PERCEPTIONS OF PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AMONG MALE AND FEMALE MINORITY GANG MEMBERS

By

MADELEINE NOVICH

A dissertation submitted to the

Graduate School-Newark

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Graduate Program in Criminal Justice

Written under the direction of Dr. Jody Miller

And approved by

_____

_____

_____

_____

Newark, New Jersey

January 2016

© 2016

Madeleine Novich

ABSTRACT

This study investigated perceptions of procedural justice and concepts of police legitimacy among San Francisco-based male and female minority gang members involved in drug dealing. This study sought to examine how the gang members experienced and articulated Tyler's (2006) four facets of procedural justice: trust, respect, fairness, and participation and how these perceptions contributed to opinions about police legitimacy more generally. To investigate the research participants' perceptions, the study sought to answer the following questions: First, are the police perceived as engaging with gang members based on prejudicial behavior (e.g. being stopped because of race, gender, age, clothing and/or location)? If so, how do these perceived police behaviors shape perceptions of procedural justice among male and female gang members? Further, how are perceptions of procedural justice impacted by the context during which participants are approached (i.e. actively engaged in law-breaking behavior or not)? And finally, how are police contacts and perceptions similar or different across genders? This study utilized secondary data, which consisted of 253 in-depth qualitative interviews. The semi-structured interviews of male (N=119) and female (N=134) gang members covered salient topics that included descriptions of police behavior during involuntary face-to-face contacts, vicarious experiences, and attitudes about law enforcement.

Overall, the results indicate that ethnic minority drug dealing gang members experience what they perceive to be procedurally unjust police behavior. Indeed, the research participants repeatedly raised concerns related to their perceptions of procedural justice on all four criteria (fairness, trust, respect, and participation) (Tyler, 2006) and concerning police legitimacy. Specific issues raised included a lack of respectful interpersonal treatment, citizen participation met with police indifference and perceptions of unfair and biased decision-making based on race, gender, neighborhood context, and dress. Further, the context of the stop was critical in forming or harming perceptions of trust. This contributed to study participants' opinions about the legitimacy of the police. While there were some notable gender differences in experiences and responses, and some suggestion that the race/ethnicity of gang members might matter as well, there were also a number of shared experiences suggesting that men and women of different ethnicities also experience and interpret police behavior in similar ways. This study affirmed that attitudes towards law enforcement, interpretations of police behavior, and legitimacy are best examined in an intersectional framework based on the dynamic exchange between police and citizen. As such, this investigation contributes to our understanding of how gender, race, presentation of self, neighborhood context, criminal involvement, along with the type and nature of the stop, converge to reveal how attitudes towards police are formed and perceptions of procedural justice are articulated among this criminally-involved population.

Acknowledgements

In Loving Memory of

Marc D. Pressman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Recently, there has been a shift in scholarly focus concerning how law enforcement operates, innovates, and interacts with citizens (Weisburd and Braga, 2006). On the street, police behavior is highly discretionary and law enforcement exercises their authority by initiating stops, making arrests, and using force when deemed necessary (Skogan and Frydl, 2004). The level of autonomy granted to police raises concerns about impartiality, appropriate behavior, and lawfulness. While most interactions with police are without incident, the sheer number of exchanges means that a significant number of citizens will experience undesirable police behavior. This is often the case among young minority males, who generally report more negative police contacts, and express more negative views of law enforcement and a lower sense of police legitimacy than other groups (Brunson, 2007; Skogan and Frydl, 2004).

Given the importance of civic engagement in crime fighting, there have been significant changes and a focus on improving police practices and police-citizen relations (Skogan, 2006). Despite these efforts, problems related to aggressive, prejudicial, and disrespectful police behavior continue to raise concerns (Rios, 2011). As a result, there is a growing body of research on procedural justice and legitimacy, particularly in the context of police-citizen interactions. Procedurally just policing—where police are perceived to behave in a respectful, honest, and unbiased manner—has been viewed as important stepping-stone to improving community relations and enhancing legitimacy,

including the degree to which the police earn compliance among citizens (Tyler, 2006; Sunshine and Tyler, 2003).

A majority of the current literature focuses on the impact of procedural justice in two primary contexts: those involving law-abiding citizens stopped for minor infractions such as speeding and other traffic violations (Murphy, 2009; Mazerolle, Antrobus, Bennett and Tyler, 2013), and those involving police-citizen interactions, such as profiling, within minority communities (Durán, 2008; Tyler and Wakslak, 2004). Research in this latter tradition challenges the neutrality of officer behavior and suggests that race, class, gender, and place shape policing patterns, practices and perceived procedural justice among citizens (Britton, 1997; Brunson, 2007; Gau and Brunson, 2008; Rios, 2011).

Given that procedural justice concepts are critical to establishing police legitimacy, there remain areas in which our knowledge can be usefully expanded. This includes developing our awareness of how law-breaking sub-groups, such as male and female drug-dealing gang members who are predominantly ethnic minorities in disadvantaged communities, experience police behavior. This also encourages a more refined understanding of how gang member/officer interactions may be impacted by perceptions of biased and questionable police actions (Durán, 2008) and how these impressions connect more broadly to concepts of procedural justice and legitimacy. Examining whether and how opinions of the police differ among male and female gang members can provide in-depth insight about the extent to which procedurally just policing is distributed among citizens equally and if not, how that may shape varying opinions of legal

legitimacy. Additionally, most research investigating procedural justice and police legitimacy employs survey data in these pursuits. There is need for a qualitative focus as it allows for a more nuanced understanding of experiences and perceptions among a diverse sample of individuals (Noy, 2008). In response to these gaps, this study will use 253 qualitative in-depth interviews and employ a rigorous comparative analysis of male and female gang members to examine how their experiences of police behavior impact perceptions of procedural justice and legitimacy.

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Police officers are among the most visible civil employees and are often viewed as the face of the government. They are charged with the safekeeping of society and have an incredible amount of discretion, authority, and power. They are held to a high standard of behavior and generally face harsh criticism when they fail to display appropriate conduct. A large aspect of their job is to maintain a safe society and they rely on voluntary compliance from citizens to reduce crime, enhance public safety, and mitigate fear of crime (Taylor, 2006). Citizens have been found to comply with law enforcement and legal authorities when they are viewed as legitimate actors of the state (Tyler, 2006).

Legitimacy is derived from police-citizen interactions and officers' treatment of persons they interact with. It is defined as "a property of an authority that leads people to feel that the authority or institution is entitled to be deferred to and obeyed" (Sunshine and Tyler, 2003: 514). The police foster legitimacy, and

thus compliant behavior, by acting 'procedurally just.' Procedural justice includes four essential components: (1) *citizen participation*– where citizens engage with police in a meaningful way by voicing their perspective during the exchange, (2) *fairness and neutrality* – where police are perceived as demonstrating neutral decision-making and treating all citizens equally, (3) *dignity and respect* – where police treat citizens with courteous interpersonal treatment, and (4) *trustworthy motives* – where police are perceived as making decisions based on honest intentions. It is the presence or absence of these four criteria that typically contribute to positive or negative attitudes towards police (Murphy, Mazerolle, and Bennett, 2014).

During police-citizen points of contact, officers are expected to treat all individuals with procedurally justice behavior. However, there is growing body of evidence that suggests some populations, such as minorities, may not experience this police conduct as frequently as others (Durán, 2008; Gau and Brunson, 2007; Visher, 1983). Instead, they may be more likely to experience racially motivated police behavior and discourteous interpersonal treatment (Durán, 2008). As such, these groups are more likely to form negative opinions towards law enforcement, which is problematic as favorable attitudes towards police are the foundation of establishing legitimacy (Tyler, 2006).

Indeed, evidence has demonstrated that attitudes towards police vary significantly depending on racial/ethnic background, gender, age, immigration status, and neighborhood context (Brown and Benedict, 2002). African Americans view law enforcement the least favorably, followed by Latinos and

other minorities. Negative sentiments are especially strong among minorities in lower socio-economic communities whose residents experience heightened levels of racial profiling and poor interpersonal treatment (Shuck and Martin, 2013). This is largely because routine and targeted stops are a common law enforcement strategy in these neighborhoods. For example, the use of stop, question, and frisk practices often raises concerns among citizens (Fratello, Rengifo, and Trone, 2013). While these practices are argued to be important and effective crime-fighting tactics, they disproportionally target African Americans and Latinos and have yielded disappointing crime reduction results (Spitzer, 1999). Instead, these types of practices contribute to feelings of disrespect, criminalization, and distrust, and can result in the greater likelihood of non-cooperation with police (Brunson, 2007; Fratello et al., 2013; Gau, 2013). In fact, police practices in disadvantaged neighborhoods result in perceptions and experiences of harassment (Brunson, 2007) and trauma among urban youth (Geller, Fagan, Tyler, and Link, 2014). These negative perceptions of police can form during an array of police encounters, including police-initiated street and car stops, raids, and voluntary citizen-initiated contacts (Carroll and Gonzalez, 2014; Murphy, 2009; Novich, 2015).

It is clear that race, gender, location, and aggressive policing play important roles in police-citizen encounters. However, there is limited scholarship that explores how criminalized and law-breaking sub-groups, such as gang members, experience police behavior, perceive procedural justice, and establish notions of legitimacy. Gang members are routinely engaged in face-to-

face contact with police and given that such members are typically ethnic minorities residing in economically depressed neighborhoods, they likely experience undesirable police behavior and have comparatively more negative opinions towards police (Durán, 2008). These attitudes are likely strengthened by their gang-related networks (Papachristos, Meares, and Fagan; 2012) and shaped by fear of arrest (Goffman, 2009).

Policing gangs has been on the rise since the 1970's largely in response to concerns about violent criminal behavior (Katz and Webb, 2006). Though gangs are typically not highly organized, criminally sophisticated groups (Decker, 1996), male and female members are generally more delinquent than their non-gang counterparts (Bouchard and Spindler, 2010; Esbensen and Winfree, 1998; Esbensen and Carson, 2013; Miller, 2001). Despite this, research has found that most gang members spend a majority of their time talking about crime as opposed to actively engaging in it (Klein and Maxson, 2006). Delinquent tendencies may be a function of groups' cohesion (Decker, 1996; Klein and Maxson, 2006) such that the more cohesive groups are, the more delinquency they exhibit. However, literature has demonstrated that gangs typically have relatively weak cohesion (Klein and Maxson, 2006).

Despite this, aggressive anti-gang policing strategies have been established to combat these groups (Katz and Webb, 2006). Anti-gang programs implemented in recent decades include building gang databases, enhancing charges on gang-related offenses, and forming anti-gang police units to arrest suspected members (Katz and Webb, 2006; Rios, 2011). Studies have found that

gang unit officers often target individuals based on their age, race, gender, clothing, and neighborhood context (Katz and Webb, 2006). Further, as gang units have become more established, evidence has demonstrated that problems with police behavior have surfaced. This includes stereotyping, intimidation, abuse, and violence against gang members (Katz and Webb, 2006).

In terms of the procedural justice literature, studying gang members is salient for several reasons. First, there is limited knowledge concerning how gang members' experience and articulate concepts of procedural justice and legitimacy, especially in the context of aggressive police behavior. Given their involvement in comparatively more delinquency, earning legitimacy should be of great import to law enforcement. As such, examining how gang members perceive police behavior will contribute to the small but growing body of research on how officers can improve relationships with them. By employing a large and diverse sample, it is my hope that these findings may inform both gang and procedural justice scholarship more generally.

Second, the study of gang members provides an excellent context in which examine the extent or lack thereof that procedural justice is afforded to all citizens, regardless of race, class, gender, neighborhood context and criminal involvement. Based on previous literature, they likely experience racialized and biased police behavior (Durán, 2008; Rios, 2011), which contradict mechanisms of procedural justice, potentially leading to variations in experiences, opinions, and responses to police and their directives. This study will further explore the relevance of these claims.

Finally, policing gangs is a complex issue and it is important to understand members' perceptions of police, how they relate to procedural justice and notions of legal legitimacy. This is especially so given that most gang members are not routinely involved in law-breaking activities and the context of the stop may matter significantly. By comparing male and female accounts and perspectives, I can provide a thorough examination of gang members' experiences and provide insight into a group seldom researched utilizing this theoretical framework. Thus this research seeks to investigate the following questions:

- Are the police perceived as engaging with gang members based on biases, such as being stopped because of race, gender, age, clothing and/or location?

- If so, how do these perceived behaviors shape perceptions of procedural justice among male and female gang members of different ethnicities?

- Further, how are perceptions of procedural justice impacted by the context during which gang members are approached (i.e., actively engaged in law-breaking behavior or not)?

- How are these perceptions similar or different among the men and women?

STUDY OVERVIEW

The 253 drug-dealing gang members in this dataset are an ideal population to use for this investigation. The data were collected in the San Francisco Bay

Area, which at the time (2007-2011) utilized multiple aggressive gang-related

policing tactics (California Penal Code 186.21). The gang members in this sample

were commonly engaged in illegal activities (Hunt and Joe-Laidler, 2011), and

nearly all reported being routinely stopped by police. The research participants

represent a diverse array of demographics in terms of age, ethnicity, gang type,

and neighborhood location. Further, the data set is equally divided between men

and women allowing for an in-depth and nuanced understanding of gender

comparisons.

The study will employ a rigorous inductive and deductive analytic coding

strategy that will have several stages (Maxwell, 2005). This will include open

coding to identify each description of a gang member/police interaction. The

analysis will then be refined using qualitative theory testing by employing related

theoretical concepts as a source of codes to guide the investigation (Gilgun,

2011). The four components of procedural justice will serve as the markers: (1)

Participation – gang members described having or lacking a voice or having the

ability to represent their situation/perspective during interactions with law

enforcement, (2) *Fairness* – the degree by which law enforcement were perceived

as making impartial decisions, (3) *Respect* – the degree to which law enforcement

were described as treating the gang members with respect, dignity, and politeness,

and (4) *Trust* – the extent to which the gang members felt they could trust that the

authorities' motives were honest and well-meaning. I will then explore if and how

these behaviors connect more broadly to perceptions of procedural justice and

legitimacy and examine how they differ among the male and female gang

members. The data will also be arranged into matrices to ensure patterns,

comparisons, trends, and deviant cases can be identified and fully assessed.

OUTLINE OF THE DISSERTATION

This dissertation will include eight chapters and an appendix. Chapter

One has provided a brief introduction to the topic, theoretical framework and

background literatures that apply, and presented the research questions and the

rationale for the study. It also includes a succinct overview of the data and the

analysis methods. Chapter Two presents a comprehensive review of the relevant

literature. This includes a discussion of procedural justice and legitimacy

research followed by an overview on how attitudes toward police are formed via

direct and vicarious contact. I qualify this section by also discussing how

attitudes towards the police vary depending on race, gender, age, neighborhood

context, and criminal involvement. Next, I provide a thorough review of relevant

literatures on street gangs, covering topics such as gang structure and

delinquency. This is followed by a discussion of anti-gang policing strategies and

an analysis of how gang unit officers police members on the streets. This

includes an overview of police engaging with gang-affiliated individuals based on

race, age, gender, neighborhood context, and involvement in drug dealing.

Chapter Three provides a detailed overview of the study setting,

including its history, relevant location-specific policing policies and research

concerning their effectiveness. This chapter also includes a discussion about

police behavior and perceptions of police in the San Francisco Bay area. Chapter

Four provides a thorough discussion of the research methods, including how the data were collected, the analyses strategies I use, a discussion on the use of secondary data, and the strengths and weakness of the study.

The next three chapters will present the study findings. Chapter Five will discuss the types of police encounters experienced by the male and female gang members. In this chapter, I provide a descriptive overview of the different stops such as street-based stops, house raids, and/or school-based encounters described by the gang members. Chapter Six will present the findings of the gang members' perceptions of procedural justice in terms of three of theory's process-based criteria: participation, respect, and trust. Chapter Seven will discuss a gendered examination of the theory's final process based criteria of fairness. The tenets of procedural justice are examined separately because of how they were raised in the interview guide. The concluding chapter (Chapter Eight) will provide an overview of the study findings, its implications, and contributions to both gang and procedural justice research, discussing the study findings in the context of the contemporary literature. Finally, the Appendix includes a copy of the original survey and interview guide used along with Institutional Review Board approval from Rutgers University.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND POLICE LEGITIMACY

For police to effectively reduce crime, ensure public safety, and mitigate

fear of crime, law enforcement relies on voluntary compliance and assistance from the public. "Producing public safety is a coproduction process, wherein police and citizens, and other organizations working with the police, all contribute to the outcome" (Taylor, 2005:106). By reporting crimes, citizens are playing an active role in the safekeeping of their environment (Taylor, 2005). The effectiveness of coproduction and citizens' willingness or unwillingness to work with law enforcement often stem from favorable or unfavorable perceptions of police behavior (Taylor, 2005). Most importantly, research indicates that citizens comply with legal authorities when they are perceived as legitimate actors of the state (Hinds and Murphy, 2007; Murphy and Cherney, 2012; Murphy, 2009; Sunshine and Tyler, 2003; Tyler, 2006). This is especially so within westernized countries that are premised on democratic governmental structures (Tankebe, 2009). Legitimacy is defined as "a property of an authority that leads people to feel that the authority or institution is entitled to be deferred to and obeyed" (Sunshine and Tyler, 2003:514).

Legitimacy is critical to effective policing because it contributes to compliant behavior among citizens. Tyler (2006)'s groundbreaking study, "Why People Obey the Law," offered empirical support for this finding. His work expanded upon Thibaut and Walker (1975), who were among the first legal scholars to uncover that individuals cared as much about how their cases were handled in court as they did their outcomes. Tyler's Chicago-based study of 1,575 respondents examined the nature of perceptions of procedural justice and legitimacy through two distinct explanations for compliance: instrumental and

normative.

The instrumental model suggests that citizen behavior is primarily influenced by rewards and punishments. Individuals are motivated by self-interests, and social control manipulates compliance via threatening sanctions and/or limiting access to valuable social resources (Tyler, 2006). This model is rooted in concepts of deterrence and rational choice, with law enforcement serving as the focal point of "influencing the personal costs of rule breaking" (Tyler, 2006:21). Compliance is a cost-benefit calculation and procedural fairness is "based on the favorability of the outcomes received: where people feel that they have control over decisions they believe that the procedure is fair; where they feel they lack control they believe it is unfair" (Tyler, 2006:7).

The normative model, in contrast, is premised on voluntary compliance derived from an internal obligation to follow the law – even when such behavior goes against self-interests (Tyler, 2006; Tyler and Huo, 2002). There are two distinct types of internal obligation: legitimacy and morality. The former is compliance defined by legal, external authority having the right to dictate behavior. The latter is a personal desire to act in accordance with one's sense of right and wrong, which is generally in line with the law. Compliance is premised on perceptions of legal legitimacy, and procedural fairness is "concerned with aspects of [individuals'] experience not linked only to outcomes. Normative aspects of experience include neutrality, lack of bias, honesty, efforts to be fair, politeness, and respect for citizens' rights" (Tyler, 2006:7).

Traditionally, policing and other forms of social control have been based on instrumental and deterrence models. This strategy is premised on the "expectation that people will react to the costs and benefits associated with accepting a particular decision, and it seeks to gain their compliance by significantly increasing the cost of noncompliance" (Tyler and Huo, 2002:9). This creates a culture of coercion where law enforcement act as the gatekeepers of order and social stability. This type of enforcement often takes the form of zero-tolerance and broken window policing strategies (i.e., aggressive enforcement of minor infractions). While some research suggests these policies are effective at crime control (Sousa and Kelling, 2006), others have offered less compelling results (Taylor, 2006). Additionally, these strategies are often costly and have been insufficient in explaining widespread public cooperation (Tyler and Walkslak, 2004). In fact, research suggests that these practices significantly damage police-citizen coproduction and perceptions of police legitimacy (Taylor, 2006).

Instead, Tyler (2006) argues that society should be premised on normative, process-based models, because legal systems are more stable when compliance stems voluntarily from personal and group morality. Tyler and Huo (2002) suggest that these strategies have several advantages. First, it likely increases individuals' willingness to cooperate with and agree to decisions made by law enforcement and judges. Second, it decreases the likelihood of secret non-compliance and/or open defiance of authority figures. Third, it reduces individuals' likelihood of harboring hostility towards legal actors by lowering the

risk they will act aggressively. This model also allows for flexibility in leadership, with rules generally followed so long as they are viewed as reasonable (Tyler, 2006).

Fostering compliance and legitimacy, according to Tyler (2006), is the main barrier. In general, research suggests that law enforcement could establish a symmetrical and mutually beneficial relationship between both parties – citizens and police– by acting in a procedurally just manner via impartial decision-making, exhibited through nondiscriminatory and respectful interpersonal treatment (Tyler, 2006; Tyler and Huo, 2002). It should be noted that while other concepts can influence compliance, such as the quality of service received by authorities (i.e., solving problems), the degree of perceived legitimacy is believed to be a primary determinant in citizen compliance (Tyler, 2006).

The legal processes individuals experience, above outcomes they receive, is crucial to establishing legitimacy. Tyler (2006: 162) posited that "procedural justice is the key normative judgment influencing the impact of experience on legitimacy." While Thibaut and Walker (1975) argued that people define fairness by their relative impact (voice) on decisions made by third-parties, Tyler (2006) alternatively, found that fairness may have little to do with control or outcomes. Tyler (2006) acknowledged that outcomes are still important, yet he argued that other aspects of the legal process, such as perceived fairness and honesty, are more meaningful.

Tyler's (2006) model identifies four main components to the process-based criteria: participation, fairness, respect, and trust. First is participation,

where feelings of fairness increase if citizens believe they have an opportunity to partake in the decision-making process. This includes having the ability to present their argument or point of view during an interaction with law enforcement. Individuals who perceive their participation as meaningful are more accepting of the outcome, even if it is not to their benefit. Second, perceptions of procedural fairness are connected to the extent of impartiality in the decision-making process (Tyler, 2006). Citizens believe that legal authorities should be unbiased and should form conclusions based on objective information. As such, they expect to be treated equally regardless of race, class, or gender.

Next, the interpersonal aspects of the interaction also impact procedural fairness. According to Tyler's model, individuals place great importance on the degree of politeness and respect afforded to them during face-to-face contacts with legal authorities. People are likely to feel disconnected from legal actors who treat them rudely or with indifference toward their rights. Finally, procedural justice is also influenced by the degree of perceived trust and honesty. Law enforcement and other authorities are judged based on their perceived motivations for engaging with individuals. Tyler and Huo (2002: 61) described this as motive-based trust: "inferences about the intentions behind actions, intentions that flow from a person's unobservable motivations and character." Thus, the intersection of these components, when present, means that legal authorities are likely to be perceived as just and deserving of compliance (Tyler, 2006). This is especially so if people perceive the police as morally aligned and acting as a representative of the larger social identity (Jackson, Bradford, Hough, Myhill,

Quinton, and Tyler 2012; Sunshine and Tyler, 2003).

In contrast, perceived unfairness likely weakens perceived legitimacy, which can result in alienation and non-cooperation (Sunshine and Tyler, 2003) as well as more widespread support for defiance and non-compliance (Fischer, Harb, Al-Sarraf and Nashabe, 2008). Indeed, research has found that if citizens perceive themselves as being treated in a procedurally just way, they will be less inclined to believe that they have been singled out for specific reasons. Tyler and Wakslak (2004), for instance, found that perceptions of racial profiling, specifically how profiling impacts fairness, is associated with the level of public support for law enforcement.

Overall, a large body of research has demonstrated a direct link between procedural justice and perceived legitimacy across an array of settings and populations, including law-abiding citizens (Hinds and Murphy, 2007; Mazerolle, Bennett, Davis, Sargeant, and Manning, 2013; Murphy, 2009; Paternoster, Brame, Bachman, and Sherman, 2007; Tyler, 1988, 2006; Tyler and Fagan, 2008; Tyler and Wakslak, 2004; Reisig and Lloyd, 2008; Tyler and Sunshine, 2003), victims (Elliott, Thomas, and Ogloff, 2012) and criminals (Papachristos et al., 2012). Tyler and Huo (2002), for example, examined the responses of 1,656 California residents to determine what factors contributed to shaping public perceptions of legal authorities (law enforcement and the courts). Specifically, the researchers were concerned with how attitudes towards authority impacted perceptions of legitimacy, decision acceptance, and voluntary deference. Overall, they found that procedural fairness, where participants described being treated fairly, was

paramount in their willingness to accept authorities' decisions. According to

Tyler and Huo (2002: 57):

> People are significantly more focused on the procedural justice of authorities' actions than they are on either the favorability or fairness of their own outcomes during personal encounters with police officers or court officials. This is true both when people voluntarily seek help from authorities and when they are being regulated by those authorities.

They also found that overall perceptions of procedural justice and motive-based

trust, critical elements for self-regulation and voluntary compliance, were

profoundly impacted by their assessments of the quality of decision making and

quality of interpersonal treatment (Tyler and Huo, 2002:96).

Mazerolle et al. (2013) recently explored procedural justice using a

randomized field study in Queensland, Australia. The researchers examined how

brief, business-as-usual police-initiated traffic stops compared to stops that

utilized key procedural justice concepts. Consistent with Tyler's (2006) study,

Mazerolle et al. (2013) found that individuals who perceived the interaction as

procedurally just had more positive specific and general views of the police.

Likewise, Hinds and Murphy's (2007) survey of 2,611 Australian residents found

that individuals who believed the police practiced procedural justice were more

likely to view them as legitimate and be more satisfied with police services.

Research suggests that perceptions of procedural justice and attitudes

towards the police are shaped during both direct and vicarious experiences with

law enforcement, as well as the courts and legal systems (Casper, Tyler, and

Fischer 1988; Murphy, 2009). A majority of the current research has focused on

direct, involuntary face-to-face interactions between police and citizens (Hinds

and Murphy, 2007; Mazerolle et al., 2013; Paternoster, Brame, and Bachman, 2007; Tyler, 2006; Sunshine and Tyler, 2003). Processes, especially regarding how people are engaged with by legal authorities (i.e., stops), are critical and can influence attitudes about the police more so than other factors including race and income (Braga, Winship, Tyler, Fagan, and Meares, 2014). For instance, Braga et al.'s (2014) randomized factorial experiment on 1,361 citizens found that factors such as the legality of police-initiated stops impacted citizen appraisals of police behavior.

While research suggests that citizen-initiated contact tends to produce more positive opinions (Cheurprakobkit, 2000), adverse attitudes, on the other hand, are commonly attributed to police-initiated negative and/or discriminatory experiences with police (Huebner, Schafer, and Bynum, 2004; Weitzer, 2000). This is especially salient among those with a strong ethnic identity (Lee, Steinberg, and Piquero, 2010), and African American and Latino minorities perceive and have disproportional experiences with profiling and police misconduct (Weitzer and Tuch, 2004). Brunson (2007)'s study of urban African American youth, for example, found that most youths' contacts with police stemmed from officer-initiated stops, which were commonly perceived as harassment. The officers' demeanor was often described as "hostile, combative, and threatening" (95) and police brutality was described as regularly part of direct and vicarious experiences. As such, "the combination of frequent involuntary police contact, coupled with what study participants considered poor treatment during such encounters, contributed to an accumulated body of unfavorable

experiences that collectively shaped young men's views of police" (95). Despite these findings, not all research suggests that unfavorable perceptions of police are attributable to negative interactions with law enforcement. For example, Jacob (1971) found that arrest experience did not result in a significant distinction in attitudes towards police between White and African American respondents, though African American respondents still viewed the police comparatively more negatively than their White counterparts.

Evidence also shows that attitudes towards law enforcement are formed via vicarious experiences from family, friends, and community members (Brunson, 2007; Hurst, Frank, and Browning, 2000; Papachristos et al., 2012; Weitzer, 2000; Wu, 2014). Social orientation plays a significant part in perceptions of law enforcement and voluntary compliance whereby obligation to obey the law and notions of legitimacy can stem from one's community (Tyler and Huo, 2002). This can be challenging, however, when neighborhood context is less favorable towards law enforcement. Particularly within disadvantaged neighborhoods, widespread negative opinions are likely to form if the police are viewed as ineffective at crime control (Kirk and Papachristos, 2011). If citizens feel they cannot rely on law enforcement for help, this can result in the proliferation of legal cynicism, "a cultural orientation in which the law and the agents of its enforcement, such as the police and courts, are viewed as illegitimate, unresponsive, and ill equipped to ensure public safety" (Kirk and Papachristos, 2011:1191). These negative sentiments can be culturally transmitted and result in a breakdown of efficient coproduction between citizens

and police (e.g. citizens do not inform police of crimes) and an increase in violence (e.g. administering of justice independently from the legal system) (Kirk and Papachristos, 2011). Social networks may also impact negative attitudes towards law enforcement. Specifically, friends' and family members' beliefs and experiences with the legal system may vicariously impact an individual's view of the police (Papachristos et al., 2012). This may be especially true for gang members, as friends and family are often intertwined and/or the group may act as a pseudo family for its members (Klein and Maxson, 2006). For instance, Papachristos et al.'s (2012) study found that gang members, particularly those with an abundance of criminal associates, were more likely than those with fewer criminal connections to view law enforcement as illegitimate.

In some cases, vicarious learning comes from the media, and evidence suggests this process may disproportionally impact African Americans (Rosenbaum, Shuck, Costello, Hawking, and Ring, 2005; Weitzer and Tuch, 2004). For example, Rosenbaum et al. (2005) examined survey data of African American, Latino, and White adult Chicago residents and found that African Americans and Latino groups were more likely to learn about negative experiences through friends, family, and neighbors. Whites, on the other hand, reported learning equivalent information through media outlets. Furthermore, Weitzer (2000) examined attitudes towards police following highly publicized incidents of police brutality and corruption and found, as expected, that the events were correlated with increased unfavorable ratings of police. While the three examined racial groups (White, African American, Latino) showed similar trends,

African Americans were found to have the most significant variation in the magnitude of attitudinal change, a finding consistent with extant literature that disapproval of police is most common among this ethnic group.

LIMITATIONS OF PROCEDURAL JUSTICE THEORY

Though procedural justice and legitimacy theory have been well established in criminological research, there remain limitations and areas in which it can be usefully expanded. Most of the critical literature does not refute major findings but instead suggests it is not optimally theorized (Bottoms and Tankebe, 2012). Specifically, the common criticisms include that Tyler (2006) and colleagues simplify how attitudes towards police are formed and the theory does not wholly account for varying constructs of legitimacy. Finally, the theory may not be universally applicable to settings that have differing definitions of normative police behavior, especially where systemic problems can impact expectations and perceptions of procedural justice and legitimacy.

The Construction of Attitudes Towards the Police

A major critique of procedural justice theory is that it fails to fully account for other influences that contribute to attitudes towards police and police legitimacy. As described above, perceptions are complex and not created in the vacuum of individual face-to-face encounters with police. Instead, an intersectional framework is required that explores how significant factors come together and contribute to an individual's orientation towards law enforcement and legitimacy. Given the importance of an intersectional investigation, I discuss

the following topics in much greater detail in section 2.2. I provide only a brief overview here. In short, direct and vicarious experiences with police, in conjunction with background factors like race, gender, age, and community context, can significantly contribute to varying opinions about law enforcement.

For example, African Americans have the least favorable attitudes towards police largely because they perceive different and comparatively more negative police behavior (Brown and Benedict, 2002, Cheurprakobkit, 2000, Lasley, 1994; Reisig and Parks, 2000). They are more likely than Whites to report personal encounters of discriminatory police behavior including experiences with police disrespect and misconduct like abuse (Mastrofski, Reisig, and McCluskey, 2002; Weitzer and Tuch, 2004). Women may have more favorable opinions about police because they may have fewer negative face-to-face encounters with law enforcement (Brick et al., 2009; Hurst et al., 2005). Juveniles, on the other hand, may hold comparatively more unfavorable attitudes because their friends share negative stories about their experiences, which can influence opinions (Brick et al., 2009, Papachristos et al., 2012). Community orientation, too, can influence individuals, where a history of ineffective policing and absent police support can contribute to widespread distrust of authorities and legal cynicism (Kirk and Papachristos, 2011).

Furthermore, no one experience can be solely responsible for attitude formation. Tyler (2006) generally focuses on the single involuntary face-to-face exchange. Instead, research suggests that attitudes are based on a culmination of previous experiences (Warrington et al., 2012), vicarious experiences of friends,

family, and community members (Brunson, 2007; Hurst, Frank, and Browning,

2000; Papachristos et al., 2012; Weizer, 2000; Wu, 2014), and from media outlets

(Weitzer and Tuch, 2004). As will be discussed, in response to this particular

limitation, the present study utilizes an intersectional framework that accounts for

the gang members' race, ethnicity, neighborhood context, as well as accounting

for experiences discussed by family and friends. Section 2.2 provides a thorough

discussion of these topics.

Constructions of Legitimacy

Another limitation of procedural justice theory concerns the construction

of legitimacy. Scholars have challenged the role of obligation, one of Tyler's

(2006) key measurements of legitimacy. Specifically, some suggest that the

presence of obligation does not wholly account for people granting police

legitimacy or behaving in a compliant manner (Bottoms and Tankebe, 2012;

Tankebe, 2013). According to Tyler and Sunshine (2003:514) legitimacy is

defined as "a property of an authority that leads people to feel that the authority or

institution is entitled to be deferred to and obeyed." Tyler (2006) posits that the

entitlement afforded to legal authorities largely stems from two types of internal

obligation to obey the law: (1) an individual's acceptance that those in positions

of power have a right to dictate their behavior and (2) because those in power are

acting in accordance with citizens' personal morality. Indeed, Tyler and Fagan

(2008: 235) later refined their definition to be as follows: "Legitimacy is a feeling

of obligation to obey the law and to defer to the decisions made by legal

authorities."

While Tyler (2006) and scholars argue that obligation is critical to establishing legitimacy and a primary measurement of its presence, expressions of obligation cannot always be equated to displays of legitimacy (Bottoms and Tankebe, 2012). In other words, even if individuals are obeying the law out of obligation, they may not being doing so because they view the legal authorities as legitimate power holders. Instead, obligation can stem from instrumental rationalizations where the cost of non-obedience may be too great. Laws are in place and the threat of repercussion should those laws be violated may be enough to encourage compliant behavior. Also, pragmatic reasons may be at play where following the law is simply easier than violating it. Finally, individuals may feel powerless and have no alternative but to obey authorities regardless of how they behave (Tankebe, 2013). Dictatorships or nations operating under colonial rule are common examples of cases in which those in power may be viewed as illegitimate, despite widespread public obedience (Tankebe, 2008). As Tankebe (2013:105) argues, "Given such possible responses, obligation can be considered a "dependent variable," sometimes explained by perceived legitimacy, and sometimes not."

In response to this criticism, Tankebe (2013:106) raised the question: "How, then, might public perceptions of police legitimacy be conceptualized and operationalized if "obligation" is inadequate as a measure of legitimacy?" The answer, scholars critical of Tyler suggest, is that procedural justice theory and constructs of legitimacy should draw from an intersectional framework that

accounts for both the power-holders and the audience in which the power is being exerted over (Beetham, 1991; Bottoms and Tankebe, 2013; Tankebe, 2013; Weber, 1978). Bottoms and Tankebe (2013) argue that legitimacy is best conceptualized as an ongoing dialogue between power-holders and audiences. The power-holders (police) make claims, the audience (citizens) responds, the power-holders may adjust claims based on the response, and so on. This is called "audience legitimacy" and these exchanges may take different forms depending on the society.

With the audience in mind, legitimacy should then be constructed as a dynamic intersection of three parts. First, there must be expressed consent among the population being governed. Second, there must be a degree of lawfulness whereby the public responds to the legality of how the power-holder came to their position and whether they exercise power in accordance with the laws of society (Tankebe, 2013). Third, legitimacy also requires that the rules enforced are justifiable based on shared beliefs of the public (Beetham, 1991, 2013, Bottoms and Tankebe, 2012, Tankebe, 2013). Shared beliefs include distributive justice, where fulfillment of the law is also important. Distributive justice refers the fairness of outcomes people receive as well as the distribution of those fair outcomes (Tankebe, 2013). It also includes procedural fairness, the perceived fairness of processes used to reach outcomes or decisions (Tyler 2006), as well as perceptions of police effectiveness. Indeed, all dimensions must be accounted for in order for legitimacy to be present. It is suggested then, that legitimacy can be more effectively measured by the degree of co-production (Taylor, 2005). When

legitimacy is present, "citizens will almost certainly be much more willing to

provide the police with a good flow of information about crime and social order"

(Tankebe, 2013:106). Ultimately, these criticisms illuminate that police

interactions with citizens are not one sided, and accounting for audience

perceptions, interpretation of, and response to police behavior and legitimacy is of

equal import as the understanding of power-holders' claim to and the exercising

of authority (Warrington et al., 2012). A dialogic approach, then, allows for a

more fluid and comprehensive construction of legitimacy (Bottoms and Tankebe,

2012). To account for this perspective, the present study offers a dialogic

approach by examining perceptions of procedural justice among gang members –

a population seldom examined in this context. By including opinions beyond

police perspectives and utilizing in-depth interviews to accomplish this

investigation, the present study is effectively contributing to literature that

provides more information about how diverse populations perceive and articulate

perceptions of procedural justice.

Generalizability to Diverse Settings

Another limitation of Tyler's (2006) theory concerns whether it is universal.

Tyler (2006) does not attend to the question of whether procedural justice theory

may extend to diverse settings. Instead, he implicitly seems to claim that the

theory's model would apply to all nations and that similar measurements and

expectations of procedural justice and legitimacy would likely transfer

accordingly. However, there is evidence that this may not be the case. Studies

demonstrate that the theory does not generalize smoothly to non-Western settings,

indicating the theory is not necessarily universal (Reisig and Llyod, 2009, Novich, 2015; Tankebe, 2009).

The majority of scholarship on procedural justice comes from democratic, Western nations (USA, Australia, United Kingdom) that generally have strong centralized oversight of police and can mitigate problems with law enforcement that can confound procedural justice and legitimacy (i.e. corruption, abuse of force, extortion). Further, other types of governance, like dictatorships or communist nations, may have differing valuations of what constitutes effective and expected policing. The fundamental understanding of justice may also be different depending on a nation's model of authority. In essence, these definitions may be locally defined and shift depending on the sociopolitical context. As such, Tyler's (2006) theoretical measurements concerning how procedurally just behavior connects to legitimacy may not be as effective in certain settings.

While some scholarship finds that the theoretical framework can generalize to certain non-Western settings (Reisig and Llyod, 2009), others have found this not to be the case (Novich, 2015; Tankebe, 2009). Specifically, some studies suggest that perceptions of legitimacy and fair procedures may not be as important in developing nations. For example, Tankebe (2009) explored procedural fairness and legitimacy in Ghana. Ghanan police reportedly exhibit violence, systemic corruption, and intimidation, and drawing from general survey data, Tankebe's (2013) findings did not support procedural justice and police legitimacy research. Instead, Tankebe (2009:1279) wrote, "people's expressions of obligation to obey police directives did not seem to have any statistically

significant relationship with their views of police trustworthiness." People's

stated compliance with police was shaped by more practical concerns such as

perceptions of police effectiveness in crime control (Tankebe 2009). These

findings support Tyler and Fagan's (2008) instrumental model of compliance,

where citizens work with police in order to combat crime and disorder in their

community. In this model, compliance is inspired by the public's self-interest in

creating a safe environment and doing what benefits the common good, with

perceptions of legitimacy being less important to their decisions and behavior[1]

(Tyler and Fagan, 2008). This study, among others, illuminates that procedural

justice research is premised on a Western understanding of individual's rights,

responsibilities and citizenship, and these concepts may not translate smoothly to

nations that have diverse models of governance, differing definitions of justice,

and context-specific expectations of police behavior. While an understandable

limitation, this concern does not apply to the present study because it is premised

in America, specifically San Francisco.

FACTORS THAT IMPACT ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE POLICE

While attitudes towards the police are generally formed during direct and

vicarious contact, evidence demonstrates that perceptions are significantly

impacted by an array of demographic characteristics. This includes

race/ethnicity, gender, age, neighborhood context, and criminal involvement.

---

[1] Tyler and Fagan recognize this as a model, but their research does not offer strong support for it, relative to the procedural justice model.

RACE/ETHNICITY

Race and ethnicity influence attitudes towards the police (Brown and Benedict, 2002). In general, African Americans have been found to view the police less favorably than Whites and other minorities (Brown and Benedict, 2002, Cheurprakobkit, 2000, Lasley, 1994; Reisig and Parks, 2000; Thomas and Hyman, 1977; Warren, 2011;Weizer and Tuch, 1999;Weizer, 2000; Hurst et al., 2000). Based on survey data of 1,225 subjects, Weitzer and Tuch (1999) concluded, "Race is the strongest predictor of attitudes toward the police and criminal justice agencies. Blacks are more likely than Whites to perceive racial disparities in policing and the criminal justice system and report personal experiences of discriminatory police treatment." This includes experiences with police disrespect and misconduct, including abuse and corruption (Mastrofski, Reisig, and McCluskey, 2002; Weitzer and Tuch, 2004). Similarly, Jacob's (1971: 73) classic study on perceptions of police found that "Blacks perceive the police as more corrupt, more unfair, more excitable, more harsh, tougher, weaker, lazier, less intelligent, less friendly, more cruel, and more on the bad than the good side than white respondents."

Latino evaluations of police are generally more favorable than African American evaluations but less favorable than White evaluations (McCluskey, McCluskey, and Enriquez, 2008; Cheurprakobkit, 2000; Weitzer and Tuch, 2004). Like African Americans, Latinos describe experiencing police bias and discrimination (Carter, 2002) and inappropriate police behavior (Weitzer and Tuch, 2004). Latinos are disproportionally the focus of police interventions, as

they are commonly overrepresented in police stops (Spitzer, 1999). Researchers

have assumed that the Latino experience with police mirrors that of African

Americans. Yet, new literature suggests Latino ethnic identity and cultural

background may differentiate them in important ways (see Rice, Reitzel, and

Piquero, 2005). What remains consistent, however, is that police interactions

have been an important aspect of their attitudes towards law enforcement (Tyler

and Fagan, 2008). For example, Carter's (1985) study of 500 Latino survey

respondents found that any form of contact with law enforcement seemingly

lowered their attitudes towards police. It is perhaps not surprising that research

has demonstrated that Latinos, as with African Americans, report less willingness

to comply with law enforcement (Mastrofski et. al., 2002; Tyler and Huo, 2002).

Asian evaluations of the police have been found to be more varied. Some

research suggests they have more favorable attitudes if they initiated contact with

law enforcement (Chu, Song, and Dombrink, 2005). However, they similarly

believe police behave in a biased manner (Wu, Smith, and Sun, 2013) and are less

likely to have favorable opinions if they have had previous contact with law

enforcement (Chu et al., 2005). Moreover, immigrants express a desire for more

bilingual officers and a greater understanding of cultural differences. Similar to

both African Americans and Latinos, however, quality of police contact has been

found to be the most impactful in terms of attitudes towards police (Chu et al.,

2005).

Among urban-based minorities, it is also essential to factor in immigrant

status, as research has suggested that it may impact the configurations of attitudes

towards police (Chu and Hung, 2010; Rengifo and Fratello, 2014). For example, Chinese immigrants may express more favorable opinions of police because they draw on experiences and perceptions of police from their country of origin (Chu and Hung, 2010). Other research suggests that foreign-born youth generally view police more positively in terms of effectiveness, but second-generation youth view law enforcement as less legitimate (Rengifo and Fratello, 2014). However, studies have found that the relative importance of immigration status on perceptions of police can be mitigated by the nature of police contact. According to Rengifo and Fratello (2014: 15):

> Exposure to involuntary police contacts, particularly stops, may matter more: Encounters that are perceived to be less fair are associated with more negative perceptions of effectiveness across all survey participants—with more strained encounters further decreasing the otherwise positive views on law enforcement by first-generation immigrants.

Rengifo and Fratello's (2014) findings mirror those of several others: while race is an important factor, the nature of police contact is arguably equal if not more important to perceptions of police (Cheurprakobkit, 2000).

GENDER

In conjunction with race, attitudes towards police appear to be influenced by gender (Hurst, McDermott, and Thomas 2005, Brick, Taylor, and Esbensen 2009). Hurst et al. (2005) studied 431 female youth, for instance, and found that the attitudes of African American and White girls differed significantly. Most importantly, race was a statistically significant indicator of attitudes; White females articulated more favorable perceptions of police than their African

American counterparts. Additionally the African American females reported being more profoundly impacted by vicarious experiences of police misconduct – including police brutality and deceit.

Attitudes towards the police also differ between men and women (Mandel, 2013), though studies have demonstrated conflicting findings. Some studies indicate that women have more favorable opinions about the police (Weitzer and Tusch 1999; Taylor, Turner, Esbensen, and Winfree, 2001). For example, Weitzer and Tuch (1999) found that African American women have more favorable opinions of the police when compared to men in their community. Taylor et al. (2001: 302) offer the following as a potential reason for gender differences in opinion:

> Males may be more likely to have adversarial run-ins with police due to disproportionate involvement in delinquent and criminal behavior. Alternatively, traditional gender roles emphasizing assertiveness and autonomy for males may have the unintended consequence of increased antiauthority sentiment. Each of these factors may potentially result in less favorable attitudes toward police among males than females.

