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Abstract

The increase of female incarceration in the United States over the past decade has become a cause for concern. This increase differs across racial groups, with black women disproportionately more likely to be incarcerated and to receive longer sentences. In the current study, we modify the “focal concerns” perspective developed by Steffensmeier et al. (1998) to explain the high incarceration rate for black males. We hypothesize that the sentencing disparity between black women and white women is at least partially due to perceived violations of traditional gender norms, an “evil woman” explanation. To test this, we examined the effects of legal and extralegal variables on sentence lengths in a sample of incarcerated drug offenders in Oklahoma. Legal factors such as prior incarceration and related factors such as employment were predictors of sentence lengths for white women, but not for black women. Instead, self-reported use of crack cocaine was associated with longer sentences for the black offenders despite the fact that white offenders were almost as likely to report use of crack. For both groups, trial by jury was associated with longer sentences, but more so for black women, providing some support for the “evil woman” focal concern.

Introduction

It is readily apparent that gender is a factor in the likelihood of going to prison. Males are incarcerated at much higher rates than females (Beck and Mumola 1999), although this is changing. In 1990, 44,065 women were in prison. However, nearly 85,000 women were incarcerated in either state or federal facilities by the end of 1998 (Beck and Mumola 1999). Furthermore, although males account for the majority of prisoners (Beck and Mumola 1999), during the last decade the increase in the rate of female imprisonment has outstripped the increase in the male rate. In 1998 alone, female incarceration increased 6.5% while the increase for males was 4.7% (Beck and Mumola 1999). However, the incarceration rate for female offenders is not the same across racial and ethnic groups. Almost half the female inmates in the United States are black, leading to concerns about discrimination (Belknap 1996; Chesney-Lind 1997). This study explores the possibility of discriminatory sentencing, suggesting that perceived characteristics of a defendant may enter into sentencing decisions. Following the “focal concern” perspective set forth by Steffensmeier, Ulmer and Kramer (1998), we suggest that differential sentencing may be partially attributable to media portrayals of black female offenders as “evil women” (Erez 1989), welfare queens (Culverson 1998) and mothers of “crack babies” (Humphries et al. 1995).

The increase in female incarceration has led to questions about possible causes. Are women committing more crimes than in the past, or are we now more likely to respond to female crime with prison sentences? The data suggest that the latter may be true. Female inmates are less likely than male inmates to have prior convictions, a history of violent crime, or juvenile arrest histories (Greenfeld and Snell 1999), suggesting a punitive stance toward female offenders. Furthermore, a recent governmental report suggests that much of the increase in female incarceration has been due to changes in sentencing practices (United States General Accounting Office 1999). This is particularly true for drug offenders, with the number of women incarcerated for drug offenses in 1997 nearly double the number in 1990 (United States General Accounting Office 1999).
This trend is relevant in Oklahoma, the state with the highest rate of incarcerated women (Beck and Mumola 1999:6). Females comprise more than 10% of the state prison population (Oklahoma Department of Corrections 1998), compared to 6% nationally (Snell and Morton 1994; Marcus-Mendoza and Briody 1996; Greenfeld and Snell 1999).

Race also plays a role in imprisonment. During the last decade, the percentage of all state or Federal prisoners who were white decreased from slightly over half to 47.9%. In contrast, the percentage of inmates who were black increased to 49.4% by 1997 (Beck and Mumola 1999). When one considers this in conjunction with the fact that blacks make up only 12% of the U.S. population, it is obvious that racial disparities in imprisonment exist. Among females, race is definitely a factor in the likelihood of incarceration. In 1997, black women were six times more likely than white women to be incarcerated (Beck and Mumola 1999:9). Equally disturbing, nearly half of the women incarcerated in state prisons are black, while two-thirds of the women on probation are white (Greenfeld and Snell 1999:7), suggesting the possibility of differential treatment (Chambliss 1995).

This disparity has led to a search for explanations. Much attention has been focused on the plight of the black male offender (cf. Chambliss 1995; Chiricos and Crawford 1995; Fishman 1998; Hawkins 1995; Mann and Zatz 1998; Steffensmeier et al. 1998). Explanations for their high incarceration rates have ranged from sociobiological ones (Wilson and Herrnstein 1985) to urbanization and poverty (DuBois 1899; Shaw and McKay 1942).

Others have examined the role of perception, suggesting that higher incarceration rates are at least in part due to the public focus on “black crime” (Spitzer 1975; Cohn, Barkan and Halteman 1991; Chambliss 1995; Lockwood, Pottieger and Inciardi 1995). Steffensmeier and colleagues (1998) attributed the trend towards harsher sentences for young black males at least partially to the use of what the authors refer to as “focal concerns.” This perspective is based on a premise that sentencing decisions reflect the desire of judges to protect their communities. However, judges must make their decisions based on incomplete information. Thus, they develop “focal concerns” or stereotypes to assist them in sentencing decisions. Young black males, the authors argue, are seen as more dangerous, more blameworthy, and at greater risk of recidivism. Thus, judges strive to incapacitate them through sentencing. Legally relevant factors such as prior records, the type of conviction, and pre-trial bail or detainment (Zatz 1984; Zatz 1987) are considered in conjunction with extralegal stereotypical attributions about the offender’s race, gender and age (Steffensmeier et al. 1998). Sentencing decisions then reflect this combination of legal and extralegal factors. The result is harsher sentencing of young black males.

A similar argument may explain the disparate sentencing of black females. However, young black women are less likely than young black men to be perceived as dangerous and a risk to the community. Instead, negative media portrayals and public outcry focus more on violation of gender norms, particularly through drug use (Culverson 1998). Indeed, Chesney-Lind has suggested that much of the rise in female incarceration is due to harsher sentences given to minority females as a result of the “War on Drugs” (Chesney-Lind 1997:99). This study explores correlates of sentence length among female prisoners in Oklahoma, focusing on racial differences. We address the issue of whether harsher sentencing of black women is the result of legal factors such as prior convictions or due to extralegal factors such as race and class. If extralegal factors are more likely to predict sentence length, “focal concerns” like those described by Steffensmeier et al. (1998) may be operational. In other words, judges and/or juries may be focusing on certain aspects of female crime and violations of traditional gender roles in assessing sentences.
Trends in Imprisonment: Race and Gender

Nationally, racial composition among male and female prisoners is relatively similar. Approximately 48% of both female and male prisoners are black (Beck and Mumola 1999). In Oklahoma, not only are women more likely to be incarcerated than in other states, but black women in particular face a higher risk of going to prison. The number of black females is disproportionately higher than that of black males (Sandhu et al. 1994). This poses several questions for researchers: Are black women more vulnerable to hardships and detrimental social factors that could ultimately lead them to prison? If so, are they exposed to these circumstances more than women of other races are? Alternately, is the higher incarceration rate of black women due to discrimination?

Two factors have contributed to the growth in the United States prison population. First, more offenders are being sentenced to prison, and second, offenders are being given longer sentences (Currie 1998). This is especially true in the case of female offenders who are being sentenced to prison more frequently and for longer periods. Reasons for the increase in incarceration may further vary by both race and gender. Over half of the increase in male incarceration between 1990 and 1997 was accounted for by violent offenses. In contrast, only one-fourth of the increase in female incarceration was attributable to violent crime. On the other hand, 38% of the increase in female incarceration during the same period can be attributed to drug offenses, compared to only 17% of the male increase. When race is considered separately, the evidence does not appear quite as clear. Overall, the increase in black imprisonment is slightly more attributable to violent offenses than the increase in white imprisonment. However, a larger portion of the increase in black imprisonment as compared to white imprisonment is attributable to drug offenses (Currie 1998; Beck and Mumola 1999). What is missing is a more focused examination of the intersection of racial and gender differences in crimes leading to incarceration.

There are clearly racial disparities in both the likelihood of incarceration and in sentence length of female offenders. What remains to be addressed, however, is whether these disparities are due to legal factors or extralegal factors. If legal factors such as prior legal history and type of conviction can account for sentence length, one could then conclude that disparity but not discrimination explains different sentence lengths (Zatz 1984). However, if extralegal factors such as race marital or parental status and unemployment are more salient, then it would appear that discrimination in the sentencing of female offenders is an issue. In her study of determinate sentencing practices, Zatz (1984; 1987) found that even legal factors may be applied differentially by race and ethnicity. Furthermore, race itself had a direct effect on sentencing (Zatz, 1984). In the current study, we examine the impact of both legal and extralegal factors on the sentence lengths of female drug offenders in Oklahoma. We further suggest that focusing on certain characteristics attributed to black female offenders may play a role in sentencing decisions.

Focal Concerns and Sentencing

Drawing from Miller (1958), Steffensmeier et al. (1998) suggest that sentencing decisions made by judges and other players in the criminal justice process are influenced by three focal concerns. The authors argue that the degree to which an offender is seen as blameworthy, the need to protect the community, and constraints and practical consequences affect the decisions rendered by judges and juries. These individuals are faced with the task of determining appropriate sanctions for offenders, and Steffensmeier et al. (1998) suggest that they do so by focusing on characteristics that they attribute to certain types of offenders. Their study demonstrates an interaction between age, race, and gender. Young black males were found to receive disproportionately harsh sentences because they were seen as more dangerous and less reformable. Two im-
Important pieces of information can be gleaned from these findings. First, the study demonstrates the importance of examining the interaction effects among relevant variables. Furthermore, and perhaps even more important, the study illustrates how definitions and attributions may affect sentencing outcomes.

Steffensmeier and colleagues (1998) did not find an age interaction effect on female sentencing. They argued that the interaction of age, race and gender in sentencing was because young black males were seen as a threat. The effect of age was not present for women because women were more likely to be perceived as victims themselves and less likely to be viewed as a threat. Thus, one might conclude that perceived dangerousness is not as much a factor in racially disparate sentencing for women. This implies a need to identify other attributes that might be focal concerns in the processing of female offenders.

Although fewer women are incarcerated than are men, there is evidence that females have been harshly sanctioned when perceived as violating gender norms (Belknap 1996; Chesney-Lind 1997; Ochi and Ngenge 1996; Schur 1984). The “evil woman” hypothesis (Erez 1992; Belknap 1996) purports that women who violate appropriate gender-roles are discriminated against in the criminal justice process.

Gender norm violation may occur in either of two ways: through characteristics of the offender or through characteristics of the offense. Offender characteristics include marital/family status as well as race and social class. Women who are married and who are caretakers of children are fulfilling “appropriate” gender norms and thus less likely to be harshly sentenced (Daly 1987; Daly 1989; Farrington and Morris 1982). On the other hand, being divorced, separated, or receiving public assistance could result in harsher treatment (Farrington and Morris 1982; Culverson 1998). Furthermore, race is a factor in sentencing. Ample evidence exists that black women receive harsher sanctions than white women (Kruttschnitt 1981; Spohn et al. 1987). Additionally, social class affects sentencing, with women from more affluent backgrounds more likely to receive leniency than poor women (Kruttschnitt 1981) do. The characteristics of the offense may also violate ideas of “appropriate womanhood.” For women, drug use, especially in conjunction with pregnancy or motherhood, may result in extremely harsh sanctions for women (Gomez 1997; Humphries et al. 1992; Humphries et al. 1995). In particular, the use of crack cocaine has received substantial negative attention. The media scare of the late 1980s and the “crack babies” campaigns brought this particular drug into the public arena, resulting in public outcry against women who used drugs, especially crack cocaine. However, a 1996 study of judicial attitudes in Oklahoma failed to find evidence of judicial bias (Ochi and Ngenge 1996).

A number of additional legal and extra-legal factors may affect sentence length, and some of these may have direct or indirect effects on sentencing decisions. Several legal factors have been reported to be significantly associated with sentencing. The type of legal representation, type of conviction (plea, bench trial or jury trial) (Albonetti 1997), posting of bail (Holmes et al. 1996), and prior criminal record (Spohn and Delone 2000) have all been linked to sentence length. Blacks are disproportionately affected by legal factors linked to economic position, such as having a public defender or being unable to post bond (Holmes et al. 1996; Walker, Spohn and DeLone 2000). Additionally, unemployment (Kramer and Steffensmeier 1993; Spohn and Holleran 2000) and prior convictions (Kramer and Steffensmeier 1993) have been found to preclude lenient sentencing. Many poverty-stricken women commit crimes in order to support their families.

Method

Data were collected during May and June 1997 at two state correctional facilities in Oklahoma. The survey was administered to 144 female drug offenders at Dr. Eddie Warrior Correctional Center (mini-
mum/medium security) and Kate Bernard Community Correctional Center (minimum security). The Oklahoma Department of Corrections (DOC) provided lists of inmates chronologically ordered in terms of initial entry into the DOC system. At the Bernard facility, every second subject was selected, resulting in a subsample of 65. At the Warrior facility, the initial plan was to survey every third subject. However, the sampling was revised upon the researchers’ arrival at the prison. The previous evening, 87 women were transferred to a prison in Texas with no advance notice. Therefore, the survey was administered to all remaining drug offenders who consented to participate. Three women refused, leaving a final subsample of \( N = 79 \).

The survey was self-administered and took approximately forty-five minutes to complete. Members of the research team assisted subjects who needed help reading the questionnaire. The inmates were assured of anonymity. They were instructed not to write their name or other identifying information on the survey form. Informed consent was obtained from all participants and participation was strictly voluntary.

**Survey Instrument**

Basic demographic data were collected including self-reported race, age, educational level, and employment status at time of arrest. Due to the small number of subjects who were Native American, Asian, or Hispanic, the sample was further restricted to two races: white and black. The final sample consisted of 51 black females and 67 white females.

Inmates were asked to respond to questions concerning several aspects of their lives prior to and during incarceration. Topics included educational level attained, drug use history, mean family income prior to incarceration, whether they lived with a minor child, and employment history. Some questions were created by the research team while others were drawn from the National Youth Survey, Wave VI (Elliot 1993), Men’s Relationship Study (Umberson 1995), Inmate Population Survey (Marcus-Mendoza and Briody 1996), and the AIDS Initial Assessment (National Institute on Drug Abuse 1993).

The dependent variable, **Sentence Length** was measured by presenting subjects with ordered categories of potential responses. In the following analyses, the variable is collapsed into four categories: deferred/delayed sentence, 1-4 years, 5-10 years, and more than 10 years. The analyses also include several independent variables. **Prior Convictions** was coded as a four category ordinal level variable, with measures ranging from “none” to “two or more prior felonies.” **Prior Incarcerations** included three categories: “none,” “one”, or “two or more.”

We also operationalized three categories for **Type of Trial/Conviction**: “plea or nolo contendere,” “trial by jury” and “trial by judge.” Finally, we explored types of drugs that subjects reported using in the six months prior to their current imprisonment. Reported drug use included Crack, Heroin, Marijuana, and Amphetamines.

**Findings**

Black females comprise 35.4 percent of the sample of drug offender and white females represent 46.5 percent. There is a significant over-representation of black females given that they only represent 7.4% percent of the total Oklahoma female population (U.S. Census 1990). The average age of both groups is mid-thirties, with a mean age for black prisoners of 34.3 years and a mean age for white prisoners of 35.8 years.

The self-reported family income of the women prior to incarceration is reported in Table 1. Blacks reported an average family income of $12,624.79 prior to incarceration whereas whites reported $31,494.38. This difference in average income could be a result of many social factors. The difference in levels of education between the two groups is one possible reason for the dissimilarity. As can be seen in Table 1, white women are more likely than black women to report graduation from high school (46.2% of the white prisoners versus 34% of the black prison-
Another possible explanation could be employment status. However, as reflected in Table 1, black prisoners are more likely than white prisoners to report that they were employed either full-time or part-time. However, with lower levels of education the earnings of the black women could be expected to be lower.

**Sentence Length**

Table 2 reports sentence length by race. It is apparent that more white than black women are found in the lower sentence categories (deferred/delayed or less than 5 years). Sentences of ten or more years are almost equally distributed by race. The category with the largest percentage difference is 5 to 9 year sentences, with 38% of the black women but only 28.1% of the white women falling into this group.

**Drug Use**

Table 3 indicates the drug use of female inmates during the six months prior to incarceration. Black women are more likely to report using crack (36.0%) than white women (22.7%). White prisoners report higher rates of cocaine use (31.8% compared to 6.0% of blacks), marijuana use (51.5% compared to 32.0% of blacks), heroin (13.6% compared to 4.0% of blacks), and amphetamines or methamphetamine use (53% compared to 2.0% of blacks). It is evident that the types of drugs varied by race.

**Legal Factors Potentially Affecting Sentence Length**

Three legal variables are presented in Table 4. First, we present information about the number of prior convictions re-
ported by the prisoners. The number of prior convictions for both blacks and whites are almost equivalent. However, 15.2% of white females report prior misdemeanor convictions, as compared to 8% of black women. The percentage of black prisoners with one prior felony is slightly higher than that of white prisoners (30% versus 28.8%). Finally, black prisoners (28.0%) are more likely to report two or more felony convictions than white prisoners (22.7%).

The second legal variable examined was prior incarceration record. White women are far more likely to report that this was their first incarceration, and less likely to report one prior incarceration. However, the difference between white women and black women is somewhat less for two or

### Table 3. Reported Drug Use in Six Months Prior to Arrest, by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crack</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocaine</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroin</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphetamine/Methamphetamine</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(35)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4. Legal Factors Potentially Affecting Sentencing, by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Convictions</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanor only</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One prior felony</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more prior felonies</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Incarcerations</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>(49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Trial/Conviction</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plea or Nolo Contendre</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial by Jury</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial by Judge</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
more prior incarcerations (9.1% versus 12.0%).

The final legal factor examined was the type of conviction or trial. Over three-fourths of white and black women report that plea bargains or "nolo contendre" pleas were entered. Of the remaining women, blacks are slightly more likely to report being tried in front of a judge, while white women are slightly more likely to report being tried in front of a jury. However, it is important to remember that these percentages apply to women in prison and may not be representative of all women facing drug charges.

**Prior Convictions, Prior Incarcerations & Current Sentence**

Table 5 is a cross-tabulation of prior convictions with current sentences of the women prisoners. One notable difference is in deferred/delayed sentences. Blacks report no delayed sentences, while four white women report receiving delayed sentences. Indeed, one white prisoner reporting a prior felony conviction reported a deferred/delayed sentence. A higher percentage of black women with no prior convictions (20.4%) than white women (12.7%) report a sentence of 10 or more years. Additionally, 16.3% of the black prisoners with one prior felony received 5-9 years whereas only 7.9% of white respondents with one prior felony received the same sentence. There is a somewhat higher concentration of white women in the 1-4 years category and a higher concentration of black women in both the 5-9 years and 10 or more years categories, regardless of prior conviction status.

Table 6 presents a cross-tabulation of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5. Prior Convictions and Current Sentences, By Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sentence length in years</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No prior convictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanor only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One prior felony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more prior felonies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The category &quot;0&quot; Sentence length refers to deferred/delayed sentencing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6. Prior Incarcerations and Current Sentences, By Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sentence length in years</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No prior incarceration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One prior incarceration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more prior incarcerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The category &quot;0&quot; Sentence length refers to deferred/delayed sentencing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
prior incarceration record by sentence length. In this table, we see that deferred sentences were given only to those white prisoners with no prior incarcerations. However, white prisoners with no prior incarcerations are also slightly more likely to report receiving sentences of ten or more years. Among those women with one prior incarceration, a higher percentage of black women report receiving sentences in the 1-4 year category, 5-9 year category and the 10 year or more category.

### Bivariate Regressions of Sentence Length on Legal and Extra-Legal Variables

In Table 7, we examine the bivariate models. For black prisoners, having a jury trial is associated with a longer sentence length, as is the level of crack cocaine use, heroin use, and marijuana use. Higher levels of education are also associated with longer sentences. For white prisoners, the significant coefficients are quite different other than the effect of having a jury trial. Instead, longer sentences for white prisoners are associated with prior incarcerations, employment and amphetamine use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior convictions</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Lived with minor child</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td></td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.005)</td>
<td>(.030)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.156)</td>
<td>(.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior incarcerations</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.397*</td>
<td>Income prior to incarceration</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.113)</td>
<td>(.167)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.156)</td>
<td>(-.090)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jury</td>
<td>1.104*</td>
<td>.792*</td>
<td>Level of crack use</td>
<td>.090**</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.220)</td>
<td>(.179)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.216)</td>
<td>(.044)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>-.226</td>
<td>-.598</td>
<td>Level of cocaine use</td>
<td>.107*</td>
<td>.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-.084)</td>
<td>(-.113)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.233)</td>
<td>(.171)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>-.517*</td>
<td>Level of heroin use</td>
<td>.092*</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.117)</td>
<td>(-.164)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.253)</td>
<td>(.240)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td>.277*</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>Level of marijuana use</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.207**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.218)</td>
<td>(.046)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.185)</td>
<td>(.315)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>Level of amphetamine use</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.207**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.040)</td>
<td>(.111)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.185)</td>
<td>(.315)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

t p ≤ .10, * p ≤ .05, **p ≤ .01, *** p ≤ .001

### Multivariate Regressions of Sentence Length on Legal and Extra-Legal Variables

Finally, ordinary least squares analyses of sentence length on the legal and extra-legal variables were undertaken. The final models are presented in Table 8. Other than having a jury trial, it is apparent that very different variables are associated with sentence length for white prisoners as compared to black prisoners. For white prisoners, the predictive variables are primarily legal factors: prior incarcerations and
Table 8. OLS Multivariate Regression of Sentence Length on Legal and Extra-Legal Variables (standardized coefficients in parenthesis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior convictions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior incarcerations</td>
<td></td>
<td>.477*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.201)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jury</td>
<td>1.210**</td>
<td>.832*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.242)</td>
<td>(.189)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.660*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-.209)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td>.300*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.237)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived with minor child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income prior to incarceration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of crack use</td>
<td>.101†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.162)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of cocaine use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of heroin use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of marijuana use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of amphetamine use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† p ≤ .10, * p ≤ .05, **p ≤ .01, *** p ≤ .001

those who were incarcerated. Our findings indicate that, in terms of sentence length, race matters. First, the sentence length received by female offenders varied by race. Second, we found that deferred or delayed sentences were only reported by white prisoners. Finally, our findings indicate that different factors predicted sentence length for black women as compared to white women.

The data also suggest that detrimental social factors experienced by black women cannot explain the difference (Currie 1998). For example, although black female prisoners report lower levels of education, it appears that higher levels of education are associated with longer sentences for this group. It is possible that this is an artifact, with those women incarcerated for the longest terms being more likely to obtain education while in prison. Certainly, the relationship between sentence length and education bears further investigation.

Prior research has suggested that employment at the time of incarceration is often associated with less harsh sentencing (Kramer and Steffensmeier 1993). However, this study did not appear to support those findings unilaterally. Regression analyses indicated that employment was not associated with shorter sentences for black prisoners, only for white prisoners. This is despite the fact that black women were more likely to report having either a full-time or part-time job prior to
Drug use varied by race. In the six months prior to incarceration, black women were more likely to report using crack, while white women were more likely to report using all other drugs. However, drug use was not associated with sentence length for all women. Instead, drug use was only associated with sentence length for black women, adding support to Chesney-Lind’s (1997) observation about the War on Drugs being a war on women of color.

In a system where disparity of sentence lengths was not due to racial factors, one should expect to find similar predictors of sentence length. In particular, legal variables should be associated with sentencing. However, this was not the case for both black and white offenders in our sample. While black prisoners were more likely to report no prior convictions, none received deferred sentences. On the other hand, white respondents were slightly more likely to have a prior conviction on their record, yet four white inmates were given deferred sentences, one of these reporting a prior felony conviction and another reporting a misdemeanor conviction. Furthermore, although black prisoners were less likely to report prior convictions, they were more likely to report prior incarcerations. This would suggest that some level of discrimination exists. Jury trials were associated with longer sentences for both races.

This study was designed to explore the possibility that focal concerns exist in the sentencing of female inmates similar to those described in the sentencing of young black male inmates (Steffensmeier et al. 1998). The Steffensmeier study suggested that young black males receive harsher sentences because they are seen as blameworthy and dangerous. We suggest that different focal concerns might be operative with female offenders, particularly concerns surrounding gender norm violations (Schur 1984; Belknap 1996; Erez 1992; Ochie and Ngenge 1996; Schur 1984). Our findings appear to support this in regards to the harsher sentencing of black female offenders. It is noteworthy that crack cocaine use was associated with longer sentencing for black women but not for white women. Given the media representation of black women giving birth to impaired infants (Humphries et al. 1995), this should not be particularly surprising. Almost one-fourth of the white prisoners reported using crack in the six months prior to incarceration, compared to slightly more than one-third of the black prisoners. However, at neither the bivariate nor the multivariate level was an association found between crack use and sentence length for white women, suggesting that there is a difference across races in the perceived “inappropriateness” of crack usage. Notably, having a minor child in the home was not associated with sentence length for either race.

It is equally telling that the variables predictive of sentence length for white prisoners are primarily legal variables (Zatz 1984). In the multivariate model, employment was the one extra-legal variable associated with sentence length. Employment has been associated with sentence length in a number of studies of male offenders, and there is some intuitive logic there. Simply, an employed offender is considered to be less of a risk. Offenders who are employed are perceived as more tied to the community, and thus better able to provide for their families (Kramer and Steffensmeier 1993; Spohn and Holleran 2000). However, the beneficial effect of employment does not appear to be extended to black female offenders, despite the fact they were more likely to report regular employment.

Conclusion
The circumstances surrounding each respondent’s case were not examined. Therefore, it is difficult to delve deeper into the issue of discrimination. Many factors influence sentencing, including aggravating and mitigating circumstances in individual cases. All offenders in this study were convicted of drug offenses. However, we do not know the exact offenses for each offender, although that might partially explain the outcomes. Nonetheless, it appears that Chesney-Lind's observation about the War on Drugs being a war on women of color, adds support to the idea that different focal concerns might be operative with female offenders, particularly concerns surrounding gender norm violations. Our findings appear to support this in regards to the harsher sentencing of black female offenders.
Lind’s (1997) warning cannot be ignored. Further research is needed to determine the specific types and levels of discrimination that exists within the criminal justice system.

A comparison of a female offenders not charged with drug offenses to those charged with drug offenses might shed further light on the role of stereotypes and focal concerns in sentencing decisions. Additionally, further research might explore whether similar patterns exist in decisions of whether to incarcerate convicted women.

The findings of this study give cause for concern about racial equity in sentencing of female offenders. In particular, the finding that legal factors were not associated with sentence length of black females merits further investigation. If these findings are replicated in terms of decisions to incarcerate as well as across a wider variety of offenders, current sentencing practices will need to be examined and changed. Otherwise, if the trend of rising female incarceration continues unchecked, we may find a generation of children with neither mother nor father available to parent them.
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Abstract

This research examines the role of the sociologist as an expert in cases of homicide. The authors argue that sociological knowledge can be particularly important at trial by presenting an interpretation of the social context of a crime. This point is illustrated by describing several case studies of homicides and by using theories and models supporting victim precipitation as an explanation of the crime. Three interacting constructs of victim precipitation are described in which to frame a homicide: 1) the behavior of the victim as it encouraged the specific offender/victim interaction; 2) the level of deviant or criminal behavior in which the victim was engaged; and 3) the level of risk in the lifestyle of the victim.

Introduction

Sociologists are regularly sought as expert witnesses in the courts (Jenkins and Kroll-Smith 1996; Radelet 1987; Rose 1967; Thoresen 1993; Wolfgang 1974). This paper examines the role of sociologists as expert witnesses in homicide cases. The first author of this paper has worked as a sociologist in over 100 capital murder cases in Louisiana. We contend that the sociologist can be particularly important for the defense by presenting an interpretation of the social context of the murder. This point is illustrated by the use and extension of the concept of victim precipitation as a mitigating factor of homicide. Routine activity/lifestyle theory is offered as support for the concept of victim precipitation as an explanation of homicide. We also extend a classification scheme (Meuller 1990; Polk 1997; Sobol 1997), which consists of four victim classification categories, based on the degree of victim involvement. Several cases of homicide, on which the first author has worked, are framed within different levels of victim/offender interaction. Finally, the applicability of viewing homicide as a sociological transaction rather than as a study of offenders and victims is addressed.

The Role of the Sociologists as Expert in Cases of Homicide

Expert witnesses are hired by defense attorneys to develop mitigation for the sentencing (penalty) phase of capital murder trials. Their responsibility in capital cases is to develop a social history of the defendant that will serve as mitigation (Jenkins and Kroll-Smith 1996; Radelet 1987). Mitigating circumstances are the most important elements of the penalty phase of a trial for the defense (Dayan 1991). Mitigating circumstances are facts that do not justify or excuse an action but can lower the amount of moral blame, lower the criminal penalty for the action, and can serve as a determining factor in life or death decisions (Oran 1983). Thus, the key element in the penalty phase is to explain the criminal behavior of the defendant so that he or she will not be sentenced to death.

