihood of a misconduct for weapons possession. Gang affiliation was not a significant predictor of weapons possession, and its inclusion in Model 2 did not significantly improve the ability of the model to explain weapons possession.

Finally, the effects of the models on the summary measure, any violent misconduct, are reported in Table 5. In Model 1, ethnicity was not a significant predictor of the likelihood that an inmate engaged in any violent misconduct, but significant effects were observed for age, violent offense of commitment, prior incarceration, sentence length, and security level. The likelihood of a violent misconduct during the first 3 years was greater among those committed to prison for a violent offense and those inmates with a prior incarceration, and it increased as age and sentence length decreased and as security level increased. The addition of gang affiliation to the model (Model 2) affected the level of the effect of security level in that security level was not a significant predictor of the occurrence of a violent misconduct when the effect of gang membership was controlled. Conversely, the effect of Mexican National ethnicity became significant when gang membership was controlled: Mexican Nationals were less likely than Whites to engage in any form of violent misconduct. It also is noted in Table 5 that gang affiliation is a
TABLE 5: Effects of Gang Membership on Receipt of Any Major Violent Misconduct: Logistic Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.074***</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.068***</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>0.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>- .200</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td></td>
<td>- .223</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>- .123</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td></td>
<td>- .194</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>0.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican National</td>
<td>- .303</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td></td>
<td>- .378*</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>0.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>1.562</td>
<td></td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>1.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent offense</td>
<td>.343**</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>1.409</td>
<td></td>
<td>.321**</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>1.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior incarceration</td>
<td>.442***</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>1.556</td>
<td></td>
<td>.404***</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>1.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence length</td>
<td>- .028**</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>0.972</td>
<td></td>
<td>- .029**</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>0.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security level</td>
<td>.124*</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>1.133</td>
<td></td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>1.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.450**</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>1.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>217.537***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>229.176***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 log likelihood</td>
<td>2,348.719</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,337.081*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagelkerke $R^2$</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. With the inclusion of gang affiliation in the model, the change in the -2 log likelihood is significant at $p < .001$.

significant predictor of the likelihood of any violent misconduct, independent of the effects of the inmate's age, ethnicity, commitment offense type, prior incarceration, sentence length, and security level. The addition of gang affiliation to Model 2 produces a statistically significant ($p < .001$) change in the -2 log likelihood statistic, compared to that of Model 1, which indicates that the inclusion of gang affiliation significantly increased the model's ability to predict any violent misconduct.

DISCUSSION

The initial months and years of imprisonment can be a difficult time of adjustment for inmates, especially for those who are serving longer sentences. New prisoners may be disoriented and fearful on entry to the prison, and they must cope with the deprivations, stressors, and authoritarian structure inherent within a prison environment (Bottoms, 1999). These problems of adjustment may be the
cause of an inmate’s violent misconduct during the early years of incarceration. Management issues differ substantially, however, if violent misconduct is an opportunistic and instrumental act committed by impulsive and predatory inmates who use violence to establish power, obtain privilege, and settle disputes (Adams, 1992). In such a situation, violent misconduct would be more likely among gang-affiliated inmates.

Adjustment to the deprivation of imprisonment surely explains some acts of inmate violence, but the findings of previous studies and this study suggest that the observed patterns of violent misconduct signal exploitative and predatory acts by inmates rather than efforts to adjust to the vagaries of imprisonment. Consistent with the findings reported by others, this study of a cohort of newly committed male inmates found that violent misconduct during the early years of incarceration was significantly more likely to occur among inmates who were younger, who were violent, and who had prior prison experience. It is important to note that gang affiliation during the early years of incarceration had an effect on violent misconduct independent of the individual risk factors of age, ethnicity, violent history, and prior incarceration.

These findings are suggestive, but they should be examined in terms of the limitations of this study. One question that arises is the extent to which these findings can be generalized to other states and other inmate groupings. The characteristics of the inmates, the gangs, and the physical, social, and managerial conditions within these prisons may not be representative of prisons elsewhere, yet the findings of this study certainly add to, and are largely consistent with, the cumulative body of research on inmate misconduct. The inclusion of only those inmates who were committed to a sentence of 3 or more years permitted the study to observe misconduct among long-term inmates who have been considered to be qualitatively different than short-term inmates (Barak-Glantz, 1983; Flanagan, 1980), but it also limits the findings to only inmates serving longer sentences. It is quite possible that the effect of gang affiliation on violent misconduct among short-term inmates will differ substantially. Similarly, the 3-year observation period permitted an opportunity to examine the effects of gang affiliation on violent misconduct during a prolonged period, but the absence of data on the date of
the violent misconduct precluded a time-series analysis of the predictors of time to the misconduct.

Two additional limitations must be acknowledged. First, the temporal sequence, and thus the causal order, between gang affiliation and violent misconduct was not specified in this study. Inmates who were affiliated with a gang had a greater likelihood of a violent misconduct during the first 3 years of imprisonment, but it is not clear whether the gang affiliation preceded, followed, or was coterminal with the violent misconduct. Second, this analysis included security level as a control variable, but there are other structural features of the prison environment (e.g., inmate-to-staff ratio, density and overcrowding, and officer training and turnover) that were not included as covariates that, when statistically controlled, may have reduced or enhanced the effect of gang affiliation on violent misconduct (Bottoms, 1999). S. D. Camp et al. (2002) and Wooldredge et al. (2001) have demonstrated the value of using hierarchical models to isolate the effects of individual and structural factors on inmate misconduct, and similar analyses are needed to confirm the importance of gang affiliation on violent misconduct.