On the contrary, literature has also shown that women's opinion about the police can be comparable to (Brick et al., 2009; Gainey and Payne, 2009) or even lower than men's (Flexon, Lurigio, and Greenleaf, 2009; Hurst and Frank, 2000). Scholars have attributed this to women vicariously learning about officer misconduct, such as sexual abuse, which has a substantial impact on their attitudes towards law enforcement (Brunson and Miller, 2006; Hurst and Frank, 2000).

JUVENILES

Age also impacts perceptions of police. The vast majority of research that has included age as a variable has found that juveniles view police less favorably than older persons (Cheurprakobkit, 2000, Hurst and Frank 2000; Lasley 1994, Sampson and Bartusch, 1998). While some research suggests that juveniles hold indifferent attitudes towards police (Taylor et al., 2001), others suggest juveniles hold strong opinions (Brunson 2007; Flexon et al., 2009, Leiber, Nalla, and Farnworth, 1998; Brick et al. 2009) and that those opinions are generally shaped by direct and vicarious experiences with law enforcement (Brick et al., 2009; Flexon et al., 2009). Leiber et al. (1998) found that any direct contact, positive or negative, with police lowered youth's attitude towards police. Though more negative perceptions, including reduced levels of trust (Flexon et al., 2009), were likely to form among youths who perceived police contact as harassment (Brunson, 2007) or when the contact resulted in arrest (Brick et al., 2009).

Further, involvement in subcultures, like gangs, and an increased commitment to delinquent peers and activities are associated with negative perceptions of law enforcement among youths (Brick et al., 2009, Papachristos et al., 2012). These negative perceptions can be exacerbated by environment, where individual strain, weaker community ties, and an increased fear of crime have been found to adversely impact youths' opinions of police (Brick et al., 2009). Like with adults, race has also been found to impact perceptions of police among juveniles. Perhaps not surprisingly, racial differences among youth tends to mirrors those of adults, with African American youths being the least supportive

of police, White and Asian youths being the most supportive, and Latino and

Native Americans falling in between (Hurst and Frank, 2000; Lasley, 1994;

Taylor et al., 2001). However, pro-social ties to the community may mitigate

negative attitudes. For example, Flexon et al. (2009) examined Chicago youths'

trust of police along four dimensions (priorities, respectfulness, dependability, and

competence) and found that trust was positively impacted by greater commitment

to school and teachers.

NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXT

Attitudes towards law enforcement are also impacted by contextual factors

including neighborhood characteristics like urban or rural settings. Residents of

small towns view police more negatively than city dwellers (Zamble and

Annesley, 1987), though the opposite has also been found (Albrecht and Green,

1977). Further, racial composition, crime, social disorder and decay can also

impact perceptions of police (Reisig and Parks, 2000; Zamble and Annesley,

1987) and citizens' willingness to report crime (Slocum, Taylor, Brick and

Esbensen, 2010). Among the most salient factors is the impact of concentrated

disadvantage; scholars have found that individuals living in these areas generally

hold lower opinions of law enforcement (Anderson, 1999; Gainey and Payne,

2009; Reisig and Parks, 2000) and the perception that police misconduct and

corruption is pervasive (Weitzer and Tuch, 2004).

Sampson and Bartusch (1998) examined opinions of police among 8,782

residents across 343 neighborhoods in Chicago and found that areas with

concentrated disadvantage (i.e., racially segregated urban neighborhoods that had

high levels of poverty, public assistance, unemployment, and female heads of

family) demonstrated elevated levels of legal cynicism and greater dissatisfaction

with police. The authors argued that there was an "ecological structuring to

normative orientations – 'cognitive landscapes' where crime and deviance are

more or less expected and institutions of criminal justice are mistrusted" (800).

Despite this, the relationship between citizens and police remains complicated and

contradictory (Carr, Napolitano, and Keating, 2007; Reisig and Parks, 2000).

Residents often hold negative views of police but simultaneously feel that tougher

law enforcement in their communities could reduce crime (Carr et al., 2007).

Further, they may rely on police to increase safety, yet find that officers may

simultaneously increase violence against citizens during crime reduction efforts

(Moore and Trojanowicz, 1988).

CRIME INVOLVEMENT

Given that the respondents in the present study are drug dealing gang

members, it is important to examine how crime involvement may impact attitudes

towards law enforcement and perceptions of legitimacy. According to Tyler

(2006), attitudes towards the police are often impacted by positive or negative

face-to-face interactions (Tyler, 2006). Officers are judged based on behavior

during immediate exchanges as well as behavior experienced during previous

encounters (Waddington et al., 2013). Those involved in delinquency may be

more likely to come in contact with police and the criminal justice system

(Slocum et al., 2006) and as such have more opportunity to experience comparatively more negative encounters with them. Indeed, evidence has shown that those criminally involved may experience deleterious police behavior. For example, Nichol's (2010) study of police interactions with transgender sex workers found that their encounters were often characterized by physical and verbal abuse as well as extortion (Novich, 2015; see also Miller 2002). Of equal import, the study revealed that police refused services and did not afford them protection when victimized, further contributing to the accumulation of negative encounters. Perceptions of police and legitimacy can be effectively measured in several ways; through direct attitudinal measures of perceptions of police and legitimacy but also in how law-breakers are found to respond to police and their directives. In this section, I will discuss the available literature that examines these questions among law-breaking groups.

Currently, there is limited research that directly measures crime-involved individuals' attitudes towards the police. There is also a notable lack of research that explicitly compares attitudes among law-breakers and non-lawbreakers. The few studies available indicate that law-breakers hold negative opinions about law enforcement (Lee et al., 2010; Papachristos et al., 2012; Novich, 2015; Rios, 2011). Papachristos et al. (2006) researched gun-offenders and gang members and found them to hold generally unfavorable attitudes towards officers. Another study that focused on sex workers had similar findings. Novich (2015) examined attitudes towards law enforcement among Sri Lankan sex workers and found they too often expressed unfavorable sentiments towards the officers. While not the

direct focus, several other investigations revealed similar sentiments among law-breaking individuals. Rios (2011), for example, found that some of the Oakland youth in his study, many of whom were involved in gang-life or drug dealing, described the police negatively. Many of Durán's (2009) gang-involved respondents also talked unfavorably about the police recalling experiences of police misconduct, unfair treatment, verbal disrespect, criminalization, and abuse of force. Of equal import, Durán indicated that non-gang involved individuals shared similar negative opinions about police given the regular suppression of their neighborhood and the erroneous labeling of minority youth as members. This suggested that gang-involved youths' opinions about police might not be so dissimilar or disproportionally negative relative to other individuals residing in over-policed communities.

In addition to research that examined opinions about the police, several studies have directly measured law-breaking populations' attitudes towards the legitimacy of the law and police. Despite their criminal involvement, evidence shows that law-breakers believe in the legitimacy of the law. They do so despite holding largely negative views of law enforcement (Lee et al., 2010; Papachristos et al., 2012).   Indeed, most deviant actors, including serious criminals, comply with the law a majority of the time (Papachristos et al., 2012). Papachristos and colleagues wrote: "Just like the general population, offenders believe in the overall legitimacy of the law, yet on average they tend to have overwhelmingly negative views of the police" (426). Yet, it is worth noting that those lawbreakers with greater criminal ties may view law enforcement as less legitimate than those

without (Lee et al., 2010; Papachristos et al., 2012). Papachristos et al. (2012)

found that social networks impacted perceptions of legitimacy. Specifically, core

gang involved respondents with very dense crime-involved networks held

significantly lower perceptions of legitimacy. In contrast, lawbreakers who were

non-gang members and non-core gang members with comparatively fewer

criminally involved social connections held more favorable perceptions of

legitimacy.

Lee et al. (2012) also investigated attitudes towards police and perceptions

of legitimacy among African American juvenile offenders. Like Papachristos and

his colleagues, they also found variations among lawbreakers. Specifically, their

study revealed that juvenile offenders with a stronger sense of ethnic identity

perceived higher levels of police discrimination yet they were found to express

greater levels of police legitimacy. The authors hypothesized:

> The increasing metacognitive abilities that make ethnic identity more salient for
> youth led them to be more aware of racial discrimination; at the same time, these
> abilities also made them mature enough to develop an understanding that the
> police were a necessary and legitimate institution for maintaining social order
> (787).

The researchers also found that experiences with procedural justice and offending

impacted perceptions of legitimacy positively. However, similar to

Papachristos's study, those more criminally involved and participating in a

broader array of offending types reported more negative perceptions of police

legitimacy.

Another means to examine perceptions of police legitimacy is through

expressions of co-production, or a citizens' willingness or unwillingness to assist

police in the safe-keeping of their environment (Taylor, 2005). Though not strictly the case (see Natapoff, 2009), criminally involved individuals generally do not partake in co-production as frequently as their non-crime involved counterparts (Goffman, 2009; Slocum et al., 2006). Slocum et al. (2006) examined how neighborhood context and individual attitudes and experiences, including involvement in delinquency, impacted rates of crime reporting among youth. They found that delinquent individuals were less likely to report crime. The authors hypothesized this may be because the youth were concerned with drawing attention to their own delinquent behavior or that of their peers.

It is important, then, to consider that for offenders, a lack of co-production may be unrelated to perceptions of legitimacy. While criminals may view police as rightful authorities, their criminal status may complicate their ability and/or desire to partake in the safe keeping of their environment and loved ones. For example, Goffman (2009) examined the pervasiveness of the criminal justice system among young, criminally involved men residing in a poor neighborhood of Philadelphia. She reported that those under state supervision were unlikely to report crimes – be it a personal victimization or a crime against a family or friend. These decisions were largely attributed to fear of arrest. Specifically, they were concerned with whether the contact would result in arrest if they had an outstanding warrant or how their reporting of the event in question could be treated as involvement in activities that were a violation of release terms.

Another indication of police legitimacy is compliance or the lack there of. Legitimacy is frequently measured by if and how individuals respond to police

directives during involuntary encounters. Obedience is typically a sign of

granting authorities with legitimacy whereas defiance is an indication of the

opposite. While this may be true of law-abiding citizens, it might not be measured

as easily among law-breakers. Indeed, research suggests that compliance among

law-breakers can be complicated (Novich, 2015). Some offenders may adhere to

police directives while others will not. These decisions may be unrelated to

perceptions of legitimacy, as the context of the stop, the persons involved, and

external factors like police corruption may also matter significantly. For example,

Novich (2015) recently studied sex worker's responses and obedience to police

orders when stopped. Her study revealed conflicting responses where some sex

workers acquiesced to officers' demands for both legal (i.e. stop when arrested)

and extra-legal requests (i.e. demands for sexual services and monetary support).

Other sex workers refused to comply with law enforcement directives. These

expressions of legitimacy were complicated by police corruption such that several

sex workers described compliance as an exchange of mutually beneficial services.

On the contrary, corruption contributed to other sex workers' vehement

opposition toward police and their requests.

On the whole, the aforementioned studies suggest that perceptions of

police and legitimacy can be complicated by criminal status. Crime-involved

individuals generally hold negative attitudes towards police but most, save for

those deeply embedded in criminal networks or involved in an array of offending,

also view police as legitimate. Regardless, they may be less likely to display

normative expressions of legitimacy, such as crime reporting, or may do so for

personal, non-procedural justice related reasons (Novich, 2015; see also Natapoff, 2009).

The review of this literature demonstrates that forming attitudes towards the police is an extremely complicated process. Many factors intersect – direct and vicarious contact with police and constructs of race, gender, age, neighborhood context, and criminal involvement – to contribute to favorable or unfavorable opinions about law enforcement. While certain extra-legal factors may be out of police control, they are responsible for their behavior during police-citizen interactions. There is a plethora of evidence that shows police practices are critical to variations in attitudes about law enforcement and behavior, especially racially based-decision making and misconduct – including abuse of force, deceit, and hostility – greatly impacts experiences and attitudes towards police. While current research has primarily examined law-abiding citizens, there are few studies that attempt to measure criminalized citizens' attitudes towards police, including gang members. Gang members, who are largely ethnic minority youths living in areas of concentrated disadvantage, and who are routinely in contact with police (Durán, 2008), likely have a unique view of procedural justice. Despite the need to understand gang members' attitudes towards the police, given its relevance for legitimacy and compliance (Tyler, 2006), there remains limited scholarship to illuminate such complexities.

STREET GANGS

In this section, I provide a detailed overview of the gang literature, including gang member demographics, structure, and targeted anti-gang law enforcement strategies. As will be discussed, gang members are generally young, ethnic minorities living in economically disadvantaged neighborhoods and are disproportionally involved in delinquency. As noted above, research suggests that race, gender, and age, in conjunction with neighborhood characteristics, significantly impacts experiences with and attitudes towards police (Brown and Benedict, 2002). Specifically, minorities in low-income neighborhoods report negative interactions with officers, which contribute to comparatively more adverse opinions of law enforcement (Sampson and Bartusch, 1998). Gang members, therefore, are a particularly useful population to examine in the context of procedural justice because they are frequently the focus of police interventions and often have repeated involuntary face-to-face contact with police (Katz and Webb, 2006). Given their demographic backgrounds and criminal involvement, it is probable that their interactions with law enforcement are extremely complicated.

BACKGROUND

Gangs have been the subjects of extensive empirical research since the 1920s (Thrasher, 1927) through the 1950s and 60s (Cohen,1950; Cloward and Ohlin,1966; Short and Strodtbeck, 1965). In the late 1980s and early 1990s, the proliferation of gangs was seen nationwide, especially in socially disorganized

and economically depressed neighborhoods that lacked collective efficacy,

resources, and access to social capital (Klein, 1995; Maxson, Egley, Miller, and

Klein, 2014). The most recent statistics from the National Gang Center (NGC)

estimated that in 2012, 30,700 gangs were operating in the United States, with a

majority being located in larger cities followed by smaller cities and suburban

counties (NGC, 2014). While there remains considerable debate about how to

properly define a gang, scholars largely agree on the following definition: "A

street gang is any durable, street-oriented youth group whose involvement in

illegal activity is part of its group identity" (Klein and Maxson 2006:4).

Since the 1950's, gang members were commonly identified as African

American, Puerto Rican, and/or Latino (Esbensen and Carson, 2012, 2014;

Esbensen and Winfree, 1998). This remains true in contemporary research, where

in 2011, the National Gang Center (NGC) estimated that Latino minorities made

up 46 percent of all gang members, followed by 35 percent African American,

11.5 percent White, and 7 percent Other (see also Esbensen and Winfree, 1998;

Klein and Maxson, 2006). There are also a number of Asian gangs and gang

members, though they generally differ in structure and criminal focus from other

ethnic street gangs (see Chin 1996; Toy, 1992; Klein, 1995). Ages of gang

members vary considerably across groups, between male and female members,

and geographic location. For example, members have been found to range from

10 years of age to 30 or older (Klein, 1995), though the NGC estimated that in

2011, a majority of the members were over the age of 18. However, the NGC

numbers draw from police reports, which are known to overestimate the

proportion of older gang members (Curry, Ball, and Fox, 1994).

Early gang research largely focused on male gang members. The NGC reports suggest that male members comprise approximately 93 percent of all gangs. As with age, the NGC's reliance on police estimates appears to overestimate the proportion of gang members who are male (Curry et al., 1994). Since the mid-1980s, there has been growing focus on understanding and examining female gang participation (Campbell, 1984; Joe-Laidler and Hunt, 1997; Miller, 2001, Peterson, Miller, and Esbesen, 2001). While previous research suggested that males join at higher rates than females, more contemporary findings indicated that young women are anywhere from a third to as many as half of all gang members (Esbensen and Carson 2012, 2014; Esbensen and Winfree, 1998; Miller, 2001). There is also evidence of female-only gangs (Joe-Laidler and Hunt, 1997; Peterson et al., 2001) yet there are significant variations among gangs in terms of gender composition (see Miller, 2001). Despite their prevalence, female involvement in gangs remains under-reported by law enforcement (Esbensen and Winfree, 1998). This is generally attributed to male members' greater likelihood of being involved in more serious gang crime (Esbensen and Winfree, 1998, Peterson et al., 2001). This may also be linked to age, where young men are more likely to retain ties to the gang into adulthood while women are more likely to exit during adolescence (Esbensen and Deschenes, 1998; Hunt, Joe-Laidler, and MacKenzie, 2005; Miller, 2001).

Gang membership is attractive for many reasons, although it can take several years of "hanging out" before an individual decides to join (Miller, 2001).

Scholars agree that individuals generally participate for emotional, social, and often economic reasons (Klein, 1995; Miller, 2001; Taylor, 1995; Vigil, 2002). Street gangs also provide access and social acceptance for delinquent behaviors and antisocial attitudes (Klein and Maxson, 2006). For example, researchers suggest that young men join to foster a sense of belonging, to be included in a family, for status on the streets, for protection, safety, to defend territory, to make money, and in some cases, for the excitement that comes with delinquent activities (Klein, 1995; Klein and Maxson, 2006; Taylor, 2008; Vigil, 2002). For women, membership can be linked to family problems such as violence, drug and alcohol abuse, weak supervision, and limited attachment to parents (Miller, 2001). For both, membership is strongly linked to having gang-related friends or family and/or to neighborhood context factors such as exposure to gangs or the presence of gangs in close proximity to their residence (Klein, 1995; Miller, 2001; Taylor, 2008).

GANG STRUCTURE AND DELINQUENCY

There are various different types of street gangs and contemporary scholars have long attempted to classify them. For example, according to Klein and Maxson's (2006:176-178) research, there are five overarching categories defined as follows:

> i. **Traditional Gang**– these gangs that have been in existence for 20 years or more, include subgroups. In some, members are separated by age (old v young), while others are separated by neighborhood. Members have a wide age range run and are generally very large in numbers (100 or more). They are almost always territorial and have strong identity tied to their neighborhood or turf.

ii. **Neo-traditional Gang** – these groups resemble the traditional gangs but have not been in existence for very long (10 years or less). They also tend to be smaller than traditional groups (50-100+). Their subgroups are likely based on age or neighborhood. Like traditional gangs, they are strongly linked to their turf.

iii. **Compressed Gang**–these gangs are generally small (50>) and lack formed subgroups. The age range is generally narrow among members as these groups have a short history (10> years). Some of these groups may be territorial, some may not be.

iv. **Collective Gang**–these emulate the compressed gang but are bigger (~100) and encompass a wider age range of members. They generally do not have formed subgroups and may or may not be territorial. They have moderate histories (10-15 years).

v. **Specialty Gang**–Unlike the other gangs, criminal focus of this group is narrow. They are largely identified by their 'specialty.' They are generally smaller in size (50>) and have no subgroups. They generally have short histories of less than 10 years but have established a distinct territory. The age range can be narrow or broad.

The researchers noted that these structures are largely based on male groups. However, as previously discussed, females can make up significant proportions of gang members. Studies that examined female gangs and gender organization generally employed Walter Miller's (1975) tripartite classification: (1) mixed-gender gangs, (2) "auxiliary" gangs, defined as female gangs that are associated with male gangs, and (3) independent female gangs. However, some scholars argued that this classification does not capture the nuances of gang formation and that it is largely male-centric (Hagedorn and Devitt, 1999).

Overall, gang-involved youth are more delinquent than their non-gang counter-parts (Bouchard and Spindler, 2010; Esbensen and Winfree, 1998;

Esbensen and Carson 2014; Miller, 2001). Deviant activities commonly include

drug use, drug sales, larceny, petty theft, stealing cars, damaging or destroying

property, assault, and property offenses (Klein and Maxson, 2006; Miller, 2001;

Peterson et al., 2001). They can also be involved in serious crimes such as gun

use and homicide (Miller and Decker, 2001). While this level of violence can be

part of gang activities, it is not commonplace (Klein and Maxson, 2006). Though

commonly discussed among members, violence is symbolically important and

many qualitative studies found that gang violence is relatively rare and not well

organized (Miller, 2001; Klein and Maxson, 2006). As Klein and Maxson (2006:

69) pointed out, "gang members spend much more time hangin' than bangin'."

Delinquency is commonly attributed to the gang's structure and

organization such that the more organized it is, the more likely the gang members

are to be involved in crime and victimization (Decker, Katz, and Webb, 2014).

As Bouchard and Spindler (2010: 929-30) found in their examination of 523

juvenile gang members:

> There is clearly something special about membership in a gang that
> influences delinquency beyond the more general membership in a
> delinquent group; and the key to understanding this finding lies, in part, in
> examining the more specific differences between gangs and delinquent
> groups. An important difference, we suspect, is to be found in the level of
> organization manifested by gangs compared to less formal delinquent
> affiliations….[O]rganization matters in understanding why gang members
> are more criminally active than group offenders [and]…some delinquent
> group members may be as criminally productive as gang members, to the
> extent that their group is sufficiently organized.

However, gangs are generally not sophisticated, highly organized groups (Decker

and Curry, 2002; Klein, 1995; Klein and Maxson, 2006). While sophisticated

organization may be true for a small percentage of street gangs, it is not for the

majority. For example, Decker and Curry (2002) examined gang organization in St. Louis with respect to leadership and organized gun-related homicides and found that gang members were most likely to be killed by others within the gang. This, the authors noted, "did not present a picture of gang homicide in which loyalty to fellow gang members controlled the choice of targets and victims for violence" (350). Instead, gangs are more moderate in their organizational complexity (Decker et al., 2014) and for many groups, there is high turnover of leaders and members (Klein and Maxson, 2006; Decker, Bynum, and Weisel, 1998).

Another important factor in terms of delinquency is gender composition (Joe-Laidler and Hunt, 1997; Peterson, et al., 2001; Miller, 2001; Miller and Brunson, 2000). Most notably, research has found that all-female gangs are less deviant than all-male gangs and both have lower rates of delinquency than mixed gender gangs (Peterson et al., 2001). For example, Peterson et al. (2001) analyzed the G.R.E.A.T data and classified youth gangs into four main categories of gender composition: all male, majority-male with some female members, gender-balanced, and majority or all female. The researchers compared the youth's descriptions of their groups' activities and individual delinquency patterns for male and females and found gender composition to be a significant determinate in shaping gang activities and individuals' propensity for offending.

This is likely due to gender differences in criminal involvement. While female gang members commit the same variety of less serious infractions as the male members, they generally do so at a lower rate (Esbensen and Winfree, 1998;

Esbensen and Carson, 2013; Peterson, 2014). This can include, for example, drug use, drug sales, and property damage (Miller, 2001). Male gang members, on the other hand, are more likely to be involved in more serious forms of delinquency, including homicide and gun use (Hagedorn and Devitt, 1999; Miller and Brunson, 2000; Miller and Decker, 2001). This imbalance may be a result of exclusion whereby male gang members omit women from dangerous and status enhancing activates, like drive-bys and shoot-outs (Miller, 2001; Miller and Brunson, 2000; Peterson et al., 2001).

STREET GANGS AND POLICE:
RESPONSE THE GROWING GANG PROBLEM

Aggressive police interventions on gangs have been on the rise since the mid-1980s, arguably in response to a moral panic about gang-related violence (see Cohen, 1980; Durán, 2008). At the time, efforts primarily focused on California given that it was at the epicenter of the nation's mounting gang problem (Katz and Webb, 2006). The legislatures declared a state of crisis and implemented several aggressive strategies statewide. In 1988, the State of California passed the Street Terrorism Enforcement and Prevention Act (STEP), a policy that made being in a gang a criminal offense. Using RICO as a model, STEP defined gangs as "street terrorist[s]" (Yoshino 2008) and it was primarily designed to increase prison sentences for offenders recognized as gang members (California Penal Code 186.22). Precincts statewide formed or expanded anti-gang units with police dedicated to aggressively monitoring, patrolling, and arresting individuals in high-gang areas (Katz and Webb, 2006). For example, San Francisco established its

gang unit in 1977 but amped up staff and efforts in the 1980's in response to increasing Latino and African American gang activity (sf-police.org, 2015). By 1999, over 55 percent of all major American police departments reported establishing a specialized gang unit focused on gang suppression (Katz and Webb, 2006).

Additionally, the state of California instituted Civil Gang Injunction (CGI) laws, flexible policies law enforcement could use to combat gangs (Maxson, Hennigan, and Sloane, 2005). These were defined as:

> a court order that prohibits alleged gang members and their "associates" from doing certain things—usually including association with one another, loitering, and other activities, many of which are already crimes—within a defined area or neighborhood" (aclunc.org 2015).

These laws enabled police to establish "safety-zones," areas where they could legally arrest individuals for non-criminal activity such as breaking curfew, carrying a cell phone, or being associated with "known gang members" including family members they might live with (RARC 2012)[2].

Though established in the early 1980's, the first gang injunction case was credited to Los Angeles district attorney James Hahn in 1987 (RARC, 2012). Since their inception, CGI laws were used moderately, yet in the mid-1990's there was a dramatic increase in their application (Maxson et al., 2005). Implementing a CGI is a lengthy and involved process, which often requires the police to collaborate with prosecutors (Maxson et al., 2005). The size of the gang, area and

---

[2]It should be noted that as of 2008, the San Francisco City Attorney's Office instituted an "Opt-Out Process" by which individuals could voluntarily request via petition they be removed from an enforcement list, either before an injunction has been issued or after a preliminary or permanent injunctions has been issued by the Court (memorandum)

defined prohibited behaviors can vary significantly (Maxson et al., 2005).

According to Maxson et al. (2005: 580):

> The number of gang members can range from a handful to hundreds, and the initial string of names is often followed by "and any other members." The targeted area can be a housing complex, several square blocks, or an entire city, but most often CGIs are spatially based, neighborhood-level interventions intended to disrupt the gang's routine activities. Prohibited behaviors include illegal activities such as trespass, vandalism, drug selling, and public urination, as well as otherwise legal activities, such as wearing gang colors, displaying hand signs, carrying a pager or signaling passing cars, behaviors associated with drug selling.

There are conflicting findings as to the effectiveness of gang injunctions (Maxson et al., 2005; Grogger, 2002; sfcityattorney.org, 2015). Research has shown that in the first year of implementation, injunctions resulted in a short-term decrease of crimes such as homicide, rape, robbery, and aggravated assaults (Chavez, Chatters, Follett, Grasska, Kyle, Nielsen, Stone, and Young, 2004). Additionally, they have been found to be an important aspect of larger strategies to reduce and impact gang activities, especially when combined with community programs like training to improve confidence and interpersonal skills (Chavez et al., 2004). Grogger (2002), for instance, examined data from 14 injunctions imposed in Los Angeles in 14 different areas. He contrasted the crime rates and found that reported violent crimes, especially assault, dropped between 5 to 10 percent compared to the pre-injunction period.

On the other hand, while Maxson et al. (2005) similarly found that in the short-term, injunctions impacted the level of gang presence, reported gang activity, and fear of gangs, these results did not extend to longer time periods. Injunctions were found to have no significant impact on social cohesion,

perceptions of neighborhood safety and social disorder, collective efficacy, and police-community relations. However, assessing the effectiveness remains problematic because there is no single law enforcement strategy, there is limited data, and relatively few attempts at measuring the outcomes of these policies, especially over time (Chavez et al., 2004).

Law enforcement in California also developed a gang database, called CalGang (RARC, 2012), which attempted to collect detailed information about gang members (oag.ca.gov, 2015). Most of the information utilized to populate this database was collected during routine stops or stop and frisks, via photos taken with and without individual's consent, and using social media sites like MySpace and FaceBook (RARC, 2012). Perhaps not surprisingly, African Americans and Latinos male youths were the majority of individuals identified and labeled as gang members (Rios, 2011). As of 2012, there were 201,094 individuals in CalGang of which 94.8 percent were male, 66 percent were Latino and 20 percent were African American. The highest proportion of individuals was aged 20-24.

Another piece of gang-related legislation was implemented in 2000, when California voters passed Proposition 21. This policy targeted juveniles (14 years and older) and modified the STEP Act to make it easier to prove gang membership (Yoshino, 2008; Chavez et al., 2004) and increase penalties for crimes previously deemed misdemeanors. According to California's Legislative Analyst Office, Proposition 21:

> Changes laws for juveniles and adults who are gang-related offenders, and those who commit violent and serious crimes. Specifically, it (1) Requires

more juvenile offenders to be tried in adult court. (2) Requires that certain juvenile offenders be held in local or state correctional facilities. (3) Changes the types of probation available for juvenile felons. (4) Reduces confidentiality protections for juvenile offenders. (5) Increases penalties for gang-related crimes and requires convicted gang members to register with local law enforcement agencies. (6) Increases criminal penalties for certain serious and violent offenses.

This enabled police to add youths to the gang-database for any reason, such as for dressing in a particular way, wearing gang-related colors, or being seen in the company of known gang members. This was particularly dangerous for minority youths because it increased the likelihood they would be tried as a gang member and given a longer sentence if arrested of a crime thereafter (Rios, 2011).

Though there are obvious benefits of a gang database, heavily skewed numbers have raised concerns about their controversial use (Barrows and Huff, 2009). Specifically, there are concerns about state-run databases accurately identifying gang members, including individuals erroneously being placed in databases, and/or omitting important gang-related persons (Barrows and Huff, 2009). Scholars have suggested that gang databases infringe on civil liberates such that inclusion can result in stigmatization and the limiting of economic opportunities (Jacobs, 2009). Also, the actual process of being added to a gang database has raised concerns with due process whereby "police, prison, and jail can label an individual as a gang member without affording him or her any opportunity to contest the label and without notifying the individual that the labeling has occurred" (Jacobs, 2009: 707). While databases may be useful and necessary for law enforcement, there remain systemic problems that can contribute to serious, life-altering consequences for those included.

Furthermore, despite the potential benefits of utilizing criminal laws such as STEP, Proposition 21, and CGIs to combat street gangs, law enforcement agencies have faced several problems with these tactics (Bjerregaard, 2003). Due to definitional vagueness regarding what constitutes gangs, membership, and members, these laws generally contribute to officers racially profiling minority youths (Bjerregaard, 2003). Law enforcement target individuals based on their neighborhood context, ethnic background and on clothing, tattoos, and colors regardless of the fact that these styles are representative of popular street fashion (Bjerregaard, 2003). This has resulted in the over-representation of innocent juveniles who were not gang-involved (Bjerregaard, 2003; Rios, 2011). Gang-suppression tactics are not focused on addressing sources of gang development and gang membership (see Bjerregaard, 2003, Lemmer, Bensinger, and Lurigio, 2008), rendering them unsuccessful at deterring gang-involved youth from engaging in law-breaking and deviant behavior (Maxson, Matsuda, and Hennigan, 2011). Indeed, police might be more effective if restructured to focus on root causes of gang membership and activities like a city's respective drug-trade (see Lemmer et al., 2008). Despite their ineffectiveness, definitional broadness, and the questionable constitutionality of these statutes, STEP, CGI, and Proposition 21 and the other aforementioned policies have survived a series of legal challenges and remain in effect today (Bjerregaard, 2003; Chavez et al., 2004, Yoshino, 2008).

Given these aggressive policing practices, it is perhaps not surprising that problems with police behavior have surfaced. This includes stereotyping,

intimidation, abuse, and violence against gang members. For example, the Los

Angeles Police Department developed an anti-gang unit called CRASH

(Community Resources Against Street Hoodlums), which, in some precincts, was

found to have developed subcultures that personified the 'war-on-gangs'

mentality (Katz and Webb, 2006). The officers in these subcultures began acting

on assumptions that all Latino and African Americans were gang members and

needed to be removed from the community via any means possible. CRASH

officers began ignoring rules, processes, and policies and were ultimately found to

have attacked and falsely accused known gang members and regularly choked and

punched gang members in order to intimate them (Katz and Webb, 2006).

Katz and Webb (2006) suggest that some of these behavioral problems

may stem from the gang unit officers and the training or lack thereof they receive.

In their cross-city comparison of gang unit officers, Katz and Webb (2006)

examined the gang unit officer, his or her pathways into the gang unit, the training

they received prior or during their post, and what they did while on the job. In

general, these officers were male, in their 30's, spent at least seven years on the

force and were ethnically representative of the larger police force in which they

operated (see Katz and Webb, 2006:166). Managers selected potential gang unit

officers based on several criteria of which the following four were determined to

be the most desirable: self-motivation (i.e., officers that were aggressive in the

field and could operate with minimal supervision), prior experience with gang

units or gangs, ability to speak a non-English language, and ethnic diversity (Katz

and Webb, 2006:168). Curiously, prior investigative experience was not among the most desired qualifications.

Once on the force, each officer received training, though the quality and process varied significantly across precincts (Katz and Webb, 2006). Overall, the researchers found that gang unit officers started their new position with limited preparation on how to police gangs and gang members, as many had minimal experience with gangs prior to joining the special unit. For example, the Albuquerque gang unit had no formal training process but allocated a pre-determined sum of money for each officer to use to attend conferences or classes of his or her choice. In general, gang unit officers felt the best training was obtained while working in the field (Katz and Webb, 2006). Many, though, expressed that there were challenges to overcome, especially with regard to how to perform their new duties. This included their being unclear about the units' practices and policies and how to conduct investigations (see Katz and Webb, 2006: 177-178).

When on the street, gang unit officers' time was generally divided between a series of responsibilities (see Katz and Webb 2006:200-235, Durán 2008). Among the most important were *enforcemen*t such as directed patrol (i.e., suppression tactics targeted at gang members in minority neighborhoods, public housing complex, and parks) and *intelligence gathering* (i.e., stopping presumed gang members in order to document those who were in the database, add those who were not, and gather information about their gangs). It was not uncommon for officers to stop minority youths based on appearance (i.e., gender, race, and

clothing), neighborhood context, for minor infractions such as jaywalking, and/or for perceived suspicious activity (Katz and Webb 2006; Durán 2008).

Though specific to Albuquerque, Inglewood, Phoenix, and Las Vegas, Katz and Webb (2006) illuminated why gang unit officers decided to interact with certain citizens. Their work demonstrated that gang unit officers might employ racial profiling and stereotyping, which clearly challenged the neutrality of procedural justice. Breaking down these components, we can unpack factors that impact how police target gang members, such as the police deciding to stop individuals based on *race, age, clothing, gender, neighborhood context, and criminal involvement*. This gives specific criteria from which to examine police behavior and how perceptions about police, procedural justice and legitimacy might be formed among gang members.

POLICING BASED ON APPEARANCE: RACE, AGE, AND CLOTHING

When policing gangs, race is a profound indicator of whom the police will stop. They generally focus efforts on ethnic minority male youths (Katz and Webb, 2006) wearing clothing, such as baggie pants, certain colors, brands, or hoodies that may be associated with gangs (Durán, 2008; Miller 1995). Indeed, research has found that legal actors identify gang-involved youth based on their dress (Miller, 1995). For example, Miller (1995: 219) found that probation officers measured gang members' relative involvement and commitment to their group by their "gang uniform." Key indicators included specific brands and types of shoes, socks, pants, hats, belts, and jackets. In fact, clothing, as a gang symbol,

became an important component of law enforcements efforts such that "officers

within these units are trained to orient themselves toward the suppression of

gangs, gang members, and gang style" (Miller, 1995:230).

This has been described as *legitimated profiling* where officers were

effectively allowed to stop citizens based on their ethnic background, clothing,

age, and demographic status, even when they were following the law at the time

of the stop (Durán, 2008). Durán (2008)'s study examined the experience

Mexican American youth gang members had with police and his findings began

to unpack the complexity of police interactions. He found that individuals were

stopped based on their Latino background, being male, wearing urban attire, and

being in certain neighborhoods. This created confusion, feelings of harassment,

and anger among the youth. Durán (2009: 163) posited that the problem lay

within the actual practice of gang enforcement. It resulted in:

> (1) racialized profiles, (2) fabricated intelligence, and (3) suppression of
> marginalized communities. The problem became not that of law…but
> rather the enforcement of laws. Gang units legitimated the social control
> of people beyond involvement in crime to include perceived criminality.

Enforcing the law has manifested in policies that employ racial profiling;

such as such as stop, question, and frisk policies (Carroll and Gonzalez, 2014;

Gelman, Fagan, and Kiss, 2012; Fratello et al., 2013; Spitzer, 1999;Weitzer,

2000). These policies disproportionally focus on minorities – a finding that

extends to both adults and juveniles (Stewart, Baumer, Brunson, and Simons

2009). For example, Spitzer (1999) analyzed New York City police practices to

determine how often Whites were stopped when compared to minorities. Spitzer

(1999) found that African Americans were 50 percent of all persons stopped

despite being 26 percent of the city's population and Latinos were 33 percent of

the stops yet were 24 percent of the total population. Whites, in contrast, were 43

percent of the city's population but constituted only 13 percent of the total stops.

While these initiatives are designed to increase public safety and mitigate

crime, they may not have the desired outcome (Spitzer, 1999). More importantly

and to the detriment of police-community relations, police visibility in

neighborhoods has been associated with perceptions of police harassment

(Brunson, 2007; Gau and Brunson, 2010; Yuning, 2014) and heightened levels of

trauma and anxiety among young urban men (Geller et al., 2014). A recent study

conducted by Vera Institute of Justice, for example, surveyed 500 New York City

residents between the ages of 18 and 25 and found that 44 percent of the sample

had been stopped 9 times or more and less than a third were informed as to the

reason. Additionally, 71 percent reported being frisked, 64 percent reported being

searched, 45 percent encountered an officer that threatened them, and 46 claimed

they experienced police use of physical force.

It is not surprising then that research demonstrates stop and frisk and

related practices negatively impacts experiences of procedural justice, perceptions

of legitimacy, and compliance. For example, Gau and Brunson (2010) examined

the intersection of procedural justice and order-maintenance policing among

young socioeconomically disadvantaged urban men. The men, as consistent with

previous literature, felt stereotyped and harassed, especially when stopped and

frisked for no justifiable reason (Durán, 2008). They also expressed concerns

about the unequal application of the law and about being criminalized and

routinely targeted based on their neighborhood. The men also raised concerns

about their interpersonal treatment, noting they were subject to discourteous and

verbally abusive behavior. As a result, the young men routinely interacted with

law enforcement in an uncooperative manner. As such, Gau and Brunson (2001)

concluded, "aggressive order maintenance manifesting in the form of widespread

stop-and-frisks can compromise procedural justice and, therefore, undermine

police legitimacy" (273). As described above, law enforcement policies directed

at gangs – especially in California, where this study takes place – appears to

exacerbate the extent to which they are targeted for such policing practices.

POLICING BASED ON GENDER

There is growing evidence that gender influences policing patterns

including who they stop, what they stop citizens for, and how they interact with

them during the point of contact (Brunson and Miller, 2008; Gabbidon, Higgins,

and Potter, 2011; Novich, 2015; Visher, 1983). Widespread cultural beliefs of

gender differences and inequalities are reproduced on an individual level through

everyday "social relational contexts" (Ridgeway and Correll, 2004:511). This is

defined as "any situation in which individuals define themselves in relation to

others in order to act" (Ridgeway and Correll, 2004:511). How individuals

describe themselves, behave, and expect to be treated is linked to gendered

hegemonic cultural beliefs.

Contemporary research indicates that gender influences criminal justice

organizations, including prisons and police forces (Britton, 1997; Herber, 2001;

Ulicki, 2012). This extends to policing gang members where officers are more

likely to detain men than women. Durán (2008), for example, found that the

Mexican male gang members were disproportionally the focus of police

interventions, despite the presence of female members. This may be because

officers act upon the assumption that men are more likely than women to be

involved in criminal behavior, especially among urban minority youth (Brunson

and Miller, 2008; Durán, 2008). Brunson and Miller's (2008) study of African

American youth, for example, found that race and gender dictated their

interactions with police. The young men described the police as "prejudicial"

because they felt routinely labeled as suspects regardless of criminal involvement

(Brunson and Miller, 2008:541). The women, conversely, described being

stopped for less serious infractions like curfew violations (Brunson and Miller,

2008). The women also did not report feeling criminalized like their male

counterparts. In some cases, women also reported being less likely than men to

experience unfair treatment on behalf of police (Gabbidon et al., 2011). This is

especially so among women who behave in accordance with middle-class

standards (e.g. older, White, and submissive), as police have been found to treat

them more chivalrously than African American women (Visher, 1983).

It is perhaps not surprising that gender can complicate experiences with

police and perceptions of procedural justice during citizens' points of contact.

Novich (2015), for instance, examined perceptions of police legitimacy among Sri

Lankan sex workers and male police officers and found that the women routinely

experienced gender-motivated police behavior that signaled problems with

procedural justice on all four criteria (respect, fairness, trust, and participation).

For example, the sex workers reported experiencing and witnessing physical and

verbal abuse, derogatory gendered comments, and solicitation for sexual services.

Despite the failings of procedural justice, the sex workers chose to comply with

extralegal requests for sex and money, in some cases, because it helped the

women navigate the system. This study suggests that compliance, police

practices, and perceived procedural justice are profoundly impacted by gender

dynamics. Given that gangs have different gender composites, including all male,

all female, and mixed-gender group, gang members may perceive and/or

experience significant differences in whom the police engage with and how they

act during involuntary face-to-face contacts.

POLICING BASED ON NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXT

Gang control typically takes place in urban neighborhoods that have high

concentrations of racial isolation, poverty, crime, and high unemployment (Durán,

2008; Klein and Maxson, 2006). Gang unit officers routinely patrol known gang

hotspots, which commonly include minority neighborhoods, public housing

complexes and parks (Katz and Webb, 2006). Living in specific neighborhood, in

conjunction with one's ethnicity and race, therefore increases one's likelihood of

being profiled, stopped, and detained by police (Durán, 2008; Katz and Webb,

2006). Further, minority youths are stopped when going into other

neighborhoods. In Durán's (2009) study, for example, police routinely stopped

youths who traveled to other parts of their city under the predication that they were "causing problems with rival gangs" (152). To complicate matters further, evidence demonstrates that police behavior shifts depending on the neighborhood in which the police are operating (Kane, 2002). Specifically, research shows that when officers work in areas of perceived heightened danger, which includes high crime and concentrated disadvantage, they are more likely to use greater levels of force (Terrill and Reisig, 2003).

Racially based policing also extends to neighborhoods where police perceive minority youths to be out of place. For example, African Americans and other minorities are more likely to be stopped when in certain types of neighborhoods. Stewart et al. (2009) examined the intersection of neighborhood conditions and racially based policing among African American youths and found the adolescents reported significantly higher levels of perceived racially-based police decision-making in predominantly White neighborhoods that had an increasing African American population. Similarly, Carroll and Gonzalez (2015) examined police contact among drivers and revealed that police routinely stereotyped African American drivers who seemed "out of place." As a result, African Americans were more likely than Whites to report being stopped and frisked.

POLICING BASED ON DRUG INVOLVEMENT

It is also common for gang members to be involved in drug dealing (Decker and VanWinkle, 1994; Fagan, 1989; Levitt and Venkatesh, 2000). In

fact, the respondents in the present study were all drug-dealing gang members and it is likely they had routine encounters with narcotics officers (Moore and Kleinman, 1989). Of late, the so-called war on drugs has contributed to aggressive targeting of street-level drug offenders, profiling drug traffickers, increasing rates of incarceration, and lengthening sentences for those convicted (Engel, Smith, and Cullen, 2102; Scalia, 2001). It is perhaps not surprising that individuals charged with drug related offenses have increased substantially in recent decades. In 2007, there were more than 1.8 million drug related arrests, a number that has more than doubled since 1982 (see BJS, 2007).

Like gang task force police, narcotics officers have also been found to disproportionally target and arrest minorities (Beckett, Nyrop, and Pfingst, 2006; Engel et al., 2012; Kochel, Wilson, and Mastrofski, 2011). This is despite evidence that people of all ethnicities use and sell illegal drugs at similar rates (Alexander, 2010; Jacques and Wright, 2015). According to the 2010 Census, African Americans make up 13.6 percent of the population but account for nearly 32 percent of drug arrests in the United States (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2010; Rastogi, Johnson, Hoeffel, and Drewery, 2011). Further, a recent meta-analysis of 40 arrest studies using 23 data sets found with "strong consistency" that race impacts arrest decisions and minorities are more likely to be arrested than White suspects (see Kochel et al., 2011). There may be several reasons that contribute to this outcome, like neighborhood context (Katz and Webb, 2006), differing concentrations of police presence in some areas (Engel et al., 2012), and/or personal biases (Durán, 2008). Research on street-level drug enforcement

has found that three factors may be responsible for an overrepresentation of minorities in drug arrests. First, police have been found to a focus on crack cocaine, a drug sold predominantly by African Americans. Second, police efforts generally target African American or ethnically diverse outdoor drugs markets. Finally, the police do not monitor White outdoor drugs markets with the same level of attention as the predominately minority outdoor markets (Beckett et al., 2006, Engel et al., 2012).