In the first phase of a capital murder trial guilt is determined. If the defendant is found not guilty or guilty of a lesser offense, the trial ends. If the defendant is found guilty of a lesser offense, the judge will impose a sentence at a hearing, on the other hand, if a defendant is found guilty of capital murder, the jury must decide on a punishment (Charvat 1996; Hall and Brace 1994). This represents the second phase and involves another trial, but with the same judge, jury, and attorneys in the same setting. In Louisiana, the penalty phase cannot begin sooner than 12 hours after the guilt phase verdict, although the judge can allow a longer period of time,
but generally the second phase starts the following day. Due to these time factors, preparations for both the penalty and guilt phase are concurrent. Any matter the judge regards as relevant to sentencing may be offered as evidence in the second phase, and the second phase must include matters relating to certain legislatively specified aggravating and mitigating circumstances. Both the prosecution and the defense may present arguments on whether or not the death penalty should be used (Lewis and Peoples 1978). In Louisiana, the jury weighs aggravating and mitigating circumstances before imposing either a sentence of death or life in prison without parole.

The U.S. Supreme Court has held that courts must consider any and all relevant mitigating evidence that is available. Louisiana law, although recognizing any relevant evidence as plausible mitigating testimony, has created a general classification of factors (West 1998). Any aspects of the defendant's life which demonstrate that he or she is not deserving of the death penalty could be considered mitigating circumstances.

The prosecution, on the other hand, presents aggravating circumstances. Generally, aggravation includes actions or occurrences that lead to an increase in the seriousness of a crime but are not part of the legal definition of that crime (Oran 1983). These are the intentionality of the act, the propensity of the murderer to kill again and the heinous, atrocious, and cruel nature of the murder. Debates about sentencing typically focus on two adversarial positions: the circumstances of the crime versus the social psychological qualities of the client (Brodsky 1991; Dayan 1991; Najmi 1992; Thoresen 1993).

The expert/sociologist explains how sociological factors have, at least partially, shaped the circumstances of capital murder (Rose 1967). The utility of sociology in a murder case may be clearest in the penalty phase of the trial, but the data obtained and delivered by the sociologist have uses other than in the penalty phase. It can be used to negotiate a plea so that a trial never takes place or at a sentencing hearing for a conviction of manslaughter which has a range of sentences rather than a determinate sentence. Such data can be used to help shorten the sentence of the client. The sociologist's report can be filed in the record to be used at later hearings to reduce the sentence of the client. Sociological data can be used on appeal to convince the reviewing court of the questionable moral appropriateness of the death sentence in the client's case, or that the death sentence of the client is disproportionate (Dayan 1991).

The major focus in this paper is the contention that sociological knowledge has and should continue to inform sentencing decisions in capital cases and other cases of homicide where appropriate. Key among the knowledge that might be useful is the concept of victim precipitation. Victim precipitation illustrates the arguments that place a defendant in social and cultural worlds that, even if they do not necessarily "explain" or "justify" grievous and heinous acts, absolve the murderer of a sufficient amount of guilt to spare his or her life or perhaps lessen the sentence if presented at the guilt phase of the trial or at trials for manslaughter or second degree murder.

The concept of victim precipitation can be counted on to cause controversy because it poses a counterintuitive notion, that a person was engaged in behavior that would bring about his or her own death. But, victim precipitation can be shown to be relevant in some cases of homicide. One of the circumstances for capital murder in Louisiana is when the offender kills while engaged in the distribution, exchange, sale, or purchase of a controlled dangerous substance. In such circumstances it is quite likely that the victim was also involved in this encounter and consequently contributed to his or her death. We suggest an interpretation of the social context of the crime in a manner that can enable judges and juries to make sense of the interactions between defendant and victim. By focusing on the specific circumstances the sociologist also avoids the criticism directed at trends rather than individuals. The law abhors abstract ex-
cuses, but indeed is keyed toward concrete explanations.

**The Theoretical Grounding of Victim Precipitation**

The expert who testifies about victim precipitation must be prepared to theoretically ground the data (Glasser and Strauss 1967). The defense expert must be prepared for any possible questions the prosecution may pose. In essence, the expert must be over-prepared. The following is an extensive review of the literature on the concept of victim precipitation and a somewhat brief exploration of routine activity theory and the lifestyle approach to the study of victimization.

**Routine Activities and Lifestyle**

Although homicide is a complex and dynamic phenomenon (Sobol 1997), there are basically two approaches to the study of homicide (or any violent crime). These may be viewed as either a study of what causes criminal behavior or of what causes victimization. Part of the emphasis on victimization has been on the situational factors that accompanied a particular crime. One of the most accepted perspectives accounting for victimization is derived from the routine activity and lifestyle approaches. These two theories developed during the same period and have considerable overlap. Both theories assume that the lifestyles and behavioral patterns of some individuals increase their potential for being victims, primarily because they are at risk for contact with offenders (Bennett 1991; Cohen and Felson 1979; Cohen, Kleugel, and Land 1981; Felson 1987; Messner and Blau 1987).

There has been a cache of research on the theory of deviant places (Stark 1987). Research findings support the view that there are certain “hot spots” where crime is more likely to occur, and that people whose activities take them routinely into these “hot spots” will greatly increase their risk of being victims of crime (Kennedy and Forde 1990; Miethe and Meier 1990; Miethe, Stafford, and Long 1987; Roncek and Maier 1991).

Lifestyle theory stresses that the lifestyle of some people puts them more at risk for becoming crime victims; you are more likely to become a victim if you spend a lot of time with people who themselves commit high numbers of crimes. People who spend a lot of time in bars or in the street increase their chances of becoming victims. Research on robbery, auto theft, rape, and other sexual crimes in one city demonstrated all such crimes occurred in only five percent of the locations, while 95 percent of the places in the city were free of any of these crimes in a one year period (Sherman, Gartin, and Buerger 1989). Crime rates in residential areas indicate that those blocks in which bars or taverns are located have significantly higher rates of every type of index crime (Kennedy and Forde 1990; Roncek and Maier 1991; Stahura and Sloan 1988).

The routine activity approach is an attempt to explain why it is that some people become victims of crime. The foundations of the routine activity perspective are in human ecological theory (Hawley 1950). It was Hawley’s idea that human activities are performed not only in a particular territory or area, as is criminal victimization, a point recognized as early as 1929 (Shaw et al. 1929), but also at a particular time (Hawley 1950). The convergence of these interrelated factors, temporal and spatial components, is fundamental to the understanding of the routine activity perspective.

Routine activities theory argues that some people engage in routine activities that increase their risk of victimization. Essentially, the approach assumes that it is a change in the routine daily activities of victims that affects an increase or decrease in victimization. For victimization to occur three phenomena must occur simultaneously: 1. the presence of an attractive target (person or property); 2. the presence of a motivated offender; 3. the absence of people who might observe or stop the crime (guardianship) (Cohen and Felson 1979). An increase in victimization is anticipated to occur only when there is a convergence in both time and space of motivated offenders and suitable targets in the absence of capable guardians.
Accordingly, a decrease is anticipated when any one of these criteria is not met. Implicit within routine activities and lifestyle theories is the idea that some individuals increase their chances of becoming crime victims by committing crimes themselves, in essence the conception of victim precipitation (Amir 1971; Sampson and Lauritsen 1990; Wolfgang 1958).

**Victim Precipitation**

In criminology, one of the recurring concepts that cues much of the research on homicide is the idea that victims often precipitate their own deaths by playing an antagonistic role in the events preceding the fatal encounter (Mann 1996; Polk 1997; Sobol 1997). Wolfgang (1958) used the term victim precipitation to describe a type of homicide (or other acts of violence) in which the victim took some active role (striking the first blow or making the initial threatening gesture) in their own victimization.

*Up to one-half of all criminal homicides may be provoked by victims who initiate physical violence...The prevalence of victim precipitation in murder and assault cases is clearly contrary to the popular image of victims as totally innocent bystanders to predatory attacks* (Miethe and McCorkle 1998:28).

Many homicides take place between individuals who have had prior social interaction with each other, although victim precipitated killings involve more than prior interaction between the two parties. In the cases designated as being victim precipitated, the victims induced their death through their own menacing actions (Amir 1971; Polk 1997). Violence from this perspective is to be understood as an outcome of action and responses by both parties and not merely those of the killer. Calculating the number of victim precipitated homicides is an arduous task, because it requires intimate knowledge of the interaction before the killing took place. Since one of the participants is dead, reconstruction of the event must rely on personal accounts by the killer and by any available witnesses. Estimates have nevertheless been made and range from 25% to 50% of homicides (Wolfgang 1958). Fattah (1991) offers a definition of victim precipitation where the victim's actions were a necessary part of the event.

*A form of overt, aggressive, and provocative behavior by the victim that triggers the action of the criminal. It is an actualizing factor; the stimulus that elicits the violent response...had it not been for the precipitating actions of the victim, the victimization would not have occurred against that particular victim in that particular situation* (Fattah 1991:295).

Fattah (1991) also describes certain behaviors by the victim which may not attain extreme levels of precipitation but which may still play a major or a minor causal role.

...*victim-precipitation is usually (and justly) confined to conscious, deliberate, and active behavior; the functional role of the victim may be in the form of...acts of negligence, carelessness, recklessness, and imprudence, which create a temptation or opportunity situation or make it easier for the potential offender to commit a certain crime, are contributing factors, even though they may not fit a narrow operational definition of victim precipitation* (Fattah 1991:297).

Earlier works on victim precipitation have been primarily concerned with studying the behavior of the victim. Other researchers (Meuller 1990; Polk 1997; Sobol 1997) have suggested a continuum of victim precipitation based on the level of involvement of the victim. They have combined much of the victim precipitation perspective into a practical application. Their model of victim precipitation offers four categories of victims based upon an increasing level of responsibility for the event. These four categories are: Innocent Nonparticipating, Noncriminal Facilitating, Criminal Facilitating, and Criminal Precipitating. Luckenbill (1977) and others (Kennedy and Sacco 1998) have suggested a broader approach; not only looking at the actions of the victim but the offender as well. This approach is
best exemplified by the concept situated transactions (Luckenbill 1977). Luckenbill characterized homicide as a product of a sociological transaction. The victim ends up dead because of what goes on between the actors involved in the event(s).

Concerns about defining victims versus offenders and the role that each play in precipitating the crime event raise the need to address the event in a way that involves looking at more than what one person does to another. Using this approach, we emphasize the study of what goes on between the participants rather than what any one of them does. This approach allows us to account not only for offender and victim actions but also for the behavior of third parties in addition to the situational factors that may influence the outcome of the interaction. The idea of a situated transaction allows us to look at social interaction in terms of a play, with designated roles, scripts to be followed, and scenes to be designed (Kennedy and Sacco 1998:106).

Understanding homicide from this perspective means that it can be better understood as a drama in which actors have roles and perform associated behaviors (Goffman 1959).

In an attempt to frame this dramaturgical analysis (Goffman 1959) of homicide, we offer three constructs of homicide victims, which the expert/sociologist can use to begin to frame the data gathered. Also offered are examples of a continuum of behaviors within these constructs. The three constructs are: 1. the behavior of the victim as it encouraged the specific offender/victim interaction (no interaction with the offender on any level-sarcastic or derogatory verbal remarks directed at the offender-verbal threats-physical threats); 2. the level of deviant or criminal behavior in which the victim was engaged (normal-deviant-criminal); and 3. the level of risk in the lifestyle of the victim (cautious-risky-risky without guardianship). The first construct is the most important because threatening behavior is the essence of victim precipitation and it most closely approximates the legitimate concept of self-defense. The second construct is more important than the third because being involved in deviant or criminal behavior indicates recklessness or criminal behavior on the part of the victim. Indeed, the third is a precarious construct, because it involves acceptable behavior. These constructs should also be viewed as interactive. It also should be noted that although the specific dynamics of each crime are different, we are attempting to fit them into categorical constructs. We also realize that these constructs will not always provide mutually exclusive dimensions to categorize homicides. We recognize these limitations, but indeed, feel it is a workable framework.

For example, a woman who sells or exchanges sex for crack cocaine has a deviant, perhaps criminal lifestyle. Each day she runs a very high risk of being involved with potential offenders. Her specific actions with an individual can discourage or encourage events leading to her being a victim. If she gets in a car and goes to a remote place with someone she meets in a crack house she is facilitating the potential for violent behavior. If she gets into an argument with this individual in a remote place she promotes the potential for violence. The intersection of lifestyle and behavior occurs on the interactional stage. The prostitute leads a high risk lifestyle and is engaged in an illegal activity (in most places). The prostitute’s potential for becoming a victim is augmented because sex takes place in private, where guardianship is lacking.

The information for assigning a category to this sociological transaction is obtained by the sociologist during the gathering of data about both the offender and the victim. The lifestyle of the victim can be constructed from focused interviews with a broad sample of individuals who know of the victim’s behavior. These are the same methods which can be used to gather defendant information. Behavior at the crime scene can only be obtained from the defendant and any witnesses to the crime or events surrounding the crime. Although
criminals have a vested interest in distorting the reality of their commission of a particular crime, most researchers have found interviews with offenders to be excellent sources of data regarding criminal motivations for and the situational dynamics of the crime (Miethe and McCorkle 1998). Police crime scene evidence can also aid in the reconstruction of this drama.

Some Cases of Homicide

The following five case studies of homicide serve as a means to illustrate the applicability of the constructs of victim precipitation. In the first four the charge was capital murder; in the fifth case study the charge was second degree murder. In each case there is some degree of victim precipitation, albeit at significantly different levels.

1. The offender was arrested for the murder of a man who was searching for a homosexual encounter at a rest stop located on an interstate highway. The victim and the offender were strangers but each had engaged in this type of behavior before. The victim had even been warned by friends of the dangerousness of his behavior. The offender had "earned" money through homosexual encounters in the past. The victim and offender met at the rest stop and then drove to another location where the victim was robbed and beaten to death. The victim had a risky lifestyle, was facilitating violence by going to a location where no one could stop the crime and was engaging in a deviant activity. The homicide was the direct result of being involved in some deviant activity, but the victim did not threaten or physically attack the offender. The victim facilitated his death through his deviant behavior.

2. The offenders were involved in the killing/robbing of two out-of-town drug dealers. The two victims were in town to buy drugs. Their deaths were planned. The victims were shot and killed in a car as they were being driven by the two defendants to the alleged drug deal. The victims were also robbed of a large amount of money. The victims were engaged in an illegal activity. Their criminal behavior facilitates their becoming victims, in that, the homicide was the direct result of being involved in some criminal act. Like case one, the victims did not threaten the offenders. But these victims had a history of robbing other drug dealers; this creates a sort of retaliatory aura. It can also be considered a threatening behavior, albeit a general threat, to all people with whom they engage in drug deals.

3. The offender waited in hiding for the owner of a small cafe to leave his business after closing. The victim, as he did every day, left the store in the early hours of the morning alone, and with the reputation for having large sums of cash in his possession. The cafe was located in a high crime area. The victim was robbed and killed. The victim was facilitating violence by leaving his business alone at a time when no one could stop the crime. This victim did not take standard crime prevention measures and consequently placed himself in a vulnerable position. If the victim had hired Wells Fargo to pick up his cash at the end of the day he would not have been a target for robbery. He has a somewhat risky lifestyle because he operates a late night restaurant in a high crime area. He is not engaged in criminal and/or deviant behavior. But the victim indirectly encouraged interaction with the defendants by having large sums of cash with him without guardianship.

4. The offender was under the influence of alcohol. He attempted the robbery of a small discount store. The robbery took place at closing. The clerk was a woman and the only person in the store. The offender attempted a robbery with no weapon. After getting the money from the register the offender attempted to lock the victim in a storage room, but the clerk grabbed a knife from a sales rack and stabbed the offender several times. The victim took the knife from the woman and killed her with the weapon. The victim encouraged the homicide by attempting to subdue the offender. The victim was a law abiding person who advanced the homicide by her unnecessary risk taking. This can include a wide range of self-defense measures of victims including vic-
tims of lesser crimes such as theft who elect to arm themselves and attack the criminal, hence prompting the offender to expand his or her actions. The clerk facilitated her victimization.

5. The offender entered a bar under the influence of both drugs and alcohol. Once in the lounge he saw a man who owed him money. He confronted the man who acknowledged the debt, but the victim told the offender to “go fuck yourself”; laughed at him and told him to get out before “I kick your ass.” Everyone in the bar saw and heard the confrontation. The offender suffered public humiliation and an argument began. The victim was shot by the offender and then the offender took money from the wallet of the victim. The offender had a history of violent behavior while under the influence of substances. He was also assumed to always be armed with a gun. This victim did not initiate the interaction, he merely responded verbally to the offender’s initiation, and was not involved in anything criminal or even deviant. He is not the aggressor in the interaction, does not commence the violence, or the interaction, but directed a derogatory verbal remark and threat at the offender. The victim encouraged the behavior of the offender through a verbal threat to an individual whom he knew would respond to the challenge violently.

Victim precipitated homicides are most likely to occur when those involved know each other and are attuned to each other’s personality. Tensions and mutual aggravations may reach the point where both personalities see reconciliation only through violence (Curtis 1974; Wolfgang 1958). In a sense, this type of victim makes the greatest contribution to his or her own death.

Cases one, two, three and four are similar in that capable guardians were lacking. In case five it is feasible that the victim wrongly assumed that there was a high level of guardianship in the bar. Only in case 5 were there witnesses, otherwise the reconstruction of the crime scene was based on the statement of the defendant and the crime scene evidence. In four (1,2,4,5) of these cases the defense could have benefited from the presentation of victim precipitation in some form. Cases one and two are significantly different. The victim in case one was involved in a minor criminal act, rather than serious criminal behavior as is case two. Case three involves carelessness, but the victim bears no responsibility for the crime. Case three has the least amount of victim precipitation. Of the five cases, case four has the highest level of victim precipitation. In cases four and five the idea of victim precipitation is weakened because neither of the victims was engaged in deviant or criminal behavior. In case four the victim was guilty of the violation of formal norms dictating behavior in a particular situation; in case five the norms the victim violated were informal. In descending order of victim precipitation these cases would appear: 4,2,1,5,3.

We must stress that the offender is always to blame for the murder, the victim is never to blame, however the causal sequence behind some homicides begins with certain actions the victim(s) initiates or encourages. Blame and cause should be kept separate. Homicide victims are not to be blamed for their violent deaths at the hands of another. On the other hand, a great deal of evidence suggests that in a large percentage of all cases of criminal homicide, the conduct of the victims actually contributed to their deaths. Such contributions exist on a continuum from a direct causal action, such as a physical threat to lesser contributions such as taking certain risks (Fattah 1991). Also being involved in a criminal activity does not inherently represent victim precipitation, but on a continuum it is closer to victim precipitation than law abiding behavior.

We have described the crimes in terms of the three constructs of victim precipitation and have not offered a level of victim precipitation on each case. In that all crimes are different, this would serve no practical purpose and would ultimately be subjectively assigned and open to interpretation. Indeed, there is no way to absolutely place these crimes within categorial levels of victim precipitation. These constructs should be seen as frames
with which to situate, discuss, and perhaps mitigate penalties for a particular crime.

**Discussion**

We have suggested victim precipitation as an appropriate classificatory scheme to facilitate defense/mitigation in some cases. The legal basis for presenting this sociological knowledge during the guilt phase of the trial is that it demonstrates "a degree of guilt" rather than mitigation. During the penalty phase of a capital murder trial its legal appropriateness has already been established.

There is growing evidence that many homicide victims precipitate their own deaths (Mann 1996; Miethe and McCorkle 1998; Sobol 1997; Wolfgang 1958). In many cases it is not possible to accurately deduce the level of victim precipitation. Most homicides are an outcome of action and responses by both parties and not merely those of the subsequent killer. The reconstruction of the event is difficult because doing so requires intimate knowledge of the interaction before the killing took place. Unless there are witnesses, the defendant is the only source of information regarding the immediate interaction which led to the crime.

There are a number of practical problems which emanate from the use of the concept of victim precipitation, the most significant of which is the offensive view that it may convey to the juror. However, it is the most useful guide with which to examine the interaction between offenders and victims (Polk 1997). Experts should develop such a focus first for understanding the homicide and subsequently for use at trial, if appropriate.

Victim precipitation has been most successfully used in the battered woman’s defense strategy. This defense requires gathering data from a broad sample of individuals who have knowledge of the offender/victim relationship, in order to reconstruct the event. Ironically, this data will usually reveal that the victim has justified his history of battering with his own version of victim precipitation. The first author has worked on two cases of homicide in which husbands have murdered their wives. Each gave accounts of victim precipitation; neither argument was persuasive. Both experience as an expert and the literature suggest that batters almost always cite provocation (Jenkins 1996; Westervelt 1998).

The sociological character of criminal acts emanates from the fact that they involve interaction between human beings. Criminologists should be interested in more than just the motivation of the offenders or the actions of the victims, although these are important ingredients to any violent crime.

Criminologists should attempt to distinguish between a victim’s responsibility for crime prevention and the offender’s responsibility for crime commission.

In this paper we have presented another tool for use in mitigation. Whether or not it is good mitigation can only be confirmed by its usefulness in court. In the penalty phase all twelve jurors must vote for death if the defendant is to receive this ultimate sentence. If one juror of twelve is persuaded by expert testimony and subsequently refuses to vote for a death penalty then it was useful.

When hired as an expert in a capital case it may be several years before the case gets to trial, indeed many never get to trial. Among the other experts and attorneys, the sociologist has the most interaction with the family. During the course of this work the expert/sociologist comes to know the defendant and his or her family very well. Success renders an embrace from a mother who thanks you because her son will not be executed. Failure means another kind of meeting. This is not an academic exercise.
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Notes

1 In some states the convicted offender may choose sentence by jury or judge.

2 Although intentionality is part of the legal definition of the charge of homicide, the concept is subjectively applied in many cases. Intent is a subjective mental element of a crime. Lack of intentionality is always part of the defense strategy. The first degree (capital) homicide statute in Louisiana states the offender must have specific intent to kill and or to inflict great bodily harm while engaged in certain prohibited activities. Specific criminal intent is that state of mind which exists when the circumstances indicate that the offender actively desired the prescribed criminal consequences to follow his act or his failure to act (West 1998).
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Gang Subcultures and Prison Gangs of Female Youth
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Abstract

Inmate violence, disruptions and problems recently have been attributed to the rise of prison gangs. While some research has investigated this phenomenon, studies of female inmates, especially the juvenile population, have been largely ignored. This study examines the role of female gangs and subcultures by giving detailed, firsthand accounts from thirty-four young incarcerated women. The models used for the analysis include both the importation and deprivation views of prison subculture development. Results include interpretations of the nature and extent of prison gangs, gang recruitment, prison gang problems and friendship patterns based on gang alliances. Findings support both subculture models depending upon the contextual question.

Both in media and public discourse, prison gangs have evoked negative reactions. They are viewed as disruptive and violent. For more than two decades, the proliferation of gangs in prison has disrupted many American correctional institutions (Fong, Vogel & Buentello 1996) with prison gangs regarded as a major source of violence and other correctional problems. A comprehensive study conducted by Camp & Camp (1985) identified the presence of 114 male prison gangs nationwide with a total membership of 12,634 in 33 adult prison systems. While these prison gangs accounted for only 3 percent of the country's adult male prison population, they have been found responsible for over 50 percent of prison management problems (Fong, Vogel & Buentello 1996). A study conducted by the American Correctional Association (1993) found similar results. They concluded that prison gang members accounted for 6 percent of the prison population and were responsible for approximately 20 percent of violent incidences toward prison staff and 40 percent toward other prisoners.

In spite of prison gangs receiving more attention and being partly responsible for inmate problems, little research has been directed toward gangs in prison. Furthermore, to date there has been no comprehensive study looking at prison gangs in state juvenile facilities for either males or females.

How gang involvement may influence the processes of prison subcultural development for females is unknown. While gang involvement in women's prisons may be viewed as the product of importation, that is, females in gangs before incarceration continuing their gang affiliation while incarcerated, it may also be the result of deprivation, i.e., gangs forming to compensate for the lack of close-knit peer groups or for protection, just as in male institutions. It also may be that gangs develop due to a combination of both reasons. Regardless of origin, a primary assumption is that gang membership in prison provides opportunities for achieving power, feeling protected and acquiring a vast array of comforts to make the prison stay more tolerable.

This study attempts to fill the void of both subcultural and prison gang research by examining the role gangs play in inmate subcultures of female adolescents, in particular, one juvenile correctional facility located in the Southwest. The questions of deprivation and importation are examined in the context of adaptation to incarceration while specifically looking at the role of gangs. This research examines to what extent gangs account for how adolescent females react and adapt to imprisonment using the deprivation and importation models. These concepts are measured through in-depth analysis with thirty-four young women to examine individual and collective responses on reactions to confinement and gang life.
Policy and Inmate Subcultures

Unfortunately, policymakers have implemented correctional policies without a clear understanding of how gangs impact the correctional experience. Further, policy is best informed by those closest to the problem (Petersen 2000; 1995) and as such, why listening to and understanding these young women is of particular significance.

Some literature has concerned itself with the question of whether gangs are imported into prisons or are an outgrowth of the deprivations of prison life. For example, McConville (1985) seems to suggest the latter is more prominent with mandatory minimum prison sentences a major factor contributing to gangs in prison. However, the recent growth of prison gangs may be the result of more individuals sentenced to prison who are gang members and as such, importation would also be a factor.

The increase of female gang involvement has most likely influenced inmate subcultures by altering the dynamics of power and status. With the increase in girls’ participation in gangs, what they import into the institution and their variable effect on inmate subcultures are extremely important issues. The present research investigates how the values and norms of incarcerated gang girls may affect the values and norms of inmates who are not affiliated with gangs. Currently, no research in the literature exists involving juveniles detained in correctional facilities exclusively regarding the issue of gangs. There are also no reported studies of girls and gangs lodged within the network of inmate subcultures. How female gang involvement and affiliation represent the processes of importation or deprivation is unknown.

Importation and Deprivation: Female subcultures and gangs

The most popular belief in the existence of prison gangs can be attributed to importation. This perspective asserts that the inmate’s social world is shaped by personal and social characteristics imported into prison (Irwin, Cressey 1962) with gangs in prison one result of such processes. Importation would suggest that gangs in prison are a result of individuals bringing their gangs into the prison. For example, if an individual is part of a street gang prior to incarceration, s/he may bring this mentality and behavior into the prison culture. How s/he adapts to the incarceration experience would be, in part, shaped by his/her prior gang affiliation. They may see prison life as an opportunity for extending their hometown gang.

Conversely, a polarized perspective on the existence of prison gangs is that of deprivation. This model argues that since the social world of inmates is shaped by a variety of prison deprivations (Clemmer 1940), gangs in prison may be the result of “easing the pains of imprisonment” especially if faced with a lengthy prison sentence (McConville 1985). Deprivation would view that individuals are deprived of, for example, companionship, status, power or protection and would form or join a gang to compensate for such losses. Inmates may find it necessary to form into groups for self-protection, power and/or dominance with such groups often developing into “prison gangs.” These prison gangs are seen as notorious for incidences of violence, threats, intimidation and other types of disruption within the prison milieu.

It is, however, also possible that prison gangs develop for a combination of both deprivation and importation reasons, something previous literature on subcultures has not adequately addressed. Matthews (1999) contends that an important relationship exists between the social and cultural backgrounds of those who enter prison and that such backgrounds provide a framework for understanding the ways in which the pains of imprisonment are experienced. In fact, both the importation and deprivation models could be intertwined to better understand gang development in prison. For instance, gang subcultures on the outside can be imported to the institution via values, culture, norms, symbols, and language. Moreover, since youth are deprived of intimate peer relationships, they may join a gang or continue affiliation to compensate for their
lack of intimacy, power, leadership, or even as a method of survival. These assertions can be applied to the understanding of gangs in prison. Clearly, the lack of knowledge and understanding of the world of female gangs lodged within the inmate social system merits serious examination.

Prior research on both female adult and juvenile subcultures is scant, at best, especially when compared to studies of male prisons (see Ward, Kassebaum 1965; Giallombardo 1966; 1974; Heffernan 1972). These and other investigations of female inmate subcultures often have been based on gender stereotypes with a preoccupation of sexual relations, in particular, homosexuality, and the role of pseudo-family relationships (Otis 1913; Ford 1929; Selling 1931; Kosofsky, Ellis 1958; Halleck, Hersko 1962; Ward, Kassebaum 1965; Konopka 1966; Giallombardo 1974; Carter 1981; Propper 1981). While incarcerated young women may be involved in homosexual relationships and may form pseudo-families, our knowledge of inmate subcultures of female youth virtually stops there. Furthermore, the few studies exclusively focused on inmate subcultures of female adolescents have produced mixed results as to which model explains subculture development accurately (Giallombardo 1974; Propper 1981; Carter 1981; Arnold 1994). It is, therefore, unclear as to the methods of how females adapt to incarceration, i.e., importation and/or deprivation, and how prior gang affiliation may account for their adaptation.

There are generally three types of ways females are involved or affiliated with gangs: (1) membership in an independent, all-female gang, (2) regular membership in a male or mixed-gender gang, and (3) female auxiliaries of male gangs. Research has overwhelmingly found the auxiliary roles most common (for example, Bowker 1978; Brown 1977; Campbell 1984; Flowers 1987; Hanson 1964; Miller 1975; 1980). These girls often are identified as girlfriends, friends, sisters or cousins of male gang members with their role in the gang minimal, i.e., carrying weapons, driving the get-a-way car, partying with the male gang members. It has been suggested that female gang membership has been increasing steadily in all the above categories, but this is far from certain and research has not concretely substantiated such claims. As such, considerable ignorance exists concerning the role of females and gangs, especially relating to the impact of such gang affiliation on imprisonment.