The dramatic rise of prison gangs in recent years brings renewed attention to these racially or ethnically homogeneous and hierarchically structured social groups, whose norms, values, and objectives both attract and foster predatory behavior (Pleisher & Decker, 2001; Scott, 2001). Prison gangs are social organizations that resist authority, violate rules, and promote violence. In competition with other gangs, and in opposition to administrative efforts, prison gangs feud over marketing territories and illicit supplies of contraband (Kalsnich & Stojkovic, 1985); their use of violence and intimidation to acquire social, physical, and economic capital affects the social order and the social climate of the prison for inmates and staff alike.

Gangs present a major challenge for prison administration. First, there is some evidence that prison gangs attract inmates with a higher level of programming need (Krienert & Fleisher, 2001). Davis and Flannery (2001) noted that gang members “often are admitted with histories of physical and sexual abuse, substance abuse, psychiatric disturbances, post-traumatic stress disorder, cognitive deficits, poor self-esteem, and other problems” (p. 37). Because of the normative structure of the gangs, however, these
inmates are less likely to participate in rehabilitative programming (Shelden, 1991). Second, formal controls and disciplinary sanctions are less effective deterrents of violent misconduct among gang-affiliated inmates than among other inmates. As gangs grow in size and strength, and as formal controls weaken, it is likely that the level of violent misconduct by nonaffiliated inmates also will increase as these nonaffiliated inmates increasingly rely on violence as a strategy of self-protection or seek protection by affiliating with a gang (Reisig, 2002; Wooldredge, 1998).

Jacobs (1976), Dilulio (1987), and others focused attention to prison management and its role in maintaining a safe and orderly prison. Dilulio, for example, stressed that strong management, formal rules and procedures, and the effective use of resources are needed to maintain control over inmate misconduct. In any discussion of the quality of prison life and prison disorder, Dilulio (1987) asserted, “prison management is the strategic variable” (p. 95). Consistent with this control model of prison management, a number of strategies have been adopted in federal and state prisons to confront and control prison gangs, to identify and isolate gang-affiliated inmates, and to revise inmate classification procedures to give greater weight to the inmate’s affiliation with street or prison gangs (Carlson, 2001). Although a limited number of case studies suggest that organizational restructuring has been an effective means of reducing inmate misconducts (e.g., Farmer, 1988; Marquart & Crouch, 1985; Ralph & Marquart, 1991; Rivera, Cowles, & Dorman, 2003), further research is needed to assess management’s ability to reduce and eliminate gang-affiliated violent misconduct effectively.

NOTES

1. Another 30 males with a sentence of 3 or more years were committed to prison in Arizona during 1996, but these cases were excluded from the analysis because of missing data on one or more of the variables used in the analysis. In 1996, 126 females also were admitted to the state’s correctional facilities with a sentence of 3 years or longer, of whom only 5 were identified as gang affiliated. Because of their small numbers, female inmates were excluded from this analysis.

2. This measure reflects only the security level at admission, but typically there would be little change in security level during the first few years of incarceration. In this sample, 11.4% were committed to a Level 2 facility (minimum security), 45.6% were committed to a Level 3 facility, 28.6% were committed to a Level 4 facility, 9.4% were committed to a Level 5 facility, and 5.1% were committed to a Level 6 facility.
3. These criteria included self-proclaimed membership, gang-identifying tattoos, appearance on gang membership lists, possession of gang paraphernalia, association with certified gang members, and other indicators of membership. A disciplinary report for any infraction was not a criterion of gang affiliation. At the time of the study, the administration identified the following prison gangs: African American Council, African Mau Mau, Aryan Brotherhood, Border Brothers, Grandels, New Mexican Mafia, Old Mexican Mafia, Pecoswood, Skinheads, Sureños, and Warrior Society.

4. Although some studies rely on self-reported behavior (Hewitt, Poole, & Regoli, 1984; Huebner, 2003), the majority of the research to date has measured inmate misconduct on the basis of official reports filed (Shestrov, 1991; Wooldredge, Griffin, & Pratt, 2001) or those filed that resulted in a formal hearing and a finding of guilty (Gaes, Wallace, Gilman, Klein-Saffran & Suppa, 2002; Hearer & Langan, 2001; Hearer & Steffensmeier, 1996; Memory, Ono, Parker, & Sutton, 1999).

5. Estimation problems arise if multicollinearity exists among the independent variables (Lewis-Beck, 1990). Two tests of multicollinearity suggest that this was not a problem; however, First, the bivariate relationships among the independent variables were not unusually strong. Second, both the tolerances for individual variables and the variance influence factors of each of the models presented in Tables 3, 4, and 5 were examined, and all were within approved limits (Norusis, 1993).

6. Current practices by which inmates are validated as members of gangs and administratively segregated have raised concerns, voiced by Tachíki (1995) and others, that these decisions violate the 14th Amendment Due Process Clause, but several key court cases have upheld these or similar practices (e.g., Tousant v. McCarthy, 1986; Turner v. Safley, 1987). For a more detailed discussion of these issues, see Eckhart (2001).
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