Indeed, anti-drug law enforcements strategies are extensive. Of particular import is that these policies are often premised on treating drug dealing gang members as "organized criminal enterprises" (Moore and Kleinman, 1989). This is despite evidence that sales among gang members are seldom well organized (Moore and Kleinman, 1989; see also Decker and Van Winkle, 1994). Regardless, police employ techniques traditionally used against such groups. According to Moore and Kleinman (1989:6), this includes:

> (1) the development of informants through criminal prosecutions, payments, and witness protection programs;
> (2) heavy reliance on electronic surveillance and long-term undercover investigations; and
> (3) the use of special statues that create criminal liabilities for conspiracy, extortion, or engaging in criminal enterprise

Law enforcement routinely conduct "city-wide, street-level drug enforcement" which seeks to disrupt drug dealing by forcing dealers and buyers indoors or having markets move with enough frequency that participants have trouble locating each other (Moore and Kleinman, 1989:8). These tactics primarily incorporate the use of criminal informants whereby involved individuals, be they sellers or buyers, identify (other) dealers for the police to arrest (see Natapoff,

2009). In fact, the use of informants has resulted "in the heaviest concentrations

of drug-related arrestees and convicted offenders in the country" (Natapoff,

2009:103). Law enforcement will also attempt covert strategies like buy-and-bust

operations where officers disguise themselves in an attempt to complete a

transaction with a seller (see also Jacobs, 1996). Officers also arrest individuals

following observed transactions (Moore and Kleinman, 1989, Weisburd and

Green, 1995) where sellers are witnessed from observation vans, patrol cars, on

CCTVs, or from building rooftops. Finally, police also attempt to arrest those

who seemingly look intent on purchasing drugs (Moor and Kleinman, 1989).

Neighborhood-level and hot spot crackdowns are another strategy often

used by narcotics officers (Moore and Kleinman, 1989; see also Weisburd and

Green, 1995). In these efforts, police may leverage resources and systematically

"engage business owners and citizens in crime control efforts, to apply pressure to

reduce drug and drug-related activity at hot spots through police crackdowns, and

to initiate a maintenance program with the assistance of the patrol division of the

department" (Weisburd and Green, 1995:713). To do so effectively, police collect

information about the physical, social, and criminal aspects of the area, consult

historical crime data, and surveil the hot spots. They also establish relationships

with local business owners and residents who are invested in the safekeeping of

their community (Moore and Kleinman, 1989;Weisburd and Green, 1995).

Following this, the police will conduct major "crackdowns" via raiding multiple

houses in specific areas. These crackdowns can last several hours and involve

numerous officers from different precincts (Weisburd and Green, 1995). Finally,

the police seek to maintain their efforts post crackdown and may do so through surveillances of the hot spot and increasing police presence if needed. The larger hot spot areas can also have foot patrols in place for up to one-week post crackdown (Weisburd and Green, 1995).

Given these efforts, drug dealing gang members likely have many involuntary face-to-face interactions with narcotics officers. As the above studies illustrate, narcotics officers disproportionally target minorities and may engage with them in ways that damage perceptions of procedural justice. For instance, the use of informants can erode trust and signal unfair police behavior "because it represents the open toleration of crime by the very people charged with enforcing it" (Natapoff, 2009:115). Additionally, being routinely stopped on the street for drug-related information and not while engaged in delinquent behavior may result in gang members questioning police motives. Finally, aggressive police presence during neighborhood crackdowns may contribute to gang members forming negative sentiments towards law enforcement. It is thus of equal import to see if and how the officers are perceived during these encounters, especially in terms of procedural justice and legitimacy.

As the review of this literature demonstrates, policing gangs is a multifaceted process rife with complex issues concerning race, gender, neighborhood context, drug involvement, attitudes towards law enforcement, and officer training and behavior. This dissertation will explore the extent to which these matters are intertwined and collectively impact perceptions of procedural justice and legitimacy among drug-dealing gang members, a population that

routinely engages with law enforcement, but may experience questionable police practices and behaviors. The goal is to unpack gang members' experiences and explore how law enforcements' behavior is perceived under the lens of this theoretical framework. This examination hopes to make significant contributions to an area of research relatively underdeveloped: an examination of law-breaking and criminally involved individuals' attitudes towards law enforcement. By comparing male and female interpretations, this study will provide important and timely knowledge concerning police behavior that is seldom verbalized outside their community. It will also hopefully identify the points in contact where co-production begins to breakdown and provide thoughtful insight to better improve relations between gang members and police.

CHAPTER 3: STUDY SETTING

In this chapter, I provide an overview of the study setting during the time the data were collected. This includes a discussion of the city demographics, policing in the San Francisco Bay area, an overview of police misconduct and perceptions of police, as well as gang activity in this setting. While the present study focuses solely on San Francisco, I include relevant background information on the neighboring area of Oakland given its proximity to the study site and similarities in policing history, police practices and citizen attitudes towards law enforcement within the region.

THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

All of the research participants in the study spent most of their time in the more distressed areas of San Francisco. This included the Mission District and the Tenderloin, areas known for being "downright scary"(Chang, 2010). In fact, the San Francisco Bay Area was an ideal place to draw data from because the areas the subjects resided in typified highly segregated urban neighborhoods that resulted in social and economic isolation, extreme poverty, and high levels of violence. They were also the focal point of aggressive anti-gang policing strategies outlined in the previous chapter (Rios, 2011).

San Francisco is home to approximately 805,235 individuals, of which 48.5 percent are White, 31 percent are Asian, 15.1 percent are Latino, and 6.1 percent are African American (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). As of March 2009, during the period in which the data were collected, the annual median household income for San Francisco residents was $70,770 (city-data.com, 2015). However, the median income for African Americans and Latino residents was $31,863 and $53,448 respectively. Oakland, located just across the Bay from San Francisco, has an estimated population of 411,480, of which 34.5 percent are White, 28 percent are African American, 25.4 percent are Latino, and 16.8 percent are Asian (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). The average median income was $48,196, yet for African American and Latino residents this was $31,939 and $47,270 respectively (city-data.com, 2015). While these may be considered livable wages in other parts of the country, the San Francisco Bay area maintains an exorbitant cost of living, on par or even more expensive than New York City (Rapacon, 2014). In

fact, the costs of living in San Francisco and Oakland are 61.6 percent and 36.1 percent above the national average (Rapacon, 2014). Finally, at the time the data were collected, the unemployment rate in the Bay area hovered around 10 percent (BLS, 2015), with the highest areas of unemployment concentrated in Oakland (Rios, 2011). Oakland's high unemployment was attributed to the flight of industrialization, which resulted in massive job loss throughout the community (Rios, 2011).

The Bay area, especially Oakland, has had a strong presence of minorities since the 1940's. African Americans migrated from the South during World War II to find war-industry jobs. However, at the end of the war, Oakland began to de-industrialize and African American communities faced rising unemployment (Murch, 2007). In 1964, the federal government officially labeled Oakland as a depressed community and in the absence of basic needs, community leaders became heavily involved in civil rights (Murch, 2007). By the 1980's, African American communities faced enormous rates of unemployment, the crack epidemic, punitive crime policies, and an influx of Latino immigrants. During the late 1980's and early 1990's, Latino populations primarily migrated from the south attracted by the availability of low-income housing. Today, many of the African American neighborhoods in the Bay area have large Latino populations. These neighborhoods are commonly referred to "Blaxican," areas in which African Americans and Latino cultures continually integrate with each other (Rios, 2011).

POLICING IN THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

The modern San Francisco police force (SFPD) was established in the late

1800's and since its formation, has faced significant challenges due to the city's

cultural, linguistic, and ethnic diversity (Chu and Hung, 2010). Most notably, the

Bay area has a history of punitive, racialized social control (Bloom and Martin,

2013;Murch, 2007; Rios, 2011). This is defined as the regulation and repression

of citizens based on their race by rules and policies formed by the governing class

(Ward, 2012). The most famous example of racialized control in the Bay area

was in the 1960's and 70's with the formation and subsequent aggressive policing

of the Black Panther Party (BPP), a group primarily comprised of urban minority

youth (Bloom and Martin, 2013; Seale, 1970).

According to Seale (1970), the BPP formed in response to the murder of

Malcom X, the atrocious treatment and criminalization of African Americans and

anti-racists across the country, especially at the hands of police forces. Bloom

and Martin (2013: 2) articulated, "the Panthers saw black communities in the

United States as a colony and the police as an occupying army." They rejected

the legitimacy of the United States government and initially, the group challenged

the local police climate by organizing armed patrols (Bloom and Martin, 2013).

However, as the group became more established, they moved away from direct

confrontations with police and focused more on grassroots organizing. The BPP

sought to impact and empower the lives of impoverish African American

communities by addressing their immediate concerns (Bloom and Martin, 2013;

Murch, 2007). They did this through programs such as the Free Breakfast for

Children Program, Free Pest Control Program, Free Shoe Program, Free Busing to

Prison Program, and the Free Food Distribution Program (Bloom and Martin,

2013). Further, their ideological concerns and criticism of the government

resonated through their communities.

Given the law-and-order movement sweeping the country and rising

concerns about African American criminality, the BPP became the focal point of

police interventions. Edwin Meese, who acted as Oakland's district attorney

before joining Ronald Reagan's staff in 1967, became tasked with controlling

BPP (Rios, 2011). He implemented harsh policing policies that sent many BPP

members to jail and he infamously cracked down on a student and community

activists' protest in People's Park in Berkeley. By the 1970's, concentrated

government efforts diminished the influence and impact of the BPP. Given that

the BPP was originally organized as a youth group, its vacuum had a significant

impact on the community. "Left without resources for mobilization and punitive

securitization, deindustrialization and the decline of social-welfare programs,

gangs and drug dealing became a new modality for some marginalized young

people in Oakland" (Rios, 2011:33; see also Alonso, 2014).

In the wake of research rejecting rehabilitation, the late 1970's in the Bay

area was characterized by "tough on crime" campaigns, zero-tolerance and

incapacitation strategies (Rios 2011). Rehabilitation programs were defunded and

'just deserts' became the new model of punishment. By the 1980's, California

law enforcement focused on gangs and related violence given the increase in gang

activity, a trend seen nationwide (NYGS, 2009). According to the Legislature:

> The State of California is in a state of crisis which has been caused by violent street gangs whose members threaten, terrorize, and commit a multitude of crimes against the peaceful citizens of their neighborhoods. These activities, both individually and collectively, present a clear and present danger to public order and safety and are not constitutionally protected (California Penal Code 186.21).

Further, the Legislature stated, "there are nearly 600 criminal street gangs operating in California, and that the number of gang-related murders is increasing"(California Penal Code 186.21). In response, San Francisco implemented many of the programs outlined in Chapter 2, including the expansion of gang unit officers, enforcement of the STEP Act, Proposition 21, and the implementation of civil gang injunctions.

POLICE MISCONDUCT IN THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

At the time the data for this study were collected (2007-2011), there was an increase in reports of police misconduct in the Bay Area. In San Francisco, for example, Police Chief Prentice E. Sanders suspended his assistant chief and five other top commanders based on allegations of criminal corruption (Murphy, 2003). In addition to those six, three police officers were also indicted on charges of assault and battery. Those officers were reportedly involved in a street brawl while off-duty and attempted to cover-up the situation (Murphy, 2003). In 2009, a total of five officers and one former officer were reportedly involved in stealing property and thousands of dollars in cash from drug-dealers, shaking down parolees, and stealing from their precinct's evidence room (Eskenazi, 2014). While only two plain-clothes police officers were convicted of corruption, the remaining individuals involved also faced disciplinary action (Egelko, 2014).

Additionally, the district attorney's office declared that it would drop dozens of

drug and robbery cases as result of this misconduct (McKinley, 2011).

There were also reports of police corruption in Oakland. In 2003, the

highly publicized "Riders Case" resulted in a civil suit against police charged with

planting drugs on suspects (Walter, 2012). In response to this case, the department

was subject to court monitoring. Despite the department promising to implement

reforms to address misconduct, disciplinary procedures and to improve use-of-

force reporting, the department has yet to fully realize these changes (*Allen v City

of Oakland*, 2012).

PERCEPTIONS OF POLICE IN THE BAY AREA

At the time the data were collected, attitudes toward San Francisco and

Oakland police varied among minority groups, but were generally negative

especially among African American and Latino juveniles. For minority youths,

research showed negative interactions with police often started at an early age,

sometimes 12 or younger, and frequently in or near school (Rios, 2011). In some

cases, the police were reported to handcuff juveniles while on school grounds

(Rios, 2011). These public arrests were often described as embarrassing and

resulted in adverse and criminalizing interactions with teachers (Rios, 2011). On

the streets, San Francisco and Oakland youth, particularly those involved in

gangs, routinely experienced unwarranted stop and frisks, arrests, as well as

physical violence at the hands of police (Rios, 2011). This contributed to a

culture of non-compliance and inherent distrust of law enforcement. According to

Rios' (2011) study of young Oakland minority gang members, young men were

"regularly incarcerated through false accusations, police 'setups,' entrapment, and

forced testimonies led many of the boys to declare a vow against ever providing

information to police, even when they were the victim" (60).

Expressions of distrust and non-compliance were also echoed among

African American and Latino adults. A recent study of 40 Oakland residents

reported that the residents viewed Oakland police as impartially enforcing the

law, serving as a mechanism for racial and economic segregation, and not

enhancing public safety (Armeline, Vera Sanchez, and Correia, 2014: 375-6).

The police "do not 'protect and serve' community members, but instead represent

a real, even organized ('gang') threat to the safety of respondents of color"

(Armeline et al., 2011: 393). The researchers argued the police were not

perceived as legitimate actors of the state and perhaps legitimacy could be applied

broadly across different ethnic groups that experienced questionable police

practices.

Though there is limited research on Chinese and other Asian minorities'

perceptions of police in the San Francisco area, a recent study of Chinese

immigrants elucidated that they typically have less than favorable attitudes (Chu

and Hung, 2010). In fact, the longer the Chinese immigrants resided in San

Francisco, the more negatively they perceived the police. Moreover, only 30

percent of the respondents in their study believed law enforcement were effective

in crime control (Chu and Hung, 2010). While this study focused on Chinese

immigrants, more research is needed to examine the experiences of American-

born Chinese youth and adults along with other minority populations more generally.

GANGS IN THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

Minority youth gangs have been prevalent on the streets of San Francisco since the 1920s following a deindustrialization of the city (Agee, 2014, BII, 2010). Early gangs were predominantly African American and Latino males who grouped together for neighborhood social affairs (Agee, 2014, BII, 2010). In the 1960's, these groups became disproportionally engaged in delinquent activities including violence, burglaries, and robberies. By the 1970's and 80's some of these gangs became heavily involved in narcotics trafficking and Latino gangs also became known for increases in violence and for using a variety of weapons including guns, AK-47s, sawed off shot guns, brass knuckles, and bats (see BII, 2010). Also by the 1970's, the state of California acknowledged the rise of Asian gangs following a highly publicized mass shooting in a Chinese restaurant (Toy, 1992). In the early 1990s, Toy (1992) uncovered that there were at least seven active Asian groups operating in the Bay Area: the Wah Ching, the Suey Sing, the Hop Sing, the Asian Invasion, the Eddy Boys, the Chinese Playground Boys (a.k.a CP boys), and the Ping Boys.

At the time the data were collected, the San Francisco Bay Area still had an active gang presence. In 2010, according to CalGang, California's official gang-member database, the San Francisco Bay Area had approximately 465 gang members in its system (Latino = 145, African American = 274, White = 21, Asian

=6, Pacific Islander = 5, Unknown = 14) and there were approximately 80 gangs

operating in the Bay area (BII, 2010). However, given definitional issues and

challenges accurately classifying gangs and gang members, these numbers were

likely inaccurate. There were several high profile gangs operating in the Bay

area. This included, for example, the Norteños, also known as "Northerners" a

Latino street gang, as well as their rivals the Sureños, also known as

"Southerners." Additionally, the Bloods and Crips, rival African American gangs

were active as well as Broke Niggas Thieven (BNT). A number of smaller gangs

not listed above were also operating within the Bay Area. This included, for

instance, the Sugar Hill Gang, Jackson Boys, The Cream Team, and the Local

North Side Gang (LNS) (see Hunt and Joe-Laidler, 2011).

The city had five major districts in which gang activity was pervasive and

gangs claimed turf: Bayview-Hunter's Point, Visitacion Valley, Fillmore/Western

Addition, the Mission, and South of Market District. These districts were home to

several large public housing communities. Hunt and Joe-Laidler (2011) suggested

that gangs operating in specific territories were often ethnically homogenous,

though a smaller number of groups were ethnically mixed. For example, the

Mission District had primarily Latino gangs and Bayview-Hunter's Point and the

Fillmore/Western Addition areas had predominantly African American gangs.

According to Hunt and Joe-Laidler (2011:10):

> Within these prominent districts, there are distinct gangs, many of which
> are smaller groups that vie for position, drug sales, and territory. Gang
> members congregated, for the most part, in the areas where they lived.
> Generally, these young people in their early teens, between the ages of
> 13 and 15, began to spend more of their time with their peers in gang-

related territories. The streets became the primary domain for their social lives and drug sales."

Though official law enforcement reports indicated these groups were not highly organized, they were found to be involved in a variety of delinquent behaviors including robbery, vandalism, drug dealing and trafficking, prostitution, and inter and intra gang violence (see BII, 2010). This resulted in increased law enforcement efforts focused on mitigating their activity (BII, 2010). They did so by imposing gang injunctions. Indeed, the San Francisco Office of the City Attorney obtained civil gang injunctions against The Bayview/Hunters Point-based Oakdale Mob, the Mission-based Norteño gang, the Visitacion Valley-based Down Below Gangsters, the Visitacion Valley-based Towerside gang, the Western Addition-based Chopper City gang, the Western Addition-based Eddy Rock gang, and the Western Addition-based Knock Out Posse gang (sfcityattorney.org, 2015). Law enforcement also aggressively policed individuals based on key identifiers, including race, clothing, and non-verbal gang communications. According to the Bureau of Investigation and Intelligence (2015:10), African American gang members could be recognized by "common non-verbal gang communications such as graffiti, hand signs, symbols, colors, and tattoos" as well as subtle inclusion of "gang colors in belts, shoe laces, hats, or sports attire meant to represent their gang." Latino gangs like Sureño members, for instance, could be identified by "the color blue, which is frequently displayed in their clothing. Tattoos often seen on Sureño members include their set or clique name: Sur, Sureño, Southerner, three dots, and various forms of the number 13, such as X3, XIII, and the Aztec symbol for 13" (BII, 2010:7).

CONCLUSION

This review of the study location revealed that the San Francisco Bay Area had many active gangs at the time the data for this study were collected. Gang members were the focus of routine police interventions during which the officers were conditioned to use race, gender, and appearance in guiding their efforts. The gang members were also predominantly young, ethnic minorities operating in low-income and economically depressed neighborhoods. This, in conjunction with ongoing issues of police misconduct and negative attitudes towards law enforcement, makes the Bay Area an ideal location in which to study gang members' interactions with officers and examine their perceptions of procedural justice.

CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY

DATA

The present study employs secondary data from a federally funded research initiative on gender and drug sales. The original project was titled "Gangs, Gender, and Drug Sales: A Qualitative Study" and was a 42-month study funded by the National Institute of Drug Abuse (R01 DA 021333). The project began at the end of September 2007 and ended in August 2011 and was based in the San Francisco Bay Area in California. The dataset, which consists of 253

interviews, is excellent for examining the perceptions of procedural justice and police legitimacy among gang members for several reasons.

First, all study participants described being involved with a gang, though self-described levels of engagement varied. Some reported being regularly involved, seeing gang friends on a daily basis, while others were less active, seeing these friends on an infrequent basis. Also, all the subjects were actively involved or had been engaged in selling drugs at the time the interviews were conducted. Given that San Francisco and the surrounding areas had been aggressively policing gangs and related drug dealing, the men and women in this study reported extensive experience with involuntary police interactions.

Next, the original data project was premised on a gender comparison. As such, the data included an equal sample size of both male and female subjects. Additionally, the interviewees were asked specific gender comparison questions, such as their perceptions regarding whether and how police treat men and women differently. Finally, the interviews were ideal because of the depth and breadth of the data collected. Salient concepts concerning perceptions of procedural justice became apparent through conversation that might not have been revealed in survey data. Most importantly, the open-ended questions enabled the interviewers to ask important and compelling follow-up questions. This was especially valuable when a gang member described being stopped by police, as the interviewer could probe for details of the exchange. Additionally, the large and ethnically diverse sample, which is unusual for a qualitative data set of this

nature, also allows for some degree of generalizability and the investigations of patterns across both race/ethnicity and gender.

DATA COLLECTION

The following is an overview of the data collection process, as described by Drs. Geoffrey Hunt from the Institute of Scientific Analysis and Karen Joe-Laidler at the University of Hong Kong, the principal investigators on the original project (Hunt and Joe-Laidler, 2011). The data were collected between 2007 and 2009 and included a total of 119 young men and 134 young women who self-identified as gang members and reported selling drugs. The principal investigators chose to define gangs using Klein's (1971) classification, which refers to any group of youths who: "a) are generally perceived as a distinct aggregation by others in their neighborhood, b) recognize themselves as a denotable group, [and] c) have been involved in a sufficient number of [illegal] incidents to call forth a consistent negative response from neighborhood residents and/or enforcement agencies" (Klein, 1971: 13). Location-wise, the research focused on areas that had reports of active gangs. This included the following San Francisco districts: the Mission, Bayview/Hunter's Point, the Tenderloin, Portrero Hill, Visitacion Valley, Western Addition, Chinatown, Bernal Heights, Excelsior, and South of Market.

To tap into gang networks and reach previously unknown gang members, the principal investigators partnered with community based organizations (CBOs) that were located in these districts. According to Hunt and Joe-Laidler (2011: 6):

> We developed contacts within these communities and specifically with local community based organizations and individuals with expertise in domains of interest that were significant within the gang arena. Some of the CBOs were located in neighborhoods where gang members live or congregate, and often serve particular youth populations based on ethnicity or other affiliations.

Key personnel in the CBOs connected with and invited participants to partake. Additionally, the data were collected via chain-referral sampling (Biernacki and Waldorf 1981; Browne, 2005). According to Hunt and Joe-Laidler (2011: 7), "given that the group being explored is hidden, by virtue of illegal activities such as violent crime and drug selling, it was necessary to utilize snowball or chain referral sampling, a method that allows for access and entree into the group and group settings."

The interviewers conducted in-depth interviews with gang members that were one-on-one and face-to-face. The interviews had a pre-coded quantitative portion. The quantitative questions captured socio-demographics and background data as well as data regarding their group's specific features (i.e. size, gender composition, location, etc.), number of times arrested, types of drugs sold, and general experiences during their time selling drugs. There was also an open-ended qualitative component and these questions covered a range of topics including family, gang involvement, arrests, detention history, and drug sales experiences. The in-depth semi-structured questions prompted narrative accounts, personal stories, and descriptions of the social context for gang behavior, drug sales, criminal activities, and interactions with law enforcement among the young men and women included in the study. The questionnaire is included in the appendix.

As per the principal investigators, the topic areas covered by the interviews included:

> Background and current life (family history, educational experiences, neighborhoods, early exposure to alcohol, drug use, criminal activity and gangs), Initiation into the gang; Group (gang) relations and gender relations (structure and organization of the group, solicitation of new members, relations within the gang, gender perceptions within the gang); Group Activities (extent of involvement in gang activities, level of involvement, criminal activity or violence in the group context; group rituals); Substance use (history and current use); and Drug Sales (including initiation into drug sales, motivations for and meaning of sales; drug selling role and relationships, gender dynamics of drug sales, drug selling contexts, and risks and consequences of drug sales) (Hunt and Joe-Laidler 2011:7).

Given that the present research will be a gendered comparison of experiences with procedural justice and interactions with police, among the most salient inquiries in the original study included, "Tell me about the first time you were busted" and "Do you think men/women are equally likely to get caught?," along with probing follow up questions when respondents described interacting with police during these and other portions of the interview.

There were a total of five interviewers hired for the project. Three were women, one White, one African American, and one Latina; and two were men, one African American and one Latino. The principal investigators made efforts to match the interviewers to communities in which they had previous experience or where their ethnicity might aid their data collection efforts. All interviewers had knowledge concerning the gang scene, as they either had previous gang ties or were involved as community workers who regularly engaged with this population. Their familiarity with street and gang life, along with their background

characteristics and experience, helped them to develop rapport with the research participants.

The interviews lasted approximately two to three hours and were held at various locations including libraries, residences, youth centers, churches, dining establishments, and in some cases, cars. The interviews were primarily conducted in English, however several respondents occasionally answered questions in Spanish. In those cases, the interviewer, who was proficient in the language, translated the responses[1]. At the conclusion of the interviews, respondents were given a $75 honorarium for their participation and an additional $25 if they successfully recruited up to two additional interviewees. The interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed verbatim by a project staff member[2]. To ensure anonymity, all respondents were assigned a pseudonym.

---

[1] It could not be ascertained if the interviewer translated the response during the interview or during the transcription stage. The interviewers were not the transcribers.
[2] It should be noted there were some redaction challenges with the several of the transcriptions. There were two transcribers on the project and one in particular redacted their transcripts extensively. This rendered some portion of the data unreadable and unusable as details, specifics, or context of the interviews could not be established. This was not common and only impacted a small fraction of the entire dataset.

To enhance reliability, Hunt and Joe-Laidler (2011: 8) note:

> As in all our gang interviews, the interviewer is required to make judgments about the veracity of responses by individual gang members. This involves the interviewer assessing both general truthfulness of the respondent and the extent to which inconsistencies existed. Part of this assessment is intuitive; part comes from interviewers' own knowledge and understanding of the community and of the gangs, which inevitably increases over time as the interviewer gains a larger overall knowledge base of the gang scene. In addition, multiple members of the same gang are often interviewed and consistent stories further validate the data that interviewers are given. Finally, the interviewer also conducts periodic field observations to further cross check respondents' veracity.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE

The dataset encompassed a diverse group of young men and women. The data were divided almost equally between men (N=112) and women (N=137). The largest ethnic group in the sample was African American (54 percent, N=137) followed by Latino/as (primarily Chicano/Mexicano, but also including Central American) (27 percent, N=68). These groups were followed by Asian American or Pacific Islanders (API) (10 percent, N=25) and finally, the sample included 17 individuals who identified as multi-racial, four Whites, and one that identified as Other. A majority of the respondents described coming from impoverished neighborhoods and from families that struggled with legal employment, drugs sales, incarceration, and substance abuse.

In general, the respondents' age ranged from 14 to 39 years. The majority of the sample was in their late teens and early twenties, with the mean age being 21.6 years. The respondents' educational backgrounds varied. A large percentage (80 percent) reported dropping out or being kicked out of school at some point during their academic career. While most (70 percent) eventually

returned to a different school, 9 percent eventually received a GED, and 18

percent did not to return to school. Almost half (47 percent) reported attaining

less than 12 years of education, however several respondents were underage

and/or currently engaged in schooling at the time of the interviews. Just over half

of the sample (51 percent) completed high school and a small percentage (1.6

percent) reported some amount of post-secondary education.

The difficulties research participants encountered in school, their criminal

records and limited work history impacted their abilities to find legitimate

employment and as a result, they commonly hustled (sold drugs). Approximately

a quarter of the sample (24percent) reported being legally employed in some

capacity. However, just over half (57 percent) reported that drug sales were their

primary source of income, followed by a smaller number who stated that legal

employment was their primary income source (14 percent). A small percentage

relied on government support (8 percent) and family (6 percent) for income.

Based on the definition employed by the principal investigators (see Klein

1971), all respondents were considered gang members though not all viewed

themselves as such. There were approximately 40 gangs/groups represented in the

sample, and groups varied in terms of size, gender composition, history, and

organizational structure and ranged from small 10-person neighborhood, school,

or block cliques, to well-established larger gangs with 200 (or more) members. A

majority of the groups were loosely defined with no structured hierarchy and were

generally ethnically homogenous. The gendered organization of the gangs varied.

Most commonly, the gangs described being mixed gender (43 percent). The next

most common type were auxiliary gangs (24 percent), where men and women were connected to a single gang but hung out in separate subgroups. A small number of the gangs were all female (12 percent) or all male (18 percent).

The gang members sold a range of substances. The most common was marijuana (sold by 86 percent of respondents in their lifetimes) and crack cocaine (sold by 72 percent). How the drugs were sold varied. Many of the male and female gang members described selling drugs individually. However, many others sold in groups taking turns. In some cases, the gang provided access to supplies and customers, however, there was a great deal of variability in terms of the role of drug sales within the gang. For some, it was only tangentially related, while for others, it was described as an important part of the gang activities.

The gang members' exposure to police and the criminal justice system varied. Many youth described having a family member, such as a parent, cousin, sibling, or uncle, incarcerated or described having dealings with law enforcement. Several described having their house raided either as a result of a family member being engaged in illegal activities or because police had watched them dealing drugs and planned a raid. A majority of the men and the women reported being arrested or stopped by police and/or spending time in juvenile detention, jail, or prison. They were arrested for a range of crimes such as stealing, robbery, loitering, drug sales, possession, gun possession, and home invasion.

The men and women's experiences with police differed. Approximately, 88 percent (N=105) of the men reported being arrested, with many recounting it as a routine aspect of their lives. About a quarter of the men in the sample

described being arrested 20, 30, or even upwards of 50 to 100 times[1]. The

average number of arrests per male was 9.6[2] times. On the other hand,

approximately 75 percent (N=100) of the females described experiencing at least

one involuntary face-to-face contact with police. The vast majority of the women

reported being stopped one, two, or three times, with a small number (N=16)

being stopped 10 times or more. The most number of encounters reported by one

female was 30 stops. The average number of contacts per female was 4.5 times.

Table 1: Overview of the Respondents in the Sample

	Male Gang Members (N= 119)	Female Gang Members (N=134)
Average Age	22.1 years	21.2 years
Racial Composition	African American (N=58) Latino (N=42) Asian (N=11), Multi-Racial (N=7) White (N= 1)	African American (N= 79) Latino (N=26) Asian (N= 14) Multi-Racial (N=11) White (N=3) Other (N=1)
Number of Respondents Stopped	105 (88%)	100 (75%)
Average Number of Stops	9.6 times	4.5 times

---

[1]One male respondent described being arrested 302 times of which 300 were for public intoxication. He described wanting to be arrested for public intoxication so that he could have somewhere, like jail, to sleep for the night.
[2] The male respondent who was arrested 302 times was omitted from the averages, given that he was an outlier. Including him, the average was 12.5 arrests per male respondent.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESIS

The purpose of this project is to examine interactions between police and male and female gang members and explore how police behavior is perceived, perceptions of procedural justice are formed, and attitudes towards law enforcement are constructed among this group. Gang members are predominantly minorities, engaged in comparatively more delinquent activities than non-gang related youth, and are embedded in neighborhoods with concentrated disadvantage. As such, they experience routine interactions with law enforcement. This research will examine how male and female gang members describe the police, compare their accounts and perceptions of law enforcement, and examine how they articulate expressions of procedural justice. This study aims to uncover if police actions are perceived as biased (i.e., impacted by the citizen's appearance in terms of age, gender, and clothing) in the neighborhood in which the gang member is stopped and how these experiences may vary by race/ethnicity. I also seek to examine how these experiences are impacted by the context of the encounter (i.e., whether they were engaged in illegal behavior or not at the time) and how these experiences relate more broadly to perceptions of procedural justice.

The impacts of racialized and biased police behavior are especially salient in terms of perceptions of procedural justice and legitimacy, concepts premised on neutrality and fairness (Tyler and Wakslak, 2004). It is through the lens of law-breaking sub-groups one can also examine the extent or lack thereof that procedural justice is afforded to all citizens, regardless of race, class, gender,

neighborhood context and criminal involvement. Finally, police gang is a complex issue and as such, a goal of this study is to uncover important and timely knowledge on how police are perceived so they can better improve their relationships and interactions with gang members.

By comparing male and female accounts and perspectives, I can provide a thorough examination of gang members' experiences and provide insight into a group rarely researched under this theoretical framework. Thus this research seeks to investigate the following questions:

- Are the police perceived as engaging with gang members based on biases such as being stopped because of race, gender, age, clothing and/or location?
- If so, how do these perceived behaviors shape perceptions of procedural justice among male and female gang members of different ethnicities?
- How are perceptions of procedural justice impacted by the context during which they are approached (i.e., actively engaged in law-breaking behavior or not)?
- How are these perceptions similar or different among the men and women?

DATA ANALYSIS

To identify relevant data, I read through all 253 interviews, approximately 20,000 pages, given to me by the principal investigator, Dr. Geoffrey Hunt. Each interview was approximately 80 pages. After reading the interviews, I created two dedicated data files, divided by gender, which included any discussions related to interactions with the police and criminal justice system. I also included

any relevant data on perceptions or opinions of police, family experiences with

law enforcement or the legal system, and time spent in juvenile or adult detention

facilities. Each data set was approximately 850 pages. Throughout the process, I

kept notes on each respondent in a corresponding Excel spreadsheet. For

example, if a particular respondent described a detailed experience with police, I

made note in a corresponding box next to his or her name. Once the files were

finalized, I evaluated the data through a rigorous thematic analysis strategy that

incorporated a data-driven inductive approach and a thematic deductive

evaluation based on a theoretically derived template of codes (see Fereday and

Muir-Cochrane, 2008). I also engaged in qualitative hypothesis testing through

my analysis (Crabtree and Miller, 1999).

I started with a rigorous data-driven inductive analytic coding strategy.

Initial coding or open coding is defined as "the early process of engaging with and

defining data. Initial coding forms the link between collecting data and

developing an emergent theory to understand and account for these data"

(Charmez, 2014:343). I did this by reading through the datasets several times to

identify and flesh out experiences and themes concerning experiences with law

enforcement. This included coding for family experiences such as a parent or

sibling in jail, personal experiences with prison, jail, or juvenile detention, and

number of times arrested. I also coded for anytime interactions with police were

mentioned, either in person or vicariously. For example, several interviewees

discussed times when the police stopped them and others commented about how a

friend or family member had been stopped. I coded for any reported gang or

group experiences with law enforcement. Additionally, I coded for any personal or vicarious opinions about police, the application of the law, enforcement, and criminal justice topics more generally.

Induction allowed me to recognize important moments, perspectives, and descriptions of criminal justice concepts without first having preconceived hypotheses. The general coding condensed the qualitative richness of the accounts without assigning meaning. From there, I organized the data and identified that a theoretical phenomena began to immerge. Specifically, it became apparent that a procedural justice theoretical framework (Tyler, 2006) might explain some of the themes in the data. To test this, I reread the data and engaged in qualitative hypothesis testing, which investigates specific relationships of verbally articulated phenomena among subjects (Ulichy, 1991). Qualitative hypothesis testing is effective in assessing theories that cannot be easily measured through quantitative analysis. This is especially so when trying to understand nuances among a diverse (i.e., race, gender, age, and other demographics) sample of individuals.

To effectively use qualitative hypothesis testing, I employed a deductive strategy via a template approach (Crabtree and Miller, 1999). Deductive coding is defined as "a type of reasoning that starts with general or abstract concepts and reasons to specific instances" (Charmez, 2014:342). Crabtree and Miller (1999: 140) state that when the goal is theory testing, "a template organizing style, with the theory shaping the template, may be a viable option early in the interpretive process." The template approach involves utilizing codes from a source that can be applied as a means of classifying the data for interpretation. When using this

approach the researcher defines the template prior to analysis and the source of codes can draw from a theoretical framework (Crabtree and Miller, 1999; Fereday and Muir-Cochrane, 2006;Guilgun, 2011).

Prior to beginning deductive analysis, I developed my coding manual by defining the code labels, the themes involved, and determining how to know when the phenomena appear. For the present study, I used the four process-based criteria (Tyler, 2006) as my template for this stage of the analysis (Gilgun, 2011) and applied it to data concerning interactions, opinions, or vicarious experiences with law enforcement. The four components of procedural justice served as codes and a means from which to draw out the themes: (1) *Participation*– having a voice or the ability to represent ones' situation/perspective when interacting with law enforcement, (2) *Fairness* – the degree to which law enforcement were described as making decisions founded in neutrality, objectivity, and factuality, (3) *Respect* – the degree to which law enforcement were reported as treating the gang members with respect, dignity, and politeness, and (4) *Trust* – the extent to which the gang members reported they felt they could trust that the authorities' motivations were sincere, compassionate, and/or well-intentioned.

In addition, I coded for gang members' described responses during police stops if applicable. As consistent with prior research, responses to stated directives are important indications of perceptions of legitimacy (Tyler, 2006). When stopped by the police, for instance, some gang members complied with police directives, including submitting to arrest. On the other hand, some gang members described running or engaging in a car chase. I coded for evidence of

perceived legitimacy of police (e.g. the police are described as doing their job). I coded for evidence of whether the gang members perceived the laws criminalizing drug sales or anti-gang practices as legitimate, as this may interact with perceptions of procedural justice. For example, if a gang member perceives the criminalization of selling weed as unjust, this may affect his or her perceptions of procedural justice towards the police carrying out said laws. Alternatively, if the gang member perceives the law as legitimate (e.g. believes selling drugs is wrong), he or she may be more willing to comply even if the police behave in a procedurally unjust way (see Novich, 2015). I then explored if and how these behaviors connected more broadly to policing practices and expressions of gender differences. For instance, several male gang members described being criminalized and the focal point of police interventions. Women, alternatively, were described being stopped by police less frequently.

Next, I re-read and further refined my investigation by using a narrative analysis on all stories of police-gang member interactions (Presser & Sandberg, 2015). Narrative analysis is premised on a "narrative of personal experience" which is defined as a "report of a sequence of events that have entered into the biography of the speaker by a sequence of clauses that correspond to the order of the original events" (Labov, 1997:2-3). The complete narrative is then organized sequentially and broken down into segments: summary, orientation, complicating action, evaluation, resolution, and conclusion (Labov 1972, 1997). I paid careful attention to important facets outlined in Labov's (1997) later work: credibility, point of view, causality, assignment of praise and blame, and objectivity. I applied

this strategy to any stories found in the data. For example, one male gang member described a time when he took an injured girl to the hospital and ended up being arrested on unrelated and unsubstantiated charges. Though the data analysis was a seemingly linear process, as new trends emerged, I continued to test, iterate, and reflect on whether the template approach applied. This ensured reliability and the theoretical codes I utilized were found to be extremely effective in analyzing the data (Fereday and Muir-Cochrane, 2006).

Once coding was completed, the data were arranged into matrices based on the emergent and iterated themes. Using matrices ensured patterns, comparisons, trends, and deviant cases could be identified in an organized manner (Maxwell, 2005). I created quasi-statistical tables that allowed me to generate numeric results based on the data (Maxwell, 2005)[3]. These analysis procedures ensured that the findings were consistent and all deviations could be identified, examined, compared to the other data findings, and used to further refine the analysis. To be consistent with comprehensive data treatment (see Silverman, 2006), all cases were included.

USAGE OF SECONDARY DATA

The present study utilizes interviews collected for another project and it is important consider and address potential concerns when using secondary data.

---

[3] In the analysis sections, the significance levels among the racial groups were measured using Chi-square tests. It is important to note that while I used statistics to make comparisons and draw conclusions about the strength of the relationships, the sample in this study is purposive in nature and violates key assumptions regarding random sampling. Though Chi-square tests were technically inappropriate for my sample, I used this method in attempt to confirm the strengths and weakness of the patterns I found (See also Miller, 2001).

The data set was originally intended to study drug dealing gang members utilizing a social health framework. There is some debate as to the definition of secondary analysis but as used in the present study, "secondary analysis involves the re-use of pre-existing qualitative data derived from previous research studies" (Heaton, 2008:34, see also Hinds, Vogel, and Clarke-Steffen, 1997). Specifically, it includes the re-use of "material such as semi-structured interviews [and] responses to open-ended questions in questionnaires" (Heaton, 1998:34). Scholars generally agree that though relatively underused, secondary analysis of previously collected data is effective, cost efficient, and maximizes potentially important data that might otherwise go unused (Heaton, 2008; Smith, 2008). Its benefits include granting researchers access to high quality data and allowing for fresh perspectives to be examined (Smith, 2008). Further, secondary data has been used effectively in a number of scholarly investigations in criminology (Brunson, 2007; Miller, 1998; Mullins, 2006; Mullins and Miller, 2008; Nichols, 2010; Novich, 2015; Slocum, Rengifo, and Carbone-Lopez, 2012; Whiteside, Mills, and McCalman, 2012). However, there are several limitations and criticisms to address. Common concerns include the questions of data fit, the quality of the data, and the relationship of the secondary analyst to the data.

Data Fit

The use of secondary qualitative data raises concerns about data fit and compatibility, especially when the original aim of the study is dissimilar from the secondary application (Hinds et al., 1997). Because the original project had a

very different purpose, the interview guide likely did not ask salient questions critical to the focus of the secondary analysis. While this is an important issue, qualitative data generally includes rich descriptions of individuals' thoughts, feelings, and concerns about a wide breadth of topics that can be examined and applied to research questions beyond the scope of the original data collection purposes. Analytic induction organically leads to new insights and this can be especially effective when the original interview guide includes sufficient questions to address a new topic of inquiry (Novich, 2015; Slocum et al., 2012; Whiteside et al., 2012).

In the present study, though the interview guide did not specifically investigate procedural justice, all four of the theory's tenets (respect, trust, fairness, participation) were discussed organically throughout the interviews with enough detail and depth to warrant a deeper examination. For example, one question from the interview schedule asked respondents to describe their 'first bust' by police. Though not specifically about procedural justice, relevant concepts were raised during the resulting conversations. The gang members often provided detailed descriptions about where they were stopped and what prompted the encounter. They also often included descriptions about the encounter, including if there was a physical exchange and how the interaction was resolved. Below is an example of what the narratives commonly looked like:

INTERVIEWER: Tell me about the first time you were busted.

RESPONDENT: Chh. It was crap. That was crap.

INTERVIEWER: Crap or crack? (Laughs.)

RESPONDENT: Crap. That was crap, you feel me. I got caught with hella weed but...that shit was crap, man. I...cuz what happened was...like a couple days before I got arrested, me and my partners...me and my niggers we had got in a fight with like ten other niggers, you feel me. Cuz they was talking shit to my one Cambodian nigger, you feel me, like he was beefing with them, and they had...they had pulled a gun out on his little brother. So like now we was just all posted outside, you feel me. And then...we seen them niggers come around the corner, like ten deep, you feel me. So instantly I run up just...(sound of hands slapping together) out the side. Cuz they...right when they turn the corner, I see them and started breaking towards them, you feel me, started running towards them, and just Superman one o' them niggers. He..., "Ugh," fell into his partner, you feel me. And then one o' my partners came up, and we started whupping their ass. And then we all got on, we all got away, smooth, clean, it was all good. And they was whupping niggers all in the intersection and shit though, like it's hella people. And...so niggers when we left...we had bounced...it was like a Friday. It was either a Friday or a Thursday I had got caught. I had went back to like around the same area, you feel me, to...cuz the store was right there, plus, you feel me...I was fixing to go holler at this chick over there. And, shit, man, I went up in...I was fixing to head up in the store, like I said, to go grab some swishers, next thing you know, the motherfucking...you feel me, narcs come up, pin me up against the wall, talking about, "Yeah, you under investigation for a shooting," you feel me, blah-blah-blah, this and that. "They said that you was holding down people over here," blah-blah-blah, this and that. The motherfucker said I had a Chrome 4-5, you feel me. Now who the...? Why the fuck would I pull out a Chrome 4-5 in a busy intersection, you feel me, in front o' everybody, and start shooting, you feel me? Didn't nobody even shoot that day, it's just the niggers who we whupped their ass...they were saying like, you feel me, that we robbed them, we whupped their ass, we held them down at gunpoint, you feel me. And there was...and they got shot at later that night, so they just...just said that it was me, you feel me, cuz I was like the only motherfucker they knew. Feel me. So...cuz you feel me, I used to do business with them, you feel me. Like I say, you feel me, I fuck with everybody, just until they try and fuck me over. So that's how I got played. Them motherfuckers hit me up. They only...they got me, you feel me, they found that shit, so...it was like, "Oh, what's up with this bag o' weed?" And it was like, "You smell like you got some weight more than this." You feel me. This and that. And they was taking me down already, you feel me. So when I was in there, I tried to hide the ounce, in my Jabose, you feel me. I tried to...you know, they got the little zips at the bottom?

INTERVIEWER: Yeah.

RESPONDENT: Like where the ankle is. So like I tried to zip that closed, like when I was taking off my pants, so it'll like keep, cuz it was in like a Ziploc. Dude shook out the pants, and he was folding 'em, and I was like, "Damn," for sure, you feel me, I thought I was getting away, so I was taking off my shorts to hand him those, and when I was handing him the shorts...he dropped the pants, and then he shook it out again, and like, whoo...ounce just flew out. I was like, "Damn." So then I got caught with another charge for what you call it? For like trying to smuggle the shit into the juvie, I guess, you could say it like that. I was like, "I wasn't trying to smuggle it in, nigger, I was just trying to keep ---."

This narrative embodies several procedural justice themes important to my investigation. When coding, for example, I identified that the involuntary interaction took place on the street. I noted that the respondent felt the arrest was unjustified because he believed he was informed on with false information. This indicated a lack of legitimacy of the stop, but not necessarily of the police. Also, the encounter started with a physical interaction that was meaningful and perceived as inappropriate use of force, given that he did not find the stop justified. This suggested a lack of respectful interpersonal treatment. When searched, the police found drugs and the encountered resulted in arrest and formal processing.