Since more young women are being incarcerated every year accompanied by changes in gender roles, it is critical to explore how the various dimensions of social life affect inmate subculture formation. Because the perspective that gang research literature has about girl gang membership may no longer by accurate given contemporary conditions, it is important to understand the importation view of gang culture into the prison experience. It has been speculated that incarcerated gang members are often versions of their hometown gangs who merely have been regrouped in prison. What type of effect this has on subculture formation and inmate adaptation of young female inmates needs closer examination.

The goal of this study is to add to the understanding of the dynamics of gang affiliation among females relating to inmate subcultures. Specifically, I examine (1) whether the youth were involved with gangs before incarceration, (2) if they continued their gang affiliation while committed, (3) the impact of gang affiliation on subculture formation, and (4) if girls who were not in gangs before commitment decided to join while imprisoned and why.

Methodology

Given the state of the prior research and literature on this topic, the goal is not specifically hypothesis-testing. However, my reading of the literature on the role of females and gangs and on the importation and deprivation models in male prisons leads me to suggest some patterns I would expect to find. Specifically, the gang literature suggests that gangs play a lesser role for females than for males and the prison literature suggests that females feel
the pains of family/role deprivation more than males. Thus, this would imply that the deprivation model may be more suitable in explaining the dynamics of gangs for incarcerated young women.

The intent of this study is not to produce a quantitative, statistical account. Rather, it is an exploratory study (Creswell 1994) designed to build constructed descriptions and interpretations of social events by the young women themselves. The findings of this study, based solely on the interview responses, are to be understood through Verstehen, that is, empathetic understanding and meaning (Weber 1949) which underscores the importance of the context of the girls' lives. This study is meant to add a holistic understanding to the role of subcultures and gangs in a juvenile correctional facility. Inferences regarding the impact of incarceration on gang membership cannot be universally generalized. However, it is hoped that through this type of methodology, the role of subcultures and gangs can be well-understood, especially pertaining to correctional and public policy.

The interview model used in this research most closely relates to the interpretive approach toward social knowledge and meaning. Interviews framed for these purposes result in one-to-one casual conversations with the interviewer listening closely to the context of what is being said. The interviewee is treated as a conversational partner rather than an object of research (Rubin, Rubin 1995). The interview is very much like an ordinary conversation, but with more depth and detail. Kahn & Cannell (1957:49) describe in-depth interviewing as "a conversation with a purpose."

All accounts must be interpreted in terms of the context in which they were produced. According to Hammersley & Atkinson (1983:126), "Interview data, like any other, must be interpreted against the background of the context in which they were produced." Interpretations of meanings are made by the social actors, in this case, adolescent females, and by the researcher as well as by the audience reading the final study.

Method and Setting
Establishing rapport with subjects is crucial for this type of study. Rapport enhances the researcher's ability to convey empathy and understanding without judgment, to elicit more truthful responses, and to build detailed answers to questions. Incarcerated young women may feel intimidated that an adult stranger, whom they may perceive negatively as an "authoritarian figure" or an "intruder" in their lives, is asking them personal questions while they are incarcerated. Therefore, it is important to underscore the importance of rapport in this study.

It should be noted that since I was a volunteer at the institution for approximately six months before the study commenced, many of the girls and I had established good rapport, and I believe a certain amount of trust already existed. Volunteers are usually perceived differently than correctional staff and are often thought of as wanting to help a population without monetary compensation or a particular political agenda. It was hoped that the young women recognized and respected this attribute. Furthermore, after some youth were interviewed, it was assumed that other youth would ask them about their experience and about the researcher and that this would help to alleviate potential suspicions. In addition each youth was awarded a certificate of appreciation for participation in the study.

Since in-depth, unstructured interviews are the method used for this research, taking notes while conducting the interview would limit the ability of recording verbatim responses. Moreover, note taking can prove disruptive with the interviewee becoming self-conscious about what is being written down. Taking notes also minimizes the informal nature of the unstructured interview and diminishes eye contact and interactive conversations. Recording interviews increases the validity of data collection, which is systematically transcribed at a later time, allowing the interviewer to be more attentive to each respondent. It was, therefore, essential to use a tape recorder during the interview.
Instead of assigning pseudo-names, each participant in the study has been given an identifying number, i.e., Youth #14, to organize data analysis and to examine differences and similarities among perspectives. Since this research is primarily a qualitative study, numeric accounts and frequencies of perspectives are not calculated quantitatively, with the exception of descriptive demographic information. Rather, categorized responses of thirty-four youth are collectively enumerated through qualitative descriptions based upon the following frequency continuum: none, one, a few, some, several, about half, over half, many, the majority, most, nearly all and all. Arranging responses using this method of analysis permits further understanding of their perspectives both collectively and individually.

The research took place at a juvenile correctional institution in the Southwest, henceforth referred to as SWI\(^1\). By law, if organizations receive federal subsidies, parental/guardian consent is required to study minors. As such, parental consent was needed for this study. According to the supervisory staff at SWI, the best and most common way they reach parents/guardians was through the mail since many of the youth's parents/guardians did not have working telephones. As such, letters were sent to each parent/guardian during a seven-month timeframe, from July 1996 to January 1997. One-hundred-three young women were incarcerated at some point during this study period.

A self-addressed stamped-envelope to the researcher was included in the letter to increase the response rate. If a response or a signed parental consent form was not received within three weeks, a follow-up letter was sent. Of the total 103 letters mailed, four notices from the youths' parents were received indicating that they did not want their daughter to participate in the study. A total of thirty-six signed parental consent forms were returned. Two of these youth had been incarcerated less than a month and were dropped from the study\(^2\). All thirty-four remaining girls were asked to participate in the study. All thirty-four agreed to participate which constitutes the total sample number of youth's interviewed\(^3\). The time length of the interview varied with each individual but ranged from forty-five minutes to over four hours with the average length of time approximately ninety minutes.

One final note on parental consent should be mentioned. Thirty-three percent of the girls incarcerated during the study time-frame were interviewed. I did not find it too surprising that over 60 percent of the parents/guardians did not sign and return the consent form. First, other research has shown that response rates for mailings, especially when the subject matter is sensitive and when the subject is a minor, are low and tend to fall between 10 to 50 percent (see Esbensen, Miller, Taylor et al. 1999; Kearney, Hopkins, Mauss et al. 1983; Miller 1991; Moberg, Piper 1990; Neuman, Wiegand 2000; Severson, Ary 1983). Unfortunately, since parental consent results in lower response rates, this invariably carries over to reduced sample sizes which not only increases the probability of subject selection bias but limits the validity and generalizability of study results (Hollmann, McNamara 1999). Second, I would speculate that many of these parents/guardians were suspect of an unknown "outside researcher" not directly connected to the correctional facility to possibly interview their child about personal issues. Finally, I would also contend that parents/guardians would not want a person to pry further into their child's life by asking a serious of sensitive questions. As such, it is difficult to estimate the effect of such nonresponses to this study's overall findings.

**Data Analysis**

Central to the analysis is gang importation into the institution, how this influenced subculture formation, and if girls joined gangs or continued gang involvement for either importation and/or deprivation reasons. The issue of gangs is addressed in themes according to perceptions of gangs, the extent of gang activity at SWI, if girls in gangs try to recruit non-gang inmates into their gang and the extent to which the latter is accomplished all...
within the framework of inmate subcultures. To keep the study and analysis focused, the analysis highlights only those issues that pertain to inmate subcultures.

### Demographic Information

Of special importance in giving meaning and shaping interpretation of the girls’ voices is to profile some demographic information, i.e., age, race, length of disposition, total time served at interview, and previous geographical residence. Such descriptive information aids in understanding the perspectives of youth. Since this researcher was not allowed access to court or other official records, all data and information collected here are gleaned from the youths themselves.

At SWI youth can be committed up until the age of eighteen. Table 1 illustrates the average age of the youth was 15.4 years with the range from thirteen to seventeen. Only one youth in the study was younger than fourteen. Table 1 indicates the ethnicity of each individual. Fifty-percent of the youth were white, followed by Hispanics (23.5%). The state in which the youth were confined is predominately white, with the largest minority population Hispanic. Hence, these findings tend to mirror the general population.

The length of institutionalization has been found to be related to the formation of inmate subcultures. The table notes the average length of incarceration was approximately nine months with the range from three months to over thirteen. For most of the young women, this was their first time sentenced to SWI. However, four indicated that they had been incarcerated at least one time before the study took place: two indicated that this was their second time at SWI; one said that this was her third time; and one expressed that this was her fourth time. To understand more clearly how the duration of incarceration affects subcultures, the table shows at what time during the sentence the youth were interviewed. As illustrated, over fifty percent of the youth were interviewed within six months of their initial incarceration. Since the average length of sentence was around nine months, these findings are not surprising. Finally, Table 1 also indicates the youth’s geographic residence prior to incarceration. Urban cities are measured by a population of at least 500,000 people. Suburbs and rural towns in the state are also included. Small cities included in the analysis are areas with approximately 40,000 residents. These findings suggest that a large number of youth previously resided in urban areas.

Table 1 profiling females in prison (American Correctional Association 1990; Glick, Neto 1977) have found similar demographic characteristics, especially age and race. However, my study further explores the geographic location of residence before incarceration.

### Gangs at SWI

Analysis of the interview transcripts soon made it clear that a major factor in the girls’ pre-prison experiences was their prior involvement with gangs. Gang af-

---

**Table 1: Demographic Information (n=34)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>8 (23.5%)</td>
<td>9 (26.5%)</td>
<td>8 (23.5%)</td>
<td>8 (23.5%)</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Af.Amer.</th>
<th>Native Am.</th>
<th>Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 (50%)</td>
<td>8 (23.5%)</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
<td>1 (2.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Disposition</th>
<th>3-4 mos.</th>
<th>6-9 mos.</th>
<th>11-12 mos.</th>
<th>13+ mos.</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 (22%)</td>
<td>15 (44%)</td>
<td>9 (26%)</td>
<td>3 (8%)</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Time Served at Interview</th>
<th>1-3 mos.</th>
<th>4-6 mos.</th>
<th>7-9 mos.</th>
<th>10+ mos.</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 (35%)</td>
<td>12 (35%)</td>
<td>6 (18%)</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Residence</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Small City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 (64%)</td>
<td>6 (18%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
filiation was evident among this group of girls with twenty-two of the thirty-four girls indicating that they were involved in gangs before incarceration. In some ways, this seemed to imply that importation, not deprivation, would be a major factor in the development subcultures. However, not all thirty-four girls were members of gangs prior to incarceration. Also, the extent to which subcultures formed in prison based on such gang alliances was further questioned by those young women affiliated with gangs as well as by those not involved with gangs.

Claiming gangs

When a young woman first enters the cottage at SWI, one of the first things that is asked by her peers is, “Where are you from?” As one non gang member noted, “I said that I was from [A City]. But that’s not what they meant” (Youth #6). What the girls mean when they ask this crucial question is, “What gang do you claim?” not which part of the state one is from. One youth stated that “When they [the girls] first come in [to SWI], most of the girls let it be known that they are in a certain gang or not in a certain gang” (Youth #10). Moreover, Youth #4 who is associated with a gang stated that “people asked me when I first got here if I was from a gang and I said ‘no’. But then they asked me who I ‘kicked-back’ with, then I told them.”

Some girls continued claiming their gang at SWI while others do not. As illustrated by Youth #3, “I told them [peers at SWI] I am affiliated with it [gang] but that I stay away from it because it’s not what I want to do with my life.” On the other hand, some still identify with and claim their gang throughout their incarceration because, as illustrated by one youth not involved with gangs, “I think a lot of the girls here want out of their gangs but are afraid of being alone when they do leave here. A lot of the girls need something here to help them out and make them feel wanted” (Youth #22). Claiming the gang may not terminate inside the institution, although, their desire to get out of the gang may subside.

These findings seem to suggest that importation may be a factor in inmate subculture formation in that the girls who are affiliated with gangs bring this identity into the institution. At face, the youth still seem interested in knowing who is or is not a gang member and some still claim their gang, which can be interpreted as part of the importation model.

Based on these perspectives, there appears to be four major reasons why prison gang subcultures are not pervasive at SWI. First, many youth affiliated with gangs “do not want to be a part of the gang anymore” (Youth #4). Another young woman suggested that, “I’m trying to get out of it [gang]. I’m really not into it as much as I was. I am getting out, slowly but surely” (Youth #19). Based on the interviews, nearly all the girls involved with gangs did not want to be part of their gang anymore and their desire subsided before entering SWI. As Youth #22 illustrated, “A lot of the girls try to get out of their gangs in here, try to leave them...when they walked in the door, leave them there and not pick them up when they leave.” Another young woman involved with a gang wanted to get jumped into her gang after release from SWI but was having second thoughts: “The way I see it is a way of getting into more trouble.” (Youth #20). Accordingly, getting jumped into a gang would mean more involvement with other gang members and thus, more trouble. Still another youth articulated that “I quit caring about the gang life. Besides, everybody was getting locked up” (Youth #1). Youth #4 mentioned that she started to lessen her involvement with the gang before coming to SWI because “it got stupid to me. I stopped claiming [the gang] ‘cause I thought the gang groups was starting to get stupid.”

Second, girls affiliated with gangs knew that they would be further sanctioned if indications of gang involvement were present and visible, i.e., claiming their gang, throwing gang signs and talking about their gang. One youth pointed out the dangers of gangs at SWI: “I never throw up my gang sign at the institution ‘cause I know you’d get in trouble. Not only that, but because your gang member
friends aren't in here with you so, they [rival gang members] can throw it back at you” (Youth #8). A third and related reason is that the SWI administration and staff discourages these activities and rules prohibit such behavior. For example, SWI attempts to restrict gangs through forbidding gang signs and requiring girls to wear only certain colors. To illustrate, the girls wear light colored t-shirts, sweatshirts, sweatpants, shorts and identical state-blue jeans. Youth #10 indicated that “that's why we have these peach and yellow shirts 'cause they are so far off from being gang-related [colors].” Similarly, Youth #30 said that, “You can't wear red or blue here. You can’t have nothin’ here red or blue. You can’t even have toothbrushes red or blue.” Similarly, another youth added that, “you can’t even have a blue toothbrush in here. That's how bad it is. When God made colors, I’m sure He didn’t have in mind that it was going to belong to a gang” (Youth #9). The issue of gangs at SWI has, in part, influenced correctional policies by placing additional restrictions on the dress code and having other rules to curtail gangs.

A fourth reason for the lack of core, prison gang subcultures at SWI is there exists an absence of protection or a defined “turf” in such small living quarters. Some youth involved with gangs may be used to a defined turf on the streets. This is related to the final reason why gangs at SWI are not rampant. Since no gang territory at SWI apparently exists, each youth is forced into the same territorial area. They have no choice but to do their time with others surrounding peers and gang life may be further minimized by personal relationships, many of which are non-voluntary. As such, the minimal presence of gangs in prison may be related to structural and ecological factors in the institution downplaying the effect of both importation and deprivation.

Recruitment at SWI

One major question this research intended to address was the issue of gang recruitment at SWI. Do girls affiliated with gangs try to recruit others into their gang, whether this be a young woman not part of a gang or an individual already associated with another gang? By and large, the answer to this was “no.” In the words of Youth #20, “they [gang members at SWI] just mind their own business.” In fact, as illustrated previously, several young women in gangs were either slowly getting out of them before institutionalization or realized that “my gang only got me here” (Youth #1). Therefore, recruiting others into a gang appeared to be minimal, at best.

Youth #8, affiliated with a gang, mentioned that, “There’s pressure to join a gang [on the outside], but there’s no pressure in here. The ones that are not [part of gangs] don’t want to join one.” A young woman not involved in gangs explained that, “They [girls in gangs] don’t want to talk about getting nobody in it. Pretty much, they talk about getting out” (Youth #24). Still another young woman not involved with gangs illuminated that being in a gang is synonymous with violence and drugs: “I didn’t want to be physically involved in drugs. I didn’t want to carry a gun and look behind my shoulder every ten seconds. That’s not my idea of fun. That’s basically how gang life is: do or die” (Youth #7). Furthermore, there are dangers of trying to recruit others into a gang at SWI as illustrated by Youth #26: “People really don’t try to recruit gang members here 'cause they might end up staying longer.” Apparently, there may be sanctions by the institution for trying to recruit gang members and hence, this activity is largely avoided by the young women.

From the various interview responses of both girls affiliated with gangs and those not, it does not appear that gang members try to recruit others into their respective gang. Those who are part of gangs do not try to recruit others into their gang, and those who are not part of gangs do not want to become associated with gangs or gang members. In fact of those young women not affiliated with gangs prior to incarceration, none joined a gang while at SWI. As to how girls in gangs initially became involved on the outside and how this could affect importation, most were not actively
recruited into their gang as they seemed to slowly “fall into” the gang lifestyle.

The same can be said to occur at SWI, as the girls involved with gangs do not actively recruit non-gang members and thus, is an illustration of importation. To further demonstrate this assertion, the girls not part of gangs often believed that a gang was nothing but a bunch of scoundrels. To illustrate, Youth #19 said that, “[A gang] is a bunch of whimps that can’t fight for themselves, so they have to have a whole bunch of people do it for them.” This view was further illustrated by Youth #20: “[Joining a gang] is trying to take the easy way out. It’s a cop-out for life and it’s not gonna get you anywhere.” Youth #6 also believed that gangs were “a bunch of stupid people who go out making their own [family and friends] in the wrong ways. They’re out to prove something and they’re out to have others supposedly love them and have their backing on everything.” Youth #28 suggested that “there’s some reasons why people do join gangs ‘cause they didn’t get the acceptance in their family and they didn’t get the love in their family, that’s understandable. But there’s other ways to get that [besides being in a gang]. You don’t need to go out killing people.” Youth #25 said “I don’t like gangs. I don’t have nothin’ to do with them…I think there is no point to them.”

Thus, the young women imported these views into the institution which can be said to be a major reason they would not join a gang if they were approached with the situation in prison. Youth #5, a gang member, suggested that “The [girls] that are not [in gangs] don’t want to join one” either in prison or when they are released from prison. In this context of importation, there would be no reason why non-gang girls would join a gang while incarcerated. A notable question would be, why would they join? For those involved with gangs, the prison milieu is completely different than what they are used to in the “real” world. These above reasons tend to suggest that deprivation is not the active factor in subculture formation and that in regards to gang recruitment, importation has some explanatory power.

**Gangs as Problems at SWI**

Some youth thought gangs were problematic to institutional life but most did not. Furthermore, their opinions did not appear to be formed based on gang membership. In other words, just as many gang girls and non-gang girls thought that gangs were problematic or not problematic at the institution.

The girls who viewed gangs at SWI as causing many problems gave various reasons. For example, Youth #24 said that, “Gangs are a really big thing in here. A lot of people will use their gang signs to get back at people, to put them down.” One young woman affiliated with a West Side gang indicated that she purposefully avoids initial contact with rival gang members at SWI to avoid any type of conflict: “At the beginning when the new girls get here, I don’t talk to them if they’re from the South Side or from the North Side, especially from the North Side ‘cause man, I don’t get along with them or the South Side at all (Youth #3). More commonly, gangs appear to be problematic on an individual-level. For example, “If two people get into an argument and it’s over something stupid, they’ll bring their gang into it...they’ll throw their gang signs or claim their gang as better” (Youth #19). As such, the girls may try to bring their gangs in for the feeling of being protected or backed-up while incarcerated, an example of importation.

However, others thought that “gang stuff is not used a lot” and that “they usually keep their gangs to themselves.” Many youth responded by saying that the girls who are part of gangs “leave it at the door.” According to one gang member, “I think some of us [gang members] leave the gang stuff at the door.”

What are we supposed to be fighting over? We don’t have a street corner here, although, some girls think that they brought it in their pocket or something” (Youth #4). Youth #2, affiliated with the Crips, explained that, “In here, I get along with the Crips, Bloods and Brown Pride. Now, I’ve had some confrontations with other Bloods [at SWI] but that was no problem.”

This process was reinforced by Youth #24...
who suggested that, “People get along despite their gangs. It really don’t matter.” Youth #13 added that, “Gangs are an issue in here, but not an everyday one.” Similarly, another youth said that, “Gangs are really not a problem here. Everybody hangs out with everybody” (Youth #15).

These findings suggest that most young women, regardless of gang affiliation, did not see gangs as problematic to everyday, institutional living at SWI. However, some believed that gangs can cause trouble on a more micro-level, that is, between two or more people rather than at a macro-level, i.e., the institution. When asked if the gangs were a problem at SWI, most of the girls (both gang members and non-gang members) indicated that gangs at SWI did not pose a serious problem and that the girls in gangs “pretty much keep it to themselves.” Exceptions to this were when a conflict arose between two or more girls and then they started claiming their gang or throwing their gang signs at each other, which can be said to be a product of importation as they brought this type of defense mechanism with them into the institution. Sometimes, the conflicts were based on friendship alliances while other times, they were not.

**Friendships**

Friendships often form through some type of commonality between two or more people. How friendships develop for the incarcerated young women and what form they take, especially in relation to gangs, was examined. One youth said that when she first arrived at SWI, she noticed that “two girls, one’s a Blood and one’s a Crip, are best friends. They’re really, really good friends. And I know two others. One’s a Crip, one’s a Blood, and they’re tight...they’re tight as anything. They don’t care about the gangs” (Youth #4). It appears that even though two or more people are from rival gangs in the community, they tend to often get along at SWI. It may also be the case that rival gang members become friends because they have a common bond of gang affiliation. For example, Youth #2 said “I see a lot of Crips talking to Bloods and a lot of Bloods talking to Crips and a lot of Bloods and Crips talking to the Mexican, Brown Pride gangs. It don’t really matter in here. We really don’t get into fights about it like we would on-the-outs.” It appears that some girls in gangs click together even though they may be from different or even rival gangs, and as Youth #31 noted: “Despite their gang differences on-the-outs, they come together real close.” The young women seem to form some degree of friendships in spite of being from different or rival gangs and in spite of being of different races. Since the youth reside and work in small areas at SWI, they often form friendships based on whom they have regular contact with.

Thus in these cases, importation does not appear to be a major factor in inmate subculture formation, particularly relating to gangs. This could be due, in part, to the fact that while incarcerated, they do not have much of a choice on whom to befriend. Since the youth live in small living quarters, have three to four roommates and work with other peers, they often are “thrown into” establishing some type of relationship with other peers. While many of the young women were affiliated with gangs before incarceration, this did not appear to have much impact on how they adapted to institutional life. They either wanted to quit the gang or their previous gang affiliation had little impact on the friendships that were made. Thus, the ways girls formed friendships were based on easing the pains of imprisonment or the deprivation model.

**Treatment and Punishment**

This study proposed to briefly examine if the type of institution (i.e., treatment or punishment) would have any bearing on inmate subcultures, as gleaned from the voices of the young women. Opinions were mixed and some thought SWI practiced both punishment and treatment elements. However, overwhelmingly most believed that SWI was more interested in discipline rather than treatment and/or punishment. “I really don’t see it [SWI] as punishment ‘cause I see it more as discipline” (Youth #10). As a matter of fact, Youth #19 indicated that, “I enjoy the discipline here.” By this, she alluded to the
strict schedule and structure at SWI something previously not noted in her life. And another youth added that, “In here we learn how to be structured” (Youth #3).

On the issue of treatment, Youth #3 suggested that “this is more of a treatment place than jail ‘cause we do groups and stuff and gotta be positive.” Another agreed and indicated that “this place is more like treatment, about issues that you have, if you like, have a drug problem and stuff like that” (Youth #33). Furthermore, one young woman suggested that the group sessions “make you think about what you’ve done that’s wrong and how you can improve” (Youth #9).

Still others believed that treatment was in the form of not only groups but also education, as the young women were required to go to school several hours per day unless they received their GED. Others explained that SWI is treatment if one makes it out to be that way. To illustrate, “I feel it’s a place...if you want to have treatment and if you want to change yourself. The girls that don’t want to change themselves, it’s not treatment at all. It’s just a place to do your time” (Youth #32). Youth #24 agreed: “You get out of this place what you put into it, pretty much.”

Many viewed SWI as a place of punishment and a place to do time. To illustrate, Youth #18 said that, “I think it’s punishment being behind these walls, you know.” Another young woman believed that “this is real punishment because having my freedom is gone” (Youth #28). One young woman expressed that “I think it’s a place of punishment ‘cause you’re not able to go home and do what you want” (Youth #22). Another youth (Youth #27) described her thoughts on punishment in great detail:

*I think it’s punishment for the crimes I have done in the past. But, I mean, when you do something wrong in here, you don’t get punished. I mean, you get punished; you go to separation or something like that. But you don’t get like, five months added on. You don’t get too much taken away from you when you do something wrong. And I think that should happen. That way it might stop you from doing something wrong again.*

This particular individual believed if punishment at SWI was implemented fully, it could possibly act as a deterrent to future misbehavior.

Another youth described that, “I feel it’s punishment...we get absolutely no treatment here. So, I basically feel like our line-movements is more important than our learning how to stay off drugs and getting our act together and figuring out what we want to do with our lives” (Youth #4). As such, this particular individual believed that treatment was virtually non-existent at SWI and that the institution stressed other issues which were not treatment-oriented. Similarly, Youth #7 suggested that, “I think it’s more punishment and it all revolves around punishment. We have a point-system here and they tally down mostly the bad things you do, but not the good things.” And Youth #34 suggested that, “I look at this place sometimes and I just laugh. I mean, I’ve only talked to a psychologist once since I’ve been here [five months].”

From the voices of the youth, it appears that SWI has both treatment and punishment elements with variations based on individual responses. However, many young women indicated that SWI is a place of discipline, rather than punishment, and that it does offer some programs and treatment services. Accordingly, whether or not SWI was treatment or punishment depended upon the attitude of the individual and what she made of the incarceration experience. As such, views were individualized depending upon the perspective of each inmate. I did not find any congruent perspectives on this issue.

Subculture Formation at SWI

The inmate subculture at SWI that does exist may be explained by the time spent at SWI (with an average of nine months), which may not be long enough for distinct, intense and different subcultures to develop. At the time of the interviews, the young women had been incarcerated for an average of 5.4 months. Wheeler (1961) notes that when inmates become aware of
their imminent release, their reference group orientation shifts from within the walls to outside of the walls. This anticipatory socialization illustrates that the youth may not need to make as many adjustments or compensations to prison life knowing that they will soon be released which appears to be the case for many young women at SWI.

Since most studies of prison gangs have been based on adult males, whose sentences are generally longer, prison gangs for young, female inmates may not be omnipresent. These young women may not be sentenced long enough to feel as if they need to join or form a gang and thus, the deprivation model may not be suitable for this particular phenomenon.

It seems as if many youth view SWI as a place of discipline and not necessarily treatment or punishment. On a custody-treatment continuum, SWI leans toward treatment in the types of services actually provided. Many hours are spent in group sessions, thereby employing a type of “therapeutic community” within the institution. Therefore, both the amount of time spent in the institution and the level of custody-treatment influence the extent of inmate subcultures. In this study, the average sentence length was nine months. As such, both the minimal time spent at the institution and the “treatment” characteristics of the institution may help explain the nature and extent of the inmate subculture at SWI. It appears as if most young women want to avoid trouble, finish their sentence and get out as quickly as possible and affiliating with gangs would hinder such goals.

Conclusion

A limited amount of empirical research exists on the nature and extent of inmate gangs, let alone female, juvenile prison gangs. This research examined the issue of gangs through a case study involving in-depth interviews of thirty-four incarcerated young women. The interviewing methodology was fitting for this study since it examined perspectives in context, lessened objectivity of the subject-researcher role (Rubin, Rubin 1995) and gave the young women a public voice. This study of a relatively unknown area of investigation began with no pre-defined hypotheses, and the topics, themes and data analysis evolved throughout the research process. Originally, the study planned to examine generally the deprivation and importation models of institutional life. However, after interviewing several youth, it incrementally became apparent that the issues of gangs and peer relationships were extensive. Thus, after analyzing the interview notes, I decided to focus almost exclusively on these two issues and how they relate to the extent of inmate subculture formation. This research examined the extent to which gangs account for the development of inmate subcultures of female youth using the deprivation and importation models.

A major conclusion of this study is that even though twenty-two youth were affiliated with gangs prior to incarceration, most of these young women indicated they no longer desired to be associated with gangs. Many youth involved with gangs appeared to leave their gangs “at the door” and did not want to become involved with them at SWI or upon release. Moreover the majority of females associated with gangs were slowly lessening their activities and contacts with the gang prior to incarceration. Thus, all of these reasons can be said to be a function of the importation model.

Even though over half the inmates were affiliated with gangs, they did not try to recruit non-gang member inmates. Those not affiliated with gangs had virtually no interested in gang life before or during incarceration. None of these women joined gangs while at SWI. The incarcerated young women not part of gangs were even more turned-off by gang life, partly as a result of being incarcerated with many girls who were affiliated with them. These women learned about gang-life in explicit detail by hearing stories of those affiliated with gangs and through living in such close proximity to each other. In the eyes of one youth, “the more people you know, the more people you talk to, the more you get into trouble. The more you stay to
you yourself, the better off you will be" (Youth #10). These findings support the importation model since while in society, those involved in gangs were not actively recruited themselves. Furthermore, the youth not affiliated with gangs had no desire of being involved with gangs while in society or while incarcerated and as such, could be an illustration of importation.

Nevertheless, this could also be interpreted through deprivation in that girls associated with gangs may not recruit non-gang members due to fear of being further sanctioned by the staff at the institution. Most young women appeared to simply be “sitting out” or merely waiting for their sentence to end and thus, did not really form distinct gang subcultures. As Youth #1 illustrated, “I just want to get out [of SWI].” Many youth tried to avoid trouble, find activities to fill their days, make limited friendships and do what they thought was necessary to survive so they could get out as soon as possible. Since several youth indicated that they just wanted to “do their time and get out,” this finding was not surprising.

A limitation of this research was that it did not adequately address the extent of the young woman’s affiliation or how strong her ties were to the male gang. It could be hypothesized that the more involved they were with the gang or if they were actually a gang member, that they would be more inclined to bring these bonds into the prison and not be as hasty to forget about their prior gang life, especially as the gang relates to whom they befriended.

In society friendships are often formed by some type of common bond that attracts two or more people together. Friendships of incarcerated girls appear to form in a similar way. Those who are affiliated with gangs often develop friendships with those who are also associated with gangs, including rival gangs, as this was the “type” of friendships they made while in society. This context suggests the importance that importation has in the development of friendships along “gang” lines.

This study found both deprivation and importation influential in the development of inmate subcultures at SWI, depending upon the contextual question at hand. However, the importation model appeared to have more influence on the nature and extent of subculture formation particularly relating to gangs. Such findings do not support previous research on inmate subcultures of female youth (Otis 1913; Ford 1929; Selling 1931; Kosofsky, Ellis 1958; Halleck, Hersko 1962; Konopka 1966; Giallombardo 1974; Carter 1981; Propper 1981). One reason may be that SWI is a vastly different context from other sites that theories were founded upon; another reason is that the few previous studies based on female juvenile inmates were done decades ago when the social roles of female youth were different than in contemporary society; yet another important conclusion is that the length of stay at SWI may be too short for subcultures to mature and develop. Studies have found that the more time an inmate spends in prison and custody-level institutions, the greater the inmate’s antisocial attitudes, and hence, the greater the prisoner subculture (McConvile 1985; Wheeler 1961). It may be that this group of youth, and other juvenile correctional populations serving time, are not committed long enough for any type of formal or distinct subcultures to mature, particularly relating to gangs.

The principal adaptation technique in this study appears to be doing time and avoiding trouble. The young women want to stay out of trouble so they can do their time to get out as quickly as possible. This seems to be the motivating force behind their efforts of conformity and adaptation to prison life. Therefore, new subculture concepts need to be developed or refined for other prison contexts, especially for juveniles often serving shorter sentences than adults. As such, this study concludes that gangs for these young women at SWI have limited influence on adaptation strategies and subculture development.

This study not only is significant to understand the context of subcultures and gangs but also to realize how such responses can affect policy. Correctional and public policy is frequently developed without going to the source for answers.
(Petersen 2000; 1995). As such, this is antithetical to democracy. Ordinary citizens, such as gang members and young offenders, are not often involved in the policy process, yet they are the ones toward whom policy is directed. “The end result is detrimental for youths and ultimately to society, in that people without power often become more alienated from democracy without further ‘buying into’ society” (Petersen 1995:648). It is, therefore, crucial to look at the ones most affected by criminal and/or juvenile justice policies, i.e., young offenders and gang members, to not only ask them their input but for them to have a meaningful effect on the way policies are framed.

By giving these thirty-four women a voice, it is hoped that this can lead to empathetic understanding to impact the direction of future policies. The findings of this research could enlighten policymakers with clearer understandings of the nature and extent of gangs in prison which could provide the basic tools necessary to conceptualize and develop gang programs both in prison and in the larger society.

A final note on parental consent

Legal and ethical standards require parental consent if the subjects of research are less than eighteen years old. It has been well-documented that parental consent reduces sample size. Moreover, I would argue that parental consent further reduces the sample size of youth who are part of the juvenile or criminal justice system and who are asked to participate voluntarily in a study normally conducted outside the purview of the system, i.e., university-based research, even if advocated by the justice system.

I contend that a major motivation behind refusal of their son/daughter to participate in such study is due to emotional distress that the interview questions, often of a sensitive nature, may inflict upon their child. The parents may perceive that their son/daughter has already “been through enough” and may want to minimize any type of further anguish. Another almost equally valid reason rests on the issue of trust. The parent(s) do not know the person directing the research or conducting the interview. They may have doubts as to the real nature of the study and if the researchers will positively keep their child’s name confidential or anonymous. They are suspect of the entire study.

The research environment with adolescents is not “user friendly” especially for incarcerated youth and female adolescents. Getting parents to read the consent form, “buy into” the study, sign the form and return the form is an arduous process. This should not halt researchers from trying to study youth but this is a fact and something that appears not to change anytime in the near future.
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**Notes**

1 It was agreed by both the author and the correctional institution that SWI would be the pseudo-name used for the study.

2 The rationale behind dropping these two from the study was based on the premise that since they had only been incarcerated a few days or weeks, their insight into subculture formation, reactions to confinement and friendship development would be naive and incomplete.

3 Demographic information of the sixty-nine non-participants was either not available to this researcher nor incomplete and therefore, not included.

4 Lack of official data/records and reliance solely on self-reporting may reduce the credibility of findings. However, not only was I restricted from obtaining their official records but the purpose of this study was to obtain information about gangs and subcultures, often not known in official records, from the actual participants to parallel the methodology of interpretivism and Verstehen.

5 This particular individual was seventeen years old and indicated that in each of the three previous times she was incarcerated, she was confined to SWI each time for approximately one week.

6 After interviewing several young women, it became apparent that there were “official” girl gang members (i.e., those who had been “jumped in” to a gang) and those involved/affiliated with gangs (those who “hung out” with gang members or who had friends/close relatives in a gang) but who were not formally initiated into a gang.

7 In this context, a “problem” could mean something to them personally, to their peers or to institutional life. Each youth responded to this in various forms of what she defined and perceived as a problem.

---
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Abstract

In recent years, American communities have witnessed an increase in school violence. While violence in schools is not a new phenomenon, the extremity of acts committed by youths is. Researchers from various disciplines have attempted to find the root cause of youth violence in general. Several factors ranging from individual to cultural have been suggested as being strong predictors of youth violence. Still, there is paucity in research documenting the variable differences between diverse ethnic groups. This paper evaluated whether differences in school violence predictors exist among different adolescent ethnic groups. We decided to focus on adolescents/youths due to the recent school crimes committed by individuals belonging to such groups. Through an extensive literature search, the authors present the reader with a vignette of school violence today. Lastly, we provide policy recommendations for combating this social ill.

Introduction

Violence in the United States

Each year, more than 50,000 people die in the United States as a result of violent acts (Rosenberg & Mercy, 1991). Homicide is the fourth leading cause of death for children between the ages of 1 and 14, and it ranks second for youths between the ages of 15 to 24 (Baker et al., 1992). Among African-Americans 15 to 34 years of age, it is the leading cause of death (Baker et al., 1992). In contrast, among white youth in this age group, the leading cause of death are motor vehicle accidents (National Center for Health Statistics, 1994). The majority of homicides, with estimates ranging from 40 to 60 percent, occur between people who know each other (Rosenberg & Mercy, 1991; Weiss, 1994).

Other factors, such as alcohol and other drugs are believed to be contributing factors in escalating anger and homicide (Reiss & Roth, 1993). The role of firearms, particularly handguns, in these deaths is significant. Increasing homicide rates parallel the increasing availability of firearms (Wintemute, 1994). Rates of homicide are higher in underserved, impoverished communities (Weiss, 1993). One study that examined injury rates by race, ethnicity and poverty found that when the racial and ethnic groups were held constant, the same communities remained at risk for violence, suggesting that poverty may play an important role (Chang, Weiss, & Yuan, 1992).

Firearm Violence in the United States

On an average day in the United States, one child dies from an unintentional shooting. Accidental shootings are the third leading cause of death for 10 to 29-yr-olds and the fifth leading cause of death for children from 1 to 15 years of age. Some 50% of all unintentional child shootings occur in the victims' homes, and an additional 40% occur in the homes of friends and relatives (Smith & Larman, 1988; Wintmute et al. 1987). In many parts of the United States, suicide rates exceed homicide rates. In 1991, 48% of the total 38,317 firearms-related deaths nationwide were classified as suicides; that proportion was found again in 1992 (Fingerhut, 1994). However, in many urban areas such as Los Angeles, deaths caused by interpersonal violence exceed those caused by self-inflicted wounds (Cervantes, Padilla & Salgado de Snyder, 1991; Hamburg, 1998). The common element in both these types of violence is the availability of firearms: In the case of suicide, a gun can escalate ideation into fatal reality; in the case of homicide, a gun can escalate an argument into a fatal outcome.

Relationship between Drug use and Criminality and Violence

Recent research indicate that the high rate of violent criminal behavior found in inner-city African-American (Sickmund, Snyder & Poe-Yamagata, 1997) and Hispanic communities (Mata & Valdez 1996)
is either directly related to alcohol and illicit drug use and the illicit drug distribution networks, or due to drug-related gang activities. A recent study of serious delinquent youths (youths 14 to 17 who committed a minimum of 10 felonies or 100 misdemeanor crimes over past 12 months) found that Hispanic males were much more likely than all others in the sample to prefer using cocaine and marijuana to other drugs (Sickmund et al. 1997).

**Prevalence of School Violence**

In a report conducted by the Center for Disease Control (1993), it was concluded that rates of youth homicide and suicide have doubled over the past decade. The U.S. Department of Justice has reported that during 1993 and 1998 violent crime rates fell 27%, from 50 to 37 per 1,000 persons age 12 or older and that in 1998, males were victimized at significantly higher rates than females, and blacks were victimized at somewhat higher rates than whites. Non-Hispanics and Hispanics were victimized at about the same rate. While this information is not school specific, it gives us an inclination to the social conditions of the general population. More importantly it points out an interesting juxtaposition: If violent crimes are decreasing in the general populous why have we witnessed an increase in violent crimes in our schools (Cantelon & LeBoeuf, 1997)?

Findings from the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) suggest that in 1994, U.S. residents age 12 or older experienced more than 42 million crimes: about 11 million violent victimizations and 31 million property crimes. Violent crimes (as defined by the NCVS) include rape and sexual assault, robbery, and both aggravated and simple assault and homicide (from crimes reported to the police). More recent data indicate that black and white students have similar chances of being victimized in or around their school (U.S. Department of Education, 1995). Although the rates of victimization are similar across ethnic lines, it is important to note, however, that when asked about "[Being] threatened with a weapon", black and white students reported incidence rates of 23.5% and 13.8%, respectively. From these statistics it is clear that black students are more prone to experience and/or witness violence in their schools and communities. Interestingly, this is despite the fact that 78% of the same schools in this study reported having some sort of violence prevention or violence reduction programs.

A similar survey (CDC, 1993) suggested that African-American high school aged youth had the highest one-month incidence rate of physical fighting (31 per 100,000) followed by Latino (22) and Non-Hispanic white youth. The higher rates of school violence have been reported in public schools--where a majority of the students are of a lower socioeconomic status--rather than in private and parochial schools. It is interesting to note that while the authors of a similar study (APA, 1991) concluded that students of all races were victimized about the same amount at their schools, the data in the survey reveal a number of cultural factors that may help to better understand school violence. Having reviewed general trends associated with community and school violence, we will now review the available research on our four areas of focus: Family, Individual, Cultural, and School influences. First, however, we provide the reader with a brief background on two national school studies aimed at detecting and eliminating violence in schools.

**Review of School Violence Literature**

Even with the negative impact that violence in schools causes on the psyche and well being of a person--especially school aged children--there is still a lack of major research studies focusing on this epidemic. For instance, the last legislatively-mandated study on school violence was conducted over two decades ago. Congress, as a response to the violence in American schools, mandated the Safe Schools Study (1978) conducted by the National Institute of Education (NIE). The study conducted by the NIE included three phases of data collection. Phase I included 31,373 students, 23,890 teachers, and 15,894 principals. In this phase, each participant completed a mailed-out questionnaire. Phase II consisted of on-site data collection (field surveys and interviews) completed by a total sample of 642 junior
and senior high school students. In Phase III, ten schools were selected as focus groups to examine the reduction of violence and disruption vis-à-vis school personnel.

As summarized by Bybee and Gee in Violence, Values, and Justice in the Schools the three major findings were as follows: 1) there was a clear indication that violence in schools had escalated over the past thirty years, 2) the risk of violence to youth is greater in schools than elsewhere when the amount of time spent in schools is taken into account, and 3) eight percent of school principals reported that violence and disruption were a serious problem in American schools. While this was a major study on school violence, it lacked a focus on differentiating between minority groups as perpetrators and victims as well as including contributors to school violence.

Scholars differ on the root cause of school violence. Some argue that school violence should be examined through a community context because school violence is an indicator of the problems experienced by the larger social group (Menacker et al., 1990). Increases in the rates of violent and aggressive acts by youth generally are likely to be reflected in and around the school yard since this is where most youths spend a large percentage of their day. If this were true then how could we explain the drop and increase of violent crimes in general and those in school, respectively.

Statement of the Problem

While the country has been conscious of violence present in our nation's inner city schools, the recent school based tragedies in California, Oregon, Colorado, Kentucky, Mississippi and Oklahoma has expanded this concern and calls for measured responses and responsive action. For school age parents and their families, these events have challenged them to view these settings as danger zones (Singer, Anglin, Song & Lunghofer, 1995; Gargarino, Dubrow, Kostelny & Pardo, 1992; Hamburg, 1998). As school violence incidents arise, spread and escalate, teachers and students alike become wary of schools, if not fear for their safety and well being.

(Sickmund et al., 1997; Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1995; Samples & Aber, 1998).

This paper will attempt to shed some light on the social and cultural issues associated with school violence. It is our hope that this review will propagate further inquiry, and debate regarding this matter toward the ultimate goal of preventing school violence. In our ever more culturally diverse society, it is imperative that those involved in working toward prevention of school violence understand the cultural implications associated with such an issue.

For the purpose of the following research, we operationally define school violence as acts including, but not limited to, assault, battery, bullying, threats of force, hazing, gang activity, and murder. While various factors have been correlated with youth engaged in violent acts, there has been little or no research on the differences and/or similarities that such factors have on different groups of youths. Of particular interest to the authors are the following questions: “Are there specific predispositions for particular ethnic groups?” “What role does culture play in violent actions by youth?” We will focus on four predictors of school violence: the individual, the family, school, and culture.

Factors Contributing to Violence

An Overview

The American Psychological Association Commission on Violence and Youth (1991) summarized the existing literature on risk factors for youth violence. Included among its developmental antecedents were biological factors, child rearing conditions, ineffective parenting, emotional and cognitive development, child temperament, gender differences, and relations with peers. Some of the environmental factors include poverty, unemployment, discrimination, substance abuse, availability of guns, and the media. Again, however, there is a lack of comparison on the degree of influence that these risk factors have on the violent action itself and on the perpetrator based on his/her ethnic membership.

Individual Influences
The American Psychological Association in 1991 conducted one of the major studies on violence and youth. *Psychology's Response* was the first volume of a summary report to focus on violence and youth. While extensive in its research and documentation of youth violence it did not take a multi-disciplinary approach on the causes and effects of youth violence. Instead, it focused on psychology. Cognitive and emotional development are by far guiding forces in the field of psychology. This study described youth violence as a possible result of cognitive deficits. For instance, it was argued that children with Attention Deficit Hyperactive Disorder (ADHD) are predisposed to violent behaviors when the disorder is accompanied by other factors. This study also discussed the higher propensity rate that students with mental or physical handicaps have for being victims of violence.

With regard to physical and/or mental disabilities, such children were classified as part of vulnerable populations (others including gay and lesbian youth as well as girls and young women). According to the American Psychological Association Commission on Violence and Youth, youth with mental and/or physical capabilities are vulnerable because of the characteristics involving their particular living situation.

According to the Centers for Disease Control, from 1991-1997, risk behaviors involving drug use increased from 23.3% in 1991 to 37.5% in 1997. Again, this is critical information in serving our young adults, however, there is paucity in data, which explains the relationship between ATODA use and engaging in violence. The connection that can be made is that feelings of inadequacy may lead to increased drug use.

The research on individual risk factors (specifically genetic, cognitive, and emotional) must expand in order to address multicultural needs and assessment of services if we seek to put an end to youth violence. This is most timely considering the documented emotional problems that several youths involved in recent school tragedies presented to mental health, school or court officials. A first step towards this would also include the dynamic needs of diverse populations.

Psychosocial variables have been studied to disengage from what Dembo and colleagues (1998) describe as “linear type” representations of complex relationships among multiple factors. Using data on approximately 4000 Anglo, Hispanic, and African-American male youths processed in a Florida state Juvenile Assessment Center, Dembo and colleagues (1998) conducted a study on psychosocial, delinquency, and substance abuse patterns among these youths. The authors sought to provide a more holistic approach to explaining the interaction of multiple variables. A combination of emotional/psychosocial (dys)function and environmental settings were combined in their analysis of the 4000 youths. Relative deviance, the dynamics of social and behavioral responses to different settings, was used as the prime theory generating this empirical study on three groups of youths.

The data for this sample were collected from the processing facility, Juvenile Assessment Center (JAC), in Tampa, Florida. The facility’s task is to process truant and arrested youths. In regard to assessments conducted in the center, youths undergo a preliminary screening to detect potential problems ranging from drug use/abuse, mental health status, and physical health status. The Problem Oriented Screening Instrument for Teenagers (POSIT) is used as an indicator of potential problem areas (Dembo et. al. 1998). The sample for this study consisted of 1,670 Anglo, 568 Hispanic, and 1,861 African American males between 12 and 19 years of age. While the study focused on several demographic items (e.g. educational characteristics, arrest charges, referral history, etc.) for the purpose of this paper, not all findings from the discriminant analysis were presented.

When examining the youth’s dependency history, a strong relationship was found with subsequent involvement in delinquent behavior. In other words, drug use/abuse for this sample predicted engagement in delinquent or criminal behavior. Ethnic differences also arose in the
analysis of data. For instance, the authors report that compared to other youths, Hispanics reported lower mental health and substance misuse rates, had fewer arrest charges for drug felonies, and had higher average age than Anglo youth, had lower rates of detention for property, violence, to name a few findings.

In sum, this study replicates others focused on relative deviance. For instance results showed that African-American males tended to live in more economically distressed environments and have higher rates than the other delinquent youth thus placing these youths at higher risk of participating in illegal and deviant activity. Echoing past research, findings for Anglo youths indicated that they suffer more behavioral problems than African-American youth in this study.

When analyzing educational levels and placement, Hispanic youths exhibited the highest rate of academic difficulties. Most Hispanic youths were held back one or more grades in school. What is important to note here is that these findings have implications for the treatment and service of these youths. This is especially true in light of the recent school violence trends. Effective services must identify each youth's problem area, regardless of ethnicity, in order to provide an appropriate delivery of services. If environmental conditions are high predictors of criminal activity and violent acts, then policy must change adverse conditions in many of America's neighborhoods.

Another aspect of youth violence that has gained much attention in recent studies has been that of predisposed intrinsic pathology. While the norm has been to look at family patterns and rules as well as external variables (e.g. poverty, discrimination, SES), some scholars believe that some individuals are predisposed to become delinquent and criminal as a result of intrinsic disorders (e.g. mood disorders, post traumatic stress disorder, etc.)

Steiner et al. (1999) examined the relationship between personality traits and criminal behavior in a sample of 481 incarcerated males. A sub sample of 148 youths was tracked for approximately 4.5 years after release. Examination of this sample focused on follow-up data consisting of rearrests rates and time out of prison from last incarceration date. The results of this study showed that individuals' personality traits, for this sample, predicted not only past criminal activity but also the potential for future criminal activity. Predictive patterns were significant even when controlled for highly reliable variables such as age at incarceration and previous arrests. It was found that juveniles who display low levels of restraint are more likely to have committed more prior offenses, and they also receive more intrainstitutional punishments than other groups. Those juveniles who displayed lower levels of restraint and distress are also more likely to be rearrested after release compared to other individuals displaying different levels of distress and restraint. Finally, the subgroup with high restraint was more likely to report distress but be less involved in serious crimes than others in the sub sample. While the sample and subsample were diverse in composition, it is quite interesting that ethnic differences were not found in diagnostic status, previous offense, or committing offenses.

Steiner and colleagues suggest that if personality traits predispose some to engage in criminal activity, both restraint and distress are high predictors of such behavior (Steiner et. al., 1999). In regard to policy, it is quite clear that delinquents are a homogeneous group deserving of needs that are significantly diverse. The approach to delinquent youth, from this perspective, should be one consisting of a typology match. The authors suggest that when referring a juvenile to a program or when assessing him/her for release, distress and restraint levels should be used as predictors of reoffense potential as well as degree of crime. Unfortunately, the data were only based on male juveniles in the CYA system.

School Influences

Bybee and Gee (1982) identified numerous aspects of the schools that can place students at risk of violence. Grades, reward structure, relevance of the curriculum, decision-making, size and impersonality (e.g., alienation of students), and
A teacher’s belief system and behavior were some of the factors that were described in their article.

A teacher’s perception of a student or group of students can greatly impact student school attachment as well as their academic performance. Teacher expectations and perceptions can elicit, from the person, behaviors that confirm the perceivers’ original beliefs. In essence, there is a sense of disrespect or devaluing of the students’ culture in the school setting. Students whose patterns of behavior do not match those of the educational institution are often erroneously classified as deficient and incompetent. Students are often placed according to their performance on standardized tests—this could become problematic. Unfortunately, these students are rarely retested and continue their education in either remedial courses or courses that do not interest them.

Curriculum

A minority student who is from a different culture may be placed at risk for various difficulties (behavioral problems) if the curriculum in his or her school is not culturally relevant. One clear example is when American Indian children are taught in school that Christopher Columbus “discovered” America. A study by the National Institute of Education (1978) confirmed that in those schools where the students felt they were being taught what they did not want to learn a higher incidence of violence occurred. While efforts are being made to detrack school systems there is no doubt that students are cognizant of their role in school. Minority students are often disenfranchised and placed in lower level courses. Being cognizant of such inequity, students may feel that school is useless, irrelevant and discriminatory towards them, so a way to counter this is by disobeying school rules and authority.

Gangs in Schools

The previously described School Crime Report (APA, 1991) added to what was known in recent times about the connection between school crime and gangs. Approximately 15% of students surveyed reported the presence of gangs in their schools. Not surprising, these same 15% of students are more likely to be victims of school violence than those who did not report existence of gangs in their schools. Additionally, students that reported existence of gangs in their schools were twice as likely to be afraid of attacks both at, to, and from school.

Here too, racial and cultural issues are relevant. The same School Crime report indicated that a higher percentage of black students (20%) reported gangs in their schools than white students (14%). Also, Hispanic students than non-Hispanics (32% versus 14%) reported higher percentages of gangs in schools. The number of Asian and Pacific Islander gangs have also grown quite rapidly in recent years. Noticing that gangs tend to be formed around racial and ethnic lines we should be weary of the racial tension that may intensify violence in schools.

The presence of hate crimes in schools has taken many by surprise. More surprising have been the rates of such crimes in some of America’s most diverse cities. In 1989 the Los Angeles public schools reported having had incidences of hate crimes (Curcio & First, 1993). Such crimes included racial slurs, graffiti, and physical confrontations. In a Midwest high school shooting it was reported the perpetrators intentionally shot and killed a classmate because of his ethnicity. These incidents occur across the country in any neighborhood.

It is very important to recognize that violence occurring on the school yard must be understood and addressed within the context of multiple systems, including local and national political institutions, law enforcement, schools, the faith community, and the family. Prevention efforts that involve multiple community institutions have typically been found to have the strongest positive outcomes (Centers for Disease Control, 1993; Pentz, 1983). School violence like other types of community-wide violence cannot be treated in isolation and must be understood as a manifestation of the frustration and hopelessness confronting many urban youth today. Excessive unemployment or under
Employment, few available educational opportunities, racial and ethnic tension, as well as institutionalized racism are cumulative stressors that confront many inner-city residents and which result in violence and other high-risk behaviors. Violence among school age children and adolescents in many instances must also be understood in the context of learned behavior, which is adaptive. Given the numerous survival stressors and demands facing inner city and urban youth (Cervantes, 1992) the need to link and understand background, social worlds, networks and dynamics of these youth social lives to school violence is essential.

Cultural Influences

Aside from previously addressed societal and individual stressors such as restraint, poverty and discrimination, there are a number of other stressors that are experienced by ethnic minority students in the schools that may place them at risk of violence.

While it is true that in general, immigrant youth and their parents have high educational aspirations, the process of acculturation may pose a barrier to the academic performance of immigrant and other minority students. In addition, these youths can experience significant distress when their cultural beliefs, customs, and mores are at odds with the mainstream culture. An example of such discrepancy is evidenced in many immigrant families where the children are raised in the mainstream culture. Family conflicts and disruptions arise as the child’s level of acculturation to the host culture is in conflict with the parents’ level of acculturation. Even if the child does not experience child abuse, the distress of such intergenerational and cultural conflict can be overwhelming to put such a child at risk of problematic behaviors including violence.

The Family

The family, the main socializing agent in a person’s life, has often been blamed for the dysfunction of individuals. Though family violence research has focused on domestic violence between parents, it would be erroneous to dismiss the fact that adolescent-to-parent violence exists in American households. Brezina (1999) analyzed data from a previous longitudinal study that focused on the aggression exhibited by male youths as an instrumental function—a response to experienced abuse. Two theories, strain theory and social learning theory, were the driving forces in the longitudinal study. The first theory contends that delinquency represents a means by which youths attempt to cope with various sources of environmental adversity (Brezina, 1999). The latter focuses on the process of learning and reinforcement that are said to shape and sustain aggressive behavior, especially in the context of certain family dynamics (Brezina, 1999). In sum the results from this study indicate that physical aggression from parent-to-adolescent is more prone to generate an aggressive reaction by the youth according to this study. One of the major reasons why adolescents hit their parents is as a means of averting parental abuse. In other words, while parental aggression leads to aggression by the child, child aggression toward the parent averts parental abuse (Pinto, Ramos & Mata, 1997).

In regard to schools, violent youth actions—regardless of extreme—may in fact be a response to continued abuse on the part of teachers, administrators, or fellow students. Teri Randall also studied youth violence as a learned behavior. Statistics from the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect indicate that adolescents have disproportionately high rates of child abuse. Randall discovered that interfamilial violence (e.g. parent-to-parent and sibling-to-sibling) is not only rampant but also widely accepted. Randall noted that violence against peers was accepted at higher percentages than violence between married couples. The use of force against a peer was approved for reasons ranging from embarrassment caused by the victim to the perpetrator, for wrecking a car, to defend one’s “turf” or clique, and if a slur had been made against the perpetrator’s parents.

Another study focusing on family abuse as an indicator of youth violence is that of Darby and colleagues (1998). In their study of 112 juveniles they tested the hy-
hypothesis that states that there is a strong relationship between parental dysfunction/abuse and juvenile homicide. Researchers have suggested that violent adolescents are people with violent, aggressive, inconsistent, and abusive environments and probably have been victims of parental violence (Truscott, 1992).

Results from this study parallel previous studies on what Cormier (1978) coined as the “lockage” phenomenon. This theory postulates that adolescents in extremely dysfunctional and chaotic families may react to intense pressure via homicide or suicide. If suicide, for instance, is not achieved, the aggression and/or stress may be relieved through homicidal acts. Such extreme acts are a means of detaching him/herself from the family or dysfunctional entity. Often times, the “main” abuser may be the juveniles’ target. For instance 9.8% of the victims were the assailant’s family members. In some, however, the adolescent may retreat to a safer target such as a classmate, a stranger, or another family member. In this study it is important to note that a high percentage of these juveniles (99%) exhibited mental health problems ranging from learning disabilities to suicidal ideation. Again we see a pattern of youth reacting to their abuser. What is quite interesting about these findings is the fact that the aggression that these adolescents carried had to be released through indiscriminant violence where anyone became a potential target. Culturally Relevant Prevention Strategies

As mentioned previously, and emphasized in a recent report published by the Centers for Disease Control, prevention of youth violence must involve multiple strategies that engage the child, his/her family, the schools and the community. Prevention services must always be developed and provided in a fashion that meets the cultural and linguistic characteristics of targeted youth, families and communities. Prevention activities that are aimed to include multiple sectors of the community have been found to have the strongest effects. The Centers for Disease Control recently provided a list of violence prevention recommendations that were based upon successful community projects (Centers for Disease Control, 1993). These activities include 1) education strategies (e.g. adult mentoring, conflict resolution, social skills training), 2) legal and/or regulatory strategies (e.g. regulation of use and access to weapons, regulation of alcohol use and access) and 3) environmental modifications (e.g. home visitation, preschool programs, recreational activities, work/academic experience,).

Traditionally, education strategies have focused on the individual and utilized traditional educational approaches aimed at changing knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors about factors which increase one’s risk of being exposed to, or involved in, violence. Conventional violence prevention curricula include sessions on conflict resolution, dispute mediation, enhancement of male self-esteem, and public education interventions (Prothrow-Stith, 1991). This approach utilizes a combination of didactic instruction and skills development techniques through role-playing or simulation and most frequently is implemented in a school setting.