Below is another example of the conversation that ensued in response to the same inquiry:

INTERVIEWER: Tell me about the first time you were busted.

RESPONDENT: For what?

INTERVIEWER: Anything.

RESPONDENT: Yeah, I was on Mission, getting my rocks off, right? Motherfucking--the ghost came. Pulled up, undercover.

INTERVIEWER: Uh-huh?

RESPONDENT: Hopped out, then choked me, damn near broke my arm. Tell me to shut up, they was gon' slap me.

INTERVIEWER: Uh-huh?

RESPONDENT: Them narcotics. You probably don't know, but, girl, they evil as hell. Them narcotics police? Shiiit. You'd think them motherfuckers just save--hell, they save the world, help the people. (Claps hands once.) They beat--they will beat the crap out the dealers.

This discourse again revealed salient procedural justice concepts. When coding, I identified that the involuntary exchange took place on the street while the respondent was either dealing or using drugs. The encounter was characterized by poor interpersonal treatment. This respondent perceived aggressive and inappropriate use of force which included being choked and having her arm twisted. The police also used impolite language and threated her with further physical harm. The respondent expressed negative attitudes towards the police, describing them as "evil" and perceived them as being excessively aggressive against drug dealers.

Additional procedural justice concepts emerged from many of the questions in the interview guide. This was the case even when the respondents were not explicitly asked about police contact. While there are too many to list, I will provide a few examples. Inquiries about the first time they were caught for delinquent behavior, for instance, elicited responses that addressed perceptions of trust of police:

INTERVIEWER: Tell me about the first time you were busted.

RESPONDENT: First time I was busted up there on 700 Block. Cops hopped out on us. We wasn't doing nothing wrong. We was just sitting in the car, cops came up to us, asked for ID. My friend was on paperwork, I mean he had search and seizure. So then they searched the car. I forgot I even had a gun in my car. They went to the trunk, found a gun, took us all to jail. I took the responsibility for the gun so everybody else could go free. So that's...yeah, that's pretty much the first time.

In this narrative, the respondent described an involuntary encounter with the police. He was sitting in a car with friends when they were approached. He explicitly stated he was not engaged in deviant or law-breaking behavior that warranted police attention. It was meaningful for him to point out that their being approached was undeserved. This signals distrust of the stop. Because one of his friends was under state supervision, they were searched. He had an illegal firearm in his possession, took full responsibly for it, and the stop resulted in his arrest.

Another respondent raised concerns about police integrity and abuse of force organically during a discussion about drug dealing and police use of informants:

RESPONDENT: So a lotta people down there, they snitch on each other to stay outta jail. And when they snitch, it gets a lotta people wrapped up and...they go to jail. So that leaves them the block. So now they all in jail, and I got the block to myself to sell dope. You know what I'm saying?

INTERVIEWER: Right. And the police off your back.

RESPONDENT: Yeah, and the police off your back, cuz you giving people up. So that's what goes on down there. That goes on in the Mission now. But before, it didn't happen like that. Now it's happening, because a lotta the police that's in the TL's [Tenderloin neighborhood of

San Francisco] they get in trouble for illegal things that they do, they get busted. For, you know...taking people's dope...or taking people money and they don't put it on the books or they don't bring it to court, they don't bring it to evidence, and. Or they beating people or doing stuff they shouldn't be doing to people, so...they relocate 'em, they don't...they don't take 'em off --- give 'em bench duty, they put the same police in a different area, doing the same shit to the...to different people, you feel me?

In this narrative, which is a discussion about general attitudes about the police, I coded for several key procedural justice concepts. Descriptions about corrupt officers extorting and robbing drug dealers, failing to produce evidence in court, and not reporting money and drugs procured during a stop suggested there was a lack of trust of police and their motivations for stopping individuals. Additionally, this narrative also raised concerns about inappropriate use of force or behaviors, suggesting the police were not perceived as affording drug dealers respectful interpersonal treatment.

Still other questions encouraged discussions about neutral and fair police behavior. Specifically, the interview guide asked how women compared to men in terms of being caught by police when drug-dealing. This question prompted the respondents to articulate whether they believed the police enforced the law fairly across gender. Here is an example of a gang girl's response:

INTERVIEWER: Is a female seller more or less likely to be caught?

RESPONDENT: Oh, yeah, she is.

INTERVIEWER: She is?

RESPONDENT: She's just a girl. Like we could be in a car full o' girls, and we all sell drugs, and the cops won't trip off of us that much, they really trip off o' guys.

This dialogue demonstrated that this respondent did not view the police as fairly enforcing the law given that they focused on men and did not target women as frequently. Follow up questions about gender comparisons provided further opportunities for the respondents to discuss procedural justice concepts. For instance:

> INTERVIEWER: OK. Do you think women can make more money than men if they wanted to, in selling drugs?
>
> RESPONDENT: Yep. Cuz they...they got their...they slicker. Like they can be more slicker. Like the police don't really trip off girls...that much. Especially if they looking like they ain' doing nothing. You know. And...like it's easier for them to tuck...their dope.

In this example, I again coded for articulations of perceived fair or unfair police behavior. Specifically, this respondent believed that women could make more money selling drugs than men because they were not the focus of law enforcement efforts. Additionally, women who looked uninvolved in the drug-trade were more likely to escape detection. Also, the respondent believed that women placed drugs in their vagina, which meant they could hide drugs more effectively than men.

Finally, the lengthy and detailed narratives often described a respondent's reaction during an involuntary police encounter. In some cases, this included if or when someone attempted to participate during a stop. For example, the below gang girl was stopped on a bus by police on suspicion of involvement in an assault:

> INTERVIEWER: [The police] said, "Check her first"?

critical to examine if the quality of the data was sufficient to provide valid findings. Of specific concern was the extent that data necessary for the secondary investigation was missing, rendering it of insufficient quality. Hinds et al. (1997:412) argued that the secondary analyst who encounters missing data is responsible for determining:

> Whether the data are missing because the phenomenon of interest occurred too infrequently to allow it to be accurately studied, or because the data did not exist in the studied sample, or because the data were not adequately solicited through the methods of the primary study. Their determination, if based on incomplete or inexplicable information, could result in a false conclusion.

Given that procedural justice topics were not specifically probed for and follow up questions were not consistently asked, it was evident that data relevant to my research was missing. To determine if it was of sufficient quality despite this, I checked the extent of the missing data by examining how frequently the proposed phenomena occurred. Zero or minimal numbers would suggest it was not of sufficient quality to proceed with the proposed study (Hinds et al., 1997). After creating quasi-statistical tables, it was clear that procedural justice topics were raised with enough frequency to justify the investigation. The adequate numbers of response rates were likely because open-ended questions that prompted discussions of procedural justice concepts were asked repeatedly throughout the interviews. Here are a few examples of questions from the guide that were particularly meaningful to my investigation and were asked of nearly all the respondents:

1. When was the first time you were caught?

2. How many times have you been arrested?
3. Tell me about the first time you were busted. How old were you?
4. Why were you arrested, and what was the outcome?
5. Tell me about other times.
6. Tell me about any times that you have been caught selling.
7. What are the chances that a male who is involved in street sales will get caught?
8. Arrested? Charged? Convicted? Locked up?
9. How are the chances of getting caught different for different sellers?
10. What do you do to reduce the risks associated with selling?
11. What about a female street seller?
12. Is a female seller more or less likely to get caught?
13. Describe your typical day on the block *(in the park, etc.)*

Though the above questions were important to my investigation, it does not

address the issue of follow-up questions that contributed to missing data. Because

my research questions were not central to the original study, the interviewers did

not ask relevant follow-up questions consistently across interviews. This likely

resulted in reporting errors, which means I cannot not provide accurate counts

among the respondents. However, even with the missing data, the response rates

still indicated the phenomenon in question was present. For example, I was able

to determine that 100 out of 134 female gang members reported at least one

involuntary face-to-face encounter with the police, with many coming in contact

with law enforcement multiple times. The male gang members, 100 out of 119,

also reported at least one involuntary interaction with police with many describing

multiple experiences. Involuntary encounters are the foundation of measuring

perceptions of procedurally just police behavior and these numbers suggested that

there were a sufficient number of encounters reported to allow me to investigate

gang members' perceptions of police.

Additionally, procedural justice concepts were discussed with enough

frequency for me to draw valid and meaningful conclusions even without an exhaustive count of their prevalence. For instance, 83 men discussed their concerns about fair or neutral police behavior, 55 raised topics relating to trust of police behavior and motivations, 24 men described police experiences in which they were treated with respectful or disrespectful interpersonal treatment, and 16 men described instances of attempting to participate in the exchange. The female respondents offered similar numbers: 117 women addressed whether the police were perceived as fairly or unfairly enforcing the law, 51 discussed trust or distrust of police behavior or motivations, 22 broached concerns of respectful or disrespectful interpersonal treatment, and 14 described attempting to participate in their stop. Ultimately, I determined that the dataset was of sufficient quality to yield meaningful conclusions and thus I was able to proceed.

Relationship to the Data

Finally, some scholars raise the question of whether a secondary analyst can credibly analyze data when they were not involved in the original data collection (Heaton, 2008; Smith, 2008). Specifically, it is argued that a distant researcher uninvolved in the collection, transcription, or primary analysis may have a superficial understanding of the data, may be out of touch with the context or setting of the original data collection, and may not understand the relationship developed between the researcher and the respondents and its impact on the data produced (Heaton, 2008; Smith, 2008). Despite these concerns, secondary analysts can still produce quality research that narrows gaps of scientific

knowledge, provides theoretical contributions and does qualitative theory testing

(Brunson, 2007; Miller, 1998; Mullins, 2006; Mullins and Miller, 2008; Nichols,

2010; Novich, 2015; Whiteside, Mills, and McCalman, 2012). For instance,

Slocum et al. (2012) used secondary data to examine General Strain Theory,

strains, and resulting emotions that surfaced during incidents where respondents

employed violence. Though the interview guide did not specifically ask questions

about emotions, the detailed narratives provided Slocum and her colleagues ample

evidence that other, less-studied emotions such as shame, frustration, and fear,

also played a significant role in women's experiences and expressions of violence.

In response to concerns of my being a secondary analyst, it is first

important to note that secondary scholars, who have limited knowledge of the

original datasets, can be impartial and assess the data without preconceived ideas

that might skew, dictate, or color an objective analysis (Smith, 2008). I was

unfamiliar with the data prior to the start of the project so I had no fixed ideas

about what was or was not present in the data (Hinds et al., 1997). This ensured

as best possible the findings were based strictly on what was presenting in the

narratives without previous ideas of what may have been found. Next, given the

concern that as a secondary analyst, I might not have in-depth understanding of

the data, I decided to read all 253 interviews to ensure I would have as thorough

understanding of the data and the respondents as possible. I read all parts of the

interviews and not only narrowed datasets that focused exclusively on my topic of

interest. I was exposed to an array of information ranging from respondents' drug

dealing strategies, personal and mental health issues, sexual history, and police

interactions.

Finally, paying close attention to the different dynamics of the interview exchange between the researcher and the respondent is an important component of the analytic process. These nuances can arguably be identified more effectively when there is more distance between the researcher and the data. Given my distance from the project, I was often able identify different aspects of the exchange between the researcher and the interviewers and identify how the report was established. In some cases, for example, the interviewer knew the gang member well and discussed personal stories unique to that respondent. Here is an example:

> INTERVIEWER: And they were cool. I remember one time, I was there and they took your weed and they just stepped on it.
>
> RESPONDENT: Oh yeah, remember Pete? Yeah they stepped on it. They were like, We ain't, just go, get out of here.

Here is another example of the interviewer knowing about the respondent's drug-related arrest:

> INTERVIEWER: Now, you just got busted for selling.
>
> RESPONDENT: I didn't sell to a narc.
>
> INTERVIEWER: That's what I heard.
>
> RESPONDENT: They saw me about to sell.
>
> INTERVIEWER: They saw you selling to somebody else?
>
> RESPONDENT: Uh-huh.

Another male interviewer had a gregarious demeanor and an excellent ability to

connect with some of the male interviewees. One of his tactics was to reference a

popular TV show called The Wire because it was premised on the struggles of

drug dealing gang members. He used this as means to relate with the men and

was often able to solicit insightful and detailed response throughout the

interviews. Here is an example of that interviewer establishing report:

> INTERVIEWER: I was interviewing some dude, literally…it was yesterday, he told me how it was just...it was completely disorganized.….There's no unity, and there's not really that many people calling the shots.
>
> RESPONDENT: No.
>
> INTERVIEWER: You got some kids that are just doing their own thing.
>
> RESPONDENT: Doing whatever they want, freelancing.
>
> INTERVIEWER: And then...cuz then I asked him if he could compare, you know, drug life here to The Wire, to the show The Wire cuz I don't know if you've ever seen that show.
>
> RESPONDENT: Yeah, I've checked it out before.
>
> INTERVIEWER: It's one of my favorite shows. And he was just telling me that like...he was telling me that people over here wouldn't be able to hang over there because....
>
> (R) No, they wouldn't. Cuz they don't know nothing about...real-life shit. Most o' these people ain' never been in a gunfight. Most o' these people ain' never been shot or nothing like that. They couldn't even hang. Most of 'em is….the females getting more money out here than the males anyway.

These examples illustrate that though not physically involved, a reasonably

thorough understanding of the data and data collection can be imparted through

the dialogue. Ultimately, I pursued the investigation because I believed there

were advantages to being an outside analyst and I was able to mitigate some

challenges given my lack of involvement in the original research project.

STUDY LIMITATIONS

Despite the positive attributes of the data and my ability to navigate potential challenges of using secondary data, there were several limitations to consider. The most significant challenge was that the in-depth interviews did not specifically ask a series of questions specifically pertaining to this research. This remains one of the challenges of using secondary data (Smith, 2008). As described above, though the data was of sufficient quality and "fit" the proposed project, there were several questions missing from the interview guide that would have been helpful to my study. First, while the interviewers asked about the first time the respondents were arrested, they did not specifically ask research participants to describe in detail their interactions with police. This information would have been helpful for understanding the nuances of each subject's direct experience with police. Second, the gang members were not asked specifically about their opinions about the police. As such, any opinions about law enforcement were raised voluntarily and throughout the course of other conversations emerging during the interviews. A direct question would have helped me understand a greater number of the study participants' opinions as well as providing me with a more refined understanding of their sentiments. Furthermore, the respondents were not asked specifically about their family and friends' opinion. This made it more challenging to determine contributing factors

to their perceptions of law enforcement. Finally, it would have been helpful if the subjects were asked how they would respond to police during involuntary contacts and why. This would help establish their views on compliance and legitimacy more generally.

Interviewers also did not consistently inquire about gang members' experiences with physical and verbal abuse, neutrality, voicing their opinion during stops, or experiences with differential treatment. This indicates that several relevant reactions may have been missed. Furthermore, the interviewers did not regularly ask salient follow up questions, and this likely contributed to error patterns in the data. As such, I was unable to accurately account for all experiences and perceptions of procedural justice, and the numbers provided in the study are estimates. Instead, all responses were raised organically during discussions about an array of topics, of which only some were directly concerning experiences with law enforcement.

As with most interview-based data, there are concerns about memory, distortion, and deceit. In fact, several interviewees admitted to being high or on drugs at the time of the interview. Additionally, several others admitted to lying during the interview. Given the sensitive nature of the questions, others expressed hesitation about answering potentially incriminating questions. One subject even asked if the interviewer was a police officer. As such, some respondents were insecure and cautious about being wholly truthful. It is also important to consider the likelihood of bias in the data with regard to the types of police encounters likely to be discussed during the interviews. Specifically, it is likely that because a

systematic set of questions about the police were not asked of research participants, they likely discussed only those experiences that were most meaningful, recent, or salient. Thus, more distance encounters and less memorable experiences with the police may have been omitted. This may have resulted in underreporting of experiences and impacted the range of types of experiences described (Slocum et al., 2012). For example, it is possible that only the most deleterious, violent, or aggressive police encounters were discussed. More moderate or even positive experiences may not have been discussed as frequently as experienced, potentially skewing the narratives negatively.

Finally, given that the interviewer was often familiar with the gang member and/or of a similar background, it important to consider that tacit emotions or meanings present in police encounters may also have been omitted from the interview. As Spradley (1976) noted, "abbreviating" is the assumption that both parties understand and can "fill in" that what is unstated (pp. 57-68). As an outsider, it is possible that I may have been unaware and unable to account for these omissions. Despite these limitations, procedural justice topics were raised organically, and relevant theoretical concepts emerged repeatedly, suggesting they were important aspects of the gang members' interactions with law enforcement. That my final dataset specifically on these topics was approximately 1,700 pages is a testament to the import of these themes to research participants, and suggests that the study data was sufficiently rich to proceed.

CHAPTER 5: POLICE CONTACTS AMONG GANG MEMBERS

According to Tyler (2006), experiences and perceptions of procedural justice are generally formed during involuntary face-to-face encounters with police (Tyler 2006). For typical law-abiding citizens, police contact commonly follows routine traffic stops (Mazerolle et al., 2014). For drug-dealing gang members, however, involuntary contacts may differ significantly in both context and location. Like law-abiding citizens, they may be approached randomly or while not involved in criminal behavior, but given their involvement in gangs and with drug dealing, it is likely there will be many instances in which they are stopped as a consequence of their criminal activities. In this chapter, I will compare the frequencies, types, and nature of stops experienced and vicarious experiences that are discussed by male and female gang members of different ethnicities. This includes a comparative analysis of when the gang members were approached while engaged in law-breaking activities and when the gang members were not involved in criminal behavior.

Frequencies

Among the men and women in the sample, involuntary encounters with police were a relatively common experience. Nearly all of the gang members in the sample (N=205, 81 percent) who reported an involuntary face-to-face

interaction with police described one or more specific type of contact with

officers[1]. Though some of the men and women differentiated between being

"cuffed" on the street, arrested and brought into the station, or arrested and

charged, most did not clearly delineate the outcomes of these stops in their

narratives. A majority (N=105, 88 percent) of the male respondents reported

being approached, stopped and/or arrested by the police at least once. Of the 88

percent that reported stops, the number of stops per individual ranged from once

to more than a hundred times, with the average being 9.6 stops per male gang

member[2]. In all, 95 men—80 percent of the sample—provided a description of

one or more specific types of involuntary face-to-face contact with officers[3].

Such experiences were described proportionally by African Americans (N=47, 81

percent), Latinos (N=34, 81 percent), Asians (N=8 of 11), multi-racial (N=5 of 7),

and White (N=1 of 1) individuals.

In terms of women in the sample, a majority (N=100, 75 percent) reported

being stopped and/or arrested by the police at least once – a proportion lower than

the men's reported experiences with police. Among this group, nearly all (N=97,

72 percent of the total female sample) described one or more specific type of

---

[1] Several respondents reported multiple contacts with police but did not consistently specify the nature, location, context, or details surrounding the type of police contact. Only involuntary face-to-face contacts that clearly indicated place, type, and context were included in the statistics. As such, these numbers are approximate and likely underestimates. Only six respondents discussed vicarious stories in relative detail. The rest were all first hand accounts of face-to-face encounters with police.

[2] This calculation omits an extreme outlier who reported being arrested 300 or more times so that he could sleep in jail for the night. If this respondent were included, average detainments per person would be 12.5 arrests.

[3] Though 105 men (88 percent of the sample) reported being detained or arrested, not all specified the nature, location, context, or details surrounding the type of police contact.

contact with officers[4]. However, unlike the men, while women's stops happened

with some degree of frequency, the number of involuntary encounters described

were significantly fewer; with the average being 4.49 stops per female.

Additionally, women's reported experiences were fewer overall, ranging from one

to thirty. Like the men, the different racial groups represented in the study

discussed these types of encounters relatively proportionally, which are as

follows: African American women (N=58, 73 percent), Latina (N=20, 77

percent), Asian (N=9 of 14), women who identified as multi-racial (N=8 of 11),

other (N=1 of 1) and White (N=1 of 3). However, when compared to men, there

were more African American women and fewer Latinas that reported stops.

Crime-Involved Encounters with the Police

The vast majority of face-to-face encounters with police the gang

members discussed were identified as being related to criminal behavior. The

interviewees described being talked to, stopped, and/or searched by police as a

result of their involvement in an array of offenses. The most common offenses

were drug dealing (N=66)[5], robberies/theft (N=55), fighting/assault (N=36), and

gang involvement (N=22)[6].

Drug-Dealing

---

[4] Like the male respondents, several women reported multiple contacts with police but did not consistently specify the nature, location, context, or details surrounding the type of police contact.
[5] This may be due to the nature of the original study, which focused on drug dealers and their experiences selling.
[6] The following offenses were also reported as resulting in face-to-face encounters but were reported much less often: weapons possession (N=12), misunderstandings/mistaken identity (N=9), driving violations (N=5), runaway (N=4), public intoxication (N=3), vandalism (N=2), jumped turnstyle (N=1), piercing someone's ear (N=1), and elder abuse (N=1).

The most reported types of involuntary face-to-face encounters with police were a result of the respondents' involvement in drug dealing (N=66)[7]. Approximately a third of the men (N=35, 37 percent) and women (N=31, 32 percent) described being talked to, stopped, and/or arrested for dealing narcotics. These encounters happened on the streets, in homes during house raids, in school, and in cars. This was reported by Latino (N=14, 33 percent) and African American men (N=14, 24 percent) as well as Asian (N=4 of 11), multi-racial (N=2 or 7) and White (N=1 of 1) men. In terms of the women, drug related stops were discussed by African Americans (N=18, 23 percent), Latinas (N=6, 23 percent), Asian (N=5 of 14), White (N=1 of 3) and other (N=1 of 1) women. While there appear to be no significant racial differences among the men and women, Latino men reported these types of encounters the most frequently.

The male and female study participants primarily described coming in contact with police either prior to selling drugs, during the transaction, or after a sale was completed. These experiences were similar between the genders and mostly described as street-based encounters, though to a lesser degree, they were also reported as happening in a house during a drug raid or on school grounds. In rare cases, these encounters happened while the gang member was in a vehicle. For both genders, a vast majority of these encounters resulted in arrest[8]. Sleepy, for example, described his bust that resulted in a felony conviction: "[The police] saw me about to sell….They rushed me." Ruthless too recalled, "I got arrested

---

[7] A vast majority of the discussed stops were first hand accounts. Only two were vicarious stories.
[8] Four men and three women described not being arrested during drug-related encounters.

because I was going to go sell it somebody….I walked up two blocks up and two blocks down, and then [a] narc pulled up and I had [drugs] in my hand unwrapped." Irma described being arrested at school as a result of selling drugs: "I was selling weed at [school]....That one time was like the first time I got busted [by police]."

Both male and female respondents believed that drug related encounters were typically a result of a specific set of policing tactics. This included, first, selling to a narcotics officer, commonly referred to as a "narc", "decoy" or "undercover" during a "buy-bust" operation[9]. Indeed, most women (N=75) were either stopped as a result of selling to an undercover officer or "hella concerned" about selling to one. Many men (N=36) too raised this concern, though fewer than the women. The respondents explained that police officers commonly disguised themselves as drug users and attempted to buy drugs from them. Either during or after a successful transaction, the police would arrest the seller on site. Aliyah lamented, "I sold to a knock. I mean a narc. I was like so upset. He had walked up to me like, 'You got a 50-pop?' Soon as I pull it out, two narc cars pull up on me. It was crazy. I tried to swallow it, it wouldn't happen. It was terrible." Jin, too, recalled her second arrested as a result of selling to an undercover narcotics officer: "The second time I got caught, I sold to a decoy. I sold to a person that was a narc that I didn't know was a narc. So, yeah, I sold to him, and I got caught right there and then." Diego explained that his employee

---

[9] Five men and two women raised concerns of additional types of police strategies, including being involved in a transaction with marked money or having their phone calls recorded.

sold drugs to officers, which resulted in his arrest even though he did not directly

sell to the police:

> I had somebody [working for me]…and he was like, "I will [be] right back." So [I] give him some crack…I guess on the way he stopped, he sold it to… a bunch of narcs….[The police] see me, I am a little drug dealer and they search me and they find the money on me but it wasn't a direct sell. It was bust and buy….[Police] buy and they bust.

Mikey too was caught selling to an undercover officer: "Car rolled up, I listened

to somebody that told me that it was cool and when I went up, it wasn't cool. It

was a narc."

Drug dealing related encounters with police were also believed to be a

result of someone "snitching." A similar number of men (N=38) and women

(N=36) believed they were stopped or were concerned about being stopped as a

result of police use of criminal informants. Such informants were believed to

include drug users, clients, or casual observers. Many respondents echoed Drew's

account: "I sold to the wrong person and [the police] came up [to] me. I got

snitched on." Jackie commented, "Somebody snitched on me plenty o' times

downtown." Bootcy explained how she was approached and arrested on the street

while selling marijuana. The police suggested someone had told them about her

dealings, prompting their interest in stopping her:

> I was walking in the street….I had a lot of weed in my purse sacked up cuz I was hustling. And the narcs approached me. They said that I looked like somebody that somebody else had called in earlier and said that I made a sale. I have search and seizure, so when they pulled me over and read my name, fortunate for them, they were able to search me. So they found the weed in my purse and they took me to jail.

Debi likewise outlined the details of her bust. She thought she was informed on

but felt that was a risk of the trade: "Someone snitched. A dope fiend. I mean I

wouldn't call him a dope fiend, but someone I sold drugs to, he told on me. You know, shit happens." Indeed, many gang members perceived being "snitched" on as a risk of selling drugs and a common occurrence that was "part of the game."

Additionally, approximately 27 percent of the men (N=32) and women (N=37) raised concerns about or believed they were stopped as a result of being observed selling by police. The respondents described the police as "watching, waiting" with binoculars from hotel windows, building rooftops, cars, and/or observations vans. If seen making a sale, the police reportedly approached and usually arrested the gang member on the street. "When people get arrested for dope sales, it's cuz they bust a sale in front of a cop, or a cop was on the roof and just seen someone, something like that," explained Slim. Fool, too, lamented about the time he was apprehended on the street: "I was being watched with binoculars, they recorded me....They were on the roof taking pictures [and] they caught me." Cassie too recalled, "Shit...[the police] was watching me, they saw me, and they came and arrested my ass." Similarly, Bunny thought she was detained after being seen selling drugs. Though she did not have drugs on her at the time of the stop, she was convinced they witnessed her making transactions but had waited so long that she was able to sell off all of her contraband: "I was seen serving, but they didn't get no dope off o' me. They was watching me for so long that...by the time that they came and got me, my dope was gone." Vanessa described how her transactions were video taped, a practice she found frightening. "I got busted, police see me by somebody….They came and just arrested me, and told me they had me on video, and they showed me the video, and it was scary."

Overall, the men and women in the study reported similar involuntary face-to-face encounters with police relating to their involvement in drug dealing.

Robbery, Burglary or Theft

The next most reported type of police encounter as a result of criminal behavior was related to respondents' involvement in robbery, burglary or theft in some capacity (N=55). This was especially so among the female gang members where more than a third (N=37, 38 percent) reported this type of police encounter. Specifically, most (N=22) described being arrested for shoplifting, with a smaller number reportedly coming in contact with police because of their involvement in more serious crimes including robberies (N=9), vehicular theft (N=5), or burglaries/other property theft (N=3). The women reported these types of encounters similarly: African American (N=22, 28 percent), Latina (N=7, 27 percent), multi-racial (N=6 of 11) and Asian (N=3 of 14) women. Men (N=21), on the other hand, reported this type of encounter less frequently than women, and relatively few such incidents (N=5) were related to shoplifting. Instead, when the men described coming in contact with police for such crimes, it was usually for more serious infractions including robberies (N=12)[10], burglaries/property theft (N=6), and vehicular theft (N=2)[11]. African American men (N=13, 22 percent) reported this most often, when compared to Latino (N=5, 12 percent), multi-racial (N=2 of 7), and Asian (N=1 of 11) men.

---

[10] One was a vicarious account of friends being arrested after a robbery. The gang member escaped detection and was not stopped by police.

[11] Several participants described more than one robbery/theft-related police encounter.

The male and female study participants primarily described coming in contact with police after participating in these types of crimes. For those caught shoplifting, police encounters reportedly took place in a department or retail store and a vast majority of the gang members indicated they were arrested at the conclusion of these interactions[12]. In these cases, most respondents were either approached while stealing merchandise or while attempting to exit the store with stolen goods. Chelsea, for example, explained, "I did get in contact with the police because I was stealing at Burlington's. 'Cause I didn't have no money so I tried to steal some clothes to sell 'em….I got caught and the police took me. I left in a police car." Jade too was arrested for shoplifting: "I got caught stealing. Boosting at Macy's [and] did two days." Clifford described getting arrested at a shop after attempting to steal sneakers:

> I was trying to steal two pairs of Jordans. And I had stole 'em, but I
> thought I was gon' get away, and I had 'em in my pants like, and I walked
> out the store, and the undercovers that work in the store, they came and
> grabbed [i.e. arrested] me.

For the men and women involved in robberies, police encounters that followed took place in an array of settings and situations. For number of cases (N=12, 7 women and 5 men), interactions with the police were described as taking place on the scene immediately following the crime[13]. Junior, for example, described how he robbed a man and attempted to flee. Shortly thereafter, he was caught and arrested by police:

---

[12] 3 women (out of 22) described instances where they were not arrested. All 5 men were arrested.
[13] This was also the case for 5 (4 men, 1 woman) of the 9 reported encounters relating to burglaries and/or property theft.

The first time [I was arrested] was [for] a robbery. It was some dude...carrying this handbag....We just seen him come from the bank, he pulled out a lotta money….I went up and grabbed it from him and he fell to the floor….My friend came up [and] hit him in his face....He let go o' the bag, I threw it over my thing, ran off....By the time we hit a couple corners and whatnot, the police [came up]….I threw the bag, didn't care no more [and] just start running but I got caught cuz the dogs chased me down into a corner.

Carmella, a male gang member, shared a similar story of robbing someone and being arrested by the police quickly thereafter: "We jacked some dudes in [an] alley….We got arrested like [a] couple blocks away cuz they called the police hella quick. [The] police...was already in the area and caught us." Chastity explained that she too was arrested swiftly following a robbery: "It was just me and a few of my girls and like we kinda just hopped on [these girls]…because they was just talking shit….We just fought 'em and end up robbing 'em [but] we ended up going to jail that night."

For a small number of cases (N=4, three men and one woman), police encounters subsequent to a robbery were reported as occurring in the respondent's home or another location following an investigation of their crime. In Jordan's case, he robbed someone of their mobile devices but did not realize they had GPS locators built in. The police were directed to his home and he was arrested: "I had robbed somebody…but I didn't know that the iPhone and the laptop, all the stuff on me had GPS…so the police had come to my house….I went down for six months." Tim also recalled being arrested at his house after being involved in a robbery: "I was at home. I was in my bed asleep. And my auntie let the police in and I woke up in handcuffs." Moody, a female gang member, had her house raided after she robbed a woman of her electronics. She too was arrested: "They

raided my house, I had to go to court, and they locked me up [because] they found...the iPod and the phone I had." In some cases (N=4, two men and two women), the study participants explained they attempted to flee the scene of the robbery in a car but were eventually apprehended and arrested. Jennifer recalled one such situation that resulted in her arrest:

> My friends stole a Camry car and…we decided to rob people first and then we were gonna go sell drugs or whatever….We were robbing people all night and…we didn't notice that the police were pulling up behind us with the same person that we had just finished robbing.

Next, several (N=4) study participants reported they were involved in stealing cars. Martine, for example, explained that she was "caught in stolen cars like three times." After stealing the car, several participants explained they drove recklessly or broke traffic laws, which attracted police attention. Rafael, for example, recalled how he was arrested for running a stop sign in a stolen car. The police chased him for a short distance before he stopped:

> Me and [my friend] together we had a stolen car.…We were taking off [and] I ended up running a stop sign that I didn't see and the police was right behind me and shit. So, I ain't taken on a chase or nothing but I didn't stop for like three blocks….[my friend] just said, "you know what, just fucking pull over. Fuck this shit you know." So I pulled over and shit, they took me in.

Nadia too was arrested after recklessly driving in a stolen car. She and some friends "were in two stolen cars...playing like bumper cars and stuff….[My friend] went up a one-way street whatever [and the] police saw us….The police pulled us over [and] they arrested us."

Finally, a small number of study participants (N=4), three males and one female, described engaging in property theft while on school premises. Once

caught, the school authorities reportedly called the police to campus to arrest them. Cameron, for example, described stealing a school computer and being arrested shortly thereafter:

> We stole a laptop from the school and then this detective came….I said, "Yeah, I did it." And the next day I was in class, minding my business, and the dean just come and say, "Come here."…Right when I got to the door, the police officer and the same detective [were there].

Walt, likewise, explained that police handcuffed him on campus after stealing school computers: "I stole some laptops….[The police] put me in the handcuffs and walked me out."

Fighting and Assault

In addition to police contacts in the contexts of drug selling, robbery and property offenses, a sizeable number of study participants (N=36) described coming in contact with police as a result of their involvement in a fight or a physical conflict with another individual. In most cases (N=27), they described being arrested at the conclusion of these interactions. A relatively similar number of men (N=16[14]) and women (N=19) reported this type of interaction with police. Of the women in the sample, a similar number of African Americans (N=13, 16 percent) and Latinas (N=5, 19 percent) discussed this type of interaction, followed by a smaller number of Asian (N=1 of 14) women. Likewise, among the men, there were no significant racial differences between the African Americans (N=8, 14 percent) and Latinos (N=6, 14 percent). A smaller number of multi-racial (N=1

---

[14] One man reported being arrested for sexual assault. However, he explained that the case was later dropped because it was determined by the court that complainant's testimony was false.

of 7) and Asian (N=1 of 11) men also reported these types of interactions. No White respondents described these types of encounters.

For many of the study participants (N=20), these police encounters were described as taking place on school grounds, either as a result of their having a conflict with another student or with an institutional authority figure. Most recalled specific examples of these interactions though Fuego stated more generally that it was a regular experience for her: "I got arrested when I was getting in fights a lot at school." In general, the men and women recalled being called out of class, spoken to, and in many instances being arrested by officers who had been called to their campus. Some encounters with the police were described as during or immediately after the skirmish. Skye, for example, recalled fighting a girl who had insulted her: "I ended up fighting her at school.…The cops came and everything." Dawn was arrested during a conflict with a teacher: "I got arrested [after]…I threw a chair at a teacher."

In some cases, the men and women reported being arrested some time after the conflict. Chelsea, for example, described being arrested a week after a fight with another student: "I tried to stab this boy at his school. Then I had to run away, run off, 'cause the police was looking for me….Like a week later they came to my school and took me to jail." Damon, likewise, described being arrested at school following a fight he had with a police officer the weekend prior: "I'm at school. I'm in class. I look out the door [and] sure enough here come the security guard and a cop. Oh, fuck, I already know they here for me." Steven

recalled his school-based arrest as resulting from an assault charge brought

against him for fighting to protect his cousin:

> I got into a fight because this nigger was fucking with my cousin. He said
> he was going to beat her ass….I knocked him out. We had a meeting at
> school, they asked the parents if they wanted to press charges. He didn't
> hit me back so they said it was an assault. And the parents said yes. So I
> got arrested right there at school.

However, not all school-based encounters with law enforcement were

reported as ending in arrest. Lavish, for instance, explained that she was

confronted, though not arrested, by police during an altercation with a teacher:

"When I first started going [to the school], I was looking at the wall, and the

teacher was like I can't look at the wall and...I got mad....We start arguing and

stuff like that. And I threatened him and he called the police and I almost went to

jail." Casper too remembered a police encounter at school that did not result in

arrest. He explained that he lost his temper fairly regularly and the teachers

eventually called the police to help manage his outbursts: "I would just start

cussing everybody out, the teachers, counselors, everybody...until the cops had to

come there one day and just tell me if I didn't sit down...calm down, that they will

arrest me."

While most fights were described as occurring in school, in other cases

(N=9), police encounters following a conflict with another person happened on

the street or in a public setting. Such incidents were described by more female

(N=7) than male (N=2)[15] study participants. The female gang members typically

---

[15] In addition, 3 men reported coming in contact with police in their home following a domestic
violence call either by their partner or a neighbor. One man recalled being arrested in his home
following a conflict with another youth because the parents knew each other. One male
participant did not specify where his interaction with police took place but described police being

described instances in which their fight with another woman was either witnessed by police or police were called to the scene. In all seven cases, the women reported being arrested at the conclusion of the police encounter. Shenal described a violent argument that was witnessed by police resulting in her arrest:

> I was fighting…and I busy with this female and we started fighting and I like tried to stab her….I chased her outside and like I really tried to stab [her]….[The] police car and everything [came]….I was going [to] throw [the knife] away but [the police] seen [it]….They found [the knife].

Nicole similarly described being in a fight with another female, though she stated she was under the influence at the time, and when the police attempted to break up the fight, she hit the officer as well. She was ultimately arrested: "The police officer was rolling by when I was fighting….They pulled me off of the girl and I hit an officer in the face….I was high and they arrested me 'cause I was under the influence of drugs and alcohol [and for] assaulting a police officer and battery." Emilio believed he was arrested after the police witnessed him hitting another person:

> My friend had ended up getting into a fight…with a couple o' guys. And I was at the other corner and I ended up seeing it so I ran over there. And then I just ended up like hitting him hard on his head and then he just fell back. And then I guess the cops saw the whole thing….So they arrested me.

Gang Related Involuntary Police Interactions

The final type of police encounter described among the men and women (N=22) related to their gang involvement. The relatively few reported encounters associated with gang involvement could be due to the focus of the original study

called during a conflict with White individuals who made racist remarks. The White persons were arrested and he was not.

on drug dealing. It could also be due to study participants' desire to avoid groups

while they were dealing, as the men and women interviewed indicated that large

groups tended to attract police attention. They described actively avoiding

spending time in public in groups because of this. Overall, a relatively similar

number of women (N=12) and men (N=10) discussed gang-related related

encounters or gang related charges brought against them[16]. In all, Latina (N=5, 19

percent), African American (N=5, 6 percent) women, White (N=1 of 1) and multi-

racial (N=1 of 11) women discussed these types of interactions. Among the men,

African Americans (N=6, 10 percent) discussed these encounters the most

frequently followed by Latino (N=3, 7 percent) and Asian (N=1 of 11) men.

There appear to be no significant racial differences reported.

In most instances, the male and female gang members reported having

different involuntary face-to-face experiences with police in the context of gang-

related stops. Most notably, four women – but no men – reported being stopped

on the street in what appeared to be officers' routine information gathering

initiatives. In these cases, the women described being approached by police on

the streets and asked a series of questions about their gang and the group's related

activities. Suzy, for instance, recalled how she was stopped and questioned by the

police about her group. Though she lied to the officers, she commented about

how frequently this occurred:

> We've gotten stopped like a lot. Not countless, but a lot, like being all
> together, "What are you all standing doing here?" You know, "I'm with
> him," or, "I'm with her," bullshitting. But just getting stopped and never
> been taken in.

---

[16] In all, three women and four men reported having gang charges brought against them.

Jackie too explained that when she was in a particularly active gang area, it was common for the police to ask questions about active groups, violence, and general activities on the street: "[The police] just trying to check out what's going on cuz [there is] a lotta shooting [in this area]….If they see you down there, [the police] gonna jump out on you…just to conversate [and] see what you know. And shit like that."

Three additional women described being stopped on the street by police as a result of gang-involved conflicts. While none of the men in the sample described these types of encounters, one woman indicated that men were involved in her conflict suggesting it is unlikely limited to female gang members' experiences. Karin, for example, recalled a violent fight that resulted in her arrest: "We had a fight with these girls…and then the boys jumped in it on their side and our boys jumped in….hella paddy wagons came. I was hella scared." Bootcy, likewise, shared a story of being arrested on the street during a gang fight: "I was throwing a bottle at a rival's car and the narcs were there. They came right behind [me]…but I didn't see them coming…so I went to juvenile hall." Two men, on the other hand, described being stopped and searched on the street for gang-related activities. While none of the women in the sample reported this type of experience, one of the men described how he and a fellow female gang member were stopped for wearing gang-affiliated colors. They were searched; he was found with drugs and arrested: "I was walking down the street with [a] homie girl. She had a red belt on and [the police] searched us and found [drugs] on me....[I] got locked up."

Despite these distinctions, there also were several instances in which the men and women shared similar stories regarding gang-related face-to-face police encounters. First, several men (N=2) and women (N=2) described coming in contact with police in public spaces or on the street as a result of their being a part of a larger group of people. This, they perceived, likely attracted police attention and resulted in their having a face-to-face encounter with law enforcement. For example, Diego recalled an instance when the police approached him and a large number of friends in a park:

> [We would be] selling weed at the park [or] kicking back….The cops would come and it [is] a big park. We [would] run all over the place. Basically they try to tell us to stop [but] there would be like so many of us, like 60 of us.

Maurice recalled a time when he was stopped and arrested by police because he was with a group of people on the streets: "I got busted [by police] for being around [my gang]." Dawn was similarly stopped because she was with a group of people. However, because she had drugs on her at the time of the stop, she was arrested: "I guess [the police] was stopping us just because we was boys and girls, it was heck of us. And I had my stuff on me, I'm like, 'Dang, like I got my stuff on me, I got my stuff on me.'"

In addition, two gang members – one female and one male – described similar experiences of having the gang task force officers pull them over while in a car. In both cases, the study participants explained that they were pulled over because of their gang affiliation and their vehicle was searched. Jackie noted that this happened several times. While she was not arrested, she said they typically searched her car for illegal contraband:

> Like they pulled me over a few times [and] they check my car cuz [of] who I hang out with, like my crew members and stuff. All the dudes be in my car. Like [the police will] pull me over, they'll be like, "Oh, we thought you had guns, dope, and weed" and shit like that.

Dominic shared a similar story, though unlike Jackie, he was arrested because the police found drugs in his possession. He was, however, suspicious of the police since he was not crime involved at the time of the stop nor had he formally been identified as a gang member: "Cops did a illegal search. We wasn't doing nothing, we was just chilling in the van. They say they recognize us from being in a gang or whatever, but I mean I ain' never been charged as a gang member or nothing."

The review of these accounts demonstrates that the male and female study participants shared a number of different involuntary face-to-face encounters with the police that were directly related to their involvement in criminal behavior, ranging from gang affiliation to drug dealing and other crimes. While there were several notable gender differences, there were many more similarities in the stories the men and women told about these experiences. Not all involuntary encounters were related to crime, however. Indeed, a number of men and women discussed experiencing stops that were not perceived as resulting from their criminal behavior.

Non-Criminally Motivated Police Encounters

Though a majority reported involuntary face-to-face encounters with police were in relation to the study participants' involvement in criminal behavior, a number of them (N=37) reported experiences in which they were seemingly

approached for no identifiable reason or while not criminally involved. This was more likely to be reported by the men (N=28) than the women (N=10). Among the men, these stops were reported predominantly by African Americans (N=16, 28 percent) and Latinos (N=11, 26 percent). Asian men (N=1 of 11) reported these encounters the least. In terms of women, African Americans (N=8, 10 percent) were the most common to report these encounters, followed by Latina (N=1, 4 percent) and Asian (N=1 of 14) women. In all, however, there appeared to be no significant racial differences in who reported these types of interactions expect that White respondents did not report any of these types of encounters.

In most cases, the police were reported as approaching the gang members while they were not involved in criminal activities. However, the gang members generally believed the police approached them based on the officers' suspicion of criminal involvement. In fact, only two cases – one female and one male- reported the police approaching them in a friendly manner, saying hello or engaging them in casual conversation. In general, study participants described being approached by law enforcement while standing on or walking down the street, while seated at a bus stop, in cars, or while hanging out with friends. Damon, for instance, recalled being approached by police when he was hanging with friends on a local stoop. He described how he and his friends were not feeling well and that resulted in an abrupt departure indoors from the stairs: "We were all sick and then the police came [up]. They were like, 'What are you guys doing?' 'Nothing, man, we all sick, we going in the house.' And then we just went in the house." In all cases, the study participants did not view themselves as actively involved in

criminal behavior that warranted police attention despite that many had drugs on them at the time of the stop. Indeed, three gang members lamented how the police would stop people for jaywalking and loitering. Bunny, for example, recalled that she had been stopped for loitering on several occasions: "I've been caught four times…[for] loitering." Brandy commented more generally how she disliked that they approached people for jaywalking: "[The police]…run after you if they see you jaywalking….[The police] hop out their car…for real. I was like, 'Uh-uh.'"

Though not all articulated the outcome of the stops, some reported not being apprehended by the police. Specifically, 7 respondents – 5 men and 2 women – reported not being arrested. On the other hand, half reported being arrested at the conclusion of these interactions. For example, Channelle, who was arrested, described an incident in which she believed the police were unjustified in stopping her. She commented on the illegality of their actions, especially since she was only standing on the sidewalk at the time of the interaction: "They unlawfully searched me. They shoulda only jacked me for loitering because when they dipped up on me, I wasn't in any transaction sales, I wasn't...I was just standing there." Mikey shared his experience of being approached and ultimately arrested for drugs while at a bus stop:

> I was downtown…at the bus stop….I wasn't with no friends or nothing. I was by myself, standing there with other people who I don't know….Outta nowhere this guy just walk up...."So where you from? Other people down here from other places." Then I see a...silver little thing, and I see that it's his badge.

Lovisse, similarly, recalled being approached and searched by police at a bus stop. She too was found with drugs and arrested: "[The police] just jumped out

on me for nothing, cuz I'm sitting on the phone…and I'm at the bus stop." The men and women expressed that these types of stops were seemingly random and they were simply unlucky enough to be approached. Chewie, for example, lamented about being randomly stopped, then searched and arrested for drug possession: "[The police] just stopped me randomly….I was walking down the street and...they just happened to pull me over." Adam, too recalled an encounter where the police randomly approached and questioned if he had drugs: "We [walked] down the street, man, [and] the fucking cops rolls by us [and asks] 'Wassup, man? You ain' got none o' that shit [i.e. drugs]?'"

While many described specific encounters, several articulated general, routine experiences about being approached while not involved in criminal behavior. Annie, for instance, lamented that non-criminally motivated police encounters were commonplace in her neighborhood: "We get jacked a lot…in our neighborhood." Jerimiah shared a similar sentiment, though his encounters were seemingly connected to the neighborhood and whom he kept company with: "I been cuffed a lotta times…just from being up [in certain area of town and]...being around [drug-involved] people." Slim also commented about his general experience of non-criminally motivated police encounters: "You just hang out on the street, kick it with your friends, and police always bothering you and shit."

It should be noted that there was a gender difference in the nature of these types of encounters. Of the sample, three men reported being pulled over or approached and searched while in a vehicle. No women reported these types of encounters. Dominic lamented how he was caught for drug possession while in a

car: "First time I was busted...cops hopped out on us. We wasn't doing nothing

wrong. We was just sitting in the car, cops came up to us, asked for ID."

Likewise, Smoker, who was arrested for driving without a license, complained

that the police "pulled me over trying to be nosey and shit and see who was in the

back of my car and shit." Roberto, who was arrested, expressed confusion as to

why he was pulled over: "I was driving on a suspended license and the car I was

driving in was a beat-up looking Camaro….It just didn't look right, I guess. I

don't know….They pulled me over and I had no license….I got jail on that one."

Overall, these perceived non-criminally motivated police encounters were

reported with some degree of frequency among the study participants. The nature

and type of encounters generally took place on the street. Most notably, however,

men reported these types of encounters far more frequently than women.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I compared the frequencies, types, and nature of police

encounters the gang members discussed during the interviews. Perhaps not

surprisingly, the men and women reported coming in contact with police in a

number of different settings. As would be expected, most of the gang members'

encounters with the police were related to crime-involved activities. However, the

study participants also reported coming in contact with police during what they

perceived as unrelated to criminal involvement – an interaction that was reported

as happening with some degree of frequency.

Next, the comparative nature of this chapter illuminated the perceived

gender similarities and differences in police encounters. Overall, the male and

female gang members shared a significant number of similar involuntary face-to-

face experiences with police. These parallels were particularly clear with regard to

their involvement in drug dealing – where both genders reported coming in

contact with the police as a result of similar types of drug-related policing tactics.

Also, both women and men described parallel experiences with police following

their involvement in robberies and property theft, as well being approached while

in a group or gang in public places.

However, there were also several notable gender differences. First, the

women reported experiencing involuntary police encounters less frequently than

men – specifically, men described approximately twice as many stops as women.

However, this was particularly evident in the perceived non-criminally involved

police encounters, where men were approximately three times more likely to

report these exchanges than women. Second, the women were seemingly over

targeted in shoplifting offenses where they were four times as likely as men to

report being stopped by police. Additionally, female gang members were the only

ones to report being stopped and questioned about their gang by the police,

indicating they may be the focus information gathering efforts and the nature of

their gang-related police-encounters may differ from men. It is important to note

that patterns in the data are not necessarily representative of study participants'

encounters with police given the nature of the data collection and the limitations

of the dataset. Regardless, however, men and women's encounters with the

police differed in important ways – where men were more likely to report being

stopped for serious infractions or while not criminally involved and women were

approached for less serious crimes or for information gathering. Finally, it is also

worth noting that were racial differences present. Specifically, African

Americans and Latinos discussed these experiences the most and Asian and White

respondents were largely absent, save for their experiences in drug dealing. In

fact, no White gang members reported experiencing perceived non-criminally

involved encounters. This demonstrates that the police may have targeted the

respondents of color - though this could also stem from the limited number of

Asians (N=25) and Whites (N=4) represented in the overall sample.

Thus, the review of encounters described by the gang members sets the

stage for a through examination of how perceptions of procedural justice may be

similar or different depending on the context of the exchange with police, and the

gender and/or ethnicity of the person being approached by law enforcement. It is

evident that many factors are at play and that this investigation requires an

intersectional framework that accounts for the respondents' unique encounters,

gender, and ethnicity. In the following chapters, each of these components will

be examined more thoroughly. In Chapter 6, I investigate how context of the

encounter impacts perceptions of procedural justice in terms of trust, respect, and

participation. Then, in Chapter 7, I utilize an intersectional framework to explore

how race and gender as well as neighborhood context converge to shape

perceptions of police, procedural fairness, and legitimacy more generally.

CHAPTER 6: PERCEPTIONS OF TRUST, RESPECT, AND PARTICIPATION

According to Tyler (2006), attitudes towards law enforcement are typically formed during face-to-face interactions with police and measured by the presence or absence of specific process-based criteria (trust, respect, fairness, and participation). In this chapter, I examine how male and female gang members perceive police behavior in terms of trust and respect, and if and how they attempted to participate in their involuntary encounter. Perceptions of fairness and neutrality are taken up in Chapter 8[1].

Though most of the respondents did not offer direct opinions about the police, the small number that did were generally unfavorable. Indeed, several men (N=16) and women (N=10) stated how they "hated" or "disliked" the police, that they were "evil" or "assholes", and that law enforcement was unreliable and indifferent towards people of color, they were ineffective at their job, and out of touch with the needs of their community. Several men and women stated they avoided interacting with police when possible and would not seek their help in times of distress. According to Tyler (2006), each face-to-face contact with the police is an opportunity to foster and improve police-citizen relations and, as outlined in the previous chapter, a majority of study participants reported at least

---

[1] In general, research that measures perceptions of procedural justice typically examines all four of the theory's tenets together (trust, respect, voice, and neutrality). However, in this investigation, perceptions of trust, respect, and voice are discussed separately from perceptions of neutrality. The three criteria central to this chapter were raised organically through the open-ended discussions. Concepts of neutrality, however, emerged through discussions generated by direct questions in the interview guide. Specifically, study participants were asked about perceived gendered differences in how the police treated men and women. This resulted in directed discussions of neutrality and fairness, and as such, these concepts were not raised in a comparable way to the three tenets core to this chapter.

one involuntary contact with law enforcement. Regardless of whether these interactions took the form of routine stops, random stops, targeted arrests, or raids, the officers had the ability to demonstrate procedurally just behavior and contribute to the respondents' attitudes towards the police. Unfortunately, the respondents in the present study raised concerns in their perceptions of procedural justice in terms of all three components discussed in this chapter: trust, respect, and participation (Tyler 2006).

Trust

As discussed, Tyler (2006) defined trust as the degree of perceived honesty in terms of police behavior. This includes observed credibility in law enforcements' motivations for interacting with citizens and the overall trustworthiness of their actions. In general, expressions of trust or distrust were articulated by study participants as being directly tied to the context of the encounter. Specifically, the men and women described trusting the nature of the stop if they were approached by police with a warrant or as a result of their involvement in serious criminal behavior such as robbery or drug dealing. Indeed, and as discussed in detail in the previous chapter, the majority (N=155, 61 percent) of men and women described at least one perceived legitimate encounter with police and these encounters were explained as resulting from their being caught "red-handed", observed by police, informed on and so on[2].

---

[2] It should be noted that the perception of a qualified stop may also be impacted by probation and/or parole. The men (N=11) and women (N=2) under state supervision who raised this issue indicated they expected to be stopped and searched more often than their non-supervised counterparts. Probation or parole status was also articulated as contributing to diminished expectations for probable cause among the gang members and as such, complicated experiences

In the descriptions of these encounters, the men and women typically understood why they were approached by law enforcement, often admitted to their involvement, and accepted the encounter as legitimate. Smoker, for example, recalled: "I got caught hustling, you feel me, by the police. And you know, it's just the way, caught. You can't change that." Chewie, too, admitted that he was pulled over for drugs because "[the police] just seen me doing some odd shit." Debi, similarly, described how she accepted her arrest after being informed on: "Someone I sold drugs to, he told on me. I'm not gon' blame him, you feel me, cuz I was in the wrong for selling shit anyway….I take responsibility for myself [and] for my actions." While most did not explicitly state how they would respond to police during perceived legitimate exchanges, Diandra described openly complying and being honest with police when she was caught: "[The police] came behind me cuz a girl snitched on me....I gave her the rock, and she sold it to the dude, and [the police] came behind me and just grabbed me….I ain' go run and lie. 'Yeah, I gave it to her.'"

These experiences and attitudes towards police motivations, however, were juxtaposed to many encounters that were perceived as illegitimate. Overall, a comparable number of men (N=33, 27 percent) and women (N=30, 22 percent) raised concerns about encounters they considered illegitimate. Among the men in the sample, this was discussed by a similar number of African American (N=16, 48 percent) and Latino (N=15, 45 percent) men, followed by a smaller proportion

---

with perceptions of procedural justice, especially in terms of trusting or not trusting police motivations for being approached and searched. Based on the questions asked during the original research project, the total number of study participants under state supervision could not be determined.

of Asian (N=1 of 11) and multi-racial (N=1 of 7) men. Among the women,

African Americans discussed this the most (N=17, 57 percent) followed by a

smaller number of Latina (N=7, 23 percent), multi-racial (N=3 of 11), Asian

(N=1, 3 percent) and White (N=1 of 3) women. Specifically, the study

participants complained about being approached while "doing nothing", sitting at

a bus stop, sitting or driving a car, or walking or crossing the street[3]. They

mentioned this despite recognizing the risks of being subject to unwarranted stops

given their gang involvement and participation in illegal activities. Indeed, some

had contraband on them at the time, resulting in their arrest. Still, when these

encounters occurred, it was common for them to express confusion, frustration,

and distrust as to why they were targeted, stopped, searched, and/or handcuffed

by the police. They emphasized that context was of great import and they did not

view stops as legitimate if they were based on minor infractions (i.e. jaywalking,

loitering), related to their gang involvement, or for no identifiable or a random

reason. Suzy referred to this as being stopped for "little shit" and Chanelle, who

was stopped, found with drugs on her person and arrested, believed it was because

the police had to "fill a quota." Patti believed the police were actually

hypocritical in their efforts: "They [are] harassing people all the time….The

police is backwards. If you're doing something, they don't mess with you, but if

you're [not] doing something...they're gonna mess with you for nothing."

        In general, when approached in such cases, the study participants, like

Patti quoted above, commonly referred to this as "being harassed", "fucked with"

---

[3] A vast majority of the men described first hand accounts. A small (N=4) number provided vicarious stories.

or "messed with" by police. Martine, for instance, who was arrested 10 times for loitering, said it was because the police "like to fuck with us." Lucid, likewise, commented, "[The cops are] arresting everybody that be out there, fucking with them." Alton, too commented on how the police "pulled me over hella times, you feel me, and fucked with me and shit." Edgar also described his routine, unwarranted stops by police as "harassment":

> I would be out there and then when the narcs would come and everybody would walk away I was the only one that would stay there, because I didn't have nothing on me. And they would always used to stop me and check me and harass me and I would never have anything, ever.

Neneh, a female gang member, also referenced general feelings of harassment and commented on the police's lack of effectiveness, suggesting that while their efforts may be helpful in some ways, in other ways, their routine encounters with people did not help the community in times of distress: "[The police are] making it safe or whatever, but they don't never be out there when people be shooting, they always just harassing people."

Interestingly and as alluded to in Neneh's quote, the majority of interviewees conveyed that these routine in-person experiences were connected to more general negative opinions about the police and their perceived lack of legitimacy on the streets. Divine, for example, described how she believed that the police were excessively aggressive, a feeling she tied to a specific, negative experience she had when having lunch with her young son: "It's ridiculous nowadays. We get harassed for nothing. I went to go eat with my son and I got harassed." Erica, too, commented that her arrest contributed to general negative attitudes towards police work and their legitimacy as law enforcers: "[The] third

time [I was arrested] I was just posted on the street….I think the police don't be

doing their job. They just be trying to mess with...young people like us, like just

arrest you for no reason."

These sentiments were especially clear in study participants' discussions

of policing strategies targeted against gang members. While they acknowledged

that the police were seemingly effective in making it difficult for the gang

members to hang out with each other, their strategies (i.e. routine stopping,

arresting of gang members, and adding them to the gang database) were

sometimes perceived as illegitimate and a form of harassment[4]. Bunny, for

example, lamented how police practices were excessive in their dealings with

gangs. While she understood the motivations and indicated they were actually

quite efficient, she felt their strategies of interacting with gang members based on

innocuous crimes were too extreme and criminalized her unnecessarily:

> It's crazy. Like we being watched all the time. Like you can't do nothing
> if you wanted to, like they cracking down on loitering and everything.
> Like if you don't live there, you can't be there….I mean I understand
> where y'all coming from, y'all trying to get the guns off the street, trying
> to make sure less people get killed a year…but...I feel like...it's too much
> though.

Divine also discussed how the gang task force officers came out every Tuesday

and Thursday in an attempt to arrest gang members. While the police were

effective in forcing her group to split up, she viewed these efforts as separate from

crime fighting and instead as personal attacks on her friends:

---

[4] Only one female in the study discussed how gang policies were beneficial and made her neighborhood safer.

>We spread out. We're never in one place because of the police nowadays....They come out, catch homeys, take 'em to jail, put 'em on the fucking gangs list, gang injunction. Just come harass everybody.

Diego shared a similar feeling of frustration directed at the police efforts against gangs: "There's a lot of heat going on [like] gang injunctions. [The police] really been like petty on stuff. Like violating us on every little thing....Anything that takes us of the streets, they are going to violate us for it."

While not many interviewees specifically commented as to how they responded to the police during these seemingly unjustified exchanges – be it gang related or not – several clearly indicated that they stopped when instructed to do so. Jackie, for example, commented on the routine nature of being pulled over in her car for being in the company of gang members. While she complied with police instructions, these face-to-face experiences were connected to a broader perception that their practices were not legitimate and instead, a mechanism with which to harass her:

>[The police] pulled me over a few times...cuz who I hang out with, like my crew members and stuff [and] all the dudes be in my car. Like [the police will] pull me over, they'll be like, "Oh, we thought you had guns, dope, and weed and shit like that."...I'll be like, "This is illegal for you to be searching my car like this."...They just be wanting to fuck with me anyway, so I just let 'em fuck with me.

On the other hand, it is worth noting that a small number of study participants described behaving in a non-compliant manner. Perhaps not surprisingly, these rare expressions of non-compliance were directly related to the perceived legitimacy of the interaction. Chris, for example, lamented about his random street encounter with police. He was confused as to why he would be approached because he felt he had done nothing to warrant the officers' attention. Instead of

adhering to their instructions, he continued on his way: "I'm walking down the

motherfucking street. Next thing I know, 'Brrp-brrp [of the police car]'....I ain't

tripping, I keep walking. Like, these motherfuckers can't be talking to me. I ain't

did shit." Mia recalled her unprovoked interaction with police while walking.

She also refused to stop because she did not perceive any justifiable reason for the

encounter:

> I'm smoking a cigarette and walking down the street and a police rolled
> up....They say, "Come here," and I say, "Naw, I'm not coming here."
> And I just kept on walking. You know, cuz they didn't have a reason to
> stop me, I didn't do anything...that was like visible for them to see to jack
> me, so I just kept walking.

While these are just several examples, they do elucidate that context of the stop

can contribute to expressions of non-compliance.

In addition to concerns about the context of the stop and distrusting police

motivations for their encounter, a number of men (N=19) and women (N=21) also

openly described the police as deceitful in some capacity[5]. The study participants

reported that officers entered residences without a warrant, lied about cases,

planted evidence, and/or exaggerated their reports to increase sentence times.

These issues were raised mostly among African American men (N=14, 24

percent) and women (N=12, 15 percent), followed by Latino/a (men, N=4, 10

percent; women, N=3, 7 percent), multi-racial (men, N=1 of 6; women, N=4 of

11) and Asian (women, N=2 of 14) individuals. No White respondents raised

these concerns. While the study participants acknowledged they were involved in

---

[5] These included both direct and vicarious accounts. It is also important to note that one study
participant described an instance where the police could not arrest her because she had no drugs on
her at the time of the stop. This suggests that the police were not consistently viewed as deceitful
and these behaviors may not be systematic.

illegal behavior, such as dealing drugs, holding guns, and/or associating with known gang members, they still seemingly expected the police behave honestly. When officers "violated their rights", often to their detriment, they expressed anger and frustration. These face-to-face encounters and discussions of vicarious experiences seemingly contributed to general negative attitudes of distrust towards the police.

Most commonly, the men and women shared stories of how "the police be lying." Lying included the perception that police fabricated details about the encounter to ensure the objective legality of the stop. For example, when asked to describe his chances of getting caught for dealing, Wiz explained how the situation could be complicated by police dishonesty: "You for surely gon' get [caught]....Unless it's an illegal search. But [the police] rarely get illegal searches now. Even if it was an illegal search, they lie and they flip it and twist it." Lying could also include the perception that law enforcement planted evidence in order to ensure arrest or increase charges during sentencing. Mia, who was ultimately arrested on drug charges, described her frustration when this happened to her: "I didn't have a warrant. I didn't have anything. The officer jacked me, he lied…and said I had a bunch o' dope, but I didn't. And they took me to jail." Aliyah shared a similar story concerning her cousin: "They will probably try to plant more than what you have on you....Recently my cousin…got arrested [in a] drug bust, but he only had a 20-sack on him. When he got to the jail, he was convicted of possession of $550 worth of crack which he didn't have." Lying could also include the perception that police gave false reasons for the arrest.

Lovisse, for example, described how she thought the police paid a drug user for

information despite being told her arrest was for selling to an undercover officer:

"They said I sold to a undercover, but I didn't. What I think is a dope fiend

snitched. They was paying a dope fiend, and they snitched." Fool shared a

similar account: "I know one time they came here and they said somebody had

stolen my license plate and done a drive by. But then they were there to serve me

a subpoena. It was a total lie, cuz I kept asking what about my license plate and

they said 'oh, I don't know.'"

Being deceitful even went beyond lying and exaggerating. A small

number of men (N=4) and women (N=10) raised concerns about corruption,

describing the police as "crooked", "dirty", or "shysty." Curtis believed police

corruption contributed to him being routinely stopped by police: "I don't like the

police out here, I think the police is corrupted. Corrupted officers…come by just

to mess with us when we not doing nothing....Pretty much harassing us." For

these study participants, the perceptions of dishonest police behavior were

seemingly more systemic than isolated cases of lying and included serious abuses

of power such as shakedowns and selling, stealing, and using drugs[6]. Mia, for

example, explained her understanding of police corruption: "A lotta the

police…get in trouble for illegal things that they do. They get busted

[for]...taking people's dope...or taking people money and they don't put it on the

books or they don't bring it to court, they don't bring it to evidence." Jin

---

[6] Three women – no men – relayed vicarious accounts where the police abused power to engage in sexual misconduct. This included rape and having sex in exchange for benefits.

explained her frustration at being shaken down and, contrary to Mia's statement, the seeming lack of police oversight and accountability, "I just hate the fact that, you know, they got crooked cops out here and, you know, the mayor, whoever's in charge or the deputy's not doing anything about it….The police wouldn't take me to jail, but they would take my money."

Thus, perceptions of distrust were complicated. For most, experiences of distrust were largely tied to the context of the encounter. Specifically, being stopped for minor infractions or for reasons related to one's gang involvement was not perceived as justified. Instead, these experiences contributed to general, negative opinions about the police and their lack of legitimacy on the streets, attitudes further compounded for some by beliefs that officers were corrupt. Notably, though, stops were perceived as legitimate – and based on trustworthy motives – when the individual in question was engaged in crime at the time.

Dignity and Respect

According to Tyler (2006), people put great importance on the degree of politeness and respect afforded to them during face-to-face contacts with police. Individuals are likely to feel disconnected from authorities that treat them rudely and with indifference towards their rights. In all, the men and women in this sample largely raised concerns about respect and the quality of interpersonal treatment received from the officers. In all, 24 men (20 percent) and 22 (16 percent) women described experiencing, witnessing, or learning about respectful or disrespectful police behavior during involuntary stops. While several men and women described experiencing respectful interpersonal treatment, 21 men and 22

women described incidents where they were treated with what they perceived as disrespect or learned about disrespectful encounters experienced by others in their social networks. These concerns were primarily raised among African American (N=14, 24 percent) and Latino (N=10, 24 percent) men as well as African American (N=14, 18 percent) and Latina women (N=6, 23 percent), followed by one Asian and one multi-racial woman. There were no White interviewees who raised this concern. Though the respondents acknowledged that they risked being detained by police due to their involvement in illegal activities and/or as a result of aggressive anti-gang law enforcement strategies, they still stressed the importance of being treated with respect during these points of contact. As Diego explained:

> I respect [gang task force and narcotics police] but if they want to come disrespecting, I don't give a fuck if you are a cop. That's my family. You can't come over here and disrespect them. I don't care if you got a badge, we are all human. That's the way I look at it. Don't come disrespecting just because you got a fucking badge and you are going to come pushing around and shit. You going to come and respect the family.

Concerns about disrespectful treatment were typically related to disproportional or inappropriate use of force during a stop. This was discussed by 16 men (13 percent) and 18 women (13 percent). This occurred both in the context of stops deemed legitimate and those deemed illegitimate. Such use of force included experiencing, witnessing or learning about the police forcefully stopping someone via "throwing", "slamming", or "grabbing" individuals as well as shoving, beating, or generally handling people roughly. Dennis, for example, recalled how the police treated him with disrespect when they arrested him for fighting during school. He remembered that the handcuffs were extremely tight

and the officers roughly placed him in the police car: "They had me in handcuffs tight as fuck. So tight that you could see the marks around my wrists and they had me in the car scuffed up." Nenah, also, described being in a fight with another girl and when the police came, they were rough enough to mark her skin: "Police was trying to grab me off her [but] I wouldn't let her go or nothing. And then they had picked me up and slammed me on the ground. That's how I got marks all over here." For three men, disproportional use of force was having weapons drawn on them in a threatening manner during a police encounter. Maurice, for example, recalled:

> I got in a truck to make a sale…nobody [was] in there but one person. But when I had got my dope out to sell [to] the dude…something happened. Mysteriously, a lotta people jumped [in to the]…back o' the truck….I was only 17 with just like seven guns pointed to my head.

While some (N=7) described disrespectful interactions during seemingly unjustified police encounters and indeed, this was raised more so among the men (N=5) than women (N=2), the majority (N=27) indicated that these experiences happened when they or someone they knew was approached during a stop they considered legitimate: on suspicion of a crime or as a result of their involvement in a crime – most commonly, drug dealing[7]. Greg, for instance, described a drug-related arrest that stood out in his memory. He felt the police were excessively physical when he was stopped on suspicion of dealing:

> [I was] playing around with my partner. Forgot I had a sack [of drugs] inside my drawers. Right when they said, "The police! The narcs!" I turned around and broke and fell....They jumped right on me….I tried to

---

[7] This may be a result of the original focus of the study and had they been probed about more general crime involvement, it is possible additional situations may have been discussed.

get up and they smashed me. [The police] handcuffed me, went in my drawers, and found that sack o' crack.

Padrino, a Latino gang member, described his arrest after he sold drugs to an undercover officer: "I gave [the undercover officer] a twenty. [The] next thing I knew I was like turned around, a couple white dudes…they threw me down on the ground, they tried to beat me down." Moreover, and strictly related to drug involved encounters with police, study participants described being choked by the officers when approached on suspicion of holding drugs in their mouth. Choking dealers was described as a law enforcement strategy to prevent sellers from swallowing drugs prior to arrest. Shannon, for example, explained: "If they see you...make a sale or anything, they gonna come choke you and sling you on the ground [and] have their knee all on your neck." Alton too commented on this practice: "[The police] choke your ass. They bounce out [of the car] hella fast, you feel me?"

Study participants explained that the rocks, if the police obtained them, could then be used as evidence against them. Despite their understanding of this, choking was perceived as an overly aggressive use of force, a violation of personal space, and physical attack on their person. Bunny, for instance, graphically described a time when the police attempted to catch her with crack. While she managed to eventually swallow them, she commented on how aggressive the police were in trying to catch her with them: "[The police] hopped out the car. I tried to swallow [the rocks but] they got me by my face, my throat, back o' my neck....They tried to make me open my mouth, but I just swallowed all my rocks." Lisa's account echoed Bunny's narrative: "I had [the drugs] in my

mouth and the police started trying to choke me out as soon as they got outta the car….I was swallowing it while they were trying to choke me." Amber, likewise, recalled when the police stopped her while drug dealing: "[The police] hopped out [of their car], then choked me [and] damn near broke my arm."

While these accounts were of specific exchanges, a small number of study participants described this type of police behavior in more general terms. Mia, for example, lamented how law enforcement are "beating people or doing stuff they shouldn't be doing to people." For the few who spoke more generally, these perceptions were also connected more broadly to opinions about the police. Amber, for instance, spoke more generally about police use of force. For her, perceived disproportionate violence directly contributed to her having negative attitudes towards law enforcement: "[The narcotics police are] evil as hell….You'd think them motherfuckers [are trying to] save the world [and] help the people [but] they beat…the crap out the dealers." Jin also complained about the general violence she witnessed and experienced, and connected these frustrations to a perceived lack of accountability and oversight of police discretion: "I've seen cops really beat the hell outta people….I've had a cop, you know, choked me….Like they get away with it, too, cuz they can do anything, they can say anything and get away with it."

In addition to physical abuse, a number of men (N=9) and women (N=11) described being subjected to or witnessing the police speak in a manner that "rude", "mean", threatening, and/or generally perceived as disrespectful. This was referred to as the officers "talking hella shit" to them, being sworn at or called

names during the encounter[8]. In most cases, the study participants described being spoken to in a disrespectful way during a stop recognized as being based on police officers' legitimate suspicion of their involvement in criminal behavior. Still, study participants maintained that it was important for the police to treat them with dignity. As Debi explained, "I was telling them like, 'You got me [but] don't cuss at me though [because] you think you tough because you walking around with guns and badges.'" One male gang member explained how the police demeaned him after he was taken into custody, a behavior that seemingly hurt his feelings:

> I'm in [the] police car and [the officer is] talking smack and stuff. He's like, "I eat you guys for breakfast." He like, "You just breakfast." He like, "You not even lunch or dinner. You little chump." He like, "You're a nobody. You won't be nobody [and] you're in nobody's world." I'm like "What!?"

Junior also shared a story of when he felt disrespected by the police. They stopped him while he was siphoning gas and though he tried to deny it, he was affronted by the officer's disrespectful language and behavior:

> The police [approached] and [said], "Can I get your ID?" I'm like, "Sure, Officer."…He said, "Why do you think I'm here?" I said, "I don't know why you're here." He's like, "Come on, man, I could smell the gas." Just all trying to get violent and stuff. So I knew what he was talking about….A neighbor had called…[and] said we were siphoning gas….I say, "I don't know what you're talking about, Officer." So he points his finger in my face like this, starts hitting me in the forehead, and said, "You know damn well what I'm talking about. Don't play dumb, you stupid—.."…So I grabbed his hand like this, I say, "Get off me. Get off me."

---

[8] One male respondent explained that being on probation complicated expectations of respect. Specifically, if on probation, he perceived the police as having "the right to talk hella shit to you anyway or do whatever they want to."

Along similar lines, Casper recalled a time when he and his friend were stopped

and found with drugs. He described how his friend was trying to make light of

the situation and the police were physically aggressive and verbally disrespectful:

"The cops asked him like what is that [powder] and then he was like…'That's

baby powder.'…He was like, I'm kinda ashy, I got eczema….He just started

joking with the cop and [the officer] elbowed him [and said] 'Shut the fuck up.'"

Melanie also shared what she characterized as a violent and disrespectful

exchange when the police surprised her while she was dealing: "Some

motherfuckers came from behind. I don't know where they came from....Them

motherfuckers choked me out...calling me bitches and all that shit." It is evident

then, based on these narratives, that disrespectful interpersonal treatment marred

the men and women's experiences with the police, even in encounters that they

otherwise recognized as legitimate because of their crime involvement at the time.

These negative experiences and attitudes towards the police differed

significantly from the descriptions surrounding the few interactions (N=6) in

which the study participants believed they were treated with respect. In these

cases, the men and women indicated that being treated with dignity was

meaningful to them. For instance, Jorge recalled when the police approached him

while he and some friends were hanging out and drinking:

> I was just being cool as hell with the police and shit. He starts talking, he
> says, "Yeah, if you serious about it, I think you'd make a great cop."...We
> shook hands and shit. He shook my hand and you know, he told me that
> I'd make a good cop and shit [and] I should consider applying when I turn
> 20.

He described the interaction positively and was impressed that the officer suggested he should apply to the police academy. At the conclusion of their discussion, the officer shook his hand – a gesture that Jorge commented on twice – and left him and his friends alone.

Doug also commented on being treated well by officers during an encounter. After he was arrested for shoplifting, the officers apprehended him and brought him to jail. Given the late hour, no one in his family could bring him a change of clothing. The officers required his current clothing and they ultimately provided him with some garments to change into, a gesture that was meaningful to Doug: "They were putting me in regular jail and the deputies were actually nice enough. I went in there at 6 o'clock and, you know, come 9, 10 o'clock…they gave me my clothes to get dressed."

Maurice also discussed a time when the police treated him with respect. Unlike the above-mentioned stories, he was approached on the street while not criminally involved. Maurice explained that he was a former gang member and had transformed his life to distance himself from a crime-involved lifestyle. The police, who were used to stopping him for criminal behavior, shook his hand and acknowledged his transformation. These words and actions of support were so meaningful to Maurice that they became a mechanism by which he measured his personal growth:

> I'm telling you for real, I had this sergeant come and shake my hand the other day like, "Whatever you're doing, you just keep doing it. I don't care if I see you every once in a while." He was like, "Man, you made the most change outta dang near everybody I've seen in this neighborhood." …Everybody used to see a totally [different me]….Police officers that used to continuously nitpick me and take me to jail for no reason, if they

> see me now to this day [they] be like, "Whatever you're doing, keep doing it." That's how I know I made a change.

Thus, the gang members in this study clearly valued being treated with respect. They commented favorably when they were treated with dignity, even when stopped on suspicion of criminal behavior and when arrested. Alternatively, they expressed frustration and anger when subjected to seemingly disrespectful and inappropriate behavior and language. These responses indicated that expectations for respect and positive interpersonal treatment hold regardless the nature and context of the stop.

Voice and Citizen Participation

Tyler (2006) argued that having a voice during an involuntary stop is important, as it can increase feelings of fairness and acceptance of the outcome. Participation affords the opportunity to partake in the decision-making process, which can include presenting one's argument or point of view during an interaction with law enforcement. Though participation may not affect the outcome, it is still viewed as a meaningful part of the exchange and its absence can increase feelings of resentment toward law enforcement. In the present sample, citizen participation was rarely discussed[9]. Only 16 (13 percent) men and 14 women (10 percent) described attempting to participate with the police during their involuntary face-to-face encounters[10]. These attempts were discussed among African American (N=9, 56 percent), Latino (N=5, 33 percent), Asian (N=1, 7

---

[9] This may be due to the original focus of the research. The study participants were not specifically asked about their engagement with police officers. It is likely these exchanges are underreported in the present analysis.

[10] All of these were first hand accounts, no vicarious experiences were discussed.

percent), and multi-racial (N=1, 7 percent) men. Similarly, African American women reported participating the most frequently (N=8, 57 percent) followed by Latina (N=5, 36 percent) and Asian women (N=1, 7 percent). In general, if they participated, they described doing so by answering police questions or attempting to explain their situation or side of the story[11].

For approximately half of these individuals (men, N=8; women, N=6), having a voice did not impact the outcome of the stop, nor was this expected. More importantly, they expressed negative experiences when participating in their encounter, which was seemingly more important than the results. Specifically, when attempting to engage with police, they were met with disbelief and disregard. In most cases, these experiences occurred during stops study participants considered legitimate because they were crime involved or stopped on suspicion of a crime at the time of the encounter, rather than those stops they perceived as procedurally unjust on their face. Jess, for instance, described attempting to tell an officer that she was not guilty of dealing at the time of the stop. Though she was a regular seller, she proclaimed her innocence during this particular stop. She was let go but recalled how the officer did not believe her: "I ain' never put nothing in my hand and served nobody [this time]....They had to let me go because I didn't serve nobody [but the officer was] like, 'You lying.' He was like, 'You lying.'"

---

[11] Participation may also be complicated by age. Two men and one woman indicated their experiences with participation occurred when they were in their early teens (under 14). The police were described as being concerned in part because of how young they were.

Nadia also described an experience when the police did not believe her. She was on a bus and the police approached her on suspicion for her potential involvement in a crime committed by her friends. She attempted to clarify to the police that she was not connected to the wrongdoing but was met with disbelief and rudeness. They asked her to remove some clothing, which made her uncomfortable, and ultimately arrested her despite her protests:

> All of a sudden we just seen hella police [on the bus]. They're like, "Put your hands up."…Like, "You, stand up. Check her first." Like to me. I was like, "What...? What you guys doing?"…I had to like take off my sweater in front o' everyone. I was like, "I'm not even with them." Like I was trying to tell them but…they were like, "Shut up, that's what everybody says." Like, you know, being mean….I was like, "Please don't take me, please."…Then they...threw us all in a car.

Henry, similarly, described how the police did not believe him during a stop. Unlike the above-mentioned examples, his was a routine traffic stop. Regardless, the police reportedly did not take him seriously, which upset him because the stop resulted in his arrest – an outcome he felt was unreasonable given that he was honest with the officers:

> It was a random check. [The police] thought that I was drunk but I was like, "Nah, I'm not drunk." They pulled me out the car, searched my car, and they found like...a half a gram o' coke….That was some bullshit cuz...I gave 'em all my information right, my information was right, I didn't lie to 'em. I wasn't drunk.

For several others, the police were perceived as being indifferent to their side of the story. Simone, for instance, described an exchange with a British couple she thought were being racist. Though she admitted to her involvement in the conflict and was arrested, she appealed to the officers to acknowledge the couple's responsibility in provoking them and escalating the situation. She was

frustrated and angered that law enforcement was unsympathetic to the disrespect she experienced:

> [The British man was] like, "…y'all low-class niggers."…Then he just threw coffee on me…He threw coffee on my bag and he was trying to attack my sister. So I stabbed him [and] then we went to jail. But the only reason why we went to jail is because [the British man] called 'em. But [the officers] didn't really care about the racism part. 'Cause we told them why it escalated and they was like, "OK, so."

Malcom also believed that, in general, participation post-stop was pointless because of officer indifference: "When you dealing with me [and] you got me in these cuffs, I know you can do anything you want to, you know. No matter what I say, they ain' gon' listen to me."

Of particular interest, participation, or the lack thereof, may be linked to perceptions of previous failings of procedural justice. Instead of partaking in their stop, eight gang members described deciding to opt out – a decision that seemingly stemmed from the belief that police had failed to exhibit procedurally just behavior either during the described stop or a previous encounter(s). This included believing the police stereotyped, demonstrated untrustworthy motives for stops, and/or exhibited poor interpersonal treatment. This contributed to concerns about officers' authority and legitimacy and resulted in study participants' refusal to participate. Rosyln, for example, commented about the hypocrisy of the police being in her neighborhood:

> Police officers are...stereotypical….That's good that they protect...the city, but they're hella fucked up. Pull you over for no reason. One time, police officer got hella mad cuz I wouldn't answer his question. You know? And I told him, "You're just mad cuz I'm not answering your question." And then he's like, "Shut the fu—"

While their presence may be beneficial, Roslyn still viewed them negatively because of their procedurally unjust behavior. She refused to engage with them during a specific interaction as a result, and the officer reportedly responded in a disrespectful manner.

Paul similarly described generally opting out of participation because he believed police behavior, specifically with regard to whom they decided to stop, was motivated by self-interest and not based on reasonable suspicion. As such, he felt that participation would do little to impact police actions during face-to-face encounters. In Paul's opinion, police stopped people in the hopes of finding contraband so they could arrest them and work out of the station as opposed to patrol the neighborhood:

> There's no way you guys could talk your way out of [a stop], you know? That's what cops look for, that's what cops want, they wanna find somebody with some drugs or a weapon or something like that, so they could take 'em down the station, you know. They ain' gotta be driving around looking for more criminals, they could be sitting there doing the paperwork.

Study participants' discussions of adverse experiences differed significantly from those who reported that participation positively impacted their experiences with law enforcement. Indeed, seven gang members described voicing their side and being heard. While several were able to sway the outcome and avoid arrest, the outcome was not articulated as the most meaningful aspect of the interaction. Instead, they indicated that it was important that their participation be respected and they be taken seriously during the exchange.

Diego, for example, recalled that the police listened and adhered to his requests during his encounter:

> [The police] went up to the house. I said, "My grandma just had a heart attack recently. Let me go inside first [and] I am going to leave the door open and let them know you are coming in." [The police] were like, "All right dude." I let [my family] know, "Just go to the neighbors house." So they came in.

While it did not stop his eventual arrest, the officers' acknowledgment of his concerns positively impacted his experience with the police. Specifically, Diego believed that participation afforded the police the ability to treat him and his family with respect, which was meaningful to him.

Jennifer also described a time when she was busted after robbing someone and attempted to flee the scene. Though she was arrested, she had tried to talk her way out of the situation. Ultimately, however, she complied with the police directives, accepted the charge, and agreed with the response given by the officer:

> [The police] stopped the car….I was so scared. Like as soon as I seen 'em, I just started crying. I was like, I'm not even gonna run. I'm not even gonna act tough right now. I knew I was going to jail, like I knew it….I start crying, "I'm only 12." They were like, "Well, you didn't act 12 when you were robbing somebody." I sure didn't.

For another gang girl, participation resulted in her being released and she described being afforded some compassion by the officer[12]. Ceci recalled when she and her sister were stopped for dealing crack. The officer suggested they not deal in his area and when they lied and said they swallowed crack, they were

---

[12] This experience may have been impacted by the study participant's age. As indicated previously, those were young (early teens) were seemingly afforded more leniency and compassion by the officers.

impressed that the officer provided instructions on how to get the drugs out of

their system:

> [The officer] brought us to the side…'cause we told him we were young, like 14. He said, "If you fixing to do this, at least don't do it in my area, go somewhere else. Cause next time it ain' gon' be like this [i.e., getting released rather than arrested]."…[My sister] admitted to like swallowing one rock even though that wasn't true. And he said, "Well, just go get some milk and throw it up."

Of particular import, being taken seriously during a stop could result in

compliance – the ultimate goal of procedural justice (Tyler, 2006). Indeed, for

two gang members, previous positive experiences with participation resulted in

later displays of compliance and honesty during involuntary face-to-face

interactions with police. Izaiah, for example, described how telling the truth

could result in non-arrest for minor infractions. More importantly, his one

positive experience of being taken seriously by police shaped the way he thought

of the officers and informed how he wanted to behave during future encounters:

> What I learned about cops is if you tell 'em the truth, they really won't do nothing to you….Like a cop has...seen me with a blunt before, and he was like, "Was that weed?" And I was like, "Yeah. There's nothing else in my pockets. I have no warrants, no nothing, I've never been in jail." He was like, "Just go to like a park or something, just don't do it around here." So I put out the blunt and just left. So that's what I learned about cops – just tell the truth – no matter what.

Krystle described a time when she was pulled over while in her husband's car

and, like Izaiah, stressed the importance of being honest with police. During her

stop, she was not concerned about being searched because she thought she was

not in possession of anything incriminating. However, the officer found a gun she

was unaware of. She explained her side and reported that the officer believed her.

When the case went to trail, the officer testified to her innocence and helped her

win the case:

> [The police] smelled marijuana in the car, so, of course, that gave them probable cause to search. I knew I didn't have anything on me, so I really wasn't worried about it….And when he popped my husband's trunk, he had a gun back there….I told him the situation and I tried to be as honest with him as possible….That saved me because the cop did vouch that he did believe my story. He did believe the gun was not mine. And pretty much without the cop and my lawyer, I probably would have been screwed.

Thus, the review of these accounts demonstrates that participation during an

involuntary encounter with police is a complicated component of procedural

justice. Though rarely discussed, the few adverse encounters contributed to

negative perceptions of police. On the other hand, the few positive interactions

were articulated as meaningful and impactful, potentially contributing to more

general displays of compliance and honesty.

CONCLUSION

This chapter investigated the study participants' experiences with police

during involuntary face-to-face interactions. Specifically, I examined perceptions

of procedural justice in terms of three of the theory's process-based criteria: trust,

respect, and participation. Overall, the women and men's accounts of these three

facets of procedural justice were very similar – despite the men reporting far more

involuntary encounters with police. Though a comparative study, no overt gender

differences were reported. In general, the men and women raised similar concerns

with regards to trust, respect, and participation. First, the data revealed that both

men and women appeared to distrust the police, though this distrust varied based

on the context of the stop. Specifically, the study participants were especially

likely to raise the issue when they were approached for a reason they did not

perceive as justifiable. Of particular import, the study participants seemingly did

not perceive their gang involvement, or policing strategies targeted at gangs, as

reasonable. While several commented on the overall net effectiveness of these

practices, they also perceived them as personal attacks and commonly referred to

these involuntary interactions as "harassment." In such cases, the men and

women connected these experiences to more general, negative opinions about the

police, the ineffectiveness of their work, and an overall lack of legitimacy of law

enforcement. This, combined with perceptions of officer deceit, corruption, and

abuse of power further contributed to the men and women lacking good faith in

police discretion and authority.

Next, both men and women indicated that face-to-face contact with police

was commonly marred by disrespectful interpersonal treatment. Regardless of

whether the stop was a result of what they recognized as their involvement in

crime or suspicious behavior, the study participants expected to be treated with

dignity. Instead, they frequently reported being subject to physical and verbal

abuse. When compared to the experiences during which they were treated with

dignity, it became clear that these interactions – both negative and positive – were

meaningful to the study participants. They expected and valued being treated

well by the officers and were hurt and frustrated when they were not.

Additionally, it is important to note that there were important racial differences

wherein African American and Latino/a men and women were more likely to

describe being subject to more negative encounters with police. Very few Asian, White, multi-racial, and other men and women discussed these facets of police contacts, a finding that suggests the police may racially stereotype and target gang members of color, treating them comparatively worse than others of different ethnicities.

Finally, participation during face-to-face contacts was rarely reported. On the few occasions study participants discussed attempting to do so, half of the men and women described how their attempts to participate were disregarded, disbelieved, and treated with indifference. In other cases, study participants opted out of participation. Specifically, several gang members described not participating as a result of perceived previous failing of procedural justice. This suggests that perceptions of procedural justice are interrelated, where the absence of one can impact the presence of another. Indeed, these concerns were raised largely among African Americans and Latinos, again suggesting that gang members of color may experience comparatively more negative treatment by the police than other ethnicities, despite that study participants from other ethnic groups in this sample were similarly involved in crime. This further supports research that indicates criminally involved minority groups may not experience procedurally just behavior as often as other non-minority populations. Descriptions of negative experiences, then juxtaposed with stories in which participation was taken seriously, suggests that being afforded the opportunity to participate was a meaningful part of police-gang member interactions, regardless of the outcome of the exchange. Perhaps most enlightening was that for a few

individuals, having a voice and being heard contributed to the desire to be honest

with police and behave in a compliant manner, suggesting that for gang members,

like law-abiding populations, having a voice is important and necessary for

establishing a working relationship between citizens and law enforcement.

CHAPTER 7. PERCEPTIONS OF FAIRNESS

As noted in Chapter 6, my analysis of perceptions of fairness has been

separated from the other three tenets of procedural justice (trust, respect,

participation) because discussions of this topic were a result of direct questions in

the interview guide. Specifically, the study participants were asked to describe

any differences in how law enforcement treated male and female drug dealers,

including whether "a female seller [is] more or less likely to get caught" or

"charged and convicted." As such, study participants' articulations of their

perceptions of fairness most often were differentiated utilizing gender

comparisons. In addition, though, just as perceptions of trust, respect, and

participation emerged organically during the interviews, other non-gender specific

discussions of fairness, such as race, clothing, and neighborhood context, were

also raised in an intersectional manner. In this chapter, I examine the nature and

extent of perceived gender differences as well as how these other factors

interconnect to contribute to gang members' perceptions of procedural fairness.