One of the most cited education prevention programs of this type is the Boston Youth Program instituted in four Boston high schools, (Prothrow-Stith, 1991). This program included an evaluation component utilizing both a control group (no curriculum) and an experimental group (curriculum participants). Evaluation results revealed a significant change in the attitudes of the participants (experimental group) around the issues of anger and violence. This 10-session anger and violence curriculum was targeted for ethnic minority students and provided the following: (a) information on adolescent violence and homicide; (b) discussions of anger as a normal, potentially constructive emotion; (c) knowledge in developing alternatives to fighting, (d) role playing and videotapes; and (e) fostering of non-violent behavior. Dispute mediation skills training, also commonly used in school-based programs, helps students develop the skills needed to mediate disputes. This often includes extensive skill development training in the areas of communication, leadership, problem solving, assertiveness, and dispute mediation.
The Community Youth and Gang Services Program (CYGS) in Los Angeles is an example of a comprehensive community-based approach that relies heavily on inter-agency communication and coordination with strong community participation. The program has three components: 1) Basic Education and Assessment, 2) Mobilization and Action Campaign, and 3) Community Youth Gang Services.

The basic education and assessment component targets the entire community including parents, local business owners, youth, educators, and religious leaders. This part aims at increasing the awareness and the level of knowledge about gangs, crime and graffiti. Important to note is the attention that this component gives the role that gangs play in the life of participating youth. This educational component addresses the sense of belonging, fraternity, ego enhancement and status issues related to youth involved in gangs.

The second component focuses on the mobilization of the community through the development of Target Area Coordinating Committees (TACC). School officials must be willing to work as partners with the community at large in order to effectively reduce and prevent school violence. Broad based community involvement is critical to the success of this effort with school administrators, teachers and other support staff working in collaboration with local community leaders, law enforcement and other community residents willing to address the problems of school violence.

The third component involves the implementation of various strategies aimed at negating the various levels of gang activity within a specific target area. The prevention effort employs the Career Paths Program, a 15-week curriculum for elementary school-aged children. This curriculum teaches youth about the negative aspects of gangs, drugs and crime involvement and promotes positive alternatives. This component is often combined with existing parent education and teacher training programs at the targeted schools. Additionally, this component employs a mental health-counseling program for identified families.

The Public Health Approach to Violence Prevention

The reduction of violent injuries requires a comprehensive public health approach. This approach is built on a three-tiered model of primary, secondary and tertiary prevention. Primary prevention would seek to reduce the incidence of new cases of violence, or first-time violent behavior. Secondary prevention would intervene early in the sequence of violent acts to arrest violent behavior. Tertiary prevention would happen after a violent act has occurred to restore as much functioning as possible to the individual or community. According to a public health model, violent behavior is assumed to follow a pattern similar to patterns of other public health epidemics. That is, its occurrence can be measured and monitored, and groups at risk can be identified. If these assumptions are correct, then the adverse outcomes associated with violent behavior can be predicted or prevented. (Weiss 1994).

Of the three tiers of prevention, primary prevention holds the greatest promise for programs aimed at preventing violence, even though primary prevention requires a long-term commitment and proactive approach. It requires a comprehensive effort from all segments of the community, beginning with the individual and involving education, community action, social support, and competency building.

Community Coalition Building for Violence Prevention

The coalition calls attention to the problem of violence, promotes and implements prevention and intervention programs, and evaluates program effectiveness. In addition, it provides a forum for influencing public policy regarding violence prevention. The Los Angeles Violence Prevention coalition is an example of one such coalition. Its three goals include reducing the availability and accessibility of firearms, changing community norms so that violence is not acceptable, and creating and promoting alternatives to violence.

In order to reduce the accessibility of firearms in Los Angeles, the coalition is working on developing a baseline estimate of the number of federally licensed firearm dealers in Los Angeles County. It is
also trying to develop strategies for reducing the access and availability of firearms in the Greater Los Angeles region. Finally, they plan to implement a policy designed to reduce the availability and accessibility of firearms through a coordinated public health campaign.

As mentioned, successful programs are comprehensive in nature, targeting several groups and involving various facets of the community. School officials are encouraged to participate in local coalitions and other community efforts addressing the problem of violence in the community. Additionally, educators should involve representatives from the community in the development of strategies to prevent violence. This enables schools to be flexible and responsive to the changing cultural, social, demographic and economic conditions in their community through continual updating and modification of prevention curricula and coordination with other service providers.
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Economic Determinants and Managed Behavioral Healthcare: Marginalization of Providers and Restrictions of Services

Tim Davidson, University of Oklahoma

Abstract

Managed care organizations tend to prioritize finance management over services and, as a result, have alienated providers and diminished the service delivery system, while profiting handsomely. The managed care strategy of cost-containment is examined as it relates to quality of care, particularly in behavioral health treatment. The problems of excessive managed care profits and administrative overhead are considered in relation to a pattern of misuse of limited healthcare resources. Managed care policies and procedures that reduce healthcare to a commodity are critiqued. The essay's key points for improving healthcare, in whatever systems evolve, are to de-emphasize “commerce” and to resuscitate preferred cultural values regarding “service”. Suggestions for reform are made that reflect inclusiveness from a wide range of constituents in healthcare and participatory management principles to redress the imbalance of authority that now rests with managed care organizations.

Introduction

Managed care ranks with deinstitutionalization and psychopharmacology among the most influential innovations in health care policy in the past twenty-five years. Health maintenance organizations (HMOs), preferred provider organizations (PPOs), employee assistance programs (EAPs) and other administrative structures characterize the managed care world and are touted as methods to control costs and to improve quality of healthcare. Some firms manage general and behavioral healthcare, while other companies are specifically contracted for behavioral (i.e. mental health and addiction treatment) services only. By the mid-1990s, advocates within the managed behavioral healthcare industry felt that it was “positioned to confer vast social benefits to the American people through its expertise on management” of the service delivery system (Freeman & Trabin, 1995).

Yet a contentious divide exists between many healthcare providers and managed care organizations (MCOs) (Davidson, Davidson & Keigher, 1999). Why the disparity? Much of the problem can be traced to the asymmetrical control of resources by MCOs accompanied by their replacement of “a service ethos with a commercial ethos” (Light, 1994, p. 1198). While key stakeholders in managed care have profited handsomely, their cost-containment measures have reduced services. Insurers, government officials, providers, employers and consumers need now to collaborate in efforts either to reform for-profit managed care, or to replace it.

Domination of providers by managed care organizations

Riffe and Kondrat (1997) observe that “human needs become shaped and invented in accordance with technological imperatives by those who control the technology” (p. 45) and conclude that providers within managed care settings often experience alienation and disempowerment as a result of accommodating managed care policies. Since MCOs set the parameters of behavioral treatment—including who has access to services, who will be on provider panels, the appropriateness and length of treatment, the rules for applying benefits and the dollar limits to providers per units of service—there are strict controls on providers’ incomes and upon the way providers work. In the late 1980’s through the 1990’s, providers experienced the changes wrought by MCOs as fiat from afar.

As extensive, for-profit, managed care plans evolved and became the prominent health service delivery system over the past decade, clinicians and behavioral
treatment agencies were typically left outside the loop of planning and development.1 MCOs would position themselves in key geographical locations, secure contracts with large employers or government entities (if Medicare and Medicaid monies were available) and then begin the process of recruiting providers in the region as contractees. Providers found themselves needing to agree with the terms of the predominant MCOs in their area, or risk losing present and future clientele, including government contracts. State block grants and private third-party insurance companies all began to funnel monies through MCOs in the 1990s. If providers opted to stay outside of the newly established “system” the prospect of financial failure loomed large on their horizon.

Controls over information processing and casemanagement

As providers lost the option of billing third party insurance directly in a fee-for-service setting, as was characteristic of the pre-managed care era, clinical autonomy was sacrificed, and in some cases, professional values were compromised (J. Davidson & T. Davidson, 1996; T. Davidson & J. Davidson, 1998). This may seem an odd or overly dramatic assertion, unless the inside perspective of the clinician-client relationship is gained. Traditionally, in behavioral healthcare, because the relations between clinician(s) and client(s) were confidential and fiduciary, with insurers on the outside in a secondary capacity, the therapeutic relationship could evolve without undue interference from the financial center. Managed care brought the insurer in as the comptroller, determining practitioners loyalties and decisions and consumers needs and possibilities. Case management—and the information processing conducted by the clinician with a client or the client’s family—is the heart of behavioral treatment. Before managed care, there were no external jurisdictions for providers other than their professional code of ethics, statutory requirements of their licenses and internal supervisory functions. After managed care, all casemanagement, and the intricacies of the professional rules of conduct that traditionally attended it, were subject to the terms of the contract between the respective MCO and the provider. Financiers ascended to the dominating position in healthcare, without effective checks and balances on business interests versus service concerns.

Presently, information processing between clinicians and clients is transformed from a clinician conferring with clients or their families to “grist for the mill” of industrialized managed care. In taking over the delivery systems of behavioral healthcare, MCOs needed and demanded data from providers. Confidential communication between a clinician and client was the first practice (and value) to go under managed care (T. Davidson & J. Davidson, 1995). Controls over clinical decisions were not far behind. Suicide assessments, decisions to hospitalize, planning for termination of treatment, clinical preferences for the kind of therapy to be employed and definitions of what behavioral disorders are appropriate for treatment have all been subjected to managed care review and authority. Many MCOs even placed “gag clauses” in their contracts with providers to ensure that all information about treatment remained under corporate control—providers could not inform their clients or patients of other treatment options if those treatments were not sanctioned by the MCO. Subsequently the courts have determined that the gag clauses are illegal, but the symbol remains. MCOs, as business enterprises, are intent upon dominating clinicians, as healthcare providers.

Wealth and disparity

In addition, the “benefits” of managed care appear often to accrue in windfall profits to the controlling companies while the subscribers to managed healthplans are denied the very services MCOs are meant to manage. It is not uncommon, for instance, for the benefit package of a managed healthplan to indicate that any given employee could access up to twenty outpatient visits with a behavioral healthcare
provider over the course of a year; whereas the MCO could restrict the actual use of the benefit to one to three sessions.  

Meanwhile, in the 1990’s (the decade of excess in the profit-driven managed care industry) stocks rose exponentially for many MCOs, capturing The Wall Street Journal headlines with titles like “Money machines: HMO’s pile up billions in cash, try to decide what to do with it” (Anders, 1994, p. A1). In 1994, cash and stock awards to the top executives of the seven largest for-profit HMOs averaged $7 million; in 1996, the twenty-five highest paid HMO executives had an annual compensation of $6.2 million and $13.5 in unexercised stock options (Freudenheim, 1995; Pollack & Slass, 1998). In 1999, many publicly traded managed care companies performed poorly in terms of delivering shareholder value; but even so the top earning executive made $1.17 million in salary, $4.28 million in bonus pay and other compensations, as well as several millions in stock options (“1999 HMO Executive Pay,” 2000). During their years of exponential financial expansion, MCOs insisted that their contracting providers submit claims up to a certain limited point only, even if the clinician or agency still judged the client to be in need of further services. Under such circumstances, those in the business of “caring” have often opted to extend treatment as much as possible even though they will not be reimbursed by the MCO, while those in the business of “managing” have rested secure in achieving a designated profit margin. Of course, other providers simply do less because they are paid less. In either regard, the MCO is determining limits, with a view of handsomely rewarding itself when possible, while clinicians and consumers remain beholden to the largesse of the company.

The tale of providers and consumers being vulnerable to the economic controls of the MCOs applies even when the managed care firm declares bankruptcy. Recently, Harvard Pilgrim Health Care (HPHC), Massachusetts’ largest and Rhode Island’s third largest health maintenance organization, went into receiver-ship (O’Neill, 2000). The MCO, following the standard practice of delaying payments to providers while cases are being reviewed, reached the point where it could not pay its contracting clinicians and agencies at all. Though owed for a backlog of previous services and with no immediate reimbursement for present services, these service providers have been ordered by the court to continue treating old clients and to accept new clients from HPHC. The providers may eventually be paid pennies on the dollar. The new, larger MCO, which is expected to replace HPHC as the primary contractor, traditionally has made its profits in three ways: (1) reducing providers’ fees, (2) eliminating healthcare services when possible and (3) decreasing the size of provider panels (O’Neill, 2000). Such “solutions” continue the problem of marginalized providers and minimized services for consumers while the MCOs continue their marketplace competitions.

The Value of Cost-Containment

For all its flaws in undermining service values in favor of corporate insatiability, managed care systems can help the national economy and eventually the healthcare industry by keeping a focus on restricted budgets. Fee-for-service indemnity plans, which were characteristic of insurance coverage before the managed care era, gave incentives to doctors and other health professionals to bill for more services and contributed to runaway healthcare costs on a national level. Valuable lessons gleaned from managed care initiatives are (1) fragmented systems with institutionally biased health facilities are not the best way to deliver services and (2) cost-containment with an emphasis upon efficient outcomes are preferred management methods for serving the public’s healthcare needs.

The problem with the strategies of the for-profit, managed care corporations is that the clinical tactics they insist upon often only cloak their own economic goals. The following list of commonplace behavioral treatment policies and occurrences from MCOs are clear ways—not to save
money—but to make money for the controlling MCO as contractor: (1) payments only for specific, narrowly defined, minimal services, irrespective of individual differences in pain and suffering; (2) preset lean conditions for referrals and authorization of services; (3) inconvenient, time-consuming telephone contacts and extensive paperwork requirements from providers; (4) delays in authorizing treatment or in reimbursing providers; (5) remuneration for "gatekeeping" physicians when they dramatically reduce the number of services they give and when they minimize referrals to specialists; (6) opposition to governmental oversight or review by neutral third party consumer groups, regarding MCOs utilization committees and procedures; and (7) resistance to "any willing provider" laws, because once the MCO does not control the provider panel the system is less responsive to the MCO's economic controls.

Such strategies fail in several regards. First, a good portion of the money that is "saved" is merely consumed by the administrative structures and shareholders of the respective MCO rather than invested in healthcare infrastructure. Second, the focus tends to be on "less" care rather than "better" care. Third, "prevention," although often espoused by managed care advocates as a feature of their systems, rarely receives necessary funding or any sustained emphasis from the MCO (which is fundamentally required in mental health and chemical dependency interventions). Fourth, consumers and providers are treated as the "other" to be restricted or suppressed, rather than constituents or partners; MCOs have totally failed to realize the organizational benefits of participatory leadership. Fifth, the tendency of federal and state governments for over a decade has been to look for solutions within the private sector. Government, on both sides of the political spectrum, could be expected to support an industry that would self-impose regulations to take care of patients' rights and provider concerns. But MCOs, as a whole, have fought for deregulation (read: operate with impunity) and concluded that patient rights are too expensive (read: reduce profit margins).

1998 may turn out to be a turning point in how managed care cost-containment principles are understood by employers and the buying public (including taxpayers). The drop in HMO memberships from 50% to 47% of employees in American companies occurred simultaneously with a rise in total employee healthcare costs of 6.1% which ended five years of essentially flat growth as MCOs established economic controls nationwide (Winslow, 1999). These juxtaposed figures illustrate that not only are consumers weary of restrictive type managed healthcare plans, but likewise, that costs will not magically be restrained as corporations satisfy stockholders and providers and consumers react to limitations in services.

Industrial analysts of MCOs observed in the early 1990s that the successes of many managed care plans in spending less for healthcare were based on the practice of risk selection or "cherry picking": employees known by actuarial analyses to be "healthier" and therefore in need of fewer services were the first recruits of managed care, while "sicker" patients were less likely to be enrolled in the managed healthplans (Light, 1992). When the benefits consulting firm of William H. Mercer, Inc. conducted their recent survey of falling HMO memberships, they concluded that the managed care promise—"if you agree we can limit your access, we will give you higher quality care for less cost" (Winslow, 1998, p. B6)—is now being broadly questioned by large employer groups. Once the net of managed care services covers a broader spectrum of the population as it now does, simple restriction policies are not a good way to achieve cost-containment.

Service restriction and behavioral healthcare

In essence, the true cost savings from managed care come from the initial bid with employers or the government. For example, if company A traditionally spent $5,000 per employee on health benefits per year, the bidding MCO might offer a plan to the employer with a guarantee to
cover all employees at $4,750 per year but then only release an average of $2,000 - $3,000 for actual services during that time frame. The rest is managed care profit. A discounted, service-restricted approach is particularly troubling when mental health and chemical dependency treatment are the needed service. Behavioral treatment is not based upon high technology that a MCO might decrease and thereby save money. Mental illness or addictions are rarely overdiagnosed and therefore a screening visit by a gatekeeping physician is not an effective way to curtail further unnecessary treatment. The hard costs are in the field of service. When those costs are eliminated people simply do not get adequate care. High non-behavioral medical cost offsets and difficult-to-trace social cost offsets typically follow whenever mental health and addiction treatments are cut back.

Before 1989, approximately 80% of the money spent on psychiatric services in the United States came from inpatient treatment (Borenstein, 1996). Effective cost-containment of the future should focus upon various levels of care in inpatient, residential, home-based and acute care, with enough community support to sustain an effective infrastructure. Theoretically, MCOs could oversee this level of network development but to do so would require hands-on management and joint planning with providers and consumers, rather than the bureaucracy of remote financial officers with the primary goal of quick profits.

**Quality and the commercial ethos**

The common wisdom of a capitalistic society is that the buying public will eventually insist upon an acceptable level of quality in whatever product is being purchased, including healthcare. The patient backlash against managed care and the class-action lawsuits by providers which characterize the latter part of the 1990’s probably attest to a degree of truthfulness in that wisdom. But MCOs have been particularly adept at securing their profit margins irrespective of service.

Over and again in the 1990’s, managed care financial gains were achieved even if adequate services were not provided. To cite a relatively mild example: In 1991, the State of Ohio paid an MCO (American Biodyne) $14 million to cover mental health and substance abuse disorders for the State’s employees. The MCO spent $4.7 million of this contract on services and kept $9.3 million for overhead and profits. An independent auditing firm found problems in 30% of American Biodyne’s cases, most commonly a failure to “properly evaluate, diagnose [and] treat” (Hymowitz & Pollock, 1995, A4). There were no mental health therapists available in 16% of the counties and no substance abuse counselors in 32% of the counties in Ohio. Only 3/5 of the State employees who were documented by the MCO as receiving treatment were actually served. Despite these objective facts, a spokesperson for American Biodyne argued: “If you overtreat them [i.e. the patients on their healthplans] some others won’t get the treatment because of limited resources” (Hymowitz & Pollock, 1995, A4). Even with these publicized failures, three years later, a merged Biodyne/Medco company won Medicaid contracts with another state, Iowa, and major contracts with IBM and Fed Ex. By 1995, the MCO showed such economic promise that the tobacco company, R. J. Reynolds, purchased Biodyne/Medco (Himmelstein, 1996).

When Florida opened the HMO market for Medicaid in the early 1990’s, 21 of the 29 plans failed to meet minimal quality standards. Five of these managed care firms had overhead and profits which consumed 51%-77% of their enrollee premiums instead of the money being put into service for the Medicaid recipients (Pear, 1995). While the MCOs were benefiting from taxpayer dollars and operating within a highly deregulated industry, analysts observed that exorbitant lobbying fees were being paid to several state government officials and brokers fees were being drawn from the Medicaid monies (Himmelstein, 1996).

Even when there is a more reasonable distribution of administrative overhead...
and service dollars, successful publicly-traded MCOs ensure that profits grow. This understandable feature of for-profit MCOs needs to be kept in perspective in any consideration of managed care as a mitigator for the nation's escalating healthcare costs. Once the competition is controlled or eliminated, MCOs will raise premiums to cover their costs just like any other business would.

In 1996, the MCO with the most assets (United HealthCare) had premium revenues of $8.5 billion, a 72% increase from 1995, which was a 46% increase from 1994. According to their financial report published for that year (Financial Review, 1998), United HealthCare's goal was to control its rate increases on premiums by 1%-2% annually, based upon anticipated costs the company might bear. However, in 1996 the costs were 3%-4% higher than expected. Therefore they raised premiums on renewal rates by 4%-5%. These kinds of rate increases, coupled with fee revenues of $1.4 billion in 1996 (a 42% increase from 1995) attributable to enrollment growth "most notably in the behavioral health and demand management businesses" (p. 4) are characteristic of the development of the leading MCOs as economic powerhouses. By the end of the decade, United HealthCare (d/b/a United Health Group) had $17 billion in annual revenue through six separate health-related groups (Best's Review, 1999).

There may be merit to the viewpoint that MCOs can reduce waste and achieve an economy of scale. However, there are no magical formulae introduced by managed care firms where shareholders can make substantial profits without absorbing healthcare resources that otherwise could be applied to services. When taxpayer dollars are part of the financial mix, in the face of 44 million uninsured Americans, and the pressing need for universal healthcare, the question of the relative good of managed care must be raised by the government and by consumers and then acted upon. Every dollar a MCO controls comes from the benefit package of a worker or from a taxpayer and should be applied judiciously for the personal and public good of consumers.

**Conclusion**

Much work is needed to improve Twenty-first Century healthcare delivery in the United States. Five key groups are required at the policy planning table to address the problems of the previous decade regarding the economic determinants of managed behavioral healthcare. These include (1) insurers (MCOs included), (2) government regulatory bodies (federal, state and local authorities), (3) providers (represented by professional and licensing organizations), (4) employers (large industry and small business leaders) and (5) consumers (recipients and family members as represented in national and local service associations). One of the key problems with the development of managed care services in the past decade is that most of the power to effect change has rested with the MCOs themselves.

With MCOs acting as the defining voice in driving industry change, there has been a fusion, even a confusion, of the proper role of the insuring and overseeing MCO as contractor, clinical personnel as contractees and government as regulators. Much provider discontent with managed care can be understood by reference to the commonly held belief that the system which unfolded is existing for financial gain rather than to promote a healthy population. The lopsided power differential also resulted in MCOs exercising authority with impunity in too many instances. The end result is an overemphasis by MCOs upon making money—health services as a commodity—and not enough long term focus on prevention, early intervention, continuity of care, community accountability, regional management, strategic treatment designs for acute and long term illnesses, improving outcomes based upon best-practice guidelines and concentrating on the health status of defined populations. Rather, under-utilization of services, denial of care and overzealous attempts to control expenditures are the impressions left of managed care.

Good financial planning is necessary for delivering good behavioral healthcare. But
the profit-driven MCOs, holding the dollars from employee insurance premiums and taxpayer Medicare and Medicaid contracts, tend in two directions: (1) either cut off funding for services as if needs no longer exist or (2) reduce their own risk by setting up capitated contracts with provider groups to solve the problem on their own. Restricted, control-oriented funding or discounted, risk-free funding protect MCOs but do not necessarily result in the best healthcare system.

The new millennium introduces an unusual problem for the few national behavioral MCOs who have taken over the market. After lowering direct treatment costs and buying out competitors, behavioral healthcare on a national level has shrunk to approximately 3% of national healthcare expenditures, down from 8%-12% in the pre-managed care era (Pomerantz, 2000). Earlier predictions suggest the numbers of people receiving services may drop even lower to 1%-2% (Borenstein, 1996). Pomerantz notes that "now that only a handful of companies control the field and supply cost-containment for about 150 million lives, future business prospects appear dim" (p. 2) and argues that the behavioral management companies own self interest may compel them to move to more outcomes-oriented management strategies rather than cost restrictions alone.

If MCOs do put more money into disease management for designated populations with mental illness and addictions, they will have to be more collaborative with providers and consumers. But any policy planning which gives MCOs more authority at this point should be suspect. Organizationally, the gulf between MCOs and providers must be bridged and the power differential redefined if the challenges of better and sufficient care are to be realized on a national level. The key points for improving healthcare in whatever systems evolve, is to de-emphasize "commerce" and resuscitate preferred cultural values regarding "service".
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Notes

1 By virtue of separate bargaining between MCOs and employers or government agencies, direct service providers with whom managed care entities would eventually contract had little input on the terms of service as managed care was becoming the dominant force in healthcare. For-profit managed healthplans established controls over the field of behavioral services in true corporate take-over fashion.

2 Once the employee goes for treatment, the all too common response from the MCO’s utilization review team invariably is to restrict the number of sessions which that employee is allowed to receive, claiming that further treatment would not comply with the healthplan’s definition of medical necessity.

3 Inpatient facilities need to be tied into the local communities continuum of care, with flexible admission and discharge procedures, and with blurring of the organizational lines between inpatient and outpatient providers, to allow for thoughtful, well-timed “step up” (more intensive/restrictive) and “step down” (less supervision/protection) treatment options.

4 The issue for national health policy planners is to determine the value of the administrative function of MCOs, in view of the services that will go underfunded once monies are placed in these corporations.
Gender Role Attitudes: Native Americans in Comparative Perspective

Richard J. Harris and Juanita M. Firestone, University of Texas at San Antonio
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Abstract

Native Americans have often been idealized as more egalitarian than other race and ethnic groups today, particularly with respect to the roles of women. Using data from the General Social Surveys 1972-1996, we test the hypothesis that Native Americans will be more egalitarian than other ethnic/racial groups on attitudinal measures of gender equality due to their cultural history of egalitarianism. Native Americans are not statistically significantly more egalitarian than whites when other variables are controlled, but Hispanics and Blacks have significantly lower scores. Interesting differences emerge from separate analyses of Native Americans and the other race and ethnic groups. For example, family income is less important for the Native Americans, while the role of keeping house appears to be more important. Age was less important for Hispanics. However, the structure of the regression equations is similar for all of the groups, with education, age, year of survey, religious intensity and sex emerging as the most important variables. Even though the Native Americans are the most egalitarian, they are influenced by these structural variables in much the same manner as the other groups.

Introduction

Native Americans are a racial minority category, with the same kind of experience base that leads scholars to analyze African Americans and Hispanic Americans as identifiable minority groups. However, much of the research on Native Americans has been anthropological or psychological rather than sociological in nature (see, for example, Allen, 1992; Bataille and Sands, 1984; Billard, 1979; James, 1992; Katz, 1997; Lewis, 1990; Moses and Wilson, 1985; Niethammer, 1977; Wall, 1993). Although early works tended to treat all Indians as a homogeneous group, much of the recent anthropological literature has stressed the heterogeneity of Native Americans based on tribal differences. The historical accuracy of such claims notwithstanding, it is likely that the commonality of Native American identity in recent times outweighs the uniqueness of tribal ancestry. Indeed, increases in the census enumeration of Native Americans may be linked to a rekindling of a common political and economic agenda (Cornell, 1988, Snipp, 1989; Nagel, 1995).1

The Native American population2 has increased dramatically in the twentieth century to nearly 2.0 million American Indian and Alaska Natives according to the 1990 U.S. Census of the Population. Demographers have suggested that a large proportion of the dramatic increases over the past decades may be attributable to shifts in racial identity (Passel, 1976; Passel and Berman, 1986; Harris, 1994). As interpreted by Nagel (1995) this shift in identity may be associated with the concept of ethnic renewal based on a resurgence of the political, economic, and cultural activities of Native Americans in the United States. As the Native American population continues to grow and Native Americans become increasingly visible in every sector of U.S. society, the need for sociological research focusing on these cultures will grow. In this research, we will attempt to expand the current sociological knowledge of the Native American cultures by examining contemporary gender roles among Native Americans.3

While it is clear that Native Americans differ culturally from tribe to tribe, it is equally clear that relations with Europeans had similar impacts on the various cultures (Deloria and Lytle 1984; Green, 1999). It is also apparent that, regardless of different cultural backgrounds, Native Americans share similar demographic characteristics (O’Hare, 1992). In spite of cultural differences, several nativist movements such as the Pueblo uprising, Tecumseh’s alliance, Chief Joseph of the Nez Perce, Wodaiwob of the northern Paiute and the Ghost Dance of the Plains

1

2
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Indians are indications of shared cultural views. These earlier movements continued into this century with peyotism and the Native American Church.4

During the 1960's and 1970's many social movements arose because of the failure of our society to recognize the basic rights of minorities (Vine DeLoria, 1969). These movements drew attention to the plight of various groups as they made claims for equal inclusion in the industrial marketplace. For Native Americans, many of the nativistic movements coalesced into Pan-Indianism, which transcended traditional tribal boundaries and focused instead on Native American culture as a whole. Through a variety of organizations such as at the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI), Pan-Indianism concentrated on unemployment, poverty, and accessibility of education including higher education, environmental protection, treaty rights, religious freedom, and cultural preservation (Nagel, 1996). One beneficial effect of the Pan Indian movement, as well as other civil rights movements, has been the resurgence of cultural pride at being Native American, whether or not tribal identity remained strong (Liebler, 1996). Furthermore, in his examination of social change and continuity in Native American societies, Champagne (1989) argues that institutional change will occur only if the preexisting social order is based on a collective solidarity, which transcends particularistic identification with specific tribes. This suggests that, while tribal identity is valued, the continuance of Native American culture in the United States may depend on maintaining an inclusive Native American identity5.