According to Tyler (2006), perceptions of procedural fairness are

connected to the perceived impartiality of police decision-making. Citizens

believe that law enforcement should be unbiased and interact with them based on

169

objective information. In the present study, the interviewers explicitly asked for the men and women to compare how law enforcement treated male and female drug dealers. Because this was prompted by a specific question, the response rate was extremely high. In all, 83 men (70 percent) and 117 women (87 percent) discussed how the law was fairly or unfairly enforced.

Concepts of fairness were most commonly raised among African American (N=42, 71 percent) and Latino (N=28, 67 percent) men, followed by multi-racial (N=7 of 7), Asian (N=5 of 11), and White (N=1 of 1) men. In terms of women, African American (N=67, 85 percent) and Latina (N = 24, 92 percent) women discussed this most frequently, followed by Asian (N=13 of 14), multi-racial (N=11 of 11), and White (N=2 of 3) women. There were no significant racial differences among the study participants in their discussions of this topic, though it was discussed more among the women than the men. As per the question in the guide, concerns about fairness most often referred to whom – men compared to women – the police approach, stop, and/or detain while patrolling, usually for drug or gang-related offenses. Though a small number of men felt women were detained equal to (N=10, 12 percent)[1] or more often than men (N=2, 2 percent)[2] a vast majority (N=75, 90 percent) believed that female drug dealing gang members were approached, stopped, and arrested less often than their male

---

[1] Three men had conflicting opinions saying that women were less likely than men to be detained but also equally likely to be arrested.
[2] Two men believed that women were caught or had the potential to be caught more often than men. One stated that women were either being "stupid" or not as careful as men. One contradicted himself stating that women were arrested less frequently but also more likely to be arrested if pregnant because babies born to drug users will test positive and implicate the mother.

counterparts[3]. Women, likewise, overwhelmingly (N=97, 83 percent) agreed with the men and perceived the police as behaving dramatically differently and significantly more unfairly toward men. However, a smaller number of women (N=20, 17 percent) believed that police treated men and women equally[4] or that women were stopped more often than men[5]. While study participants acknowledged that men were more likely engaged in high-profile crimes, were on the streets selling more often than women, and that female dealers were less common, most attributed the differential police behavior to two primary reasons: (1) the police stereotype based on gender, ethnicity, clothing, and/or neighborhood, and (2) there were organizational or compositional facets of the police force impacting who was and was not stopped. Specifically, the gang members recognized the San Francisco police force as predominantly male, and this contributed to the perception that male suspects were disproportionally targeted and approached.

Perceived Stereotyping based on Gender, Race, Clothing, and/or Neighborhood Context

In all, the men (N=71) and women (N=56) in the sample primarily believed that police enforced the law unfairly as a result of their stereotyping in

---

[3] One man was not sure if women were more or less likely to be detained by police.

[4] Despite believing that men and women were treated equally, nearly half of this subgroup of women stated that women had previously been stopped less frequently than men. Several believed that only recently had police been detaining women at a relatively equal rate to men. Additionally, three women articulated conflicting perceptions as they also described believing that women were less likely to be stopped by police.

[5] Only three women perceived that women were detained more frequently than men. Two women attributed this to what the women wore, suggesting that when women wear black hoodies and flashy jewelry, they draw police attention. One woman suggested this was because there were more female drug sellers operating on the streets.

terms of gender, race, clothing, and/or neighborhood context. Specifically, the study respondents suggested that minority men who wore particular clothing and/or were in certain neighborhoods were generally the focus of police attention and therefore subject to disproportional stops when compared to women[6]. This was mostly discussed by African American men (N=35, 60 percent) and women (N=33, 42 percent), followed by Latino men (N=24, 57 percent) and women (N=13, 50 percent), Asian men (N=7 of 11) and women (N=4 of 14), multi-racial men (N=4 of 7) and women (N=7 of 11), and White (N=1 of 1) men. These percentages are fairly similar suggesting there are no significant racial differences reported.

First, in terms of gender, the vast majority of study participants believed that men, rather than women, were typically the targets of police interventions. Amber, for example, stated: "The police look at males more than they look at the women." Opal agreed: "The focus is not really on the female." Dawn also noted that "[the police] will drive right past [women]. They won't even look at you twice." Edward, likewise, explained that women were caught less because "most police they looking for dudes, you feel me?" Rodney also affirmed that "females ain' really getting messed with [by the police] like that all the time."

Some gang members noted that this perceived gender difference was due, in part, to officers' gendered assumptions about who was and was not criminally involved. Specifically, study participants noted that they thought police did not

---

[6] Four women and two men suggested that police stops of female dealers might increase if one became known to the police or was engaging in behaviors that warranted police attention. This could include standing on the street for extended periods of time, being where caught previously, wearing flashy or expensive clothing, jewelry, or shoes, and/or being in the company of male gang members and drug dealers.

expect women to be involved in drug dealing or criminal behavior. As such, this contributed to the general belief that women were approached and stopped on suspicion of criminal involvement less frequently than men. Porcha, for instance, suggested that men were more likely to be watched because the officers assumed they were drug dealing: "I think men are always under the scope because they're expected to be out there selling drugs more than…a female." Pixie concurred, noting that "police really don't...view females as like drug sellers." Michelle similarly described that she thought she was not stopped because the police did not assume her to be involved: "The police…don't really ever think...that girls or...me...might be selling [drugs]."

Male study participants' reports were similar. Jeremiah said: "The police will less expect a female to be selling….Let's say if I was on the corner and a girl was on the corner, they expect me to be selling drugs before she was." Eddie similarly described the perceived gender assumptions in terms of drug enforcement on the street: "If I'm walking down the street, I get checked. If it's me and like my boys [and] we're just walking, [the police will] see what we're walking for….But if it's just some females just walking down the street, it's just some females, you know?" Several study participants referred to this as the police "not tripping off girls." 'Not tripping' was a colloquial term that indicated the police did not pay attention to them as possible dealers. Renee, for example, explained how she and her female gang were generally not approached by police because of their gender: "Like we could be in a car full o' girls, and we all sell

drugs, and the cops won't trip off of us that much, they really trip off o' guys."
Carter likewise, affirmed, "Like the police don't really trip off girls that much."

This perception was further complicated by the belief, largely expressed by the men, that even if women were stopped, the police treated them more leniently. Indeed, several study participants believed that when women were stopped on suspicion of criminal behavior, they were more likely to "get away" with dealing drugs and other law-breaking behavior. Specifically, the male gang members expected women to be questioned and released, whereas they anticipated being searched and arrested. Casper, for instance, explained how he experienced this gender difference: "[The police] will just stop [a female]...and question her. But they won't do that if it was a dude, yeah, they will check us and take us [arrest us]." Doug agreed: "The risk [for women] is a little bit lower, 'cause the cops…even if they do suspect them of doing it…the guy will be the first one to get searched and stuff before even they think about stopping a female." Melvin surmised that this perceived gender difference was because the "police have a soft spot for females." These narratives, therefore, elucidate that the study participants believed gender was a primary determinate of whom the police decided to target and contributed to overt differences in how the police behaved towards men and women.

However, these perceived gender differences were further complicated by the role of race, and how the race of the suspect was seen as influencing police behavior. In general, the study participants believed the police had an image of who they were supposed to be focused on – men of color – because they fit the

stereotype of what a lawbreaker looked like. As Miracle commented on general law enforcement efforts, "the police probably looking for mostly like Latinos and Blacks." As such, the police were believed to act according to both race- and gender-based assumptions, resulting in the display of unfair and biased police behavior. Chanelle, for example, explained how race in tandem with gender contributed to more general perceptions of unequal enforcement of the law: "Men are more racially profiled and just more profiled than girls. Like a girl could be selling big dope and be rolling and making transport drops and all that and will never get jacked by the police….But…guys they're easily targeted." Tommy also noted more generally: "There's quite a lot of…prejudice cops out here."

Indeed several male participants recalled specific experiences in which they were stopped based on what they believed was racial and gender profiling. This contributed to feelings of anger and frustration towards the officers. Spencer, for example, lamented: "Police don't be on [women] like that….It's all about the nigger….It's all on the guy." Slim shared the story of when he was stopped, searched, and arrested for jaywalking. Given that he was approached for a minor infraction, Slim made the assumption that police stereotyped him as a criminal because he was a gang involved, African American male:

> [The focus is on] the niggers. [The police] stop us…if they think that we selling, like feel me, [the police think]...he's a nigger from somewhere, and he's a gang-banger, he must be doing something….I got arrested for jaywalking….I ran across the street, and then like the [police car] pulled up on me. They ran my name and shit and they was going through my pockets.

Similarly, Brian believed he was approached because the police stereotyped him as a criminal given he was male and African American, perceiving himself as not engaged in illicit behavior at the time. He was arrested for drug possession:

> [The police] actually just grabbed me...just being African American....Outta nowhere this guy just walk up and like, "So where you from?"….I see a silver little thing and I see that it's his badge….I just had [drugs] on me, I wasn't doing nothing suspicious or nothing….[The police] were just like, "Black dude, crack."

Miles also recalled a specific experience of being pulled over, a decision he thought the police made based on his race: "[The police] was riding past, they see us right there [thinking they] Mexican, [they] got something going on." Thus, the study participants commented that race, in tandem with gender, seemingly resulted in biased police behavior.

Furthermore, the study participants explained that police targeting individuals based race and gender could be complicated further by clothing. Specifically, minority men who wore specific garments and accessories could attract even more police suspicion. This was referred to as dressing like a "thug" and was described as wearing hoodies, baggy pants, gang colors, and/or flashy jewelry. Men involved in drug dealing and gangs were described as particularly likely to dress in this way. Yet, the study participants simultaneously noted the individuals who did so were "obvious" to the police and should be aware of the risks associated with wearing this type of clothing. Melvin, for instance, cautioned against it when drug dealing: "Don't be so obvious….Like a lotta people dress like with baggy jeans, baggy clothes….The cops can easily tell you're a dealer." Darius also noted that "flamboyant-ass clothes, saggy pants,

big-ass gold chains, rings, [and] jewelry" attracted police attention. Roberto

agreed that particular clothing signaled to police that those who wore it were

involved in illegal behavior, despite that he wore them himself: "If you're selling

coke and you're out there wearing two chains, like the earrings I got on, and like

six rings and four watches…you're wearing your pants all the way down to your

ankles, either you're rapping or you're selling dope."

In general, the men and women believed those who wore such garments

were in some way responsible for their being stopped – something that was

viewed as more common among men. Indeed, this gender difference in dress

further contributed to the perception that police disproportionally targeted males[7].

Jin, for example, explained, "Guys look hot all the time….They attract the police

a whole lot. When they say black doesn't attract the police, black is the main

[color]...like the black sweaters, cuz everybody wears black hoodies….Guys just

look...obvious and wanna get arrested." Likewise, Sonia noted the male members

of her group "look so obvious, of course they gonna check you, of course you

gonna get caught…the way you're dressed." Tia concurred: "The man on the

block with the hoodies, with the baggy jeans, like, y'all draw that attention to

y'all, you know." These discussions, therefore, illuminate that such individuals

were sending unnecessary signals to the police indicating their criminal

involvement and the police were responding accordingly. This contributed to the

perception that men were targeted more so than women. While not explicitly

---

[7] Several men and women noted that, in addition to clothing, individuals could also attract police attention by playing dice in the street, wearing fancy/dressy clothing, being loud or rowdy, and/or driving expensive cars.

suggesting the police behaved unfair, the men's decision to dress in this way contributed to the perception that men were targeted more so than women because of this.

Of particular interest, the women were described as differentiating themselves, in part, by how they dressed – which was not typically in the above mentioned style. Women specifically discussed dressing in a feminine style and avoiding stereotypical clothing in order to avoid detection. The women thought their clothing disguised them to a certain extent and they were able to hang with their gang and/or sell drugs without being noticed or stopped by the police as frequently, not just because they were women but also because of their presentation of self. Indeed, Alphonso noted that female gang members' "appearance or how they carry themselves" made them less suspicious. This included wearing backpacks to give the impression they were coming from school or being "dressed up nice." Dawn explained: "[The police] really don't be looking too much at the girls…especially when you dress up. Like when you get dressed [up] and stuff, [the] police be like, 'Nah, she ain' doing that…She probably is doing that [if] she got a hoodie and a jacket on.'" Divine also described dressing differently from the men in her group. She indicated that choice of clothing contributed to the outward perception that she was not dealing, a particularly important strategy in avoiding police: "'Cause if you look at us and look at [the men], who would you think sells drugs? Like you got us all dressed up, looking like we just came from a party, and then guys in hoodies and baggy pants." Likewise, Tia, noted that "[the police] would never think [I deal]…cuz I

never get caught up. You know, I have my purse on, flip-flops, you know."

Krystle affirmed: "When the police see you, they're like, 'Maybe, maybe not.'

It's really hard to tell. As long as you dress nice, like you're supposed to

be…usually you're good." It is evident in these accounts that the gang members

in this study believed that clothing, in conjunction with race and gender, played

an important role in who the police approached. Thus, clothing served as an

important mechanism for the drug-dealing gang members. For the men, it was a

means of signaling criminal involvement to the police. For the women, it was a

way in which to disguise illicit activities. In both cases, the police were perceived

as responding accordingly and contributing to the perception that men were

targeted more so than women resulting in the men's disproportionate contacts

with law enforcement.

Finally, study participants believed that neighborhood context also

contributed to biased police behavior. Unlike the previously discussed themes,

concerns regarding neighborhood context did not explicitly emerge in response to

the gender comparison questions in the interview guide. In addition,

neighborhood-related topics were raised almost exclusively by the men in the

sample. Women were largely silent on this issue[8] suggesting that gender may

have played an important role in such perceptions. Specifically, 10 male study

participants felt stereotyped by police because of their neighborhood and believed

---

[8] Of the entire sample, only two women discussed neighborhood-related types of experiences with police.

that had they not been living in these specific areas, they may not have been

subjected to some of the police attention they experienced[9].

These 10 men described being confronted by police, typically on the

streets, in their home neighborhood. They assumed these interactions were a

result of a large or increasing number of officers patrolling their community. This

contributed to the perception that they were disproportionally targeted by the

police because of where they lived and were subjected to routine, unjustified

involuntary face-to-face interactions. These interactions translated into more

general negative attitudes that questioned the legitimacy of these types of

encounters. Damon, for example, commented on what he perceived as an

increased police presence in his neighborhood:

> [My average day is] getting harassed by the police. You know. Getting
> harassed by the police some more. Hanging out some more….[The
> police] walking and everything....Didn't used to be like that. Nowadays
> they just...flooding the 'hood with police.

Cornell too lamented about the excessive police presence in his neighborhood and

how they were seemingly petty in their efforts: "[My neighborhood] is too hot.

[There are] too many police. They be trying to be on everything." Sergio

commented that he was afraid to be out in his home neighborhood because he was

concerned about the police stopping him – even when involved in non-criminal

and family oriented behavior:

> It's hard to stay…downtown [because the police] jump out on you any
> time. Even when you're doing nothing. [You] could be walking to your

---

[9] These perceptions are differentiated from their experiences with police in high drug areas relating to their involvement in drug dealing. These accounts emerged in the context of discussions about the individual's home area, high crime areas, or areas where they were perceived to be out of place, as two men discussed being stopped for being out of place in a different high-crime area.

grandma's house or something, walking to get your baby something to eat and police fucking with you.

These encounters, tied to neighborhood context, were perceived by Sergio and others as illegitimate.

For some men, the increased police presence and their feelings of harassment contributed to negative attitudes towards their community. Again, only the men in the sample commented on how these neighborhood-based police encounters shaped these adverse opinions. Diego lamented: "The only thing I really don't like [about my neighborhood is] I get harassed a lot by the police." Ryan agreed: "[The] only thing I dislike [about my neighborhood is that]...the police mess with your ass too much." Steven too said the only thing he disliked about his neighborhood was "the police harassment, that's about it." While most men talked about these neighborhood-based stops in more general terms, Angelo recalled a specific encounter when he was approached in his neighborhood. He was searched, found with drugs and arrested: "It was just a random [stop]. [I] just walking around the 'hood and I had some [drugs] in my pocket and they just bothered me for no reason."

Study participants' discussions of gender, race, dress, and neighborhood context thus suggest that perceptions of fair or unfair police behavior is best understood intersectionally, where many different factors come together to shape an individual's orientation and understanding of their experiences with law enforcement. As discussed, gender, race, clothing, and/or neighborhood context all played an important role in these diverse experiences, which ultimately contributed to many study participants' belief that police largely behaved unfairly

to men relative to women, in that their decision-making was not gender neutral and thus they did not treat all citizens equally.

Perceived Gendered Differences Resulting from the Gender Composition of the Police

While most study participants believed unequal police behavior stemmed from stereotyping, a smaller number of men (N=32, 27 percent) and women (N=13, 10 percent) suggested that the police unfairly enforced the law because of the gender composition of the San Francisco Police Department. Such discussions emerged specifically with regard to drug enforcement. When asked how law enforcement treated drug dealing men and women differently, the study participants noted that the San Francisco police force was primarily male and that there were too few female officers to enforce the law equally. Instead, a male dominated police force was perceived as resulting in several processes by which male drug dealers were treated differently – and comparatively more harshly – than female drug dealers. These concerns was raised primarily among African American men (N=18, 31 percent) and women (N=7, 9 percent) followed by Latino men (N=7, 17 percent) and women (N=2, 8 percent) and multi-racial men (N=4 of 7) and women (N=1 of 11), Asian men (N=2 of 11) and women (N=2 of 14) and White men (N=1 of 1) and women (N=1 of 3). In general, these percentages are approximately proportional to the sample demographics. However, African American men raised this issue more often than women or men of other ethnicities.

Study participants who discussed this issue noted that the officers working in drug enforcement were predominantly male. As such, they believed male officers could not search female suspects like they could male suspects. This contributed to the perception that male law enforcement could not pat women down for drugs and thus that women dealers were let go more frequently than male dealers. Classique explained how this resulted in what she perceived as a gender imbalance in who was and was not found with drugs: "Guys get caught more than girls [because] they can't really search a girl how they search boys." Chastity agreed: "It's a lotta male cops. So shit, [the men] could get searched more easily than the female can. 'Cause most of the time it's male cops." Izaah likewise stated: "Most of the times in my neighborhood it's mostly…male cops that patrol. So male cops can search the males, but they can't search females. So if it's a female selling weed, it's gon' be hard for the males to find the weed…because they can't search her." Illinia confirmed that she usually escaped detection because it was mostly male officers stopping drug dealers: "Usually only male cops [are] working and they have no authority to touch a girl. So we'll get away with it." Indeed, several study participants commented on how this advantage seemingly made women better and more efficient drug dealers. As Austin pointed out, women had a strategic advantage on the street: "Nine times outta 10, [women are] gon' get away with it….Bad enough they can't search a female without another female officer, so automatically it's a wrap, you feel me? It's a wrap….I think females got it better than the males on that." Of import, this discussion illuminates a contradiction in perceptions of procedural justice.

Specifically, the men and women trusted the police would not violate rules that prohibited their searching a suspect of the opposite gender. Yet, the expectation of procedurally just behavior (trusting officers to act in accordance with the policies of the force) then contributed to the perception that men were targeted more so than women.

This perceived inability to search females or search them as thoroughly as men contributed to the belief that women could hide drugs more effectively than male dealers. The study participants described how females seemingly used their biological differences (i.e. breasts, vagina) to their benefit. This included the perception that women placed drugs within their private areas – including in and around their bra or panties or "stuffed" in their female cavity – to escape detection, and therefore arrest, more often than male suspects. Pushe, a male gang member, explained his perspective of this strategy and the seeming benefit that women dealers had when selling and hiding drugs:

> Girls have that pocket [vagina] and they take advantage of it….And they got a bra, they just throw it in a bra. So they got another extra pocket. They got two extra pockets. 'Cause I mean you can't be like a police officer all in a female's breast. And then they be putting 'em in extra places, you know, they got more hiding spots.

Drew also illustrated the dilemma: "Usually the narcs are men, so they can't just go and touch a girl's tittie or pull her pants down, or look, you know, they can't do that. Therefore women can get away with a lot more you know." Mala confirmed that hiding drugs near her vagina was one of her strategies. She explained that she put drugs in her panties because she knew male officers could not check there: "Like they can't search me….I put it in my underwear because

they can't touch you." Male drug dealers, on the other hand, "don't have nowhere

to hide it." Nia commented on men's notable lack of comparable options, which

she believed they were unwilling to do anyway: "[Men] can't [stuff]. It's either

you're going to jail or you have to stuff it in your butt. And nine outta ten, some

males won't stuff it in their butt." Indeed, several women commented on the

comparable advantage women had because of this. Neneh noted: "[Girls are]

more slicker cuz…girls stash their stuff up, they stuff sometimes." Simone felt

"the females could actually hide it quicker than a guy" too.

Finally, these study participants believed that female officers were needed

to assist in stops and searches, as only same-gender officers could search same-

gender suspects. Jordan noted that women could escape arrest if male officers –

and no female officers – were patrolling and searching suspected dealers: "A girl

could put [the drugs] in her coochie or her titties and a male cop can't touch

her….So if it ain' no female cop around, then a lady gon' get away off top." The

study participants mostly assumed there were too few women officers to patrol

regularly like the male officers. This further contributed to the perception that

women were searched less and caught less often with drugs than men. Henry

commented on the perceived gender advantage on the street: "It's easier for

[women] cuz the [male] cops ain' gon' jack 'em. You gotta be a female cop to

pat 'em down, and it's mainly male...so they can't really touch 'em."

In fact, several study participants commented that male officers would, on

occasion, call female officers to the scene to assist when they stopped women on

suspicion of drug dealing. As Khia explained, "[there's] not many female

officers, so they have to wait for a female officer to search them." However, the police following rules about searches complicated perceptions of procedural justice. On one hand, the gang members believed the police would exhibit trustworthy behavior by waiting for a female officer to arrive, yet simultaneously, it contributed to the perception of unfair and unequal application of the law in several ways. For one female, the time between calling the female officer to the scene and her arrival was actually beneficial. It afforded her the opportunity to hide her drugs effectively and escape detection: "They have male police officers that have to call backup for a female officer and sometimes that gives us enough time to put our [drugs] where it needs to be. With a male [suspect], you can't do that." For one male gang member, the situation was further complicated by the perception that there were too few female officers available to respond even when male officers requested their assistance. This resulted, again, in the perception that women were let go more often than men because male officers could not search female suspects. Joshua described how this happened:

> There's been times that girls had drugs, and there was no female officer, and you don't get searched….She gotta get let go. I remember a couple times they tried to call the female officer, and they were busy doing something else. They're just like, "Man, just get outta here."

Additionally, Trey believed that female officers were not interested in stopping potential drug dealers. This too contributed to perceptions of how the law was unfairly enforced: "Only girl cops can touch them, and it ain' too many girl cops that's just gon' come around and stop you. Like girl cops really don't do that, it be the dudes that be the jackasses that wanna search you. And they can't search no girl…so they good." Thus, there review of these accounts illuminate several

complexities that can arise with regards to perceptions of procedural justice in terms of structural police force issues. In one respect, male officers outnumbering female officers contributed to the perception that the law was unfairly enforced whereby the men were targeted and searched far more often than women. However, this opinion was formed because the men and women trusted the officers to behave procedurally just by following the policies about searching male and female suspects.

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I examined perceptions of fair and neutral police decision-making. According to Tyler (2006), fair and neutral decision-making takes place when the police are perceived as interacting with citizens based on objective and unbiased information. Again, my discussion of this aspect of procedural justice was separated from the other three components because of how the topic was raised in the original study. Concerns about fair police behavior were articulated primarily with regard to gender differences in policing because of particular questions in the interview guide that asked study participants to discuss how law enforcement treated male and female drug dealing gang members differently. As such, gender was the primary point of comparison, while other topics, such as race, clothing, and/or neighborhood context, were raised organically through the narratives in much the same way that the themes of trust, respect and participation

emerged. Overall, the study participants overwhelmingly perceived the police as acting in a procedurally unfair way.

First, the men and women in the study believed that gender, in conjunction with race, clothing, and/or neighborhood context, impacted whom the police targeted and disproportionally stopped. In general, the study participants believed that minority men, wearing specific garments in particular neighborhoods were targeted more so than women. This was, in part, because the men and women thought the police made gendered assumptions that women were less involved in drug dealing and serious offenses, and thus failed to notice women's criminal activities. The gender composition of the San Francisco police force was also pointed to for explanation, such that a predominantly male police force was seen as resulting in male suspects being stopped, searched, and arrested more often than women. The study participants also believed that the officers stereotyped and racially profiled – specifically, they reported that African American and Latino males were the primary targets.

Next, clothing was viewed as in important indicator of whom the police targeted. Specifically, the study participants believed that the police used certain garments – such as baggy pants, hoodies, hats, and jewelry – in conjunction with race and gender to signal drug or gang involvement and policed accordingly. Interestingly, the study participants assigned responsibility to the wearer of garments for these types of stops, rather than perceiving the police as unfairly targeting individuals who dressed this way. Indeed, an additional gender difference emerged in which men were described as more likely to dress in this

style and attract police attention while women, in contrast, described being aware that police targeted specific garments and opted to dress in a more feminine way in hopes of disguising themselves.   Some study participants believed that such strategies, in addition to women being described as better able to hide drugs, contributed to women's ability to be adept and skillful dealers. Men, alternatively, were seen as subjected to disproportionate policing that could hinder such successes.

Additionally, neighborhood context was also thought to be an important factor in police-decision making. Men of color in particular felt disproportionally targeted because of where they lived. Residing in a specific neighborhood, in conjunction with one's gender and race, seemingly increased the perception of being profiled and stopped by police. Neighborhood-specific encounters contributed to feelings of criminalization in their home spaces and signaled concerns with police legitimacy. Ultimately, these findings regarding race, gender, clothing, and neighborhood were largely interrelated and reinforces the importance of utilizing an intersectional framework when examining perceptions of police behavior, articulations of procedural justice, and attitudes towards legal legitimacy.

CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSION

This qualitative study utilized secondary data to examine perceptions of procedural justice among male and female ethnic minority drug dealing gang members. The data were collected between 2007 and 2011 and included 253 in-

depth interviews. Overall, this research sought to investigate how gang members'

experience and articulate concepts of procedural justice and legitimacy, especially

in the context of policing strategies oriented toward aggressively intervening on

gangs (Katz and Webb, 2006) and drug markets (Beckett et al., 2006, Engel et al.,

2012; Moore and Kleinman, 1989). According to Tyler (2006), police establish

legitimacy and foster compliance by behaving in a procedurally just manner,

including by demonstrating respectful interpersonal treatment, neutral decision-

making, trustworthy motives, and engaging citizens in a meaningful exchange.

Given that drug dealing gang members may be involved in comparatively

more delinquency and experience legitimated profiling (Durán, 2008), they likely

have a unique experience with police during involuntary face-to-face encounters.

As such, interviews with this group provided an excellent opportunity to explore

the extent and contexts in which they perceive their encounters with the police as

procedurally just. Understanding their perspective on such encounters provides an

additional window into the question of whether and how procedurally just

policing is afforded to all citizens, regardless of race, class, gender, neighborhood

context and, most notably, criminal involvement. Though Tyler's theory of police

legitimacy has been examined extensively, important questions still remain,

including its applicability to young people involved in crime. In this chapter, I

review and assess the key findings of this dissertation. First, I provide an

overview of the types of stops experienced by the study participants, as well as

how the men and women in this study understood the contexts of these

interactions. I then discuss the main substantive findings and their key theoretical

contributions to procedural justice theory's four process-based criteria: fairness, respect, trust, and participation. The examination of each component revealed unique and salient findings that expand current procedural justice literature and concepts of legitimacy more generally.

Overview of the Stops Experienced

Understanding the nature of police-citizen exchanges proved to be critical in establishing the contexts in which the men and women perceived police behavior, conceptualized procedural justice, and established legitimacy or its absence. After analyzing the types of stops and encounters reported, most individuals (N=205, 81 percent) in the sample reported at least one involuntary encounter with the police. Of the men, 88 percent (N=105) reported such encounters, with an average of approximately 9.6 reported encounters per male gang member. For the women, a majority (N=100, 75 percent) reported being stopped and/or arrested by the police at least once. This was a slightly lower proportion than men, though still a significant number of female study participants. The numbers of involuntary encounters described by the women were notably fewer than men's, with an average of 4.49 stops per female. For both genders, there appeared to be no meaningful racial differences in the number of stops reported.

My analysis of study participants' narratives revealed that there was a range of police encounters described. This included, first, crime-related police interactions such that the respondents described being approached or stopped as

result of their participation in a range of activities like drug dealing, robbery/burglary, gang fights, and vehicular theft. Second, the study participants also described being approached by the police for what they perceived as no identifiable reason or while not criminally involved. The men and women shared a number of parallel face-to-face encounters with the police. Specifically with regards to their involvement in drug dealing, both genders reported coming in contact with the police as a result of drug-related policing tactics. Also, the women and men described similar experiences with police following their involvement in robberies, property theft, and gang involvement. However, there were also several gender differences. The women reported experiencing involuntary police encounters less frequently than men especially in perceived non-criminally involved police encounters and women were seemingly over represented in shoplifting offenses. Notably, the nature of the stop and the frequencies with which stops occurred both proved to be important in terms of study participants' perceptions of procedural justice, especially with regard to fairness.

Fairness

Tyler's procedural justice framework defines fairness as perceived impartial decision making on behalf of the police. Individuals believe that legal authorities should be unbiased and act based on objective information. Previous work on fairness and its impact suggests that perceived unfairness weakens perceived legitimacy and contributes to feelings of alienation, non-cooperation

(Sunshine and Tyler, 2003), and widespread support for defiance (Fischer et al., 2008). Research has found that perceptions of procedural unfairness, such as racial profiling, has also been connected to lowered levels of public support for law enforcement (Tyler and Wakslak, 2004). Considering the case of the drug dealing gang members in this sample, my examination of perceptions of procedural fairness revealed several substantive findings with theoretical import. Most notably, and to answer one of the primary research questions of this investigation, both men and women overwhelmingly perceived the police as acting in a procedurally unfair manner. This was largely because the officers were viewed as engaging with the study participants based on biases such as gender, clothing, race, and neighborhood context.

A number of important gender differences were described that signaled to study participants problems with procedural fairness. Most apparently, the men described coming in contact with the police far more often than the women. This was clearly revealed when comparing the extent of men's and women's reports of involuntary contact with police in non-crime related contexts. As noted, 28 men, as compared to 10 women, described such encounters. This suggests that men may be more likely than women to be viewed by police as criminally suspicious (Brunson and Miller, 2008), and supports earlier research which finds that police hold gendered expectations about criminal involvement and target men more so than women (Brunson and Miller, 2008, Durán, 2008). Notably, this appears to be the case even for individuals actively involved in crime. In the present study, female gang members actively involved in drug sales and other crimes reported

fewer police contacts than their male counterparts—especially in contexts that were not crime-related.

On the one hand, similar proportions of women and men reported being stopped by the police for drug-related offenses, which both groups described as related to policing tactics adopted to intervene on drug sales. Likewise, a similar number of women and men reported police contacts resulting from fights or assaults, as well as gang-related activities. However, the women were more likely than men to report being stopped by police for shoplifting, a crime often considered as gendered (Abelson, 1989), despite evidence that men have been found to shoplift as often as women (Cox, Cox, and Moschis, 1990). Additionally, although the frequency of such descriptions was not high, female gang members were the only ones to report being stopped and questioned about their gang by the police. This suggests they may be the disproportionate focus of police information gathering efforts (Katz and Webb, 2006). While these gender differences in experiences with police could be a result of the gender-gap in offending patterns where men have been found to commit crime at higher rate than women (Haynie and Soller, 2015; Zimmerman and Messner, 2010), it may also be due to the women's involvement in less serious delinquencies (Miller, 2001). This discrepancy may also be explained by police officers focusing on men as gang members and as responsible for serious criminal offenses, a finding that supports several other notable studies in the field (Brunson and Miller, 2006; Curry, Fox, Ball, and Stone, 1992). Overall, however, these differences illuminated that men described being stopped more often than women, an

especially notable disparity with regards to the proportion of men who reported

being stopped "for no reason." While the women in the sample were criminally

involved, they did not report experiencing police contacts as frequently for their

crime involvement or in perceived non-crime related contexts. It is important to

note that the perceived differential in experiences may be due to limitations of the

data and the purpose of the original study. Specifically, the interview guide did

not include a mechanism for identifying self-reported prevalence and frequencies

of involvement in different crime types. Thus, I cannot assess the extent to which

policing patterns across genders are a reflection of actual gendered patterns for the

study participants and this limitation could be an explanation for the men's

disproportionate police contacts.

The next important gender difference reported centered on the gang

members' clothing and personal decisions concerning what they wore. In the

present research, the study participants commented that garments were viewed as

an important signifier of who law enforcement targeted. Certain items, like baggy

pants, hoodies, hats, and jewelry were believed to be signals of drug or gang

involved individuals – items described as being worn by men more so than

women. This finding supports previous research that the police use certain labels,

styles, and clothing to identify perceived criminal and/or gang involvement and

police accordingly (Ferrell, 1995; see Miller, 1995). However, what constitutes

'dressing well' can shift depending on the cultural context (Ferrell, 1995;

Hedbige, 1979; Katz, 1988). For example, among inner-city men, wearing

'stylish clothes' can include baggie pants, hooded sweatshirts, and fancy sneakers

(Treadwell, 2008) while among Latino men, armless white shirts paired with plaid button-ups may be a desirable fashion (Katz, 1988). In the present study, the shared aesthetic of baggie pants and black hooded garments among the male study participants were what the police were described as focusing on, suggesting that symbols of what is culturally cool, like the black hoodies, can actually be mechanisms in which to criminalize individuals (Ferrell, 1995; Nyugen, 2015; Treadwell, 2008).

More importantly, the study participants assigned responsibility to the wearer of such garments for these involuntary police encounters, instead of perceiving the police as unfairly targeting individuals who opted to dress this way. This suggests that gang members and drug dealers were, in some way, perceived as responsible for their own profiling – perhaps indicating the internalization of legitimated profiling (see Durán, 2008). Policing based on clothing may be a source of contention because clothing can be a meaningful aspect of one's identity (Ferrell, 1995). Men were described as more likely than women to dress in a style that attracted police attention, while women, in comparison, described being aware that law enforcement focused on specific clothing and described dressing in a more feminine way in hopes of disguising themselves as dealers – adopting what Jacobs and Miller (1998) describe as gendered contextual assimilation strategies to avoid detection. Though study participants did not explicitly label stops based on clothing or dress style as indicative of police unfairness, this finding on their recognition of the role of style in generating police attention suggests that perceptions of procedural unfairness

may be more nuanced than discussed in Tyler's (2006) works. Specifically, interpretations of unfair police behavior can extend beyond race, gender, and neighborhood context, and may be triggered when police target based on clothing and other symbols in street culture. Indeed, more research should be done to examine the extent to which perceptions of procedural unfairness are impacted by stops premised on an individual's style.

It is also notable, in light of perceived gender differences, that the study participants pointed to the gender composition of the San Francisco police force as a contributing factor for perceived differential treatment. Male officers, who made up 85 percent of the SFPD (BJS, 2000), were described as stopping—but also searching and arresting—male suspects more often than women. Ironically, study participants insistence that male officers could not search women meant that the officers were described as behaving in a procedurally just manner and were trusted by the study participants to follow cross-gender stop and search rules. Yet this contributed to the belief that men experienced a greater number of involuntary encounters with police and these exchanges were comparatively harsher than the women's interactions. This finding offers an interesting theoretical contribution because it suggests that procedurally just behavior can, counter intuitively, also contribute to perceptions of procedural injustice. In some respects, procedurally unfair behavior may actually be a systemic problem where the gender composition of the police force itself, given the imbalance of male to female police officers, creates an inherently unfair system. Thus, while the police

may behave in accordance with the rules, more female officers may be needed to provide basic equitable enforcement of the law.

Finally, in addition to perceived gender differences – which emerged from a specific set of questions in the interview guide – the male and female study participants raised concerns about racial and neighborhood differences in police behaviors. Overall, the study participants believed that officers stereotyped, racially profiled, and targeted African American and Latino males during law enforcement efforts (see also Carter, 2002; Durán, 2008; Fratello et al., 2013; Stewart et al., 2009). These experiences were further complicated by neighborhood context whereby the study participants described that men of color felt disproportionately targeted because of where they lived (Durán, 2008). These encounters contributed to feelings of criminalization in their home spaces and signaled concerns with police legitimacy (Brunson, 2007; Gau and Brunson, 2010; Yuning, 2014). While there were too few White respondents in the study to provide a racial comparison, the White men and women present in the sample did not report similar experiences. This key finding contributes to the growing body of research that suggests minorities, especially criminally-involved men of color, may not receive procedurally fair behavior as often as non-minorities. This finding has been connected with lowered opinions of police by the public (Tyler and Wakslak, 2004), a lack of legitimacy in law enforcement, and wider spread support for non-compliance (Fischer et al., 2008). Thus, even criminally-involved young men of color felt that some portion of the police attention focused on them was driven by race and class bias, rather than their involvement in crime. Such

opinions seemed to be reinforced specifically when they experienced involuntary stops they believed were unwarranted because they were not involved in crime at the time. Indeed, concerns about the impact of race echoed through several additional components of procedural justice examined in the study, including respect and citizen participation – which will be discussed next.

Dignity and Respect

Tyler (2006) notes that dignity and respect are important facets of procedural justice because individuals value positive interpersonal treatment. This is generally measured by the degree of politeness and respect afforded during face-to-face encounters with law enforcement. As elucidated in chapter 7, study participants – especially African American and Latinos – reported that their face-to-face encounters with police were commonly characterized by disrespectful interpersonal treatment. These concerns were similarly raised by men and women, demonstrating that they shared several meaningful perceptions of police with regard to procedural justice. Irrespective of whether the stop was due to criminal involvement or not, the study participants desired and expected to be treated with dignity. Instead, they frequently reported being subjected to physical and verbal abuse (see Mastrofski, et al., 2002; Weitzer and Tuch, 2004). This included descriptions of officers being excessively aggressive by choking, shoving, and/or handling them roughly, especially when approached on suspicion of drug dealing. In several cases, these incidents were also described as including being sworn at or spoken down to with demeaning language. In contrast, few of the Asian and

White respondents raised these concerns. While this may be a result of the limited Asian and White individuals in the sample, these reported experiences of physical and verbal abuse suggest that African Americans and Latinos who are criminally or gang involved may be subject to comparatively worse police treatment (Mastrofski, et al., 2002; Weitzer and Tuch, 2004) – despite being citizens deserving of equal treatment. This finding suggests that racialized patterns of disrespectful treatment, therefore, can be found in the general population as well as those who are crime-involved.

Moreover, when compared to study participants' descriptions of encounters during which they were treated with respect, it was obvious that these interactions had starkly different consequences. In fact, one interviewee even measured his personal growth by how the police treated him. The participants articulated that they *wanted* and *valued* being treated with dignity and respect – a finding consistent with expressions of respect in street culture (Anderson, 1999; Bourgois, 2003). Tyler (2006) identified that respect is meaningful among law-abiding citizens and this appears to extend to crime-involved individuals who value positive interpersonal treatment on the street – whether from family, social networks, or law enforcement. This suggests that police may be more effective at policing and establishing coproduction if they treat criminally involved individuals with the dignity they value, even when they are intervening on their criminal activities.

More commonly, involuntary interactions were marred by reports of physical and verbal mistreatment. While characterized by study participants as a

lack of respectful interpersonal treatment, it is potentially so much more. Not only does it impair a possible positive relationship between the police and gang members, but police abuse against citizens is a serious infraction and a social health issue worthy of intervention. Research suggests, for example, that it is harmful, traumatic and can cause anxiety and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) among the recipients (Geller et al., 2014). Further, disrespectful police behavior should be examined in the context of gang-involved individuals. Many people who join gangs, especially women, have histories of physical, sexual, and verbal abuse (AACAP.org, 2015; Miller, 2001, 2015, Novich and Miller, 2015) and abusive experiences at the hands of police can be considered a form of re-victimization (Follette, Polunsny, Betchle, and Naugle, 1996). This may contribute to "cumulative trauma" and impact such individuals' mental stability, increase anxiety, depression and disassociation (see Follette et al., 1996). Thus, these policing efforts may be doing far more harm than good. Though victimization and trauma are generally examined among immediate family (parents, intimate partners) and peers, perhaps there is a need to further examine violence by police in this context. This means investigating how *these* kinds of experiences contribute more broadly to the cumulative experience of traumatic encounters, including among lawbreakers – who already have disproportionate risks for victimization (Lauritsen, Sampson and Laub, 1991).

Trust

Tyler (2006) argued that procedural justice is also influenced by the degree of perceived honesty whereby legal actors are judged based on their perceived motivations for engaging with individuals and overall trustworthiness of actions. Trust in police is important for establishing legitimacy and distrust can contribute to an increased likelihood of non-cooperation with police (Brunson, 2007; Fratello et al., 2013; Gau, 2013). With regard to trust among the gang members, this investigation revealed that the context of the stop was a primary differentiating component that shaped perceptions of trust – or the lack thereof – of police behavior. This concern was raised by study participants across gender and race/ethnicity. When stopped for what they recognized as justifiable reasons, such as drug dealing or an investigation following a crime, the study participants expressed an understanding the nature of the encounter and belief that the officers' motivations were honest. However, both men and women appeared to distrust the police when they were stopped for a reason they did not perceive as justifiable.

Specifically, study participants commented negatively when they believed they were approached while doing nothing or while not engaged in drug dealing or any other suspicious behavior. This was despite that they narrowly defined what active criminal behavior was (i.e. carrying drugs was not viewed as illegal). The perception of stops as unjustified included perceived non-criminally involved street stops, whereby study participants described being approached while standing on the corner, walking down the street, sitting in a car, and/or sitting a bus stop. These experiences also extended to situations in which study

participants were approached as a result of their gang involvement when not involved in gang-related or other crime. Such incidents likely occurred when the police were engaged in the types of anti-gang enforcement strategies described in chapter 2 (Katz and Webb, 2006). While several study participants commented on the overall positive effects of these aggressive policing practices targeted at gangs and drug markets, the vast majority perceived these seemingly unjustified stops as personal attacks. These experiences resulted in study participants questioning the legitimacy of law enforcement more generally, and for some it contributed to non-compliance, the antithesis of law enforcement goals.

These findings offer several key insights for future research. Most notably, procedural justice scholars should examine the role that the context of stops play in shaping perceptions of procedural justice and police legitimacy. Random traffic stops – commonly investigated in procedural justice research (Mazerolle et al., 2014) – and encounters resulting from criminal involvement may be viewed very differently than targeted stops in which the recipient does not view themselves as engaged in behavior that warrants the police encounter. In such cases, recipients of these encounters may connect these specific experiences to more general, negative opinions about the police, the ineffectiveness of their work, and an overall lack of legitimacy of law enforcement. The adverse reaction to perceived unwarranted stops supports previous research that found aggressive order maintenance policing – specifically the use of stop, question, and frisk – damaged perceptions of procedural justice and undermined legitimacy (Fratello et al., 2013; see Gau and Brunson, 2010), extending it to gang members as well. As

such, this finding supports gang scholars who argue the harms of such policing practices (Maxson et al., 2014) has practical policy import for police approaches to effectively combat gangs.

Further, the negative reaction to perceived unwarranted stops stresses the importance of a dialogic approach in examining perceptions of procedural justice (Bottoms and Tankebe, 2012, Tankebe, 2013). As Bottoms and Tankebe (2012) argue, perceptions of procedural justice and the establishment of legitimacy are best conceptualized as an ongoing dialogue between power-holders and audiences. The power-holders (law enforcement) make claims, the audience (citizens) responds, and the power-holders may adjust claims based on their reaction. Bottoms and Tankebe refer to this as "audience legitimacy" and these exchanges may differ depending on the group or sub-group being policed. In the present study, I examine perceptions of procedural justice among drug dealing gang members, of whom many reported being arrested or stopped by police at least once. Though participants did not explicitly state this concern, these types of interactions with law enforcement may have been a source of stress and were to be avoided whenever possible for fear of (re)arrest (see Goffman, 2009). As such, their reaction to these types of encounters may differ greatly from non-gang/drug involved individuals who do not fear arrest, re-arrest, or parole violations. Much of the current procedural justice theory focuses on routine traffic stops among law-abiding citizens (Mazerolle et al., 2013). My study suggests that more comparative work should be conducted to expand the dialogic approach argued by Bottoms and Tankebe (2012) and thoroughly examine how the context of the

encounter may impact perceptions of police and police legitimacy among law-breaking populations that view unwarranted police encounters as a source of frustration and fear (Goffman, 2009).

Voice and Citizen Participation

Finally, Tyler's (2006) procedural justice theory defines participation as the ability for individuals to partake in the decision-making process during face-to-face encounters. This includes being afforded the opportunity to present their point of view during an interaction with law enforcement. People who perceive their participation as important are more accepting of the outcomes, even if it is not to their benefit. In regard to voice and participation among the gang members, attempts to engage during police encounters were rarely reported by the men and women in this study. Among the few described attempts, half of the men and women believed their participation with the officers was met with disregard, disbelief, and/or indifference. Only African Americans and Latinos raised these concerns suggesting that African American and Latino law-breaking populations may not experience procedurally just behavior as often as law-abiding citizens (Brunson, 2007; Durán, 2008; Gau and Brunson, 2007). While the outcomes of an encounter matter, they were seemingly not the most important aspect of these exchanges. The law-breaking citizens in the present study reported instances in which they attempted to participate but were not granted the opportunity to either explain their side and/or be taken seriously.