Within this changing context the role of native North American women was largely ignored or characterized by popular culture. Thus “squaws,” were characterized as powerless servants to men, or as the romanticized “Indian princess,” who rejects her own cultural traditions for the European model of morality and love (Albers, 1983: 3; Jameson, 1988: 762; Lurie, 1972: 29; Mankiller and Wallis, 1993: 19; Powers, 1986: 8-14). While early anthropological works often presented Native American women as reflecting European standards of behavior (see Leacock, 1981: 134), recent works focused on the depth and diversity of roles among women in various Native American cultures (Bataille and Sands, 1984; Blackman, 1989; Mankiller and Wallis, 1993; Foster, 1995).

Klein and Ackerman (1995: 14) in the introduction to their edited book presenting chapters on gender and power issues in eleven different Native American cultures came to the following conclusion:

A more uniform theme is that of balanced reciprocity. The authors in this volume conclude that the worlds of men and women were, and are, distinctly different but not generally perceived as hierarchical. In other words, while there are different roles expected of men and women, neither men’s roles nor women’s roles are considered superior; the efforts of both women and men are acknowledged as necessary for the well-being of society.

While they do not argue that the case studies in their book suggest either equality of the genders or superiority of one gender over another (except in the case of the Muskogees in the Southeast), the experiences described illustrate that stereotypically simplistic dichotomies of public/private or domestic/economic domains do not fit the experiences of many Native American women (Klein and Ackerman, 1995: 14).

Thus, in spite of cultural differences, one aspect of Native American culture which differs from other minority groups is a history of egalitarianism towards women that the other groups do not share (Fiske, 1991; 1995; Green, 1989; Laframboise, Heyle and Ozer, 1990; Foster, 1995). It seems clear that there was a conscious effort on the part of missionaries and other agency administrators to change gender roles to fit the norm of non-Indian society (Castillo, 1994; Fiske, 1995; Klein and Ackerman, 1995: 13). It seems equally clear that these attempts met with varied success, but that, according to the contributors to Klein and Ackerman’s (1995) edited volume, the role of women in most
tribes has returned to their original positions of gender equality and/or gender reciprocity (see also, Miller, 1994). As noted by Laframboise, Heyle, and Ozer (1990), "...the current claim is not that women in all tribes shared equal status and power with men, but that the high frequency of egalitarian relationships has been greatly underrepresented."

Additionally, the resurgence in Native American identity associated with a resurgence of original cultural values may support a return to traditional views of gender balanced roles. Presumably these changes would include socialization processes which would lead to different orientations towards appropriate roles for men and women in society. Given the preponderance of literature suggesting that in general Native American women were given equal or reciprocal status, we hypothesized that on measures of gender role ideology, Native Americans would be more egalitarian than other racial/ethnic groups. We expect this relationship will be impacted by a variety of other variables. For example, respondents living in more highly populated areas may score even higher because of their increased participation outside their own culture. Decreased family size and a trend toward nuclear rather than extended family households are associated with "modern" society; therefore those with smaller families should show higher scores on measures of egalitarianism than those with larger families.

While the history of Native Americans suggests more egalitarian attitudes about the roles of men and women, in previous research Harris and Firestone (1998) documented an ubiquitous convergence toward egalitarian attitudes among White, African American and Hispanic American women in the U.S. Thus, while we expect Native Americans to score more egalitarian on the index measuring gender role attitudes, we expect the views of other race/ethnic groups in the U.S. to be converging with that of the Native Americans. In this research, we will attempt to expand the current sociological knowledge of Native American cultures by examining contemporary gender role attitudes among Native Americans and comparing them to the attitudes of other race/ethnic groups in the United States.

**Sample, Variable Construction and Method of Analysis**

The General Social Survey (GSS) is an ongoing survey of social indicators. The survey was administered to 35,284 respondents between 1972 and 1996 with approximately 1500 administered each year until 1993, and then about 3000 in 1994 and 1996. Block quota sampling was used in 1972 through 1974 and for half of the 1975 and 1976 surveys. Full probability sampling was utilized for the remaining half of 1975 and 1976 as well as for the years 1977 through 1996. Weights are used to adjust for over sampling of Black respondents for the years 1982 and 1987. All respondents are English-speaking persons 18 years of age and over who were living in non-institutional settings within the United States. These surveys contain a total of 1091 individuals who self-identified as Native Americans for this period.

An index of gender role ideology (SEXIDEOL), with an overall standardized Chronbach's alpha of 0.66, was created from attitudinal variables measuring the degree of egalitarianism present in the responses of those individuals completing the GSS survey (see Table 1). The four questions used in the index are as follows:

1. Women should take care of running their homes and leave running the country up to the men. [FEHOME]
2. Do you approve or disapprove of a married woman earning money in business or industry if she has a husband capable of supporting her? [FEWORK]
3. If your party nominated a woman for President, would you vote for her if she were qualified for the job? [FEPRES]
4. Most men are better suited emotionally for politics than are most women. [FEPOL]

The variable responses have been recoded with zero representing the less egalitarian response and one representing the more egalitarian response. Index scores range from zero to four. An index
including more variables would have allowed a greater range in index scores and picked up more subtle differences between groups. However, the four variables included in this index were the only questions asked with consistency during time frame analyzed. A total of 19,613 respondents answered the four gender role questions, and of those, 623 (3%) self-identified as Native Americans.

The independent variables used in the analysis of gender role ideology are sex of respondent, race/ethnicity, year of interview, respondent’s working status, marital status, age, educational attainment, size of place in which interview was conducted, number of hours per day respondent viewed television, household size, and strength of religiosity.

Means and standard deviations for all variables included in the regression model are presented in Table 2.

Dummy variables were created from the variable working status for those respondents who are in the labor force full time, part time, and keeping house (unpaid domestic labor).

Dummy variables were also created for marital status for married, never married and those either separated or divorced. Respondent age, educational attainment, year of interview, size of place of residence, number of television viewing hours, and household size, are interval/ratio variables. Additionally, family income is included as an indicator of respondent’s economic context (Ligon, 1989). Religiosity measures the strength of the respondent’s religious preference. This is an ordinal variable with response categories of Strong, Somewhat Strong, and Not Very Strong and No Religious Preference. Additionally, dummy variables are created for each racial category. Upon completion of the first regression model, a separate model is initiated for each racial category. Comparing the original model to those obtained by race will highlight differences in effects and strengths of relationships.

The hypothesis being testing is that Native Americans will score higher than other ethnic/racial groups on attitudinal measures of gender equality due to their cultural history of egalitarianism. However, controlling for a variety of other variables may impact this relationship. For example, respondents living in more highly populated areas should score higher because of their increased participation outside their own culture. For example, Leibler (1996) found that living in areas with higher concentrations of Native Americans was a good predictor of a strong group identification. Most areas with higher densities of Native Americans are rural areas. Decreased family size and a trend toward nuclear rather than extended family households are associated with “modern” society; therefore those with smaller families should show higher

### TABLE 1 RELIABILITY INDICATORS FOR AN INDEX OF GENDER ROLE IDEOLOGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Total Sample Item to Index Correlations</th>
<th>Native Americans Item to Index Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEHOME</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEPOL</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEWORK</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEPRES</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total cases = 19,613; Standardized Alpha = .66
Number Native Americans = 623; Standardized Alpha = 0.63
Table 2  Means and Standard Deviations for Regressed Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL (n=16392)</th>
<th>NATIVE AMERICAN (n=541)</th>
<th>WHITE (n=13272)</th>
<th>BLACK (n=1688)</th>
<th>HISPANIC (n=596)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Role Ideology</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping House</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated/Divorced</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Intensity</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Demographic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>30890.15</td>
<td>27721.23</td>
<td>23340.84</td>
<td>20297.63</td>
<td>32756.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>12.57</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>12.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>44.56</td>
<td>17.19</td>
<td>39.60</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>45.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Size</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Size (Ln)</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Hours</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>86.01</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>86.99</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>85.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
scores on measures of egalitarianism than those with larger families.

Increased education would be indicative of increased participation in modern society; therefore education should be positively related to measures of egalitarianism. Respondents who are employed outside of the home should score higher than those who are not because employment status is indicative of the degree of participation in the modernization process. Higher income levels indicate greater participation in the industrial marketplace; therefore income should be positively related to egalitarianism. Whether living in urban or rural areas, women should score higher than men on measures of egalitarianism because it is in their interest to do so to attain full equality in the industrial marketplace. Native Americans will score higher on measures of egalitarianism than other minority groups because of their past cultural history of egalitarianism. White respondents will score higher than all other groups by virtue of their longer participation in the industrial marketplace. As time increases, the number of individuals brought into the modernization process should increase. Therefore, there should be a positive relationship between year and measures of egalitarianism.

Married and widowed individuals are hypothesized to score lower on measures of egalitarianism by virtue of their participation in a traditional behavior pattern. Divorced and never married individuals are expected to score higher on egalitarianism due to their nontraditional behavior patterns. We expect egalitarian attitudes to be more prevalent for younger respondents because of their more active participation in the processes of modernization. The impacts for religion should vary depending on the respondent’s race/ethnicity. Religiosity measures the intensity of one’s religious feelings, but does not depend on Christian beliefs. Since religion of various forms has been such an integral part of the lives of Native Americans, those respondents who are Native Americans should show increased levels of egalitarianism as religious intensity increases. The Christian religion has been prominent for the other racial groups in our analysis. Because Christianity has been associated with traditional gender role beliefs, religious intensity should be negatively related to egalitarian attitudes.

Television viewing allows individuals to become part of the modernization process even if they are not actively participating in the industrial marketplace. The effect of television viewing time should be interesting since longer television viewing time is usually associated with acceptance of traditional gender role stereotypes and few hours of television viewing time may not be sufficient to indoctrinate those individuals who are isolated from modern media images.

Findings

Figure 1 displays the mean values of gender role ideology for each race/ethnic group controlling for whether they lived in a rural or urban environment. Importantly, Native Americans score most egalitarian with respect to gender role ideology when compared to Whites, Blacks and Hispanics. Interestingly, those living in urban environments display the most egalitarian gender roles among all race and ethnic groups, including Native Americans.

Further analyses of the means of the variables used in the regression shows that the groups analyzed are homogenous with respect to sex of respondent, working status, and marital status (see Table 2). Educational level is lowest for Hispanics and Native Americans, with both being less likely than other groups to have completed high school. With respect to the amount of time spent viewing television, Black respondents watch television more frequently than other groups while White and Asian respondents watch less frequently than other groups. Hispanics appear to have the largest household size, but the difference from other minority group respondents is not large. White respondents have the smallest household size.

There are a few variations between the groups when correlations are examined for each group separately. When comparing the correlations of races or ethnicities to those of Native American respondents,
Figure 1 Mean Gender Role Scores by Race and Ethnicity^*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Native American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural</strong></td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban</strong></td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^* Mean differences in sex role ideology scale by race/ethnicity significant at p < .01 (F=7.33, df = 5, 19607).

Mean differences by race and ethnicity for urban areas, statistically significant at P < .01 (F=14.35; df = 5, 15447). Mean differences by race and ethnicity for rural areas not statistically significant (F = 0.83, df = 5, 4155).

no significant difference exists with regard to the variables year, education, age, family income, full time work status, being never married, keeping house or vocabulary score. Respondent’s sex was not significant for White, Other, or Native American respondents. Community size, household size, part-time work status, and television viewing hours were only significant for White respondents. Finally, religious intensity was not significant for Native American or Hispanic respondents.

**Regression Results**

The results of multiple regression equations are summarized in Table 3. In the regression model that includes all racial categories the adjusted R Square value indicates 22 percent of the variability in the gender role index score is explained by the independent variables. When analyzing the effects of the independent variables for each racial category separately, the adjusted R square value varies. For White respondents, 23 percent of the variation in index score is attributable to the independent variables. Twenty-one percent of Black respondents’ variation in index score is attributable to the variables in the regression equation. Over twenty percent of the variation in index score for Hispanics can be attributed to these variables. Finally, 20% of the variation in score for Native American respondents is explainable by the independent variables. Though not presented in Table 3, regressions were
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B (SE) Beta</td>
<td>B (SE) Beta</td>
<td>B (SE) Beta</td>
<td>B (SE) Beta</td>
<td>B (SE) Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Native American</strong></td>
<td>.04 (.05) .01</td>
<td>-.19 (.13) -.08</td>
<td>.01 (.03) .01</td>
<td>-.03 (.08) -.01</td>
<td>-.14 (.13) -.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-.20 (.05) -.03**</td>
<td>-.31 (.19) -.08</td>
<td>-.01 (.04) -.00</td>
<td>-.13 (.11) -.03</td>
<td>-.35 (.18) -.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-.03 (.03) -.01</td>
<td>-.43 (.16) -.15**</td>
<td>-.28 (.03) -.09**</td>
<td>-.21 (.09) -.07*</td>
<td>-.24 (.17) -.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-.37 (.09) -.04**</td>
<td>-.09**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>-.50 (.08) -.04**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labor Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>.00 (.02) .00</td>
<td>-.19 (.13) -.08</td>
<td>.01 (.03) .01</td>
<td>-.03 (.08) -.01</td>
<td>-.14 (.13) -.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>-.04 (.03) -.01</td>
<td>-.31 (.19) -.08</td>
<td>-.01 (.04) -.00</td>
<td>-.13 (.11) -.03</td>
<td>-.35 (.18) -.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping House</td>
<td>-.27 (.03) -.09**</td>
<td>-.43 (.16) -.15**</td>
<td>-.28 (.03) -.09**</td>
<td>-.21 (.09) -.07*</td>
<td>-.24 (.17) -.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>.13 (.03) .05**</td>
<td>-.09 (.22) -.04</td>
<td>.14 (.04) .06**</td>
<td>.20 (.10) .08**</td>
<td>-.22 (.25) -.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated/Divorced</td>
<td>.18 (.04) .05**</td>
<td>-.06 (.23) .02</td>
<td>.18 (.04) .05**</td>
<td>.19 (.10) .07</td>
<td>-.11 (.25) -.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>.08 (.04) .03*</td>
<td>-.05 (.25) -.02</td>
<td>.07 (.04) .02</td>
<td>.15 (.12) .06</td>
<td>-.41 (.27) -.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Intensity</td>
<td>-.12 (.01) -.11**</td>
<td>-.11 (.04) -.11*</td>
<td>-.12 (.01) -.11**</td>
<td>-.08 (.03) -.07**</td>
<td>-.10 (.05) -.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socio-Demographic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (Female=1)</td>
<td>.21 (.02) .09**</td>
<td>.26 (.10) .11*</td>
<td>.19 (.02) .08**</td>
<td>.33 (.06) .13**</td>
<td>.30 (.10) .13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>.00 (.00) .06**</td>
<td>.00 (.00) .06</td>
<td>.00 (.00) .06**</td>
<td>.00 (.00) .08**</td>
<td>.00 (.00) .09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.09 (.00) .23**</td>
<td>.08 (.02) .19**</td>
<td>.09 (.00) .23**</td>
<td>.06 (.01) .15**</td>
<td>.08 (.02) .23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.01 (.00) -.21**</td>
<td>-.02 (.00) -.20**</td>
<td>-.01 (.00) -.21**</td>
<td>-.02 (.00) -.22**</td>
<td>-.01 (.00) -.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Size</td>
<td>-.01 (.01) -.02*</td>
<td>.01 (.03) .01</td>
<td>-.02 (.01) -.02*</td>
<td>-.01 (.02) -.01</td>
<td>-.04 (.03) -.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Size (LN)</td>
<td>.00 (.00) .00</td>
<td>.00 (.00) .02</td>
<td>.00 (.00) .00</td>
<td>-.00 (.00) -.00</td>
<td>-.00 (.00) .02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Hours</td>
<td>.01 (.00) .02*</td>
<td>.02 (.02) .04</td>
<td>.00 (.00) .01</td>
<td>.03 (.01) .06**</td>
<td>.01 (.02) .03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year</strong></td>
<td>.03 (.00) .17**</td>
<td>.03 (.01) .18**</td>
<td>.03 (.00) .16**</td>
<td>.03 (.00) .18**</td>
<td>.04 (.01) .23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. R-Square</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>16392</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>13272</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.000
also completed for those identifying as “other” racial groups and for those identifying as Asians. About 25% of the variation is explained for “Other” respondents, however this figure should be treated with caution since there were only 132 respondents in this category. About 18% of the variation is explained for Asians, however once again, these results should be treated with caution as the number of cases is only 163.

The significance level of F is less than 0.01 in all equations so there is a statistically significant relationship between the variables in our model. The values of Multiple R indicate that the relationships are substantial for all races/ethnicities separately, as well as when analyzed together.

In the equation containing all racial categories, the variable that is most strongly related to the gender ideology index is respondent’s education. This relationship is of moderate strength and is positive indicating that as years of education increases, respondents expressed more egalitarian gender role attitudes. When the regression equation is computed for each racial category separately, the strength of the relationship with education remains positive, but varies somewhat in strength. The relationship is strongest for Whites and Hispanics (Beta = .23 for both groups) and weakest for Blacks (Beta = .15). The strength of the relationship between education and the gender role index for Native Americans falls between these values (Beta = .18). Education is the most important factor for Whites, and tied with year survey was completed as the most important factor for Hispanics. For Native Americans education was the second most important predictor of gender role attitudes, based on the Betas, and for Blacks it was the third most important

The variable year of survey exhibited a moderate relationship with the index. As indicated above, year tied with education as the most important predictor for Hispanics, was the second most important predictor for Blacks, tied with education as the second most important variable for Native Americans, and was the third most important predictor for Whites. Thus, in dependent of all other variables in the equation, those responding in more recent years exhibit more egalitarian gender role beliefs for all groups. Sex of respondent is the second most important variable in the regression model for Hispanics, although it drops to fourth in importance for Native Americans and Blacks, and to sixth most important for Whites. It is also fifth in the model for the total sample.

Age is significant and strong for all models although it is far less important for Hispanics (Beta = -.12) than the other groups. For Native Americans (Beta = -.19) as well as for Blacks (Beta = -.22) age is the strongest predictor of gender role attitudes. In all cases, the relationship with gender role ideology is inverse — the older the respondent, the more traditional the expressed beliefs about appropriate roles for men and women. Because this finding is counter to our expectations, we investigated further.

We compared the predicted gender role attitude scores of individuals with characteristics typically associated with very traditional views about the roles of men and women. First, we solved the regression equations for married men sixty-five years old, with a high school education who are no longer in the labor force for all race/ethnic groups included in our analysis (all other variables were set at their mean values). On average, Native Americans in this group exhibited more egalitarian gender role attitudes (predicted score, 2.65) than did White, non-Hispanics (predicted score, 2.60), Hispanics (predicted score, 2.57) or Blacks (predicted score, 2.49). This pattern is reinforced by examining the predicted scores for married 25 year olds employed full time with a high school degree (Native Americans = 3.27, Whites = 3.17, Blacks = 3.13 and Hispanics = 3.01). Thus, while the overall pattern for age may be the same (on average, older individuals have more traditional views), among comparably situated individuals, Native Americans seem to hold more egalitarian attitudes than members of the other race/ethnic groups included in the analysis.

Family income was a significant, but
weak predictor of gender role beliefs for Whites, Blacks and Hispanics, but was not significant for Native Americans. The relationship for Hispanics is strongest (Beta = .09) followed by Blacks (Beta = .08). Overall, the gender role index score had a negligible relationship with each category of Marital Status. When considering each race/ethnicity separately, being married or separated/divorced were significant for Whites, and being married was significant for Blacks and Whites.

*Full-time or Part-time working status* was not significant for any of the models. The relationship between being a full time homemaker and the gender role measure is significant for all groups except Hispanics, with homemakers expressing more traditional views. The relationship, however, is not significant for Hispanics. *Keeping House* has the strongest impact on Native Americans (Beta = -.15) and is ranked 3rd in importance as a predictor. The next strongest impact is for Whites (Beta = -.09), and is 5th in importance. Thus, respondents who are White, Black, or Native American and are full time homemakers have more traditional expectations about gender roles.

The Beta values for *intensity of religious beliefs* are weak, significant and negative in all models. Interestingly, religious intensity has the weakest relationship to gender role ideology for Blacks. While the relationships are negligible in strength, they are consistent with the prediction that the stronger the religious intensity a respondent espouses, the more traditional his/her gender role attitudes. This negative relationship holds up for Native Americans, contradicting the hypothesis of a positive impact of religiosity in this cultural context. This finding may result from only a small number of Native Americans in this sample practicing traditional nativistic religions.

The variable *household size* was not significant in any of the models. This finding indicates that there is little variation in gender role attitudes that can be attributed to the number of people residing in a respondent’s home. The *number of hours spent viewing television* was significant only for the overall equation and for Black respondents; however in both of the latter models the strength of the relationship is negligible. It would appear that number of hours spent watching television is not an important variable for predicting gender role attitudes among the various race/ethnic groups included.

**Conclusions**

We first proposed that Native Americans would score higher than other racial/ethnic groups on measures of egalitarianism, but that this relationship would be mediated by other variables. Initial evidence shows that Native Americans do indeed have the most egalitarian views about gender roles. While our primary hypothesis is supported, Native Americans are not significantly more egalitarian than Whites when other variables are controlled. Blacks and Hispanics, however, are statistically significantly less egalitarian in the regression model.

Some interesting differences emerge from separate analyses of Native Americans and the other race and ethnic groups. Family income is less important for the Native Americans, while the role of keeping house appears to be more important. Age has about the same influence as a predictor of gender role attitudes for Native Americans, Blacks and Whites, but was less important for Hispanics. However, a comparison of the specific regression equation predicted scores for older, married, high school educated men, who are not in the labor force illustrates that the older Native Americans are still predicted to be the most egalitarian. The younger Native American men employed full-time are also predicted to have the highest score. This suggests more egalitarian cultural values with respect to gender roles among most Native Americans than the other race and ethnic groups.

Even so, some of the hypotheses linked to traditional Native American culture are not supported. Those identifying themselves as most strongly religious have more traditional gender role attitudes among the Native Americans as well as the other groups. The negative coefficient
for age does not suggest that elders are promoting a tradition of egalitarian attitudes about appropriate roles for men and women. In fact, the structure of the regression equations is similar for all of the groups, with education, age, year of survey, religious intensity and sex emerging as the most important variables. Even though the Native Americans are the most egalitarian, they are influenced by these structural variables in much the same manner as the other groups.

It should be emphasized, however, that it is unlikely that many of the Native Americans in this sample are living in traditional Native American communities or on reservations. While those on reservations have a chance of being included in the sample in proportion to their representation in the population (Davis and Smith, 1996), this includes only a small number of cases and there is no variable to identify whether or not the respondents live on a reservation. Further research in such communities would be valuable in order to more clearly identify the cultural dynamics influencing the egalitarian gender role attitudes demonstrated in this analysis, and any possible variations in these attitudes among different Native American groups.

Of course it is important to remember that individual attitudes do not always reflect behaviors, nor does egalitarianism negate current problems. Native Americans today continue to suffer from high rates of alcoholism, crime, mental illness, unemployment, and poverty. Native American women “have consistently been the lowest paid, lowest ranked, most unemployed segment of the national work force (Green, R, 1992, see also Green, D.E., 1999).”

Women, regardless of racial or ethnic differences, confront many of the same issues in daily life. As Mary Crow Dog (Crow Dog and Erdoes, 1990) asserts, Native American women are victims of double jeopardy -- oppressed by race and ethnicity as well as by sex. These experiences should bind women together and make the movement toward egalitarianism a stronger and more cohesive effort. It is obvious from this research that there has been some progress toward egalitarianism among all race and ethnic groups. On the whole, though, women still face constraints both within and outside of the home (Green, 1999; Miller, 1994; Fiske, 1995).

In 1980, Rayna Green commented that “For Indian feminists every women’s issue is framed in the larger context of Native American people....Their call is for a return to Native American forms which, they insist, involve men and women in complementary, mutual roles (p.264).” Our findings indicate that a return to traditional ways in all its forms may not be necessary to reinforce egalitarian gender role attitudes. As the contexts in which different race and ethnic groups live becomes more similar over time, attitudes among group members may also converge (Harris and Firestone, 1998). As the role of women becomes openly integrated into all aspects of society (not focused exclusively on the home) views about the appropriate roles of men and women are becoming more egalitarian and more similar regardless of race or ethnicity. Our findings suggest that beliefs about appropriate roles for men and women among most Native Americans may have come full circle back to ideas of gender reciprocity and/or gender equality. Additionally, the views of other race and ethnic groups in the United States may be catching up with the traditional views of Native Americans.
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Notes

Unfortunately, tribal affiliation is not available in the General Social Surveys to allow a clear test of this contention. Thinking that region of origin might loosely get at tribal identification, in one regression analysis for the Native Americans we included dummy variables for eight areas where the respondents were living at age 16 (REG16). Only those in the East North Central (including Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan and Ohio) were statistically significantly different from the omitted category of South Atlantic and there was virtually no change in the adjusted $R^2$ (0.176 vs. 0.179). We concluded that region at age 16 did not add substantially to the analysis and for parsimony we have left the region variables out of this presentation.

Some anthropologists estimate that the indigenous population of North America totaled between 900,000 and 1.15 million prior to European contact, while other estimates are much higher (Snipp, 1992). According to Snipp (1992), the estimate of 1.15 million as proposed by Smithsonian anthropologists Mooney and Kroeber is too low; however, it is unclear by how much. Snipp notes that other research has yielded population estimates of 4.4 million (Denevan) and 18 million (Dobyns). Due to warfare, genocide, and disease, the Native American population had dropped to 250,000 by the end of the nineteenth century (Snipp, 1992).

Native American respondents to the General Social Survey experienced the same regional trends as other racial/ethnic groups in measures of liberalism and conservatism. Specifically, all racial/ethnic groups tend to be more liberal in New England, Mid-Atlantic, Mountain, and Pacific regions. Because they follow these same patterns, Native Americans will be considered as a single racial/ethnic group rather than by region, which might be a proxy for tribal affiliation.

We thank reviewer Michael Lauderdale for pointing out that these earlier move-
ments were also Pan Indian and point to a shared cultural perspective.

This does not preclude multiple identification—as Native American and as a member of a specific tribe. Liebler notes that about 90% of respondents to the 1990 census who identified themselves as American Indian also identified themselves as members of a particular tribe.

Before completing the analysis, we matched the profile of Native American respondents in the NORC/GSS to the profile of Native Americans as depicted by the U.S. Census. For both the GSS and the Census, 1980 was used as the base for which comparisons were made. A majority of Native Americans reside in urban areas, however, the percentage of urban dwellers is higher in the NORC/GSS. The 1980 census further revealed that 55.8 percent of Native Americans 25 and over were high school graduates; the GSS frequency for this group is 57.5 percent which is slightly higher. Finally, the ratio of males to females is very close for both the U.S. Census and the GSS. These comparisons seem to indicate that the Native American respondents in the GSS are representative of the Native American population.

7 According to Robinson, Shaver and Wrightsman (1991), a coefficient alpha of .60 - .69 describes a “moderate” level of internal consistency for an index.

Originally, number of correct responses on the vocabulary test was included in the analysis to test for language ability. However, including this variable excluded about half of the Native Americans in the analysis and did not impact the overall findings, so vocabulary score was excluded from the final analysis. Native American respondents follow White respondents in vocabulary score with a mean of 6.38. This result would seem to preclude any language barriers for Native American respondents.

Of course there are exceptions; urban areas located in states with high concentrations of Native Americans may also have equally high concentrations. Examples include Oklahoma City, OK, Sioux Falls, SD, and Milwaukee, WI.

10 Correlation matrix available from authors on request. Examination of the correlation coefficients indicated no problems with multicollinearity.
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Gender Differences Related to Interest in Participation in Intercollegiate Athletics: Another Look at Title IX

Jerome C. Weber, Myrna Carney, and Jeff Frazier, University of Oklahoma

Abstract

Since 1972, Title IX of the Education Amendments has required that institutions eliminate all vestiges of discrimination in education based on an individual's sex. This has come to be known as gender equity. In the area of intercollegiate athletics the determination of how to achieve gender equity has been problematic and, at times, contentious. These are not simply abstract issues, since, in many institutions, large numbers of dollars are involved.

Recently, court rulings have held that the most appropriate way to determine if gender equity has been achieved is by means of the criterion of proportionality. This criterion holds that an institution should provide essentially the same opportunities for participation of female athletes in its athletics program as female students represent in the undergraduate student body. In a challenge to this criterion, Brown University argued that such a measure was inappropriate in that it assumed that female students were as interested in participating in intercollegiate athletics as male students. The court ruled that this was not an essential element of proportionality, and that if opportunities were provided, women would eventually utilize those opportunities. However, the question of how male and female students compare in terms of their interest in participating in intercollegiate athletics has not been studied.

"The single most important influence on what we feel about another person is whether that person happens to be a man or a woman. We have fixed ideas about what men and women are like, and about what constitutes 'typical' masculine and feminine behavior." (Nicholson, 1984)

Introduction

In 1972 the Congress enacted legislation intended to eliminate all vestiges of discrimination in education based on an individual's sex, intending to achieve what we now refer to as gender equity. The enabling legislation was Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. This legislation reads in part:

"No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any educational program or activity receiving federal financial assistance..." (Kaplin and Lee, 1995).

The legislation addresses the time frames for implementation and, finally, describes exceptions that may exist for institutions which are religiously affiliated and for which "...the application of this subsection would not be consistent with the religious tenets of such organizations." Title IX originally was associated with "...many activities and areas including admissions, student activities and organizations, student [services]...all institutional rules and policies, treatment of students, publications, facilities, housing and employment." (Durrant, 1992, p. 60). Lazerson (1996) states that Title IX is viewed as either a villain or a hero, depending upon one's view as to whether the impact is to create more opportunities for female students, or result in fewer opportunities for male students. Guenin (1996) points out that initially there was confusion about whether Title IX applied to athletics because the scantiness of the language did not specifically mention equal opportunity or athletics. In 1984 the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that Title IX applied only to program receiving direct federal funds. However, in 1988 Congress specified that Title IX applied to "...all aspects of an educational institution's programs, including athletics, if any part of it received federal funds." (Suggs, 2000, p. A56).

Although many of the goals originally intended by the Congress have been real-
ized, questions still remain almost thirty years since the passage of Title IX. Many of these questions relate specifically to athletic participation and the associated opportunities which schools should provide for women. As with most legislation aimed at changing the ways in which individuals and groups behave, it takes years and, predictably, court challenges before the intent of the legislation evolves into practices that are widely understood, agreed upon and fully implemented. While the goal of gender equity has remained clear, and while Title IX is understood as the mechanism to achieve this goal, confusion and disagreement continue to exist as to how to determine when institutions have achieved compliance. Regardless of how well-intended the individual institution, coach or athletic director may be, there remains a lack of clarity as to what gender equity means and should mean, and how to achieve that elusive goal.

The initial attempts to implement Title IX produced a broad array of daunting questions. Even assuming a real desire to achieve gender equity, it was not always clear how to proceed. For example, did the law mean that an institution was required to spend the same number of dollars on women's athletics as on men's? Was the number of sports, the number of scholarships, the number of dollars or the number of participants an appropriate measure? Did the law absolutely require a quantifiable definition of gender equity? Did exactly the same sports have to be offered to both men and women? Did each sport offered to male students have to have an analog in a sport offered to women students? If the decision was that it was either inappropriate or unnecessary to have a women's counterpart for each men's sport, what about the participation of individual women in traditional "men only" sports? Could a woman try out for the football team? Was it different if the woman was a potential kicker as opposed to a potential lineman (lineperson)? What about a woman trying out for the wrestling team? Should the "revenue sports" (i.e., men's basketball and football) be exempt from the intent of the legisla-

tion since they were the sports which, by definition, produced the revenue that helped support the other sports, both men's and women's, offered by the athletic department? The questions proliferated, and, with the passage of time, answers to most were worked out in practice. As would be predicted, most women were not basically interested in playing football or wrestling, but in having the opportunity to compete against other women in such sports as swimming, gymnastics, soccer, tennis, basketball, softball and others.

At the same time as some of these questions were being resolved, resistance to Title IX evolved, based largely on financial considerations. If athletic budgets were relatively fixed and now had to be stretched to accommodate a whole new group of participants, the former "haves" were in danger of becoming "have nots" and responded predictably. With this resistance, the need to have a clear measure of when gender equity was achieved, or even if an institution was moving in the right direction, became more acute.

The criteria which evolved to determine compliance required a university athletics program to meet at least one of three tests: 1) having a history and continuing practice of expanding athletics opportunities for women; 2) demonstrating success in fully and effectively meeting the interests and abilities of female students; or 3) providing approximately the same percentages of female athletes and female undergraduates. Given the resistance to Title IX based upon its financial impact, and the fact that two of three criteria were difficult if not impossible to quantify, it was predictable that the criterion of percentage would come to dominate the discussion of compliance. Thus, the discussion of whether an institution's athletics program is in compliance with Title IX is largely determined by what has come to be known as substantial proportionality; that is, the institution should provide essentially the same opportunities for participation of female athletes in its athletics program as female students represent in the undergraduate student body.

The most recent issue which has arisen as a result of this focus on proportionality
was demonstrated in the case of Brown v. Cohen which was filed in 1992. In this case Amy Cohen, a Brown undergraduate and member of its women's gymnastics team, filed suit in federal court claiming she and other women had been discriminated against when the university cut support for its women's gymnastics and volleyball teams as part of a series of budget cuts that affected two men's teams as well. The argument made by the plaintiffs was “...that Brown was required to fund all viable women's sports or continually expand opportunities for women until gender parity is achieved on the varsity level.” (Mahoney, 1998) A lower-court judge found that the university was in violation of Title IX, and the First Circuit upheld that judgment. The case was appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court with the university claiming that, if the decision were upheld, colleges would have to either eliminate men's sports or spend unreasonable amounts of money on women's sports. The university's counsel of record argued that the measure used — proportionality — was not an appropriate measure of institutional compliance. Her argument was that women have less interest in participating in athletics and thus the criterion of proportionality to determine gender equity in athletic programs is inappropriate.

In an article describing her views to a lay audience, Maureen E. Mahoney, Brown's attorney in the case, describes the issue as follows:

“Title IX should not be read to prohibit a varsity program that is 60% male at a university where half the students are women for the same reason that we do not prohibit a collegiate dance program that is 90% female or an engineering program that is 70% male. Who would advocate a ruling requiring colleges that receive applications from 100 qualified dancers - 75 women, 25 men - to set aside 25 spaces for men and 25 spaces for women to ensure gender balance in a program with room for 50 dancers? Is it fair to structure that dance program so that it affords qualified men a far greater chance of participating and guarantees that many more qualified women will be excluded? That's not equal opportunity, that's preferential treatment - which Title IX expressly says is not required.” (Mahoney, 1998)

The Supreme Court refused to hear Brown's appeal, thus letting the lower court ruling stand. In analyzing this sequence of litigation, it is important to note that the general conclusion is that the courts believe that if athletic opportunities for women exist in sufficient number, interest in participation will grow. After all, the argument goes, men have had a much longer period of time to develop interest in participating in athletics since they have always known that the opportunity to do so was available. This might be viewed as the “If you build it they will come” scenario. While the relationship between opportunity, interest and participation can be postulated, it has not been demonstrated. However, the argument regarding differences in interest in athletic participation between men and women has also not been demonstrated, but only speculated upon. Thus, it seems important to determine if men and women have the same level of interest in participating in intercollegiate athletics as an important step toward establishing more equitable practices related to proportionality and participation opportunities for male and female students.

Since the criterion of proportionality has evolved as the primary basis for determining if an institution is in compliance with Title IX, it seems reasonable to address the underlying question of whether women have the same level of interest in participating in intercollegiate athletics as men. If this assumption were supported by available data, the criterion of proportionality as currently interpreted in the Cohen v. Brown case would seem clearly appropriate. If, however, this underlying assumption is not valid, it may be necessary to address the question of whether different levels of interest in athletic participation between men and women should influence institutional requirements for gender equity, and, if so, how those requirements might be modified. For example, if men and women students differ in their interest in participating in intercollegiate athletics, institutions might be required to
monitor those data annually to determine what would be, at a given point in time, equitable levels of participation opportunities for men and women students.

Given the great size of athletic department budgets, the impact of finances on number and types of athletic teams available to men and women college students, the great visibility of intercollegiate athletics and their importance to their sponsoring institutions, as well as the long history associated with the determination of what the phrase "gender equity" means in this regard, this is an important question to address and resolve.

This article reports a study undertaken by the authors that was designed to provide real data that would provide at least a partial answer to the questions raised in this discussion. The purpose was to survey the members of a freshman class at The University of Oklahoma to determine if they had participated in varsity athletics at the high school level, and also to determine if, given the opportunity, they would be interested in participating in intercollegiate athletics. These questions were embedded in a larger questionnaire regularly given to incoming freshmen students who participate in the summer advance enrollment program run by the university.

**Methodology**

The University of Oklahoma, like many other institutions, conducts an extensive summer advance enrollment program for incoming freshmen students. In this program, students are asked to respond to a number of issues so that they can be compared with national data. Demographic information is also collected so students' responses can be compared on such variables as gender, ethnicity, high school background, etc. As part of this process, students were asked if they participated in high school athletics, and if they would be interested in participating in athletics at the college level. The freshman class consisted of 3,224 students, 1,576 (48.8%) of whom were men and 1,648 (51.2%) of whom were women. However, not all incoming freshmen students are required to go through the advance enrollment program. Of the total of 3,224 students in the freshman class, 2,710 (84%) participated in the advance enrollment program and turned in completed questionnaires upon which the results of this study are based. Of the total number of men in the freshman class, 82.5% participated in the advance enrollment program and thus participated in this study, while 85.6% of the total number of women in the freshman class participated in the advance enrollment program and this study.

The specific items to which the students were asked to respond were as follows:

1) While in high school, I participated in varsity athletics: Yes No

2) If the opportunity arose, I would be interested in participating in a varsity sport at O.U. (The students answered using a five-point Likert scale with responses ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree.")

**Results and Discussion**

The data in Table 1 show that freshmen men had a significantly higher rate of participation in varsity athletics in high school than freshmen women. Over one-half (55%) of the total freshmen students indicated they had participated in high school varsity athletics. Of the male freshmen, the percentage who had participated was 62%, while for the female freshmen, the percentage who had participated was 49%.

The data in Table 2 represent the responses of all male and female students to the question of interest in participation in intercollegiate athletics. Fifty percent of the male students agree or strongly agree, while only twenty-three percent of the female students answered in this manner.

The data in Table 3 show the responses of male students who had been high school varsity athletes vs. female students who had been high school varsity athletes regarding interest in participation in intercollegiate athletics. Almost twice as many males (41%) strongly agreed that they would be interested in participating in college varsity sports if the opportunity arose than did females (22%). Almost three times as many females (20%) strongly disagreed with this item than did males (7%).

The data in Table 4 shows the same sig-
Significant differences between male and female level of interest in competing in varsity athletics at the collegiate level when non-high school varsity athletes are compared by gender. Three times as many non-athlete males (27%) strongly agreed or agreed that they would be interested in participating in college varsity sports than female non-athletes (8%).

The data in Tables 5 and 6 clearly indicates that past participation in high school varsity sports has an impact in level of interest in participating in college varsity sports. Both male and female high school varsity athletes indicated a higher level of interest in participating in college sports than did the male and female non-athletes.

**Table 1: Male vs. Female High School Varsity Athletic Participation**

While in high school, I participated in varsity athletics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>801 (62%)</td>
<td>499 (38%)</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>696 (49%)</td>
<td>714 (51%)</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,497 (55%)</td>
<td>1,213 (45%)</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.0001

**Table 2: Male vs. Female Students’ Interest in Participating in Intercollegiate Athletics**

If the opportunity arose, I would be interested in participating in a varsity sport at OU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>373 (29%)</td>
<td>271 (21%)</td>
<td>247 (19%)</td>
<td>190 (15%)</td>
<td>216 (17%)</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>175 (12%)</td>
<td>160 (11%)</td>
<td>284 (20%)</td>
<td>286 (20%)</td>
<td>506 (36%)</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>548 (20%)</td>
<td>431 (16%)</td>
<td>531 (20%)</td>
<td>476 (18%)</td>
<td>722 (27%)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.0001

**Table 3: Male Athletes’ vs. Female Athletes’ Interest in Participating in College Varsity Sports**

High School Athlete: Did participate in high school varsity sports. If the opportunity arose, I would be interested in participating in a varsity sport at OU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male HS Athletes</td>
<td>324 (41%)</td>
<td>186 (23%)</td>
<td>143 (18%)</td>
<td>86 (11%)</td>
<td>56 (7%)</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female HS Athletes</td>
<td>152 (22%)</td>
<td>124 (18%)</td>
<td>154 (22%)</td>
<td>129 (19%)</td>
<td>136 (20%)</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total HS Athletes</td>
<td>476 (32%)</td>
<td>310 (21%)</td>
<td>297 (20%)</td>
<td>215 (14%)</td>
<td>192 (13%)</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.0001
Table 4: Male Non-Athletes' vs. Female Non-Athletes' Interest in Participating in College Varsity Sports

Non-High School Athlete: Did not participate in high school varsity sports. If the opportunity arose, I would be interested in participating in a varsity sport at OU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male non-Athletes</th>
<th>Female non-Athletes</th>
<th>Total non-Athletes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></td>
<td>49 (10%)</td>
<td>22 (3%)</td>
<td>71 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agree</strong></td>
<td>84 (17%)</td>
<td>36 (5%)</td>
<td>120 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neutral</strong></td>
<td>103 (21%)</td>
<td>129 (18%)</td>
<td>232 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagree</strong></td>
<td>103 (21%)</td>
<td>156 (22%)</td>
<td>259 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Disagree</strong></td>
<td>160 (32%)</td>
<td>368 (52%)</td>
<td>528 (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sd</strong></td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>t</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.43*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p<.0001

Table 5: Male High School Athletes' vs. Male Non-High School Athletes' Interest in Participating in Intercollegiate Athletics

If the opportunity arose, I would be interested in participating in a varsity sport at OU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HS Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></td>
<td>324 (41%)</td>
<td>49 (10%)</td>
<td>373 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agree</strong></td>
<td>186 (23%)</td>
<td>84 (17%)</td>
<td>270 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neutral</strong></td>
<td>143 (18%)</td>
<td>103 (21%)</td>
<td>246 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagree</strong></td>
<td>86 (11%)</td>
<td>103 (21%)</td>
<td>189 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Disagree</strong></td>
<td>56 (7%)</td>
<td>160 (32%)</td>
<td>216 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sd</strong></td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>t</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.02*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p<.0001

Table 6: Female High School Athletes' vs. Female Non-High School Athletes' Interest in Participating in Intercollegiate Athletics

If the opportunity arose, I would be interested in participating in a varsity sport at OU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HS Athletes</th>
<th>Non-Athletes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></td>
<td>152 (22%)</td>
<td>22 (3%)</td>
<td>174 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agree</strong></td>
<td>124 (18%)</td>
<td>36 (5%)</td>
<td>160 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neutral</strong></td>
<td>154 (22%)</td>
<td>129 (18%)</td>
<td>283 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagree</strong></td>
<td>129 (19%)</td>
<td>156 (22%)</td>
<td>285 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Disagree</strong></td>
<td>136 (20%)</td>
<td>368 (52%)</td>
<td>504 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sd</strong></td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>t</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.57*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p<.0001
Conclusions

The data in this study show that freshmen male students differ significantly \( p < .0001 \) from their female counterparts in regard to the degree to which they participated in varsity high school athletics and the degree to which they might be interested in participating in intercollegiate athletics. Further, the data also show that, for both male and female students, their interest in participating in intercollegiate athletics is associated with whether or not they participated in varsity high school athletics. In other words, the male students participated in high school varsity athletics more than their female counterparts, and they were more interested in the possibility of participating in intercollegiate athletics. Both male and female students were more likely to be interested in intercollegiate athletic participation if they had been high school varsity athletes. These results seem logical in light of the longer history during which males have been encouraged to participate in athletics.

However, perhaps the most striking observation regarding participation rate in high school varsity athletics is that almost half (49%) of the females surveyed indicated that they had participated in high school varsity athletics. While the males’ participation rate (62%) was significantly greater, it is not unreasonable to conclude that the impact of Title IX has been dramatic in increasing participation rates among women. Further, it is also not unreasonable to speculate that, at least at the high school level, the participation rates for females in high school varsity athletics might be expected to equal that of males in the not-too-distant future.

For students overall, the difference in interest in participation in intercollegiate athletics is also significant, but far more striking with 50% of the men indicating they agreed or strongly agreed that they would be interested in participating in intercollegiate athletics, while only 23% of the women expressed such an interest. In other words, regardless of whether they participated in high school athletics or not, men are more than twice as interested in participating in intercollegiate athletics. When these responses are divided among those men and women who participated in high school athletics vs. those who did not, the gender differences remain. For those with high school varsity experience, a total of 64% of the males expressed interest or strong interest in intercollegiate athletics, while only 40% of the females expressed such an interest. For those without high school varsity experience, a total of 27% of the males expressed interest or strong interest in intercollegiate athletics, while only 8% of the females expressed such an interest. Finally, for both male and female students, interest in participation in intercollegiate athletics is greatly increased for those who participated in high school athletics.

Looking at these outcomes, it is possible to see a pattern evolve. For students overall, these figures indicate that male students are a bit more than twice as interested (50% vs. 23%) in participating in intercollegiate athletics as women. For students without high school athletics experience, male students are more than three times as interested (27% vs. 8%) in participating in intercollegiate athletics as women. For students with high school athletics experience, male students are slightly more than half again as interested (64% vs. 40%) in participating in intercollegiate athletics as women. In other words, it appears that although men certainly seem more interested in participating in intercollegiate athletics than women, that difference narrows if they have had the opportunity to participate in high school athletics. If further studies should determine that these results are widely applicable, one might reasonably conclude that as women students move toward equity in high school athletic participation, they may also be expected to move toward equity in their level of interest in participation in intercollegiate athletics. In other words, the “If you build it they will come” scenario may indeed be reasonable.

As with any such study, one must make assumptions regarding the respondents’ accuracy and honesty in reading, interpreting and responding to the questions. However, in this case the questions were straightforward and it is reasonable to as-
sume that few, if any, questions as to meaning should have arisen. While the present study is based on a rather large number of responses, questions of external validity must also be raised. The University of Oklahoma is a large (>20,000), public institution in a specific region of the country. In addition, it is an institution with a tradition of athletic excellence that has long been a source of pride on a statewide basis. Since the percentage of incoming students who are state residents is, like most state universities, quite high, it is reasonable to assume that a large percentage of its freshman class would be aware of this tradition, possibly increasing their interest in athletic participation at the intercollegiate level. Thus, it may not be appropriate to make direct extrapolations of the data from this study to other types of institutions in other areas of the country. On the variables of size, source of funding, region and athletic tradition, The University of Oklahoma and, as an example, Brown University are quite different institutions and further study may indicate that the results of this study are institution type-specific. However, as an initial effort designed to test the question of whether men and women differ in their interest in participating in intercollegiate athletics, this data answers that question affirmatively.

Finally, it should also be noted that the “If you build it they shall come” argument can be seen as supported by the data in this study. Given the fact that male students participated significantly more in high school varsity athletics than females, coupled with the fact that interest in participating in intercollegiate athletics is associated with high school sports participation for both men and women, it is logical to guess that if more athletic opportunities were available to women in the years before they enter college, their interest in participating when they come to college would also increase. Almost three decades after the landmark passage of Title IX, it appears that questions remain as to how to best achieve, and measure, gender equity, a goal that is both the law of the land and in the best interests of all students and institutions.
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Abstract
This study examined the extent to which commuters and the first cohort of residential students occupied separate worlds of university life due to differences in role conflict. The population of the first cohort of residents \( n = 109 \) and a random sample of commuters \( n = 121 \) were compared on demographics, use of facilities, and social interaction. Residents were more involved in campus activities, and used campus facilities more. Residents reported a greater number of interactions with other students. Commuters were less integrated into the campus due to role conflict from heavier off-campus responsibilities and time constraints. Suggestions for mitigating role conflict and meeting the needs of these distinct groups are presented.

Introduction
There is a relationship between the living situations of college students and their satisfaction with their college experience. Research suggests that several factors contribute to a more favorable college experience. Some of these factors are: strong links between student and faculty (Boyd 1997; Villella, Widener 1997; Vieira 1996), quality of teaching, involvement in student activities, and social interaction (Chebator 1996; Meredith 1985). If satisfaction with the college experience is the goal, then the question this research attempts to address is: are the afore-mentioned social factors more easily attained by students if they live on campus or if they commute to campus?

Separate Worlds
Living on campus involves students in an environment that is quite different from the environments of commuters. Although studies suggest that grade point average is positively affected by having a commuter status as opposed to living closer to campus (Delucchi 1993), and that traditional students tend to be relatively more anxious about their academic performance (Dill, Henley 1998), results from national samples show that residents are more satisfied with their campus environment than commuters (Schroeder, Mable 1994). This may be at least partially attributed to the fact that social events have more of an influence on traditional students than on commuters (Dill, Henley 1998). Prior research has shown that those who are nearer to activities are more likely to participate in them (Graham, Verma 1991; Glynn, Pugh, Rose 1990; Ostro, Adelberg 1976). Furthermore, quantity of social activities strongly predicts happiness (Cooper, Okamura, Gurka 1992).

In addition, there is a plethora of research which suggests that proximity has a profound effect on one’s social life not only in terms of participating in activities, but also in terms of interpersonal relationships. As physical distance between people lessens, the likelihood of social interaction increases (Adams 1985-6), and the likelihood of being chosen as a friend increases (Festinger, Schachter, Back 1950; Yarosz, Bradley 1963; Ebbesen, Kjos, Konecni 1976; Adams 1985-6; Latane et al. 1995). Finally, Rook (1987) demonstrated that friendship was a strong predictor of social satisfaction.

It is also interesting to note that students living on campus are less likely to experience conflict with other students than commuters are (Lundgren, Schwab 1979). Furthermore, residential living has been positively associated with personal growth (Pascarella, Terenzini 1980; Welty 1976) and personal adaptation and well-being (Nosow 1975). These concepts, then, point to the idea that simply by their living situation, residents are more likely to...
be more involved in social activities on campus, and more likely to have more friends on campus. Again, this paves the way for a higher level of satisfaction with their college experience, as compared with commuters.

Most prior research has not made distinctions among various types of commuters and residents. At residential colleges and universities, traditional students have moved from the home of their parents in another community to residence halls on campus. As they matriculate, these students move just off-campus. At commuter campuses, most students live with parents, friends, or with their own spouses and children. Most of these students hold jobs, and they commute to campus in cars or on public transportation.

Commuters, therefore, experience more role-conflict than traditional, residential students because they must balance “several important and demanding roles” (Jacoby 1989: 62). Although the status of “student” necessitates performing multiple roles (termed “role set” by Merton 1968) such as: researcher, learner, classmate, writer, etc., most commuters add to their list of roles exponentially with each additional status. This includes, but is not limited to their often demanding responsibilities in their roles in the home (Dill, Henley 1998), which most residents do not have to address. Commuters’ access to participation in campus functions and extra-curricular activities usually is limited by constraints of time and distance. Furthermore, commuters report more financial problems than residents (Chickering 1974). Exigencies of work, family, school, and the commute that links them can collide. The result is a harried life in which all “non-essential” activities are swept aside.

Research Setting

The University of Colorado at Colorado Springs (UCCS) became a campus in 1965. By 1996, it had grown to 6,000 students (4,000 FTE), but it had neither housing on-campus nor any appreciable off-campus housing within walking distance. In Fall, 1996, the campus opened residence halls for 300 residents, and 215 students occupied these new facilities. Basic services for residential students still were being created as students moved in. For example, parking lots were not completed; in fact, new buildings obliterated existing parking lots which, consequently, meant a more controlled residential environment for research purposes, since the residents had little access to get off campus. Unfortunately, other effects could not be controlled. Residents and commuters were likely to be different in demographic characteristics and in the degree of role conflict, so these variables were measured in an attempt to understand how they affected the lives of students.

Predictions

1) Residents were predicted to be traditional students: younger (Rebellino 1997), having earned fewer units toward graduation, taking fewer courses, and working fewer hours per week than commuter students (non-traditional).

2) Even though the campus could not yet offer a complete residential experience, residents were predicted to participate far more in campus activities than commuters (Graham, Verma 1991; Glynn, Pugh, Rose 1990; Ostro, Adelberg 1976).

3) Residents were predicted to have a greater number of social contacts with other residents (and with commuters) than commuters (Adams 1985-6). Furthermore, residents were predicted to consider the campus a greater part of their social lives than commuters.

4) Residents were predicted to be less concerned about parking than commuters, based on the fact that the lack of parking spaces significantly impacts how much time a commuter needs to get to campus before class, since they would have to leave enough time to find a space.

Methods

Sample and Participants

The population of residents (N = 215) and a simple random sample of undergradautes (n = 215) were contacted via mail beginning in November, 1996. A total of 109 residents responded, 45 men (41%) and 64 women (59%). A total of
121 commuters responded, 52 men (43%) and 68 women (57%). The overall response rate was 53%. The mean age of the respondents was 24.78 (SD = 8.08), and the median age was 21.

Materials

The survey packet contained a cover letter that explained the purpose of the study and sought informed consent. The packet also contained a three-page survey instrument and a business reply envelope that was addressed to a research center on campus housed in the Sociology department.

Respondents reported their use of 31 campus facilities during the first 11 weeks of the semester. Seven items dealt with the extent to which campus life was a part of the respondent’s social life. A demographic item asked about the living situation of the respondent. Responses were divided into the following five categories: 1) resident having a permanent address within Colorado Springs (n = 40), 2) resident having a permanent address outside Colorado Springs (n = 69), 3) commuter living with parents (n = 29), 4) commuter living with friend(s)/roommate(s) (n = 28), 5) commuter living with family (e.g., spouse/children) (n = 64). Other demographic items asked about age, gender, and ethnicity. Finally, an open-ended question asked respondents their biggest concern about UCCS.

Procedures

In early November, 1996, packets of wave 1 were mailed to everyone in the sample. After two weeks, a reminder postcard was sent. The card thanked respondents who had returned their questionnaires, and it urged non-respondents to reply. After the winter break, complete materials were sent to non-respondents in wave 2. Response rates are presented above.

Results

Resident and Commuter Characteristics

The means on Table 1 show that ages of both residential groups and commuters who lived with parents were about 20 years, but the ages of commuters who lived with friends or family were over 27 years. Using the F-ratio, the differences among the five means were statistically significant (p < .001).

The means on Table 1, row 2, show that residents and commuters who lived with parents were taking more semester hours (about 13) than were commuters who lived with friends or family (between seven and eight). Also, both groups of residents and commuters who lived with parents had accumulated between 30 and 40 semester hours, but commuters who lived with friends or family had accumulated over 50 semester hours. Using F, both of these relations were statistically significant (p < .001). Finally, the two groups of residents worked less (< 16 hours) than the three groups of commuters (>23 hours). The differences among the means were statistically significant (p < .001).

Prior to the analyses below, the possible correlations between semester units, length of commute, hours worked, and gender on dependent measures of use of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permanent Address:</th>
<th>Lives With:</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident (Within City)</td>
<td>Resident (Outside City)</td>
<td>Commuter (with Parents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>21.33</td>
<td>20.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Hours</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>12.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hours</td>
<td>38.94</td>
<td>38.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Worked</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>23.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Differences Among Mean Ages, Current Academic Hours, Academic Hours Completed, and Hours Worked per Week for Five Types of Residential and Commuting Students
facilities, social contacts, and perception of campus problems were investigated. No statistically significant relations were found, so analysis of variance was used to examine differences in means of dependent variables (DVs) across the five categories of residents/commuters (IV).

**Use of Facilities**
Principal components analysis resulted in 11 factors that represented 29 items on use of campus facilities (see Appendix A).

The scales shown on Table 2 were created by weighting items by their loading on a factor and adding them. The sums were divided by the number of items so that entries presented in Table 2 were roughly comparable to each other.

While the means on Table 2 showed greater use of Special Services (Factor I) by residents, results were not statistically significant. It was not surprising that for the next three factors, Residential Services, Sports, and Residence Halls, results showed greater use by residents, since these facilities were connected with residential life. Differences among the means were statistically significant for all three analyses (p < .001). No statistically significant differences among means were observed for Use of Library/Science Labs, Advising, or Bookstore/Communication Help Labs. The Student Success Center and the Arts were used more by residents (p < .05). No significant difference among means was observed for the Math Center. Commuters who lived with friends, and commuters who lived with family appeared to use day care more than the other groups, but large variation within groups prevented these differences from being statistically significant.

**Social Interaction**
Residents considered the campus to be part of their social lives far more than commuters did, and results were statistically significant (see Table 3; p < .0001). Furthermore, residents had many more contacts with residents than commuters did (p < .05). Residents also had more contacts with commuters than commuters did, but due to large within group variation, the difference was not statistically significant.

**Problems**
Commuters were twice as likely (42%) as residents (21%) to voice that parking was their “biggest concern about the University of Colorado, Colorado Springs” (see Table 3). While few respondents cited costs of college education as a problem, 15% of resident respondents who listed a permanent address in Colorado Springs cited costs as a problem. This percentage was five or more times higher than the percentage for the other groups, and the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permanent Address: Resident (Within City) Resident (Outside City)</th>
<th>Lives With: Commuter (with Parents)</th>
<th>Commuter (with Friends)</th>
<th>Commuter (with Family)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Serv.</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Serv.</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resid. Halls</td>
<td>24.71</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib/Sci Lab</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>7.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Labs</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success Center</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Center</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daycare</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Table 2. Significant Differences Among Factor Scores for Use of Campus by Five Types of Residential and Commuting Students During the First 11 Weeks of the Fall Semester]
differences among means were statistically significant ($p < .01$).

**Discussion**

Residents and commuters have different activities, and they live in distinct social worlds that have varying amounts of role conflict. Part of this separation was a result of proximity.

**Proximity**

Residents were more likely to use some of the facilities on campus and to get involved in campus activities because these amenities were close to “home.” The independent effects of proximity were separate from those of differences in stage of life cycle and work and family roles, as shown by similarities throughout the study between residents who had a permanent address in Colorado Springs and commuters who lived with their parents. Furthermore, on many dimensions, including degree of role conflict, those commuters who lived with parents were midway between residents and commuters who lived with friends or with spouse/children.