These findings suggest that criminally involved individuals value this component of procedural justice. In fact, when these negative experiences with

participation were juxtaposed to several narratives during which participation was taken seriously, such gang members spoke favorably of the police as a result of these positive experiences with law enforcement. This was the case even when an arrest was imminent, as in the case of Diego who was allowed to move his grandmother to a neighbor's house prior to police raiding his home. These findings offer some evidence that participation can actually shape gang members' behavior and responses to law enforcement. This was particularly evident in the two cases where participation was connected to a desire to be honest and display compliance, the ultimate goal of procedural justice (Tyler, 2006). This suggests that when the police behave in a procedurally just manner, it may increase the likelihood of favorable responses to their directives and establish a better rapport between law-breakers and law enforcement.

Additionally, eight study participants described opting out of participation during their encounters with the police. Their decisions to do so were largely as a result of perceived procedural justice issues with police behavior either during the stop or a previous encounter(s). This included believing the police stereotyped, demonstrated untrustworthy motives for stops, and/or exhibited poor interpersonal treatment. This finding offers a theoretical contribution suggesting that the four process-based criteria of procedural justice may be interrelated – a nuance seldom discussed in the literature. The four components of procedural justice theory can arguably be broken into two distinct categories – police behavior acted upon the citizen (demonstrations of respect, trust, and neutrality) and citizen responses acted upon the police in the form of engagement (participation/voice in the

exchange) (Tyler, 2006). In general, research on procedural justice examines these four components independently and how their presence or absence translates to more general opinions about the police and legitimacy (Murphy et all, 2014; Tyler and Huo, 2002). Instead, the present study suggests we re-evaluate how perceptions of procedural justice are conceptualized and investigate how they may be interrelated in such as a way that the presence or absence of one component can impact the presence or absence of another. In this study, the lack of perceived trust, for example, resulted in some gang members' refusal to participate. More research should be done to examine the interconnectedness of these concepts.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Given that the men and women in the study valued the four components of procedural justice proposed by Tyler (2006), there are several important policy implications to suggest. Most importantly, police agencies—including gang task forces and narcotics officers—should implement procedural justice training that will enhance skills to strengthen citizen perceptions of procedurally just behavior. While there is limited research utilizing experimental designs to demonstrate the positive effects of procedural justice training, the few studies available indicate that dedicated training has contributed to favorable perceptions of police (see Mazerolle et al., 2014). This is not surprising given that there is ample evidence that procedurally just behavior is linked to favorable opinions of police among law-abiding citizens (Hinds and Murphy, 2007; Murphy, 2009; Tyler and Fagan, 2008) including youth (Hinds, 2007). Based on the studies available, procedural justice training would seek to improve police-citizen relations by developing

skills targeting each of the four tenets discussed by the theory (trust, respect, fairness, and participation), emphasizing their applicability when dealing with crime-involved citizens (Tyler, 2006).

In order to promote trust, develop respectful interpersonal skills and mitigate perceptions of procedural unfairness, the present study suggests that police – specifically gang task force and narcotics officers – undergo intensive procedural justice training. Given that the skills needed to enhance procedural justice are comparable to officers trained as specialists in Family Crisis Intervention, a similar training strategy could be adopted (see Bard, 1970, Hansson and Markstrom, 2014). This includes intensive on-site training courses, lectures, and "learning by doing" during role-play exercises (Bard, 1970). This would also include human relation workshops to sensitize officers to their own values, judgments, attitudes, and automatic responses (Bard, 1970, Hansson and Markstrom, 2014). The training would focus on several core themes.

First, and to specifically improve perceptions of trust and fairness, the officers would learn and practice articulating specific reason(s) as to why they approached individuals. The officer would clearly explain their justification (i.e., they witnessed the said individual previously, were provided information about criminal acts) and provide some explanation as to what prompted their action (i.e., drug dealing is pervasive in this neighborhood). To promote consistency, a template or script could be provided to the officers. Also, the officers would be trained via role-play so as to be prepared for different situations. This strategy would inform citizens as to the context of the stop and help clarify that it was not

based on biases tied to gender, race, and/or clothing. Indeed, this strategy was found to be particularly effective by Mazerolle and colleagues (2014) who required officers to demonstrate 'trustworthy motives' during random alcohol testing of drivers "by informing each driver about the number of deaths from road accidents in the previous year and conveying that the police genuinely wanted to reduce the road toll" (41).

This strategy may be particularly useful for both gang task force and narcotics officers, as the participants in the current study perceived them stopping individuals for unjustified reasons and/or for reasons based on individual characteristics (race, gender, neighborhood context). These perceptions then raised concerns about trust and fairness, respectively. For example, a common strategy of gang-task force officers is to stop known gang-involved individuals and ask questions about gang activities during routine information-gathering initiatives (Katz and Webb, 2006). The study participants subjected to these policing interventions raised concern about trusting the nature of the encounter. In attempts to modify this perception, the gang task force officer would be trained to explain that they are trying to understand the gang activities in order to prevent gang-related violence on the streets.

Similarly, the narcotics officers should explain what prompted their interest in individuals, especially when they approach someone not actively engaged in drug sales at the time of the encounter. As the men and women in the study explained, being approached while actively engaged in law-breaking behavior was important in establishing trust. When approached outside such

instances, the study participants often attributed these encounters to police biases based on race, gender, and clothing. To mitigate these negative perceptions, the narcotics officers could inform each citizen as to what prompted their suspicion. For example, if the narcotics officer had seen them deal previously or had witnessed them prior to the encounter, they should state this as such. Improving communication may help increase transparency and mitigate feelings of being singled out for other non-criminally related reasons such as racial profiling (Tyler and Wakslak, 2004). Moreover, it is possible that training officers to articulate their suspicions could diminish their reliance on perceptual shorthand based on demographic and other biases by bringing awareness of such tendencies to the foreground.

Next, the on-site training, lectures and workshops could help officers develop better interpersonal skills so as to improve perceptions of respectful treatment (Bard, 1970). Several of the study participants described that they or someone in their social network were subjected to disrespectful behavior – be it perceived disproportionate use of force or being spoken to in a demeaning manner. To improve this, police officers, especially gang task force and narcotics officers, could undergo training aimed at increasing their sensitivity to the persons they are interacting with (Bard, 1970). This would include lectures, role-play, human relations training (Sikes and Cleveland, 1968) but also educational courses designed to increase their understanding of how treating individuals with respect and compassion can improve interactions with citizens (Hansson and Markstrom, 2014). The training would emphasize the use of respectful language and behavior

(Mazerolle et al., 2014). For example, Mazerolle and colleagues trained officers to be polite during car-based encounters and to thank each citizen for his or her time, practices found to contribute to favorable perceptions of police. In addition, the police would be taught that their use of "trigger" words (i.e., derogatory comments) might be hurtful and escalate tension (Sikes and Cleveland, 1968).

In light of recent media attention to police misconduct and questioning of police training (Davey, 2015), increasing accountability and monitoring these efforts may also be helpful. Affixing body cameras and/or dashboard cameras may be particularly effective whereby these increase transparency and accountability of officer conduct but also provide mechanisms by which to review and learn from recorded behavior (Harris, 2010). Specifically, with regard to officers like those described in the present study, these efforts may be important in improving narcotics officers relationship with citizens, as they were commonly described as excessively aggressive in using threat with weapons and physical tactics described as "choking." While each citizen-officer encounter is unique and may require different responses by the officers, these policy suggestions may help mitigate negative perceptions by improving respectful interpersonal treatment and increasing accountability.

Finally, the training and workshops would also be designed to help officers develop skills at promoting engagement during involuntary encounters. Attempts to participate during exchanges were rarely reporting by the gang members interviewed. To facilitate such participation, officers would be trained to ask questions and provide an opportunity for the citizens to voice their

viewpoints about police and the stop. The officers would also be encouraged to solicit feedback about broader perceptions of community and policing issues (Mazerolle et al., 2014). These questions could come from a script or questionnaire developed by the different departments and could be tailored to the particular goals of the officers and their units. For example, gang task force officers could ask gang-involved youth about the gang issues that concern them in the neighborhood – be it about rival gangs, gang-related policing practices (i.e. the development of CalGang), or legal concerns regarding the use of civil gang injunctions, the STEP Act, or Proposition 21. Narcotics officers could inquire about drug-related concerns but also ask about individual situations such as why the person in question may have become involved in dealing in the first place. While promoting a conversation may not change the outcome of the stop, it does provide a means for citizens to partake in their encounter, which enhances perceptions of procedural justice. More importantly, however, encouraging a dialogue provides police officers insight into the effects of their practices among the different populations subjected to these interventions (Bottoms and Tankebe, 2012). While these policy suggestions do not address all of the problems described by the men and women in the study, procedural justice training and the use of cameras are important steps in addressing concerns about perceptions of trust, fairness, respect, and participation in order to improve police behavior in each of these areas. In doing so, this may result in better relationships between officers and gang/criminally involved individuals.

Conclusion

In conclusion, my hope is that this research has provided several substantive findings with import for expanding procedural justice theory. I have explored perceptions of procedural justice among a population – male and female drug dealing gang members – rarely examined. Most critically, the key findings suggest that gang and criminally involved ethnic minorities, especially African Americans and Latinos, perceive being subject to procedurally unjust police behavior. Concerns were raised with regard to a lack of respectful interpersonal treatment, citizen participation met with (police) indifference, and perceptions of unfair and biased decision-making. Further, the context of the stop was critical in forming or harming perceptions of trust and contributed to study participants' opinions about the legitimacy of the police. While there were some notable gender differences in experiences and responses, and some suggestion that the race/ethnicity of gang members might matter as well, there were also a number of shared experiences suggesting that men and women of different ethnicities also experience and interpret police behavior in similar ways.

Attitudes towards law enforcement, interpretations of police behavior, and legitimacy are best examined in an intersectional framework based on a dynamic exchange between police and citizen. As such, this investigation attempted to explore how gender, race, presentation of self, neighborhood context, criminal involvement, along with the type and nature of the stop, converged to reveal how attitudes towards police are formed and perceptions of procedural justice are articulated among this population. While the study is not without its limitations,

its insights can inform policing practices and offers procedural justice scholars new lines of inquiry for further understanding of how this theoretical framework extends to diverse settings and among unique populations more generally.

Works Cited

Abelson, E. (1989). *When ladies go a-thieving middle-class shoplifters in the Victorian department store*. New York: Oxford University Press

ACLU. aclunc.org, retrieved 2015

Acker, Joan. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, and bodies: A theory of gender organizations. *Gender & Society*. 4.2:139-158.

Agee, C. (2014). *The Streets of San Francisco Policing and the Creation of a Cosmopolitan Liberal Politics, 1950-1972*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Albrecht, S.L. & Green, M. (1977), Attitudes toward the police and the larger attitude complex: implications for police-community relationships, *Criminology*, Vol. 15, pp. 67-86.

Alexander, M. (2010). *The new Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness*. The New Press.

Allen v. City of Oakland, Case No. C00-4599 TEH Decl. of Plaintiffs' Counsel in Support of Motion to Appoint Receiver

Alonso, A. A. (2014). Maxson, C., Egley, A., Miller, J., & Klein, M. (Eds.). The Modern Gang Reader, 4th ed. Oxford University Press.

Alpert, G. (2004). *Understanding police use of force: Officers, suspects, and reciprocity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Anderson, E. (1999). *Code of the street.* New York: Norton

Armaline, W. T., Vera Sanchez, C. G., & Correia, M. (2014). 'The biggest gang in Oakland': re-thinking police legitimacy. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 17(3), 375-399.

Bard, M. (1970). Training Police as Specialists in Family Crisis Intervention.

Barrows, J. & Huff, R.C. (2009). Gangs and public policy: Constructing and deconstructing gang databases. *Criminology & Public Policy.* 8(4): 675–703.

Bay City News Service. "Three MS-13 Gang Members Sentenced to 27 Years for 2010 Daly City Murder." - *San Jose Mercury News*. October 23, 2014. Web. 24 Feb. 2015. http://www.mercurynews.com/crime-courts/ci_26785127/three-ms-13-gang-members-sentenced-27-years?source=rss

Beckett, Katherine, Kris Nyrop, and Lori Pfingst. (2006). Race, drugs, and

215

policing: Understanding disparities in drug delivery arrests. *Criminology*, 44: 105–137.

Beetham, D. (1991). *The legitimation of power*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press International.

Biernacki, P. & Waldorf, D. (1981). "Snowball sampling: Problems and techniques of chain referral sampling." *Sociological Methods & Research* 10:141-163.

Bjerregaard, B. (2003). Antigang Legislation and its Potential Impact: The Promises and the Pitfalls. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 14*(2), 171-192.

Bloom, J., & Martin, W. E. (2013). Black against empire: The history and politics of the Black Panther Party. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bottoms, Anthony, and Justice Tankebe. (2012) "Beyond Procedural Justice: A Dialogic Approach to Legitimacy in Criminal Justice." *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 102.1: 119-70.

Braga, A., Winship, C., Tyler, T., Fagan, J., & Meares, T. (2014). The Salience of Social Contextual Factors in Appraisals of Police Interactions with Citizens: A Randomized Factorial Experiment. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*. 30(4):599-627.

Brick, B. T., Taylor, T. J., & Esbensen, F. A. (2009). Juvenile attitudes towards the police: The importance of subcultural involvement and community ties. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *37*(5), 488-495.

Britton, D. M. (1997). Gendered Organizational Logic: Policy and Practice in Men's and Women's Prisons. Gender & Society. 11:796-181.

Brown, B., & Benedict, W. (2002). Perceptions of the police. *Policing*, *25*, 543-580.

Browne, Kath. (2005). "Snowball sampling: Using social networks to research non-heterosexual women." *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 8:47-60.

Brunson, R. (2007). "Police Don't Like Black People": African-American Young Men's Accumulated Police Experiences. *Criminology & Public Policy,* 6.1:71-101.

Brunson, Rod & Jody Miller. (2006). Gender, Race, and Urban Policing: The Experience of African American Youths . *Gender & Society*, 20(4): 531-552.

Brunson, Rod & Jody Miller. (2006). Young Black Men and Urban Policing in

the United States. *British Journal of Criminology*, 46.4:613-640.

Bouchard, M., & Spindler, A. (2010). Groups, gangs, and delinquency: Does organization matter? *Journal of Criminal Justice,* 38(5):921-933.

Bureau of Investigation and Intelligence. (2010). Organized Crime in California. http://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/publications/org_crime2010.pdf

Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS). (2006). Drugs and Crime Facts (NCJ 165148). Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.

Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS). (2000). Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics, 2000: Data for Individual State and Local Agencies with 100 or More Officers. (NCJ 203350). Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.

Campbell, A. (1984). *The girls in the gang.* New York, NY: Basil Blackwell.

Carr, P., Napolitano, L., & Keating, J. (2007). We Never Call The Cops And Here Is Why: A Qualitative Examination Of Legal Cynicism In Three Philadelphia Neighborhoods. *Criminology, 45*(2), 445-480.

Carroll, L., & Gonzalez, M. (2014). Out of Place: Racial Stereotypes and the Ecology of Frisks and Searches Following Traffic Stops. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 51*(5), 559-584.

Carson, D. (2013). Perceptions of prosocial and delinquent peer behavior and the effect on delinquent attitudes: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 41*, 151-161.

Carter, David L. (1985). "Hispanic perception of police performance: An empirical assessment." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 13.6: 487-500.

Casper, J., Tyler, T., & Fisher, B. (1988). Procedural Justice in Felony Cases. *Law & Society Review,* 22:483-483.

California Penal Code 186.21

Chang, K. (2010). Safe and Dangerous Places in San Francisco. http://news.travel.aol.com/2010/08/16/safe-and-dangerous-places-in-san-francisco/

Charmaz, Kathy. (2014). *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis*. 2nd ed. London: Sage Publications.

Chavez, Octavio, Shirley M. Chatters, Charles Follett, William Grasska, Robert W. Kyle, Carole Nielsen, Claire Stone, & Grayce N. Young. Los Angeles Civil Court. 2003-2004. Management Audit of the Civil Gang Injunctions.

Cheurprakobkit, S. (2000). Police-citizen contact and police performance: attitudinal differences between Hispanics and non-Hispanics. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, Vol. 28, pp. 325-36.

Children and Gangs: Facts for Families. (2011). Retrieved November 23, 2015, from www.aacap.org

Chu, Doris, John Huey-Long Song, & John Dombrink. (2005). Chinese immigrants' perceptions of the police in New York City. *International Criminal Justice Review* 15.2: 101-114.

Chu, D. C., & Hung, L. S. (2010). Chinese immigrants' attitudes toward the police in San Francisco. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, *33*(4), 621-643.

City-Data.com - Stats about all US cities - real estate, relocation info, crime, house prices, cost of living, races, home value estimator, recent sales, income, photos, schools, maps, weather, neighborhoods, and more, Retrieved February 15, 2015

Cloward, R., & Ohlin, L. (1966). *Delinquency and opportunity: A theory of delinquent gangs*. New York: Free Press.

Cohen, A. (1960). *Delinquent boys: The culture of the gang.*

Cohen, S. (1980). *Folk devils and moral panic: The creation of the mods and rockers* (Rev. ed.). Oxford: Martin Robertson.

Connell, Raewyn W. (2002). *Gender*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Corsianos, M. (2009). Policing and Gendered Justice: Examining the Possibilities. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Cottler, L. B., O'Leary, C.C., Nickel, K. B., Reingle, J. M. & Isom, D. (2014). Breaking the Blue Wall of Silence: Risk Factors for Experiencing Police Sexual Misconduct Among Female Offenders. *American Journal of Public Health* 104.2: 338-44.

Cox, D., Cox, A., & Moschis, G. (1990). When Consumer Behavior Goes Bad: An Investigation Of Adolescent Shoplifting. *Journal of Consumer Research, 17*(2), 149-159.

Crabtree, B., & Miller, W. (1999). A template approach to text analysis: Developing and using codebooks. In B. Crabtree & W. Miller (Eds.), *Doing qualitative research* (pp. 163-177.) Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Curry, G. David, R., Ball, A. & Fox, R. J. (1994). Gang Crime and Law Enforcement Recordkeeping. *Research in Brief.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Curry, G.D., Fox, R.J., Ball, R.A., and Stone, D. (1992). *National Assessment of Law Enforcement Anti-gang Information Resources.* Final Report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

Davey, Monica. (2015). *"Families of 2 Fatally Shot by Chicago Police Question Officers' Training".* New York Times. http://www.nytimes.com/2015/12/28/us/families-of-2-fatally-shot-by-chicago-police-question-officers-training.html

Decker, S. (1996). Collective And Normative Features Of Gang Violence. *Justice Quarterly, 13*(2):243-264.

Decker, S., Bynum, T., & Weisel, D. (1998). A tale of two cities: Gangs as organized crime groups. *Justice Quarterly, 15*(3): 395-425.

Decker, S., & Curry, G. (2002). Gangs, gang homicides, and gang loyalty: Organized crimes or disorganized criminals. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 30*(4): 343-352.

Decker, S., Katz, C., & Webb, V. (2014). Maxson, C., Egley, A., Miller, J., & Klein, M. (Eds.). The Modern Gang Reader, 4th ed. Oxford University Press.

Decker, S., & Van Winkle, B. (1994). "Slinging Dope": The Role Of Gangs And Gang Members In Drug Sales. *Justice Quarterly, 11*(4), 583-604.

Durán, R. (2008). Legitimated Oppression: Inner-City Mexican American Experiences with Police Gang Enforcement. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography,* 143-168.

Elliott, I., Thomas, S., & Ogloff, J. (2012). Procedural justice in contacts with the police: The perspective of victims of crime. *Police Practice and Research,* 13(1): 437-449.

Egelko, B. (2014) "2 San Francisco Police Officers Convicted of Corruption." *SFGate.com*. Web. 24 Feb. 2015.

Egley Jr, A., & Howell, J. C. (2011). Highlights of the 2009 national youth gang survey. *Juvenile Justice Fact Sheet*.

Engel, R., Smith, M., and Cullen, F. (2012). Race, Place, and Drug Enforcement: Reconsidering the Impact of Citizen Complaints and Crime Rates on Drug Arrests. *Criminology & Public Policy, 11*(4), 601-635.

Esbensen, F.-A., & Carson, D. C. (2012). Who are the gangsters? An examination of the age, race/ethnicity, sex, and immigration status of self-reported gang members in a seven-city study of American youth. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 28,* 465-481.

Esbensen, F.-A., & Carson. (2014). Maxson, C., Egley, A., Miller, J., & Klein, M. (Eds.). The Modern Gang Reader, 4th ed. Oxford University Press.

Esbensen, F.-A., & Deschenes, E. P. (1998). A multisite examination of youth gang membership: Does gender matter? *Criminology, 36*:799–828.

Esbensen, F.-A., & Winfree, L. T. (1998). Race and gender differences between gang and non-gang youths: Results from a multisite survey. *Justice Quarterly, 15*, 505–526.

Eskenazi, Joe. "San Francisco Cops Guilty on Federal Corruption Charges, Chief Suhr Calls for Their Termination." *Sfweekly.com*. N.p., 05 Dec. 2014. Web. 15 Feb. 2014. http://www.sfweekly.com/thesnitch/2014/12/05/san-francisco-cops-guilty-on-federal-corruption-charges

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2010). *Crime in the United States: 2010*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Fereday, J., & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating Rigor Using Thematic Analysis: A Hybrid Approach of Inductive and Deductive Coding and Theme Development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 5*(1).

Ferrell, J. (1995). 'Style matters: Criminal identity and social control' in Ferrell, J and Sanders, C (eds) *Cultural Criminology* Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.

Fischer, Ronald, Charles Harb, Sarah Al-Sarraf, and Omar Nashabe. (2008). Support for resistance among Iraqi students: An exploratory study. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 30(1):67–75

Flexon, J., Lurigio, A., & Greenleaf, R. (2009). Exploring The Dimensions Of Trust In The Police Among Chicago Juveniles. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 37*:180-189.

Follette, V., Polusny, M., Bechtle, A., & Naugle, A. (1996). Cumulative trauma: The impact of child sexual abuse, adult sexual assault, and spouse abuse. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 9*(1), 25-35

Fratello, J., Rengifo, A., & Trone, J. (2013). Coming of Age with Stop and Frisk: Experiences, Self-Perceptions, and Public Safety Implications . Vera Institute of Justice Center on Youth Justice.

Gainey, R., & Payne, B. (2009). Gender, victimisation, perceived risk and perceptions of police performance in disadvantaged neighbourhoods. *International Journal of Police Science & Management, 11*(3):306-323.

Gallupe, O., & Bouchard, M. (2013). Adolescent parties and substance use: A situational approach to peer influence. *Journal of Criminal Justice. 41*:162-171.

Gau, J. M. (2013). Procedural justice and police legitimacy: A test of measurement and structure. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*. 1-19.

Gau, J., & Brunson, R. (2007). Procedural Injustice, Lost Legitimacy, and Self-Help: Young Males' Adaptations to Perceived Unfairness in Urban Policing Tactics. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice,* 132-150.

Geller, A., Fagan, J., Tyler, T., & Link, B. (2014). Aggressive Policing and the Mental Health of Young Urban Men. *American Journal of Public Health,4.12:*2321-2327.

Gibbidon, S. L., Higgins, G. E., & Potter, H. (2011). Race, Gender, and the Perception of Recently Experiencing Unfair Treatment by the Police: Exploratory Results From an All-Black Sample. *Criminal Justice Review*. 36(1) 5-21 .

Gilgun, Jane. (2011). *Reflexivity and Qualitative Research*. Amazon Digital Services.

Goffman, A. (2009). On the Run. *American Sociological Review, 74*, 339-357.

Grogger, J. (2002). The effects of civil gang injunctions on reported violent crime: evidence from Los Angeles County*. *Journal of Law and Economics*, *45*(1), 69-90.

Hagedorn, J. M., & Devitt, M. L. (1999). Fighting female: The social construction of female gangs. In M. Chesney-Lind & J. M. Hagedorn (Eds.), *Female gangs in America: Essays on girls, gangs and gender* (pp. 256– 276). Chicago: Lake View Press.

Harris, D. A. (2010). Picture This: Body Worn Video Devices ('Head Cams') as Tools for Ensuring Fourth Amendment Compliance by Police. *Texas Tech Law Review, Forthcoming*.

Haynie, D. and Soller, Brian. (2015). Cullen, F.T, Wilcox, P., Lux, J.L, & , C.L (Eds). *Sisters in crime revisited: Bringing gender into criminology : In honor of Freda Adler*. Eds

Heaton, J. (1998). Secondary analysis of qualitative data. Social Research Update, 22. Retrieved 25 October, 2015, from http://sru.soc.surrey.ac.uk/SRU22.html

Heaton, J. (2008). Secondary Analysis of Qualitative Data: An Overview. *Historical Social Research, 33*, 33-45.

Hebdige, Dick (1979). *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*. London: Routledge. ISBN 0415039495.

Hennigan, K., & Sloane, D. (2013). Overview of: "Improving Civil Gang Injunctions: How Implementation Can Affect Gang Dynamics, Crime, and Violence." *Criminology & Public Policy, 12*(1), 7-41.

Herbert , S. (2001). 'Hard Charger' or 'Station Queen'? Policing and the Masculinist State. *Gender, Place, and Culture*. 8.1:55-71.

Hinds, L. (2007). Building Police Youth Relationships: The Importance of Procedural Justice. *Youth Justice, 7*(3), 195-209.

Hinds, L. & Murphy, K. (2007). Public Satisfaction With Police: Using Procedural Justice to Improve Police Legitimacy. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*. 40:27–42

Hinds, P., Vogel, R., & Clarke-Steffen, L. (1997). The possibilities and pitfalls of doing a secondary analysis of a qualitative data set. Qualitative Health Research, 7, 408 424.

Huebner, B. M., Schafer, J. A., & Bynum, T. S. (2004). African American and White perceptions of police services: Within-and between-group variation. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *32*(2), 123-135.

Hunt, G. P. & Joe-Laidler, K. (2011). Gangs, Gender, and Drug Sales: A Qualitative Study. Final Report

Hunt, G. P., Joe-Laidler, K., & MacKenzie, K. (2005). Moving into motherhood: Gang girls and controlled risk. *Youth and Society, 36,* 333-373.

Hurst, Y.G. and Frank, J. (2000), How kids view cops: the nature of juvenile

attitudes toward the police, *Journal of Criminal Justice*, Vol. 28, pp. 189-202.

Hurst, Y.G, Frank, J., & Browning, S. (2000). The attitudes of juveniles toward the police: A comparison of black and white youth. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 23*(1), 37-53.

Hurst, Y. G., McDermott, M. J., & Thomas, D. L. (2005). The attitudes of girls toward the police: Differences by race. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, *28*(4), 578-593.

Jackson, J., Bradford, B., Hough, M., Myhill, A., Quinton, P., & Tyler, T. (2012). Why do People Comply with the Law?: Legitimacy and the Influence of Legal Institutions. *British Journal of Criminology,* 11(1):1051-1071.

Jacob, H. (1971). Black and white perceptions of justice in the city. *Law and Society Review*, Vol. 6, pp. 69-89.

Jacobs, J.B. (2009). Gangs Databases: Context and Questions. *Criminology & Public Policy.* 8(4): 705–709.

Jacobs, B. (1996). Crack Dealers And Restrictive Deterrence: Identifying Narcs*. *Criminology, 34*(3), 409-431.

Jacobs, B., & Miller, J. (1998). Crack Dealing, Gender, and Arrest Avoidance. *Social Problems, 45*(5), 550-569

Jacques, S., & Wright, R. (2015). *Code of the suburb: Inside the world of young middle-class drug dealers*. University of Chicago Press.

Joe-Laidler, K., & Hunt, G. P. (1997). Violence and social organization in female gangs. *Social Justice, 24,* 148-169.

Katz, C., & Webb, V. (2006). *Policing gangs in America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Katz, J. (1988). *Seductions of crime: Moral and sensual attractions in doing evil*. New York: Basic Books

Kirk, David & Matsuda, M. (2011). Legal Cynicism, Collective Efficacy, and the Ecology of Arrest. *Criminology* 49:443-467

Kirk, David & Papachristos, A.V. (2011). Cultural Mechanisms and the Persistence of Neighborhood Violence. *Journal of Sociology*. 1190:1228–29

Klein, M. W. (1971). *Street gangs and street workers.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Klein, M. W. (1995). *The American street gang: Its nature, prevalence, and control*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Klein, M. W. & Crawford, L.Y. (1967). Groups, gangs and cohesive- ness. *J Res Crime & Del* 4:63–75

Klein, M. W., & Maxson, C. (2006). *Street gang patterns and policies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kochel, Tammy R., David B. Wilson, and Stephen D. Mastrofski. (2011). Effects of suspect race on officers' arrest decisions. *Criminology*, 49: 473–512.

Labov, W. (1972). Language in the Inner City. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press

Labov, W. (1997). Some further steps in narrative analysis. *Journal of narrative and life history*, *7*, 395-415.

Laidler, K. J., & Hunt, G. (2001). Accomplishing femininity among the girls in the gang. *British journal of criminology*, *41*(4), 656-678.

Lasley, J. (1994). The impact of the Rodney King incident on citizen attitudes toward the police. Policing and Society, 3, 245–255.

Lauritsen, Janet L., Robert J. Sampson, and John H. Laub. (1991). "The Link Between Offending and Victimization Among Adolescents." *Criminology*, Vol. 29: 265-292.

Lee, J., Steinberg, L., & Piquero, A. (2010). Ethnic Identity And Attitudes Toward The Police Among African American Juvenile Offenders. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 38*(4), 781-789.

Leiber, M.J., Nalla, M.K. & Farnworth, M. (1998). Explaining juveniles' attitudes toward the police. *Justice Quarterly*, Vol. 15, pp. 151-73.

Lemmer, T., Bensinger, G., & Lurigio, A. (2008). An Analysis Of Police Responses To Gangs In Chicago. *Police Practice and Research, 9*(5), 417-430.

Levitt, Steven, and Sudhir Alladi Venkatesh. (2000). "An Economic Analysis of a Drug-Selling Gang's Finances." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 115.3: 755-89.

Mandel, D. (2013). Gender Differences in Attitudes Toward Police Use of Tasers Following the Dziekanski Case. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy, 13*(1), 310-326.

Mastrofski, S. D., M. D. Reisig, & J. D. McCluskey. (2002). Police disrespect toward the public: An encounter-based analysis. *Criminology* 40:515-51.

Matsueda, R. L. (1982). Testing control theory and differential association: A causal modeling approach. American Sociological Review, 47, 489–504.

Maxson, C., Egley, A., Miller, J., & Klein, M. (Eds.) (2014). The Modern Gang Reader, 4th ed. Oxford University Press.

Maxson, C. L., Hennigan, K. M., & Sloane, D. C. (2005). It's Getting Crazy Out there": Can a Civil Gang Injunction Change a Community?*. *Criminology & public policy*, *4*(3), 577-605.

Maxson, C. L, Matsuda, K., & Hennigan, K. M. (2011). Deterrability" Among Gang and Nongang Juvenile Offenders: Are Gang Members More (or Less) Deterrable Than Other Juvenile Offenders? *Crime & Delinquency, 57*(4), 516-543.

Maxwell, J.A. (2005). *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Mazerolle, L., Antrobus, E., Bennett, S., & Tyler, T. R. (2013). Shaping Citizen Perceptions of Police Legitimacy: A Randomized Field Trial of Procedural Justice. *Criminology*, *51*(1), 33–63.

Mazerolle L., Bennett, S., Davis, J., Sargeant, E., & Manning, M. (2013). Legitimacy in Policing: A Systematic Review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*.

McCluskey, J. D., McCluskey, C. P., & Enriquez, R. (2008). A comparison of Latino and White citizen satisfaction with police. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *36*(6), 471-477.

McKinley, J. (2011). *Dozens of Cases to Be Dropped in San Francisco Police Scandal.* The New York Times. March, 9, 2011. *http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/10/us/10narcs.html?_r=0.* Accessed 2015.

Miller, Jody. (1995). Struggles Over the Symbolic: Gang Style and the Meanings of Social Control. Pp. 213-234 in Jeff Ferrell and Clinton Sanders, eds. *Cultural Criminology.* Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Miller, Jody. (1998). "Up It Up: Gender and the Accomplishment of Street Robbery." *Criminology.* 36(1): 37-66.

Miller, J. (2001). *One of the guys: Girls, gangs, and gender*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Miller, J. (2002). Violence and coercion in Sri Lanka's commercial sex industry: Intersections of gender, sexuality, culture and the law. *Violence Against Women, 8*, 1044-1073.

Miller, J., & Brunson, R. K. (2000). Gender dynamics in youth gangs: A comparison of male and female accounts. *Justice Quarterly, 17,* 801-830.

Miller, J., & Decker, S. H. (2001). Young women and gang violence: An examination of gender, street offending and violent victimization in gangs. *Justice Quarterly, 18,* 115-140.

Miller, W. B. (1975). *Violence by youth gangs and youth groups as a crime problem in major American cities.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Moore, H., Mark and Kleinman, A.R., Mark. (1989). *The Police and Drugs.* U.S. Department of Justice. A publication of National Institute of Justice and Criminal Justice Policy and Management, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

Moore, M., & Trojanowicz, R. (1988). Policing and the Fear of Crime. *Perspectives on Policing. U.S. Department of Justice, 3*, 1-7

Mullins. Christopher W. (2006). *Holding Your Square: Masculinities, Streetlife, and Violence.* London, UK: Willan Press.

Mullins, Christopher W. and Jody Miller. (2008). "Temporal, Situational and Interactional Features of Women's Violent Conflicts." *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology.* 41: 36-62.

Murch, D. (2007). The campus and the street: Race, migration, and the origins of the black panther party in Oakland, CA. *Souls*, *9*(4), 333-345.

Murphy, D. E. (2003). "San Francisco Police Suspended; Chief's Future Unclear." *The New York Times*. The New York Times, Web. 24 Feb. 2015. http://www.nytimes.com/2003/03/04/us/san-francisco-police-suspended-chief-s-future-unclear.html

Murphy, K. & A. Cherney. (2012). Understanding cooperation with police in a diverse society. *British Journal of Criminology.* 52:181– 201.

Murphy, K. (2009). Public Satisfaction With Police: The Importance Of Procedural Justice And Police Performance In Police–Citizen Encounters. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology,* 40(1):159-178.

Natapoff, A. (2009). *Snitching criminal informants and the erosion of American justice*. New York: New York University Press.

National Gang Center. https://www.nationalgangcenter.gov

Nguyen, M. (2015). The Hoodie as Sign, Screen, Expectation, and Force. *Signs,* 791-816.

Nichols, A. (2010). Dance Ponnaya, Dance! Police Abuses Against Transgender Sex Workers in Sri Lanka. *Feminist Criminology, 5*(2), 195-222.

Novich, M. (2015). Perceptions of Police Legitimacy among Sex Workers in Sri Lanka. *Women's Imprisonment: An International Perspective edited by Candace Kruttschnitt and Catrien Bijleveld.* Routledge. 2015

Novich, Madeleine and Miller, J. (2015). *Sisters in crime revisited: Bringing gender into criminology : In honor of Freda Adler*. Cullen, F. (eds). Oxford University Press.

Noy, C. (2008). Sampling Knowledge: The Hermeneutics of Snowball Sampling in Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*. 11.4:327–344.

Papachristos, A., Meares, T., & Fagan, J. (2012). Why Do Criminals Obey the Law? The Influence of Legitimacy and Social Networks on Active Gun Owners. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*. 102.2:397-440.

Paternoster, R, Brame, R., & Bachman, R. (1997). Do Fair Procedures Matter? The Effect of Procedural Justice on Spouse Assault. *Law and Society Review* 31.1:163-204.

Peterson, D., Miller, J., & Esbensen, F.-A. (2001). The impact of sex composition on gangs and gang member delinquency. *Criminology, 39*, 411–440.

Presser, L., & Sandberg, S. (2015). *Narrative Criminology Understanding Stories of Crime.* New York: NYU Press.

Rapacon, S. (2014). "Most Expensive U.S. Cities to Live In-Kiplinger." *Www.kiplinger.com*.Web. 24 Feb. 2015.

Rastogi, S., Johnson, T. D., Hoeffel, E. M., & Drewery, Jr., M. P. (2011). *The Black Population: 2010*. (Rep. No. C2010BR-06). Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.

Real Search Action Research Center. (2012). Tracked and Trapped: Youth of Color Gang Databases and Gang Injunctions. Youth Justice Coalition.

Reisig, M.D. & Parks, R.B. (2000), Experience, quality of life, and neighborhood

context: a hierarchical analysis of satisfaction with the police. *Justice Quarterly*, Vol. 17, pp. 607-29.

Reisig, M. D., & Lloyd, C. (2009). Procedural justice, police legitimacy, and helping the police fight crime: Results from a survey of Jamaican adolescents. *Police Quarterly* 21:42–62

Rengifo, A., & Fratello, J. (2014). Perceptions of the Police by Immigrant Youth: Looking at Stop-and-Frisk and Beyond Using a New York City Sample. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*.

Rice, S. K., Reitzel, J. D., & Piquero, A. R. (2005). Shades of brown: Perceptions of racial profiling and the intra-ethnic differential. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice*, *3*(1-2), 47-70.

Ridgeway, Cecilia L., & Correll, S. (2000). Limiting inequality through interaction: The end(s) of gender. *Contemporary Sociology* 29:110-20.

Rios, Victor M. (2011). *Punished: Policing the Lives of Black and Latino Boys*. New York: New York UP.

Ring, M. K. (2005). Attitudes toward the police: The effects of direct and vicarious experience. Police Quarterly 8:343–365.

Risman, B. J. (2004). Gender as a Social Structure: Theory Wrestling with Activism. *Gender & Society*. 18.4:429-450

Rosenbaum, D. P., Schuck, A. M., Costello, S.K., Hawkins, D. F., & Ring, M.K . (2005). Attitudes toward the police: The effects of direct and vicarious experience. Police Quarterly 8:343–365.

Sampson, R.J. & Bartusch, D.J. (1998), Legal cynicism and (subcultural?) tolerance of deviance: the neighborhood context of racial differences. *Law and Society Review*, Vol. 32, pp. 777-804.

San Francisco Attorney General. sfattorney.org. Retrieved July 1, 2015

San Francisco Police Department. www.sf-police.org. Retrieved July 1, 2015

Short, J. F., Jr., & Strodtbeck, F. L. (1965). *Group process and gang delinquency*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Schuck, A., & Martin, C. (2013). Residents' Perceptions of Procedural Injustice During Encounters With the Police. *Journal Of Ethnicity In Criminal Justice*, *11*(4), 219-237. doi:10.1080/15377938.2012.762635

Seale, B. (1970). Seize the time. Baltimore, MD: Random House.

Silverman, D. (2006). *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analysing Talk, Text and Interaction.* London. Sage Publications.

Sikes, M. P., & Cleveland, S. E. (1968). Human relations training for police and community. *American Psychologist*, *23*(10), 766.

Skogan, W. G. (2006). *Police Innovation: Contrasting Perspectives*. Weisburd, D., & Braga, A. A. (Eds.). Cambridge University Press.
Skogan, W. G., & Frydl, K. (Eds.). (2004). *Fairness and Effectiveness in Policing: The Evidence*. Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press.

Slocum, L., Taylor, T., Brick, B., & Esbensen, F. (2010). Neighborhood Structural Characteristics, Individual-Level Attitudes, And Youths' Crime Reporting Intentions*. *Criminology, 48*(4), 1063-1100

Slocum, L., Rengifo, A., & Carbone-Lopez, K. (2012). Specifying the Strain-Violence Link: The Role of Emotions in Women's Descriptions of Violent Incidents. *Victims & Offenders, 7*(1), 1-29.

Smith, E. (2008). Pitfalls And Promises: The Use Of Secondary Data Analysis In Educational Research. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 56*(3), 323-339.

Spitzer, E. (1999), "The New York City Police Department's "Stop and Frisk" Practices," Office of the New York State Attorney General; available at *www.oag.state.ny.us/press/reports/stop_frisk/stop_frisk.html*.

Spradley, J. P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Sousa, W. & Kelling, G. (2006). *Police Innovation: Contrasting Perspectives*. Weisburd, D., & Braga, A. A. (Eds.). Cambridge University Press.

Sunshine, J. & Tyler, T. R. (2003). The role of procedural justice and legitimacy in shaping public support for policing. *Law & Society Review* 37:513–47.

Tankebe, J. (2009). Public Cooperation with the Police in Ghana: Does Procedural Fairness Matter? *Criminology* 47:1267-1293.

Tankebe, Justice. (2009). Viewing Things Differently: The Dimensions of Public Perceptions of Police Legitimacy. *Criminology* 51.1:103-135.

Taylor, R. B. (2006). Incivilities reduction policing, zero tolerance, and the retreat from coproduction: Weak foundations and strong pressures In D. Weisburd & A. Braga (Eds.), Innovations in Policing (pp. 98-114).

Taylor, T. J. (2008). The boulevard ain't safe for your kids…: Youth gang membership and violent victimization. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 24,* 125-136.

Taylor, T.J., Turner, K.B., Esbensen, F.A. & Winfree, L.T. (2001). Coppin' an attitude: attitudinal differences among juveniles toward police. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, Vol. 29, pp. 295-305.

Thibaut, J. W., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. L. Erlbaum Associates.

Theobald, N. A., & Haider-Markel, D. P. (2009). Race, bureaucracy, and symbolic representation: Interactions between citizens and police. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *19*(2), 409-426.

Thomas, C.W. and Hyman, J.M. (1977). Perceptions of crime, fear of victimization, and public perceptions of police performance. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, Vol. 5, pp. 305-17.

Thomas, K. (2015). Delinquent Peer Influence On Offending Versatility: Can Peers Promote Specialized Delinquency? *Criminology, 53*(2), 280-308.

Thrasher, F. (1927). *The Gang: A study of 1,313 gangs in Chicago*. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.

Toy, C. (1992). A Short History of Asian Gangs in San Francisco. Justice Quarterly, 9(4): 655-659.

Treadwell, J. (2008). Call the (Fashion) Police. How fashion becomes criminalized. Papers from the British Society of Criminology. Vol. 8: 117-133

Tyler, Tom R. (1990). Why People Obey the Law. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Tyler, T. R. (2003). Procedural justice, legitimacy, and the effective rule of law. In Crime and Justice: Review of Research, ed. Michael H. Tonry. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Tyler, T. R. (2006). Psychological perspectives on legitimacy and legitimation. Annual Review of Psychology 57:375–400.

Tyler, T., & Fagan, J. (2008). Legitimacy and Cooperation: Why Do People Help the Police Fight Crime in Their Communities? *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law*, *6,* 231–275.

Tyler, T. R., & Huo, Y. J. (2002). *Trust in the Law: Encouraging Public Cooperation with the Police and Courts (Russell Sage Foundation Series on Trust*. Russell Sage Foundation Publications.

Tyler, T. & Wakslak, C. (2004). Profiling and Police Legitimacy: Procedural Justice, Attributions of Motive, and Acceptance of Police Authority, *Criminology* 42.2:253-281

Ulichny, P. (1991). The Role of Hypothesis Testing in Qualitative Research. A Researcher Comments. *TESOL Quarterly,* 200-202.

Ulicki, T. (2012). New Directions or Half Measures? Organizational Response to Gender Inequity in the South African Police Service. *Policing and Societ*y.1-23. Print.

U.S Bureau of Labor Statistics, www.bls.gov, Retrieved February 15, 2015.

U.S. Census Bureau. U.S. Census 2010, Retrieved February 15, 2015

Vásquez, B., & Zimmerman, G. (2014). An investigation into the empirical relationship between time with peers, friendship, and delinquency. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 42*, 244-256.

Vigil, J. D. (2002). *A rainbow of gangs: Street cultures in the mega-city.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Visher, C. A. (1983). Gender, Police Arrest Decisions, and Notions of Chivalry, Criminology V21 I1:5-28

Waddington, P., Williams, K., Wright, M., & Newburn, T. (2013). Dissension in public evaluations of the police. *Policing and Society,* 212-235.

Walker, J. T. and L. (1975). *Procedural Justice: A Psychological Analysis*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Walter, S. (2012). "Decisions Must Now Go through Court Monitors, as Department Steps Closer to Federal Takeover." *The Bay Citizen*. N.p., Web. 24 Feb. 2015. https://www.baycitizen.org/news/policing/judge-strips-power-oakland-police/

Ward, G. K. (2012). *The black child-savers: Racial democracy and juvenile justice*. University of Chicago Press.

Warren, P. Y. (2011). Perceptions of Police Disrespect During Vehicle Stops: A Race- Based Analysis. *Crime & Delinquency*, *57*(3), 356–376.

Weber, Max. (1978). Economy and Society. University of California Press.

Weitzer, R. (2000). Racialized policing: Residents' perceptions in three neighborhoods. *Law & Society Review*. *34*(1), 129-155.

Weitzer, R., & Tuch, S. A. (2004). Race and perceptions of police misconduct. *Social Problems*, *51*(3), 305-326.

Weisberg, D., & Braga, A. A. (Eds.). (2006). *Police Innovation: Contrasting Perspectives*. Cambridge University Press.

Weisburd, David L. and Green, L. (1995). Policing drug hot spots: The Jersey City drug market analysis experiment. *Justice Quarterly*, 12: 711–736.

Whiteside, M., Mills, J., & Mccalman, J. (2012). Using Secondary Data for Grounded Theory Analysis. *Australian Social Work, 65*(4), 504-516.

Wu, Y. (2014). Race/ethnicity and perceptions of the police: a comparison of White, Black, Asian and Hispanic Americans. *Policing and Society* 24(2): 135-157.

Wu, Y, Smith, B. W., & Sun, I .Y. (2013). Race/Ethnicity and Perceptions of Police Bias: The Case of Chinese Immigrants. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice* 11.1-2 (2013): 71-92.

Yoshino, E. R. (2008). California's Criminal Gang Enhancements: Lessons from Interviews with Practitioners. *S. Cal. Rev. L. & Soc. Just.*, *18*, 117.

Zamble, E. & Annesley, P. (1987). Some determinants of public attitudes toward the police. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, Vol. 15, pp. 285-90.

Zimmerman, G., & Messner, S. (2010). Neighborhood Context and the Gender Gap in Adolescent Violent Crime. *American Sociological Review, 75*(6), 958-980.

Institute for Scientific Analysis
San Francisco, CA
GANGS, GENDER AND DRUG SALES
Version 03/01/08

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Respondent's Nickname: _____

1.	Case Number _____(*do not assign case number*)	QN1.___ ___ ___ ___

2.	Date of Interview
QN3.___ ___/___ ___/___ ___
Month /   Day /   Year

3.	What is your birth date?
A1.___ ___/___ ___/___ ___
Month /   Day /   Year

4.	How old are you?	A1a. ___ ___

5.	Gender 1) Male	2) Female	QN4. ____

6.	What is your main/primary ethnic group or race?	A2. ___ ___

00) None	08) Vietnamese
01) Black/African American	09) Japanese
02) Chicano	10) Other Asian *(specify)* _____
03) Mexican	11) Filipino
04) Latino/Hispanic	12) Samoan
05) Puerto Rican	13) American Indian *(specify)*_____
06) White	14) Other *(specify)*_____
07) Chinese	19) Mixed *(specify)*_____

6a.	If applicable: What is your secondary ethnic group or race?
	A2s. ___ ___

00) None	08) Vietnamese
01) Black	09) Japanese
02) Chicano	10) Other Asian *(specify)*_____
03) Mexican	11) Filipino
04) Latino/Hispanic	12) Samoan
05) Puerto Rican	13) American Indian
06) White	14) Other *(specify)*_____
07) Chinese	19) Mixed *(specify)*_____

6b.	Where were you born? Town_____	A3. ___ ___

(*write in birthplace*)   (*code region)*
State or Region_____

Country_____

IF NOT BORN IN THE U.S. ASK:

6c.   How long have you lived in the U.S?

Months_____   Years_____(*calculate total months*)   A3a. ___ ___ _

7.   What religion were you raised in?   A7. ___ ___

00) None   08) Protestant (Methodist, Presbyterian, etc)
01) Baptist   09) Fundamental Protestant (Pentecostal, etc)
02) Buddhist   10) Eastern religion
03) Catholic   11) Christian
04) Jewish   12) Non-institutional religion
05) Mormon   13) Other_____
07) Muslim

8.   What was the last grade of school you completed?
        A8. ___ ___

8a.   What type of school are you presently attending?
        A8a. ___ ___

00) None   07) Other_____
01) Regular school   08) Continuing education
02) Private or Catholic school
03) Alternative school (eg. RAP)
04) Vocational/training school
05) G.E.D. classes
06) College

8b.   Did you ever drop out or get kicked out of school?
        A8b.____

0) No   1)Yes

8c.   **IF YES:** What happened after that?   A8c. ____

1) Never went back
2) Went back to same school
3) Went back to different school *(specify)* _____
4) Got G.E.D.

9.   What is your father's age?
        A1b.___ ___

9a.   What is your mother's age?
        A1c.___ ___

10.   What country is your father from? _____
        A2b. ___ ___
(*write in*)

10a.   What country is your mother from? _____
        A2c. ___ ___
(*write in*)

11.   How long have your mother and father lived in the U.S.?

0) Unknown
1) 0-1 Year   Father: A3b. ___
2) 2-5 Years
3) 6-10 years   Mother:A3c. ___
4) 10 or more years
5) All their lives

12.   What type of work does/did your father (or father figure) do?   A5. ___ ___
(*code work type*)

_____
(*write in*)

12a.   What type of work does/did your mother (or mother figure) do?   A6. ___ ___
(*code work type*)

_____
(*write in*)

13.   What is the highest grade of school your father completed?   A5a. ____

1) Less than high school
2) High school graduate
3) Some college
4) College graduate
5) Other *(specify)*_____
6) Unknown

13a.   What is the highest grade of school your mother completed?
        A6a.____

1) Less than high school
2) High school graduate
3) Some college
4) College graduate
5) Other *(specify)*_____
6) Unknown

14.   How many brothers and sisters do you have?   A18a. ___ ___

14a.   How many are older?
        A18b.____

14b.   How many are younger?
        A18c.____

14c.   How old is your oldest brother or sister?
        A18d.___ ___

14d.   How old is your youngest brother or sister?
        A18e.___ ___

14e.   How many of your siblings grew up in the same household with you?
        A18f.___ ___

15.   Which family members were most responsible for raising you before age 16?
(**Select more than one only if equally responsible**)   A4. ___ ___

00) Mother and father separately   08) Aunt &/or uncle
        A4s.___ ___
01) Mother and father together   09) Various family combinations
02) Mother only   10) Foster homes or group homes
03) Father only   11) Other institutions (e.g., orphanage)
04) Mother & step-father   12) On your own
05) Father & step-mother   13) Other_____
06) Grandparents   14) Grandmother
07) Brother &/or sister

16.   Which side of your family is currently most involved in your everyday life?
        A4f.____

1) Mother's side   3) Both sides
2) Father's side   4) Neither side

17.   What is your marital/partnership status?
A9. ____

0) Single
1) Presently married, living with spouse
2) Presently married, separated-not living with spouse
3) Living with partner
4) Living with gay lover
5) Other *(specify)* _____
6) Divorced

18.   How many long term (more than 1 year) relationships have you had?
        A9d.___ ____

19.   How many children do you have?
        A10.___ ___

19a.   How old is your oldest child?
        A10a.___ ___

19b.   How many of your children live with you?
        A10b.___ ___

19c.   How many of your children do you have contact with?
        A10c.___ ___

19d.   How many of your children do you support financially?
        A10d.___ ___

20.   Where do you currently live?   A14. ___ ___

_____
(*write in cross streets only*)

20a.   How long have you been living here? (*calculate months*)   A14b. ___ ___
___
(*months*)

21.   What type of housing do you live in?   A14c. ___ ___

1) Public housing   7) Halfway house
2) Apartment building   8) Drug/alcohol facility
3) House   9) Homeless/ no fixed shelter
4) Hotel   10) Other_____
5) Emergency shelter   11) Group or foster home
6) Jail/prison

21a.   Do you live in government subsidized housing (Housing projects or Section 8)?
A14d. ____

0) No   1) Yes

22.   Who is most responsible for paying the rent/mortgage at your residence?
A14f. ___ ___

01) Myself
A14g.___ ___
02) Spouse or partner   (*if more than
one)*
03) Myself and spouse or partner
04) Mother
05) Father
06) Both parents

07) Parents in law
08) Grandparent
09) Other relative *(specify)*_____
10) Roommate
11) Friend
12) Other *(specify)*_____
13) Self and other person/s *(specify who)*_____

23.   Who lives in your current residence?   (*write in corresponding code for each household member*)

01)	Mother	
02)	Father	A20a.___ ___
03)	Stepmother	
04)	Stepfather	A20b. ___ ___
05)	Brother	
06)	Sister	A20c.___ ___
07)	Half /Step Sibling	
09)	Child	A20d. ___ ___
10)	Spouse	
11)	Boyfriend/Girlfriend	A20e. ___ ___
12)	Grandmother	
13)	Grandfather	A20f. ___ ___
19)	Aunt	
20)	Uncle	A20g. ___ ___
21)	Cousin	
35)	Friend	A20h. ___ ___
37)	Self	
38)	Foster sibling	A20i. ___ ___
39)	Foster mother	
40)	Foster father	A20j.___ ___
45)	In-laws	
55)	Other (specify)_____	

24.   Who is the head of your household?   A21. ___ ___
(*select from list above*)
A21a. ___ ___
(*if more than one*)

EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME

25.   What kind of legitimate work are you doing presently?   A12. ___ ___
(*code work type)*

_____
(*write in*)

IF NOT WORKING SKIP TO QUESTION 26.
IF WORKING ASK:

25a.   Is It: 1) Part time   2) Full time   A12a. _____

25b.   How long have you been working at this job? *(calculate weeks)*   A12c. ___ ___
___

Weeks_____   Months_____   Years_____

25c.   **IF WORKING MORE THAN ONE JOB GET JOB TYPE**:
A12b. ___ ___
(*code work type)*

_____
(*write in*)

25d.   Approximately how many hours do you work per week?   A12d. ___ ___

26.   From what source did you get the most money last month?   A11a. _____

0) Welfare, SSI, unemployment, etc.   4) Friend(s)
1) Job   5) Combination *(specify)*_____
2) Family   6) Drug sales
3) Hustle

27.   Estimate your average monthly income from each of the following sources of income.

Source	Code
Job/Employment	IS1. ___ ___ ___ ___
Child Support	IS1a.___ ___ ___ ___
Financial support from boyfriend/girlfriend	IS1b.___ ___ ___ ___
Financial support from family	IS1c.___ ___ ___ ___
Financial support from friends	IS1d.___ ___ ___ ___
School Financial Aid	IS1e.___ ___ ___ ___
TANF (Temporary Aid to Need Families)	IS1f.___ ___ ___ ___
SSI (Supplemental Security Income)	IS1g.___ ___ ___ ___
SSA/SSDI (Social Security Disability)	IS1h.___ ___ ___ ___
GA (General Assistance)	IS1i.___ ___ ___ ___
SDI (State Disability Insurance)	Is1j.___ ___ ___ ___
Unemployment	IS1k.___ ___ ___ ___
Food Stamps	IS1l.___ ___ ___ ___
Drug Sales	IS1m.___ ___ ___ ___
Boosting/Shoplifting	IS1n.___ ___ ___ ___
Pimping/ Prostitution	IS1o.___ ___ ___ ___
Theft/Robbery/Property Crimes	IS1s. ___ ___ ___ ___
Welfare scams	IS1p.___ ___ ___ ___
Other Hustles *(specify)*_____	IS1q.___ ___ ___ ___
Other Sources *(specify)*_____	IS1r.___ ___ ___ ___
Estimate your total monthly income from all sources	A13/1.___ ___ ___ ___

27a.   Estimate your monthly expenses for rent, food and utilities, etc. IS1x.___ ___ ___ ___

IN-DEPTH SEMI-STRUCTURED
INTERVIEW
BACKGROUND AND LIFE HISTORY

1. Tell me about all the places you lived starting from where you were born to where you live now.
Did you move around a lot? If so, why?
How would you describe the different places you lived?
Tell me about the home that you liked the most when you were growing up.

2. Who did you live with as you were growing up?
Who were the members of your household?
Were there other family members that didn't live with you who you were close to?
Who did you spend a lot of time with?
Who were you closest to? Why?
Tell me about any other households that you spent a lot of time at when you were growing up.
Why did you spend time there?
Who were you closest to in that household?
What was it like growing up in your family?
What was your family's economic situation?
How did your family get along with one another?
What kind of roles and responsibilities did you have in the family?
Tell me your best childhood memory.
When you were growing up who did you look up to or have high regard for? Why?
Describe any big changes that occurred during your childhood. (*illnesses, divorce, etc...*)

3. Tell me about any times you have run away or been reported as a runaway.
Why did you run away?
How long did you stay away?
Where and with whom did you stay?
How did your family react?
How many times have you run away?
Have your brothers and sisters ever done this?

4. Tell me a little about your parents'/family's attitudes toward different issues that youth face.
In what ways does your family have different roles for male and female family members?
How do your parents/family feel about education and school?
Did your parents/family ever talk to you about sex or birth control?
What did they say?
Did they ever talk to you about AIDS or HIV?
What did they say to you about HIV/AIDS
What did your family say to you about using drugs and/or alcohol?
What about gangs and violence?

5. Tell me about your family's use of alcohol when you were growing up.
How much did your mother and father drink? What about other family members?
What effect has drinking had on their lives?
How do you feel about your family members' drinking?
Can you describe a situation when drinking in the family lead to violence?

How did you feel about these incidents? How did these usually end?

6. Tell me about your family members' use of drugs.

Did either of your parents use drugs? What drugs were used?

What about your siblings or extended family members' drug use?

What effect has drug use had on their lives?

How do you feel about your family members' drug use?

Has a family member's use caused any problems for you or the rest of your family?

Have any of your family members been involved in drug sales?

Which family members and which drugs?

What were the circumstances regarding their drug sales?

Does anyone in your family smoke cigarettes? Your parents, brothers or sisters?

7. Tell me about any of your family members who were involved in gang activities?

What do you know about their involvement?

For how long were they involved?

Tell me about any family members' involvement in criminal activities that you remember.

Were you aware of any crimes being committed when you were growing up?

Were any of your family members incarcerated while you were growing up?

Which family members and for what crimes?

Tell me about any family violence that you remember during your childhood.

Was there any violence in your household as you were growing up?

Who was violent with whom?

> During your childhood and adolescence, did your parents or adult care givers ever hit you with something? Beat you up? Burn you? Threaten you with a knife or gun? Use a knife or gun on you?

Please tell me about those experiences.

Who harmed you? Why were you harmed?

8. Describe your school experiences.

What were your early impressions of school.

What was/is high school (or middle school) like for you?

Tell me about any teachers (good or bad) that stand out in your mind.

Describe any school experiences (good or bad) that stand out in your mind.

How was/is your attendance in school?

How often did/do you cut class? Why?

What did/do you do when you cut school?

Was/is language a problem for you in school? How so?

Tell me about any problems or confrontations you had with classmates.

Who did/do you hang around with at school? Why these individuals?

Tell me about any times when you dropped out or were kicked out of school.

What were the circumstances?

What happened after you dropped out or were kicked out?

Do you have any plans to continue your education?

9. Tell me about all the jobs you have had.
Which ones did you like? Which ones did you dislike?
Have you held any jobs prior to turning 16?
Tell me about any legal jobs or money making activities you are involved in.
When were you last employed?
Tell me about your current job.
How much money do you bring in from your job?
What about other legal sources of income?
How much money do you pay in monthly expenses like rent and food?
What do you do with the money you earn?
Tell me about any other money making strategies that you have.
What kind of hustles for money have you been involved in?
If you are not currently working, tell me why you are unemployed.
What type of work would you like to do?
What type of work would you be good at?
Have you ever been involved in any work training programs?
How did those work out for you?
Do you get any support from others, including friends, girlfriends, family members or others?

10. Tell me about the household that you currently live in.
How long have you lived in this neighborhood?
How does everyone in the household get along?
Are there any conflicts among anyone living here?
What do you like and dislike about living here?
How does this living situation work for you?
How much time do you spend with various household members?
What kinds of things do you do together?
How do household responsibilities get divided up?
Who buys groceries, who does chores, who handles bills, etc.
Tell me about other households where you might stay or spend a lot of time.
Are there any other family members households that you frequently visit or stay?
Tell me about any friends' homes where you spend a lot of time.

11. What sorts of activities do you like to do in your spare time?
Probe for entertainment, sports, eating out, concerts, movies, etc.
When do these activities take place?
How much time do you spend doing them?
How do you generally get around the city?
What kind of transportation do you use? Do you own a car or have access to one?
Tell me about any kind of public or social services programs that you participate in?
Probe for: work programs, after school or youth programs, counseling, etc.

12. Tell me about the relationships you've had with men/women.
Have you had many boyfriends/girlfriends?
Describe the characteristics of men/women you have been involved with.
What do you look for first in a boyfriend/girlfriend?
What qualities should he/she have? (*e.g., good looks, money, fun to be with, kind*)
Tell me how these qualities compare with any guys/women you've dated.
What kind of men/women would you NOT like to be involved with?

At what age did you first become sexually active? How old was your partner?
What made you decide to become sexually active?
What happened when you first became sexually active?
How did you feel about it?
Have you/your partner ever been pregnant?
How did you react to that?
What was the outcome of the first pregnancy?
Tell me about any additional pregnancies.
How many children do you have?
Where and with whom do your children live?
How are your relationships with your children?
How are your relationships with the mothers/fathers of your children?
Tell me about your current relationship.

13.   How many sexual partners have you had in your lifetime?
Have you ever had casual sex with someone you've just met?
Have you had sex when you were high on drugs? What drugs?
What forms of birth control have you used?
Have you ever used condoms?
How often do you use condoms?
When you don't use condoms, what is the primary reason?
Have you ever been diagnosed with an STD?
Have you ever been tested for HIV?
Have you ever considered being tested for HIV? (Why, why not?)
Do you worry about or think you might be at risk for contracting HIV/AIDS?
        What risky behaviors do you engage in that you think might expose you to HIV/AIDS?
In what ways do you feel you are protected against getting HIV/AIDS?
Has anyone close to you gotten HIV/AIDS that you know of? Who?
What would you do if you found out you had HIV/AIDS?

Have you ever been pressured to have sex when you didn't want to?
Have you ever been forced to have sex or commit sexual acts against your will?
If you are comfortable discussing this, what happened?
Did you go to the police? (Why, why not?)
Did you contact any rape crisis or support groups?
Was the perpetrator a member of your gang?
A member of a rival gang? Someone not gang affiliated?

BASELINE AND TIME LINE DATA

In this section I am going to ask you some questions about the events and activities that may have taken place in your life. I'll begin by listing a number of things that may happen in the lives of youth and ask you to tell me the age that each of these things happened to you. If any of these things didn't occur in your life, just say never. At what age did you:

1.   Have the most fun with your family?   T1. ___ ___

2.   Feel closest to your family?   T2. ___ ___

3.   Start having any problems at home?   T3. ___ ___

4.	First run away from home? *(ask for subsequent times)*	T4. ___ ___
5.	Get placed in a foster home or group home?	T5. ___ ___
6.	Leave your home/family?	T6. ___ ___
7.	Move back home?	T7. ___ ___
8.	Have your best year in school?	T8. ___ ___
9.	Start cutting classes at school?	T9. ___ ___
10.	Drop out or get kicked out of school?	T10. ___ ___
11.	Go back to school?	T11. ___ ___
12.	Get your high school degree?	T12. ___ ___
13.	Meet your best friend?	T13. ___ ___
14.	Have the most fun with your friends?	T14. ___ ___
15.	Start hanging out on the streets or become involved with a gang?	T15. ___ ___
16.	Start spending less time with gang or on the streets?	T16. ___ ___
17.	Quit hanging out with gang or on the streets?	T17. ___ ___
18.	Get your first tattoo?	T18. ___ ___
19.	Get your first job?	T19. ___ ___
20.	Get in your first physical fight?	T20. ___ ___
21.	Become more violent?	T21. ___ ___
22.	Become a victim of violence?	T22. ___ ___
23.	Quit being violent?	T23. ___ ___
24.	Fall in love for the first time?	T24. ___ ___
25.	Get together with your first boyfriend/girlfriend?	T25. ___ ___
26.	Get together with the father/mother of your child?	T26. ___ ___
27.	Get together with your current boyfriend/girlfriend?	T27. ___ ___
28.	Become sexually active (intercourse)?	T28. ___ ___

29.	Become pregnant/or your partner become pregnant the first time?	T29. ___ ___
30	Have your first child?	T30. ___ ___
31.	You/your partner have an abortion?	T31. ___ ___
32.	Commit your first crime?	T32. ___ ___
33.	Begin some kind of hustle for money?	T33. ___ ___
34.	Get arrested?	T34. ___ ___
35.	Get placed on probation?	T35. ___ ___
36.	Get placed in Juvenile Detention?	T36. ___ ___
37.	Get placed in CYA (Youth Authority)?	T37. ___ ___
38.	Get sent to jail/County?	T38. ___ ___
39.	Get sent up to prison?	T39. ___ ___

40. How much time have you served in all in each of the following institutions? *(write in/calculate days)*

a. juvenile detention	_____	E9a. ___ ___ ___
b. CYA institutions	_____	E9b. ___ ___ ___
c. jail	_____	E9c. ___ ___ ___
d. prison	_____	E9d. ___ ___ ___

Substance Use Chart: Interviewers: Explain what information you will be asking for in this chart. "Regular" use is at least once a month. For past year and lifetime use, use codes at the bottom of the page.

Have you ever used:	Age First Used	Age at Regular Use	Current Use (Yes/No)	Age Quit Using	Days Used Last Week	Days Used Last 30 Days	Days Used Last Year	Days Used in Lifetime
q. Cigarettes								
aa. Beer								
bb. Wine/ Wine Coolers								
cc. Hard Liquor								
a. Marijuana or Hashish								
b. Cocaine								
c. Crack/Rock								
d. LSD/Acid								
e. MDMA/Ecstasy								
f. PCP/Angel Dust								
g. Methamphetamine/ Crystal/Ice/Shabu								
i. Pill Amphetamines (Uppers)								
k. Tranquilizers (Valium, etc.)								
m. Heroin								
n. Pill Opiates/ (oxycontin, percodan)								
o. Quaaludes								
p. Glue/Chemo or Other Inhalants								
s. Mushrooms								
r. Other_____								

Codes for Last Year and Lifetime Use:

0) Never	5) 26-50 days
1) 1-2 days	6) 51-100 days
2) 3-5 days	7) 101-200 days
3) 6-11 days	8) 201-300 days
4) 12-25 days	9) More than 300 days

SUBSTANCE USE, VIOLENCE AND CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES

1. Tell me more about your own drinking history.
How old were you the first time you drank?
Where were you, what were you drinking, and who were you with? What happened?
Tell me about the situations in which you currently drink.
Who do you usually drink with?
Do you think drinking ever lead you into violent situations? How?
How much has drinking been part of your regular activities?

2. What about drug use, how did you first start using?
Who were you with the first time you used any drug?
What happened after that? Did you try other drugs?
What did you like about the different drugs you used?
Have you ever felt addicted to any drugs?
Which drugs? What made you feel addicted?
Have you ever injected any drugs? Which drugs?
If yes: Have you ever shared needles?
Do you always use clean works?
Where do you get your needles from?
> What drugs do you use most often? What do you like and dislike most about using them?
> What are the most common places and times that you get high? Who do you usually get high with?

3. Tell me about your history of violent activities.
Can you tell me about the first time you learned to fight? What happened?
What happened after that? Did you seem to get more involved in violent situations?
Can you describe any fights that were the result of racism?
Tell me about any fights that started over guys/girls.
To what extent is your violence related to being part of a gang?
> How much do you think drinking or drugs influences violent behavior? Your own? Other peoples'?
Can you describe a violent incident that stands out in your mind?
Tell me about the kinds of weapons you have carried?
Have you ever had to use a weapon? What happened?

4. Tell me about any criminal activities you have been involved in.
Describe the first crime you committed. How old were you?
Describe any other crimes.
What happened and what were the outcomes?
What about violent crimes?
Tell me about the first time you were busted. How old were you?
Why were you arrested, and what was the outcome?
Tell me about other times.
> If you have been incarcerated, tell me about your experiences at each of the following places:
Juvenile Hall? YGC? Log Cabin? Youth Authority? Jail? or prison?
Have you ever been on probation? For what crime?
Tell me about your probation experiences.

How many times have you been arrested?   E5. ___ ___

ARRESTS AND CONVICTIONS

	Juvenile # Arrests	Juvenile # Convictions	Juvenile Sentences	Juvie time Served	Adult # Arrests	Adult # Convictions	Adult Sentences	Adult Time Served	Where Served (code each site)	Current Status
a. Drug Possession										
b. Drug Sales										
c. Property Crimes										
m. Vandalism										
e. Assault										
j. Domestic Violence										
f. Weapons Possession										
n. Gang Enhancement										
g. Extortion										
d. Stolen Goods										
o. Drunk Driving										
p. Car Jacking										
h. Alcohol Related										
q. Murder/Attempted										
s. Violation (Parole/Prob)										
r. Other:_____										

Sentences:
0) Probation
1) Less than one month
2) One up to six months
3) Six months up to one year
4) One year up to two years
5) Two years up to five years

Time Served:
0) Probation
1) Less than one month
2) One up to six months
3) Six months up to one year
4) One year up to two years
5) Two years up to five years

Where Served:
1) Juvenile Detention
2) CYA (eg. Log Cabin)
3) County Jail
4) Pelican Bay
5) San Quentin
6) Soledad

Current Legal Status:
0) No Further Action
1) Home Detention
2) Probation
3) Parole
4) Other: _____

GANGS, STREET LIFE AND DRUG SALES

In this section of the interview we are going to explore your involvement on the streets and in drug sales. We'll start by getting some general information about the gang and then talk about how you got involved with the group of people that you hang out with, how you first got involved in sales, and then talk about some of the issues, challenges, risks and benefits of street sales.

Gang Organization and Affiliation

1. What is the name of your group? _____
2. QN2. ___ ___ ___

(write in name)

If more than one gang, name other groups. _____   QN2a.___ ___
(write in names)

If more than one gang, name other groups. _____   QN2b.___ ___
(write in names)

> *Interviewer: If more than one gang, briefly probe for the circumstances around changes in gang membership, people who influenced membership, reasons for joining, structure and gender organization of previous gangs, conflicts, problems, reasons for moving to another gang. Then go on to ask the following questions about current or most recent group.*

Describe the location (district/cross streets) where your main group hangs out.
A14a. ___ ___

*(write in district/cross streets)*_____

What is the ethnicity of the majority of the people in your group?   B3. ___ ___

00) None
01) Black/Afr. American
02) Chicano
03) Mexican
04) Latino/Hispanic
05) Puerto Rican
06) White
07) Chinese

08) Vietnamese
09) Japanese
10) Other Asian_____
11) Filipino
12) Samoan
13) American Indian
14) Other_____
19) Mixed_____

Estimate how many people are part of the group *("local" San Francisco area)*.   B2. ___ ___
  ___

How old is the oldest person?   B2a. ___ ___

How old is the youngest person?   B2b. ___ ___

How many people would you say hang out regularly or on a daily basis?

B2h. ___ ___ ___

How many males hang out regularly?   B2i. ___ ___ ___

9.   How many females hang out regularly?   B2g. ___ ___ ___
10.   How is the group organized?   B14.   ___

0) No real organization
1) Divided into younger and older members
2) Everyone is equal
3) One person is the leader
4) A small group of members are the leaders
5) One person has a lot of influence
6) A small group of members have a lot of influence
7) Ranked *(e.g. seniority, older to younger, etc.)*
8) Other_____

11.   How is the group organized around male and female members?   B14a. ____

1) All male members
2) All female members
3) Mixed male and female members, all with equal status
4) Mixed male and female members, divided by gender groups
5) All male members with females (non members) who hang out
6) All female members with males (non-members) who hang out
7) Other_____

How old were you when you first heard about your present group?   B6. ___ ___

How old were you when you first started hanging out with your group?   B6a. ___ ___

How old were you when you first joined your group?   B6b. ___ ___

How did you get into the gang?

1) Recruited   B6c. ____
2) Came in from another gang
3) Grew up in the group
4) Just hung around
5) Jumped in
6) Other_____
7) Started hanging out at school

16.   Who influenced you to get involved?   B6d. ____

1) Family member *(specify)*_____
2) School friend
3) Neighborhood friend
4) Other friend *(specify)* _____

5) Girlfriend or boyfriend
6) Other person or group *(specify)*_____

17. What was the main reason that you became involved?   B11. ___ ___

01) For protection
02) To defend the neighborhood
03) For friendship and camaraderie
04) Peer pressure
05) It gives me a family feeling
06) It makes me feel important in the neighborhood
07) It's just the way things are in my neighborhood
08) My family members belong
09) Opportunities to make money
10) Opportunities to use drugs
11) Opportunities to buy and/or sell drugs
12) There is nothing else to do
13) Other *(specify)*_____

17a.   What would you say was the next most important reason you joined? *(from list)*
B11s. ___ ___

18.   How many days *(on average)* do you get together with your group each week?
B7a.   _____

19.   About how many hours a week do you spend with your group?_____
B7c. ___ ___ ___

20. Were/are any of the following members of your family involved in gangs?
Please answer no or yes for each. For brothers, sisters, and extended
family members, please indicate the number involved.

Father		0) No	1) Yes	FG1. ____	
Mother	0) No	1) Yes		FG2. ____	
Brother	0) No	1) Yes		FG3. ____	#____
Sister		0) No	1) Yes	FG4. ____	#____
Uncle		0) No	1) Yes	FG5. ____	#____
Aunt		0) No	1) Yes	FG6. ____	#____
Cousin		0) No	1) Yes	FG7. ____	#____
Grandparent		0) No	1) Yes	FG8. ____	#____

21. Tell me about the group of people that you hang out with on the block or on the streets.
How would you describe the group?

Probe: Group of friends, partners, clique, street gang, drug selling group, block.
Does your group have a name? How did the name come about?
Is the group affiliated with a larger organization that goes beyond the San Francisco area?
Describe your group's interactions with the larger group.

Describe the characteristics of the place that you all hang out most frequently.
Probe: traffic, layout, parks, people in area, businesses, residences, school.
How long has your group hung out at this location?
Do you also live in this area? For how long?
Describe other places where your group hangs out? Homes? Bars? Restaurants?

22. Tell me about the people who hang out with your group.
What do you call the people in the group? *(E.g., friends, partners, associates, homeboys)*
Would you say that there are "members" of your group?
What does someone have to do to be considered part of the group?
Do most people in the group live in the neighborhood?
How many people come from outside the neighborhood?

Personal Involvement

23. How was it that you became associated with your gang/clique/street group?
Describe how you first learned about the group.
When did you first become involved in the group?
How did you personally become a member of the group? What happened?
Why did you join the group?
What does membership in the group mean to you personally?
Who do you think influenced you to get involved on the streets?
Tell me about the important people in your life who are gang members.
Any family members? *(probe: parents, siblings, extended family, close friends)*
What about boyfriends/girlfriends?

Describe your typical day on the block *(in the park, etc.)*
Who is there, who is coming and going, when do people gather, what are people doing?
What are you generally doing?
What are the main reasons that you are involved with your group?
What role do you play in your group?
How much is hanging out on the block an important part of your daily routine?
Tell me about the other activities that you are involved in.
Do you have any tattoos? How many?
Do any of your tattoos represent your gang affiliation?
Where did you get them done? (tattoo parlor, friends, juvie/jail, etc.?)

Group History and Evolution

24. Tell me what you know about the history of the group.
How long has your group been around?
How did the group get started?
How has the group been organized?
Tell me about the group leaders and different roles that members play.
Tell me about any individuals who have more respect or power than others.

How do women get power or become leaders in the group?
Tell me about any female leaders (past and present) in your clique.
Tell me about any rivalries your group (or group members) have had with other groups.

How has the group changed over time?
Has the name changed?
Have the people changed?
Have the activities that people are involved in changed?
Has the organization changed?
Describe the ages of people who are involved.
How are the age groups different in your opinion?
How are younger and older members involved in different types of activities?

25. How has your own involvement changed over time?
Has the amount of time you spend with the gang changed in any ways?
How have the types of gang activities that you are involved in changed over time?
Do you tend to spend more or less time with specific individuals?
How and why has it changed?
When did these changes take place?
Tell me about any specific incidents that caused these changes.

Gender Differences in the Group

26. Tell me about women who hang out with your group.
How involved are females with your group?
How many would you say are involved on a daily or regular basis?
Who are they and how are they involved?
Probe: relatives, girlfriends, sisters, residents, members, friends, partners?
Do females have their own group or are they considered members of a mixed group?
Where do the women hang out?
Do the females hang out separately or together with the males?
How active are the girls in your group?
What kinds of activities are they involved in?
Probe for: hanging out, partying, getting high, having sex with members.
What illegal activities are the girls who hang out involved in?
Probe for: robbing, stealing, violence, joyriding, property damage.
How are the females who hang out viewed by the males?
How are females in the group treated?
What do you think about the females who hang out?
What do you think about the males who hang out?
Tell me about any relationships you have had with males/females that hang out on the block.
Are sexual activities a regular or expected part of involvement in your gang?
What do the females think about the males?
What are the different roles of males and females in the group?
Are the males and females treated differently?
How do the females in the group treat the other women?
How do the males in the group treat other males?
Do you think that women have equal power in the gang?
Do you think they should?

Initiation into Drug Sales
27. What had your experience been with drug sales before you began selling?
Tell me about family members who were involved in drug sales.
Who was involved?
What was their level of involvement?
What drugs did they sell and in what amounts?
What about other important people in your life who sold?
What was your first personal experience with drug sales?
How did you first begin selling drugs?
How old were you then?
What made you decide to try selling?
Did any particular person or persons get you into sales?
Who was it and how did it happen?
Tell me about the first sale you made.
What was the first drug you sold? Why this particular drug?
Where were you and who were you with?
Who did you sell to?
What time of day was it?
What happened?
What role did you play? *(probe for: direct sales, steering customers to a seller, copping for a customer, lookout, holding stash or money, packaging, other)*
Were you selling as an individual?
Were you selling as a member of a group?
What was the name of the group?
How was it organized?
Were there leaders?
Were there rules?
Was there specific territory?
Can you describe how you felt the first time?
Tell me about any early drug selling experiences that stand out in your mind.

Group and Individual Sales
28. How much did your gang or group members influence you to sell drugs?
Were you involved with selling before you started to hang out?
Were you attracted to the gang because of drug selling opportunities?
How much is drug selling a major part of your groups activities?
To what extent do sales increase ones status in the group?
Does selling increase one's power in the group?
What proportion of males in the gang are involved in sales?
Are street sales an individual thing or group activity?
Is there overlap between group sales and individual sales?
Where do you and/or your group post up?
Can you tell me about any organized drug sales (even loosely) among your group?
What drugs and what amounts are sold by members of your group?
Describe any of the rules concerning sales within your group?
Are there differences between younger and older sellers?
Are there rules about who to buy drugs from or sell drugs to?
Are there rules about using the drugs being sold?
How does your group respond when someone breaks the rules?

Can you tell me about any types of behaviors that are disapproved of in a drug seller?
What types of things might a seller do that would make him or her disrespected?
Do street sellers score drugs for sale from members of the group?
Did you obtain drugs for sale from other group members or from their connections?
Where do supplies typically come from?
Do you sell to other group members?
Do you work with any group members when selling?
How competitive are street sales in your area?
Tell me about any sales turf issues you and/or your group has encountered.
How has competition affected you, your group, and sales in your neighborhood?
How common are drug sales out of homes in your neighborhood?
Are you involved in this type of sales activity?

Male/Female Drug Sellers
29. How active are females in drug sales in your area (on your block/corner)?
What proportion of females in your group are involved in sales?
Do women sell alone, in all female groups or in male and female groups?
Tell me about any dealings you have had with female sellers.
How much are they selling for themselves?
How much are females selling for males?
Are sales and sales activities divided or organized by gender?
How and why do women play different roles in sales than men do?
What types of roles do females play in drug sales?
Probe for: holding drugs for others, scoring for others, lookouts.
Are women likely to be packaging and delivering for men?
Why are female roles organized this way?
How is this different from the roles that males play?
What are some of the other differences between male and female sellers?
How are men and women's selling styles different? Why are there differences?
Are there different rules about females selling than male sales? Why is that?
What are the differences in types of drugs sold between males and females?
Different amounts sold? Why is that?
Are females selling to a different market than the males? Why the differences?
Who are their customers?
What about differences in the amount of money that females bring in?
Do men and women sell in different locations? Why is that?
To what extent are female sellers competing with male sellers?
Tell me about any female sellers who are not connected to the group.
How do male sellers in general view the female sellers?
How are drug sales seen as more a male activity than a female thing? Why is that?
Why is it more appropriate for men to be drug sellers than females?
How do you personally view females selling drugs?
Tell me about your personal interactions or deals with female sellers.
Have you ever sold drugs with a woman?
What do you think about women selling drugs? Are they good at it?
What makes a female seller good or bad in your opinion?
Do female sellers have the same status as male sellers?
Do you feel that females should be involved in other group activities than drug sales?
What illegal activities would be better money making strategies for females?
How and why are female sellers viewed differently than male sellers?

Types of Sales Involvement
30. Tell me about the different drug selling activities you have been involved in and which drugs.
Have you sold directly to buyers? Which drugs?
Have you steered customers for a seller? Which drugs?
Have you bought for someone else? Which drugs?
Have you bought large amounts for distribution? Which drugs?
Have you been involved in delivering drugs for sale?
Have you prepared/packaged drugs for distribution to other sellers?
Have you been a lookout for other sellers?
Have you held drugs for sale for others?
Tell me about any other ways you have been involved in sales.
Have you ever sold drugs for someone else?
What was the arrangement?
Were you fronted the drugs, or were you paid to make sales?
How did this arrangement work out?
Have you ever fronted drugs or paid someone to sell for you?
How did that arrangement work out?

Ongoing Sales
31. What made you decide to continue selling?
Did you continue to hang out with your group because of opportunities for sales?
Would you have continued to hang out if drug selling was less profitable?
What specific drugs have you sold over your career?
Tell me about the different experiences you have had with each drug you sold.
When did you begin selling each drug?
How long did you sell each drug?
Who were the customers that you typically sold each drug to?
What were the positive and negative results of each of the drugs you sold?
In what quantities have you sold different drugs?
Which drugs have been the most profitable?
Which drugs have been the most risky?
Tell me a little bit more about the customers.
Are they from a particular ethnic group? Males or females?
Are they local residents or from outside the community?
Tell me how a typical sale might take place.
How do you obtain the drugs for sale?
Do you process the drugs for sale?
Do you cut and/or package the product? How and how much?
Where do sales occur?
How are you approached by a buyer, or how do you approach a potential buyer?
How quickly can you access the drugs? Do you usually keep your stash on you?

Risks of Sales
32. What are some of the risks of selling drugs?
Probes: Rip offs, getting bad product, problems with rival dealers, collecting debts.
Describe any of these situations that have happened to you.
Describe any violent incidents that you have been involved in regarding sales.
Have any of these incidents been because of competition? Rip offs?
Describe any time you were a victim of crime because of sales.

What are the chances that a male who is involved in street sales will get caught?
Arrested? Charged? Convicted? Locked up?
How are the chances of getting caught different for different sellers?
What do different sellers do to reduce the risks associated with selling?
What do you do to reduce the risks associated with selling?
What about a female street seller?
Is a female seller more or less likely to get caught?
Is she more or less likely to be charged and convicted?
What are the differences in risks to males versus risks to females?
Do you feel that women are more prone to be victims of violence because of sales?
What do you think about this?
In what types of situations would someone most likely get caught selling?
Do some sellers attract more attention than others?
What types of things draw attention to sellers?
Probes: Selling to narcs, being too wasted, drunk, high, loud, rowdy, violence.
What happens as a result of these behaviors?
How do you/your group respond to these sellers?
In what types of situations are there conflicts between sellers?
How often are conflicts between women, between men, or between men and women?
Can you describe any incidents when there has been beef between sellers?
Do these involve female sellers?
Have you experienced problems with using the drugs you are selling?
Have you ever been addicted to any drugs? Can you tell me about that?
What about other members of your group?
Tell me about any times that you have been caught selling.
When was the first time you were caught?
What were you selling?
Where were you selling?
Tell me about any other times.
Tell me about any times you have been convicted for drug sales.
What about incarceration for sales?
How much time have you done for drugs sales?
When and where were you incarcerated?
How long were you locked up?
What happened after you got out?
How soon did you return to selling after you were busted?
Tell me about any problems your selling created in your personal relationships.
Have you had any trouble within your family due to your drug sales?
Have you had any conflict with your friends or fellow gang members?
What about with your partner/boyfriend/girlfriend?

Attractions to Selling
33. Tell me about the main reasons that you are involved in drug sales.
Do you like selling drugs and if so, what do you like about it?
Tell me the most important positive things you get out of selling.
What are the benefits of sales?
> *Probe for increased status, ability to avoid working, hanging out with friends, being in control of time, emergency cash, primary source of income for self , supplementing job.*

What do you do with the money you make selling drugs?

Probe for: family support, to make money for drug use, paying rent, paying bills, other expenses, child support, spending on self, spending on others, buying clothes.

For each of the drugs you have sold, can you estimate how much money you made per week?
To what extent do other types of drug exchanges (other than financial) take place?
How would you describe the value of those exchanges?
What are the attractions of drug sales as opposed to other jobs?
Can you see yourself in an other jobs? What jobs for instance?

Wrap Up /Changes Over Time
34. How have sales changed over time?
Did your sales increase or decrease while you were part of your group?
Did you view your drug selling as a career with possibilities of going up the ladder?
In what ways is drug sales like a career?
How has your selling style changed over time?
What types of things regarding sales would you do when you were younger but no longer do?
How have sales become easier or more difficult?
What are the conditions that make sales more difficult?
How has competition increased or decreased over time?
How have the drugs changed over time?
How have new drugs changed the market?
How have different popular drugs changed the market?
How have drug changes effected the amount of money a seller can make?
Overall, how do you think drug sales have effected your life?
What have been the positive effects of drug sales on your life?
What have been the negative effects of drug sales?
Do you expect that drug sales will be part of your future?
What role do you expect drug sales to play in your future plans?

35.   In general, how would you describe your life up to now?
If you had a chance to do anything different, what would you have done different?
How do you think that would have changed your life?
Do you feel positive and hopeful about your future?
Where do you see yourself in the future?
Describe your future plans.
What do you think you'll be doing in one year's time?
What do you think you'll be doing in five years?
What kind of money would you like to be making when you are thirty years old?
What kind of work do you think you would be doing to make that kind of money?
Do you have any specific plans right now to get that kind of work or hustle?
Is there anything else you think is important about your life experiences that I didn't ask you?
Is there anything you would like to ask me? What did you think about this interview?
INTERVIEWER ASSESSMENT *(to be filled out following the interview)*

What is/was the name of gang/group/clique/turf (*write name*)   QN2.___ ___
(*do not code*)

_____

Area where gang hangs/hung out (*write in cross streets*)   A14a. ___ ___
(*code district*)

_____

How was the respondent located?_____   H1___ ___

Did you observe any inconsistencies in the respondent's answers?   H2____

0) No

1) Yes, one or two inconsistencies

2) Yes, three or more inconsistencies

How truthful was the respondent?

H3____

1) Generally truthful

3) Generally untruthful

2) Occasionally truthful

4) Extremely untruthful

Did the respondent demonstrate by his behavior any mental health problems?   H5____

0) No   1) Yes *(explain)*_____

Was this person high on drugs during the interview?   H6____

0) No   1) Yes

IF YES: What drug -alcohol, weed, speed, crack, heroin, etc._____

Where did the interview take place? _____

Please describe your impressions of the participant (physical description, demeanor, attitude, etc...) the interview setting, and your assessment of how the interview process went.

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY
Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
ASB III, 3 Rutgers Plaza, Cook Campus
New Brunswick, NJ 08901

February 26, 2014

P.I. Name: Novich
Protocol #: E14-451

Madeleine Novich
School of Criminal Justice (Rutgers Newark)
241 W110th St
#35
New York NY 10026

Dear Madeleine Novich:

Notice of Exemption from IRB Review

Protocol Title: "The Impact of Gendered Policing on Gang Member's Perception of Police Legitimacy and Procedural Justice"

The project identified above has been approved for exemption under one of the six categories noted in 45 CFR 46, and as noted below:

Exemption Date: 2/11/2014   **Exempt Category:**   4

This exemption is based on the following assumptions:

- **This Approval** - The research will be conducted according to the most recent version of the protocol that was submitted.

- **Reporting** – ORSP must be immediately informed of any injuries to subjects that occur and/or problems that arise, in the course of your research;

- **Modifications** – Any proposed changes MUST be submitted to the IRB as an amendment for review and approval prior to implementation;

- **Consent Form (s)** – Each person who signs a consent document will be given a copy of that document, if you are using such documents in your research. The Principal Investigator must retain all signed documents for at least three years after the conclusion of the research;

Additional Notes: None

Failure to comply with these conditions will result in withdrawal of this approval.

The Federalwide Assurance (FWA) number for Rutgers University IRB is FWA00003913; this number may be requested on funding applications or by collaborators.

Sincerely yours,

Michelle Herbine

Acting for —
Dr. Beverly Tepper, Ph.D.
Professor
Chair, Rutgers University Institutional Review Board

cc: Jody A. Miller