Another interesting group was residents who had a permanent address in Colorado Springs. These students were older than other residents, and had accumulated more semester hours. Why would non-traditional students want to live on-campus, a place which has been considered more appropriate for younger students, and one that is constrained by rules, regulations, and even a curfew? Many of these students may have been commuters who preferred the idea of leaving their parents’ house to live in a dorm, fulfilling the desire to be “on their own” and perhaps to lessen role conflict involving family obligations to parents and siblings. Further, based on the high rates of renting an apartment in Colorado Springs, it is likely that many residents chose the campus life for sheer financial reasons. It is not surprising that more of these students considered costs of college education to be a problem than students in the other groups.

**Matriculation**

Of course, differences between commuters and residents went deeper than proximity, and results pointed to more fundamental differences between the groups. Residents and commuters who lived with parents were taking more courses, but they had not accumulated as many semester units as commuters who lived with friends or spouse/children. Advanced courses were smaller, and many of them were offered only in the evening once per week. This scheduling issue highlights the likelihood that more commuters are on campus taking classes in the evening (after work) than residents: another distinction between the two groups, and something

| Table 3. Differences in Perception of Social Life, Number of Social Contacts Per Week, and Perception of Campus Problems for Five Types of Residents and Commuters |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                                | Permanent Address:             | Lives With:     |                 |                 |                 |                 |
|                                | Resident (Within City)         | Resident (Outside City) | Commuter (with Parents) | Commuter (with Friends) | Commuter (with Family) | p                |
| Campus as part of social life  | 4.15                           | 4.33                     | 2.10             | 2.03             | 1.50             | .0001           |
| No. of Contacts with Residents | 36.78                          | 32.29                    | 2.72             | 1.03             | .91              | .05             |
| No. of Contacts with Commuters | 76.98                          | 26.04                    | 5.27             | 5.68             | 7.04             | NS              |
| Parking cited as a problem     | .22                            | .20                      | .52              | .32              | .42              | .01             |
| College costs as a problem     | .15                            | .03                      | .00              | .00              | .03              | .01             |
to consider in terms of commuter's inability to participate in campus activities in the evenings during the week. Students taking fewer, but more advanced courses that met less often would be expected to be on campus less, to use some facilities less, to have fewer social contacts, and to have a greater problem parking.

Social Interaction
Another theoretical difference between commuters and residents stems from the fact that, as predicted, commuters had fewer social contacts than residents. Perhaps the difference goes beyond mere time constraints, and points instead to the way each group conceives of social interaction on campus. It is possible that residents view contact with others, and the act of establishing relationships, as part of a goal of their college experience. In fact, Moffatt (1989) states that residential students claim that fifty percent of their "total college education" takes place outside the classroom. Based on their relatively more complex lives and greater role conflict, commuters, on the contrary, might view contact with others as more of a time-consuming hindrance to their objective of acquiring their degree.

Stage of the Lifecycle
A fourth explanation of observed differences was stage of lifecycle. Residents rarely were parents, but among commuters, many were parents, and many commuters lived with their parents. Thus, their role conflict was higher. This fact was illustrated graphically by the fact that while commuters took about half as many courses, they worked more than twice as many hours as residents. Furthermore, of the 121 commuters, 64 (53%) lived with spouses/children, so they were at least partially responsible for 1) maintaining a household, 2) contributing to financial support of others, and 3) caring for a spouse and/or children. This surplus of responsibilities carried a much greater potential for role conflict, and it served as another broad explanation of observed differences between residents and commuters. In retrospect, role conflict should have been measured more directly by asking specifically about the cross-pressures of work, family, and school.

Conclusion
Based on the research previously cited regarding the social factors which can contribute to a more satisfying college experience: involvement in student activities and social interaction, it seems that the new residents at UCCS might have a more positive experience in store for them.

Given the high level of role conflict that most commuters face, their challenge is to create effective means to deal with their myriad of responsibilities. One suggestion is offered by VanderZanden (1988): "One way to handle role conflict is to subdivide or compartmentalize one's life and assume only one of the incompatible roles at a time. For instance, college students may attempt to segregate their school and home experiences so they do not have to stage their behavior before their parents and peers simultaneously" (pp. 94-95).

Merton (1968) called these concepts of compartmentalization and segregation, "insulation". He suggested "insulating" one role from another by taking them on at different parts of the day, thereby alleviating some of the strain or conflict associated within or between specific statuses.

Another effective solution to dealing with role conflict is to establish priorities. Continuously choosing which role is most important and demands immediate attention might help to organize one's time, and potentially alleviate stress. Another helpful option would be for universities to provide, and students to utilize, facilities such as childcare centers on campus that are easily accessible and inexpensive. In addition, the availability of work-study programs might help to reconcile students' conflicting demands.

Another question that this research raises is whether the addition of residence halls to a long-time commuter campus inevitably creates inequality between the university and/or residents on one side, and commuters on the other. Based on the inher-
ently greater needs of the residents (for food, shelter, entertainment, etc.), the administration must give residents relatively more money and attention. Further, for the residents, the university is not only a place to learn, but also their home, often making their allegiance to the school stronger.

Early research suggests, in fact, that prejudice has been shown by college administrators toward commuters (Foster et al. 1977). If future research shows that these attitudes still exist, and are widespread, how will this potential inequality be perpetuated against the commuters, many of whom have been loyal students of the university long before the residents came along? Will the needs of commuters be taken as seriously as those of the residents?

An example of this competition is the parking situation on campus. In addition to a loss of existing parking lots by the construction of new residence halls, the addition of residents meant the loss of several hundred "prime" parking spaces because residents were permitted to park their cars in these spots overnight. The result is that not only commuters, but also residents, cited an emerging and pressing problem that became rancorous. Fortunately, it did not further divide the students, but it points out pitfalls of growth and change.

Additionally, the introduction of a resident population creates the need for a wider spectrum of services on campus. Given tight budgets, priorities are necessary, at least in the short run. One suggestion would be to focus on the "life" needs of the residents while providing the commuters with only the necessary services they have found, through research such as this, that commuters actually make use of. Research, such as the present one, can identify facilities and activities that are used by students in all groups, and the identification of five student groups seems to represent a more effective way of grouping students for assessment of needs. It is clear that the structural mentality of the administration must be one of flexibility and continual inquisitiveness in order to fulfill its role of meeting the needs of each group. It is important to note, however, that by their very nature, the needs of each group may keep commuters and residents segregated and competing for facilities and activities.

Appendix A
Factors and Factor Loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>Special Services</th>
<th>Student Employment (.84)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activities and Special Events (.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Computing Services (.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Resident Services</td>
<td>Weight Room (.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Game Room (.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Laundry (.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lounge (.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>Intercollegiate Player (.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intercollegiate Spectator (.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intramural Player (.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use of Sports Facilities (.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Residence Halls</td>
<td>Dormitory Suites (.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dormitory Food Service (.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Health Center (.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Lib./Science Support</td>
<td>Library (.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Science Learning Center (.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Science Labs (.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parking (.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Advising</td>
<td>Student Support Center: Advising (.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Language Learning Center (.89)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A Continued

| VII | Book./Comm. Support | Bookstore (.71) |
|     |                     | Writing Center (.81) |
|     |                     | Oral Communication Center (.55) |
| VIII | Student Success | Student Success Center |
| IX   | Arts               | Theater (.74) |
|      |                    | Art Gallery (.47) |
| X    | Math Learning Center | Mathematics Learning Center |
| XI   | Daycare Center     | Daycare Center |
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Abstract

The purpose of this article is to provide a case study of child advocacy in the legislative arena in the State of Oklahoma by a private, not-for-profit advocacy organization. Specifically, this article (1) describes the events leading to the creation of the Oklahoma Institute for Child Advocacy (OICA), (2) presents an effective strategy developed by OICA to engage a wide range of public and private stakeholders in an exercise to establish a children's legislative agenda for state legislators in advance of their legislative session each year, and (3) articulates the essential lessons learned during the process of formulating the children's legislative agenda. The approach discussed in this article is one of legislative advocacy as a way of benefiting large groups of children and youth across service settings.

Improving the lives of children takes more than saying the right things, kissing the right babies at a political rally, or showing up in the right places. It takes a focused agenda based on facts. It takes boldness. It takes action. It takes child advocacy.

National Association of Child Advocates 2000

Introduction

"Children are our most precious resource" is a commonly asserted truth uttered by political figures and not necessarily during an election year. The tireless efforts of child advocates at the local, state, and federal levels have collectively made important inroads to the capitol houses, county commissions, and city councils across the United States. Denny et al. (1989) accurately assessed that among others, advocacy groups had begun to recognize the significance of "developing effective, long-range strategies for influencing legislative policy making on federal and state levels (276)." Yet for every child advocate, there are countless other special interest groups who are competing for attention to and priority for their issues, as well as vying for scarce dollars.

Background

The concept of child advocacy is relatively recent and is an outgrowth of the children's rights movement. Hawes (1991) cites the children's rights movement began as early as 1641 with Massachusetts' "stubborn child" law. Others place its roots in the "child saving era" of the late 1800's to early 1900's (Cahill 1986; Herbert, Mould 1992; Litzelfelner, Petr 1997; Tompkins et al 1998). Some of the benchmarks of the children's rights movement include but are not limited to the National Child Labor Committee of 1904, the series of White House Conferences on children and youth beginning in 1909, and the creation of the U.S. Children's Bureau in 1914 (Hawes 1991). Other significant milestones include Aid to Dependent Children Program as part of the Social Security Act in 1935; federal prohibition of "oppressive child labor" in the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; Brown vs. Board of the Education in 1954; the first child abuse reporting law enacted in Colorado in 1963; In re Gault, where the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in 1967 that juveniles are due equal protection under the law; and the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (P.L. 93-247) and the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (P.L. 93-415), both enacted in 1974 (Hawes 1991; NACA 2000). Two more recent pieces of legislation affecting nearly
half million children in foster care were the Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980 (P.L. 96-272) and the Adoption and Safe Families Act (P.L. 105-89) in 1997, which require permanency-planning efforts and shifts the focus from family preservation to permanency, respectively (Kadushin, Martin 1988; NACA 2000).

Child advocacy has no single definition, hence its implementation assumes different forms. Some define child advocacy as using public power and pressure toward improving the lives of children (Hawes 1991; Herbert, Mould 1992; Riley 1971). Others define advocacy in terms of interventions on behalf of children to avert harm or injury resulting from inadequate programs, services, or policies (Cahill 1986; Kahn et al 1973). Tompkins et al. (1998) characterize child advocacy as “...representing the personal and practical needs and requirements of children where/when the children and their natural advocates cannot ably represent themselves in fulfillment of those personal and practical needs (4).”

Schneider and Lester (2001) call for a new definition of advocacy that includes the use of understandable words and concepts, observable and empirically verifiable dimensions, specific boundaries to the activity, focused proactive engagement and actual doing, and applicable to every setting in which advocates find themselves.

Another aspect of child advocacy is the approach, which Litzelfelner and Petr (1997) say is either case or class advocacy. The latter is also known as social or cause advocacy. Case advocacy refers to speaking on behalf of or directly representing and supporting an individual; whereas, the class advocacy relates to working to effect a change on behalf of a group. Schneider and Lester (2001) refer to four types of advocacy: client, cause, legislative, and administrative. Legislative advocacy informs legislators at local, state, or federal levels about new problems and “...seek support and resources for disadvantaged persons, can raise public expectations about the rights and needs of all citizens (242).” Administrative advocacy is described as either agency leaders who engage themselves or their organizations in advocacy activities and/or internal organizational advocates that work toward effecting change for employees or consumers.

Court appointed special advocate (CASA) is one example of case or client advocacy that began in Seattle in 1977 (Litzelfelner, Petr, 1997). These individuals, or CASAs as they are referred to, are citizen volunteers who are specially trained and carry very low caseloads (Poertner, Press, 1990). The National CASA Association statistics show that there are currently 926 programs, which include 26 active tribal programs with a total of 442,000 volunteers throughout the United States. Locally, the Oklahoma Association of CASA has 25 programs including three tribal ones and a total of 914 volunteers (Naukam 2000). Research has demonstrated that CASAs are effective in averting foster care re-entry, increasing the likelihood that a child is adopted, and providing continuity due to the service longevity of its volunteers (Litzelfelner, Petr 1997).

An example of class advocacy is discussed in an historical essay by Trzcinski (forthcoming), when a class action lawsuit (Terry D. et al., vs. L.E. Rader et al.) was filed by Legal Aid of Western Oklahoma, the American Civil Liberties Union, and the National Youth Law Center citing unacceptable conditions in the state’s children’s institutions. It took almost twenty years to ameliorate the alleged conditions in the lawsuit. Legislative advocacy is what numerous lobbyists and organizations accomplish across the U.S. when they present their special interests group’s agenda to legislators and legislative staffers. The most easily recognizable form of administrative advocacy is found in the role of the ombudsman, which is found in social service organizations, health care facilities, and universities to name a few.

Schneider and Lester (2001) urge a focus on activity—what one actually does in the role of an advocate. They propose a new definition of advocacy as “…the exclusive and mutual representation of a
client(s) or a cause in a forum, attempting to systematically influence decision making in an unjust or unresponsive system(s) (65).” The activity of child advocacy is defined by Herbert and Mould (1992) as “Initiating needed changes to ensure the responsiveness and relevance of policies, procedures, programs, or practices of child-serving organizations and agencies; and/or encouraging the removal of organizational conditions or practices that are harmful to children (118).” This may include identifying new or expanded services needed by children, evaluating program effectiveness, building an infrastructure to support service delivery, or proactively influencing policy development and implementation at local, state, and federal levels.

Child advocacy must be proactive, and in so being must address challenges, such as:

- Finding a solution to fit the child rather than to fit the child to the solutions;
- Creating engineering capacities to help our child serving agencies to reassess policies, standards, procedures, and practices;
- Holding ourselves and others accountable to sustain appropriate goals and programs on the basis of children’s needs; and
- Attracting individuals and groups of parents, citizens, and professionals at all levels to pick up the gauntlet on behalf of children (Tompkins et al 1998: 55).

Cahill (1986) adds a cautionary note regarding advocacy efforts in the area of public policy and parent-child intervention in particular to be planful, deliberate, and sensitive in order to minimize the usual emotional minefields encountered. While advocates may not entirely agree on a definition or approach, child advocacy is clearly an essential component of ensuring that all children receive their fair share of attention, protection, and consideration in obtaining the necessary resources to meet their biological, educational, economic, and social needs.

The purpose of this article is to provide a case study of child advocacy in the legislative arena in the State of Oklahoma by a private, not-for-profit advocacy organization. Specifically, this article (1) describes the events leading to the creation of the Oklahoma Institute for Child Advocacy (OICA), (2) presents an effective strategy developed by OICA to engage a wide range of public and private stakeholders in an exercise to establish a children’s legislative agenda for state legislators in advance of their legislative session each year, and (3) articulates the essential lessons learned during the process of formulating the children’s legislative agenda. The approach discussed in this article is one of legislative advocacy as a way of benefiting large groups of children and youth across service settings.

Creation of the Oklahoma Institute for Child Advocacy

The emergence of child advocates and child advocacy organizations did not occur in a vacuum. Historically, pressing issues, dramatic events, and even tragedies have been catalysts for change and thus the rallying point for advocacy. This was true in the late 1800’s with the case of Mary Ellen, who was severely abused by her foster parents (Kadushin, Martin 1988). Advocates sought protection for her under the prevention of cruelty to animals’ law, claiming she warranted protection as a member of the animal kingdom. While there have been numerous examples of advocacy on behalf of children since then, Litzelfelner and Petr (1997) indicate that it was not until the creation of the National Joint Commission on the Mental Health of Children in 1969 that the term child advocacy enjoyed widespread use.

In the early 1980’s, an informal group of child advocates was meeting weekly at the Oklahoma State Capitol called the Coalition for Children, Youth and Families. This group consisted of between 25-30 representatives from different youth services organizations, the Conference of Churches, and others. They followed legislation and the issues of the day, provided information to legislators and their staffs, and sought support in areas that impacted their scope of interest (Carter 2000). National attention turned to the Oklahoma...
juvenile justice system in February 1982 through a series of much publicized investigative newspaper articles by the Gannett News Service, widely broadcast television coverage, and congressional hearings alleging maltreatment of children in Oklahoma's institutions under the auspices of the Department of Human Services (DHS) (Carter, 2000; DeJames, 1988; Kemper, 2000). The Gannett Foundation's affiliation with the local Channel 5 television station is what helped bring the national perspective into the picture. Gannett's expose entitled Oklahoma Shame involved numerous interviews and the review of hundreds of documents. This series "...alleged that Oklahoma's institutionalized children had been:

- Bound and manacled for extended periods.
- Hospitalized with serious injuries, including broken bones from attacks by adult attendants.
- Coerced into performing homosexual acts with state employees.
- Recruited to join a prostitution ring.
- Provided with illegal drugs by supervisors.
- Thrown into solitary confinement for weeks at a time (DeJames, 1988, p. 2)."

Moreover, DeJames (1988) wrote that DHS with its $1.2 billion budget, ...answered to no one—not the governor, the legislature, nor any oversight authority, even though it received more than half of the state budget. Because funding for DHS came from earmarked sales tax revenues, the Department did not have to rely on the legislature or governor for program or fiscal approval. As a result, there were only minimal fiscal or operational controls in place. Nor were there checks and balances by outside agencies or internal or external monitoring for compliance with forms and standards. Finally, since Oklahoma did not participate in the federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act, DHS had no federal monitors looking over its shoulder (p. 1).

The Coalition for Children, Youth and Families was outraged about the situation of children in the Department's custody. "We believed what was going on. No one had the power in the past to do anything about it. We were all in agreement with Oklahoma Shame and Terry D...convinced we had horrific institutions and little money going into community services (Carter, 2000)."

One of the group members wrote a letter to Channel 5 asking what the television station was willing to contribute to ameliorating the problems experienced by children in Oklahoma that they exposed to the world at large. The Gannett Foundation, through their affiliation with the television station, asked the group to send them a proposal. Max Glenn, chair of the Conference of Churches, and Eva Carter from the Council for Adoptable Children, developed a proposal to establish a formal private advocacy organization—the Oklahoma Institute for Child Advocacy.

Begun in 1983, the OICA was provided $150,000 in startup funds by the Gannett Foundation, and Eva Carter was appointed as its first executive director (Carter, 2000; Johnson, 2000). Another significant contribution was made by the Kerr Foundation, who gave the OICA the use of their beautiful downtown offices at no cost for two years, following Kerr's move to a new location (Carter, 2000). Thus was born this statewide, independent organization designed to assess and express the needs of children and youth in Oklahoma.

The fledgling organization's first major initiative was to host a "Fall Forum" that would include the heads of all the agencies to examine the most pressing issues that were affecting children. The timing was critical as some of the major institutions in the state were being closed as a consequence of Terry D. This meeting represented the first time that diverse agencies, their staff and leadership had especially come together to discuss programs, services, and strategies that were needed to avert a recurrence of the issues that prompted the Terry D. lawsuit (Carter, 2000).

Scarcely a year before the creation of the OICA, the combination of the Terry D. lawsuit and the harsh, continual news-
paper coverage about the conditions in Oklahoma's public children's institutions provided favorable conditions for the passage of a comprehensive bill. Known informally as the "McCorkell legislation" named after its primary author and sponsor that, among other things, created the Oklahoma Commission on Children and Youth (OCCY)—a public child advocacy organization to provide oversight and leadership on children's issues (DeJames 1988). Both the OICA and OCCY have collaborated on numerous child advocacy efforts since their inception.

Early on, the OICA made a critical decision to look not only at the issues within the juvenile justice system in Oklahoma, which was the reason for its creation, but more importantly, at issues highlighting prevention—specifically early childhood and child abuse prevention (Carter 2000). A major thrust was to develop legislation to create the Office of Child Abuse Prevention, which is housed in the Oklahoma Health Department and to obtain $5 million in funding. Numerous options were considered, attempted, and failed to obtain the needed financial support. Eventually, the legislature approved $2 million for the effort. There were other initiatives, one to reduce low birth weight babies, another to address the high cost of psychiatric care for children and mothers having to give up custody of their children in order for the state to assume financial responsibility for the high cost of care estimated to be as much as $1,000 per day. While various public and private agency heads periodically met to discuss the status of care for children, a more systematic approach was needed in order to more effectively influence a legislative agenda for children and youth in Oklahoma.

A New Plan of Action for OICA

With the appointment of Anne Roberts as the executive director for OICA in 1990, a new plan of action began to unfold. Roberts immediately began to connect with other advocates at the State Capitol to determine the best course of action in order to advocate for children in the legislative/public policy arena. Many groups were observed seeking to address the needs of children and youth, some of whom shared concerns, others with different priorities, and yet others with overlapping issues. There were child advocates for child abuse prevention, childcare, child support, education, intervention and treatment, juvenile justice, mental health, and welfare/public assistance. The groups varied widely in their levels of knowledge and experience regarding the legislative process, as well as the amount of resources they could commit to their advocacy efforts.

Roberts made several observations. First, many groups employed an approach of a one-day blitz at the State Capitol during the legislative session to advocate for their particular issue. There appeared to be little awareness of both the lengthy process of policy-making or the extensive nature of budgetary appropriations. Second, each group tended to work in isolation and developed their own plans with little information, understanding, or input from anyone outside of their immediate circle. Third, legislators conveyed a sense of confusion by the sheer number of groups calling themselves "child advocates" and the wide range of requests for support.

Some of the groups were successful in securing state-appropriations for projects they supported. Clearly, some successes came at the expense of other groups who lacked comparable levels of resources or experience. Most strikingly, there were few discussions between the groups that acknowledged the inextricable link of some of the issues or the need to prioritize and strategically plan a unified course of action as a means of more effectively influencing the legislative process. A more coordinated, informed, and holistic approach to the development of a public policy agenda to meet the needs of children and youth was desperately needed.

The Fall Forum on Children's Issues

What began as an idea to bring together various groups with diverse interests to explore the feasibility of collaboration and more targeted advocacy efforts, developed
into an effective strategy that would be instrumental in helping to shape an informed, concrete children's legislative agenda on an annual basis. The senior author had numerous conversations with members of the many issue-specific groups and received favorable to skeptical responses. Each person queried agreed that although hundreds of conferences and seminars were held each year around unique child-related topics, there was no opportunity nor mechanism for advocates and other interested professionals to learn how other issues impacted their own. Neither was there available training about advocacy in the political arena, including the legislative process, working with the media, or building a legislative campaign. With few staff or financial resources, Roberts called upon many of the groups and organizations for assistance and cooperation in sponsoring a Fall Forum that hoped to engage others in more effectively working on children's issues.

The first Fall Forum using this new format was held in October 1990, and there were 200 advocates in attendance. The goals of the event were twofold: (1) to provide an opportunity for advocates to learn about the most pressing needs of Oklahoma's children and youth, and how their own area of interest was connected to the overall solutions; and (2) to build and prioritize a children's agenda that advocates would commit to collectively work on in the next legislative session.

Day One of the Fall Forum

The opening day of the Forum provides participants with information on specific topics through keynote addresses from experts in a specific child-related field in the form of either a panel of state level policy makers or nationally recognized speakers. Depending upon the theme for any given year, the morning may focus on an issue from a national or state-level perspective. For example, when welfare reform was unfolding and the federal government increased their expectation of the state's responsibility, a series of panel discussions concerning the implications of the new requirement on Oklahoma was discussed from various views.

Another year when the juvenile justice system was under scrutiny, each of the discussion panels included a young person who had been impacted by the system. The panels were followed by an open microphone discussion with the audience. For several consecutive years, the Forum hosted a Youth Speak Out, where 10-12 young people spoke candidly about issues important to them. This powerful experience served to remind the adult participants of their true purpose in attending the Forum, and challenged them to remain actively engaged in the process.

For the 1997 Fall Forum, the OICA partnered with the Oklahoma Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) to bring Connecticut Supreme Court Judge Charles D. Gill to speak. Judge Gill is the co-founder of the National Task Force on Children's Constitutional Rights. This organization believes that the U.S. should ratify the United Nations' Convention on the Rights of the Child, which has been ratified by all 192 members of the U.N. except for Somalia and the United States. The partnering with AAP allowed for Judge Gill to speak to several hundred pediatricians during Grand Rounds at Children's Hospital prior to his presentation at the Fall Forum. Moreover, his keynote luncheon address at the Forum was also provided as a Continuing Legal Education Seminar, thus providing a professional development opportunity for attorneys.

In the most recent election year, the Forum slated a Legislative Leadership Roundtable moderated by the League of Women Voters. The Senate and House Leaders from both parties participated, and presented information on the direction each party and each chamber would pursue on behalf of children in the coming year. Senate representatives included Appropriations Vice Chair Cal Hobson (D)
and Assistant Minority Leader James Williamson (R). Participants for the House of Representatives were Speaker Loyd Benson (D) and Minority Floor Leader Fred Morgan (R). Each panelist made a presentation and accepted questions from the audience, which had been written on 3”x5” cards found on seats. A keynote address by Tamara Copeland, President of the National Association of Child Advocates in Washington, DC, provided the bridge to the afternoon program.

During the afternoon of the first day, the Forum provides training opportunities in various aspects of advocacy. This component varies year to year, but usually provides a choice of concurrent workshops on topics such as coalition building, working with the media, involving congregations as advocates, increasing public awareness, and the legislative process. In preparation for the Children’s Agenda for 2000, the afternoon session was titled: State of the State on Children and Youth and consisted of four concurrent workshops during two different time periods. Thus, a person could attend two issue-specific workshops in the afternoon. The first four issues were child abuse prevention, children’s mental health, school and adolescent health, and juvenile justice/delinquency prevention. The second four issues were child abuse intervention, substance abuse, maternal and child health, and early childhood development.

Each one of the workshops had four facilitators who filled the roles of resource person, legislator (State Representative), legislative staffer, and agency representative. For example, in the children’s mental health workshop, the resource person was a representative from the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill of Oklahoma. The legislator was one of the State Representatives who has been a long-time advocate for children’s issues; and the agency representative was the Director of Children’s Services for the Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services. The facilitators for each of the workshops were knowledgeable and well informed concerning the current issues pertaining to their topic area. Moreover, they were committed professionals who were actively involved in the advocacy process.

A secondary goal of the Fall Forum that has gained importance over the years is to involve as many legislators as possible. This is important for two reasons: (1) to allow legislators to see that children’s issues have a large and strong constituency, and (2) to allow participants to see that legislators are our partners in working on behalf of children. The workgroups provide an ideal opportunity to accomplish this goal. The OICA is a non-partisan statewide organization that seeks to address children’s issues from a non-partisan approach. As such, it is important that legislators from all parties and all parts of the state are invited to participate in the Forum. This is one of the more challenging aspects of putting the Forum together. Denny et al. (1989) study of legislators’ attitudes suggests that legislators involved with specific issues tend to have positive beliefs pertaining to those issues. At the end of Day One of the Forum, workshop participants have a more thorough understanding of the range of issues that impact their specific areas of interest.

Day Two of the Fall Forum

The second day of the Forum has been described as the “roll-up-your-sleeves” day. It is the agenda-building day, when advocates offer their solutions to the needs of children and youth, and then negotiate with other advocates to prioritize the items. Traditionally, the participants meet in workgroups according to their areas of interest or expertise. Whereas on the first day, participants were able to attend two different issue groups, on the second day, participants usually select one of the issues on which to focus their work. A small number of individuals spend a brief amount of time in various issue groups in an attempt to get an idea of the different discussions and strategies.

Workgroups are staffed by a facilitator and two legislators (one senator and one representative). In general, each group begins with an educational overview of the issue, including Oklahoma facts and figures, programs currently addressing the issue, funding levels, and recent legisla-
tion impacting the issue. The facilitator then takes over his or her respective group to lead the participants through a brainstorming session to determine the most pressing needs remaining to be addressed. After identifying the needs, the group will attempt to develop solutions to those needs, and to prioritize which items to address. The goal of each group is to select their two top items to be placed on a ballot that includes two priority issues from every workgroup. Participants learn that what they experience in this process is very similar to what legislators experience as they try to convince their colleagues to give favorable consideration to their ideas. It is also pointed out that if they cannot agree on the priorities, they may negotiate with each other to address one of the priorities in the next year. The goal is to find common ground and to provide a strong, united voice to move an agreed-upon issue forward.

At the end of the group sessions, the facilitators bring the two priorities from their respective workgroups to OICA staff at the Forum. A ballot is prepared on-site that contains the priorities from each group. The ballots are duplicated quickly and distributed to the participants after lunch. Each item is read for clarification and necessary modifications. There have been times when more than one group emerged with the same or similar priorities; therefore, the same item appeared twice on the ballot. If there is consensus, the items are combined.

Over the past ten years, various methods have been used for the voting process. The most effective method has been to give each participant five votes that must be distributed on five different items on a single ballot. No participant may use more than one ballot. There are no proxy votes, and participants must be present to vote. Each ballot must be signed, and the ballots are turned in to OICA staff before participants may leave the room.

While the votes are being tabulated, participants attend workshops or other program activities. In some years, there has been a keynote speaker for a concluding plenary session. In others, a series of concurrent workshops have been provided. Most recently, the concluding session included a demonstration of new technology that enabled advocates to access legislative information both from the OICA website and from various government homepages. At the end of these activities, the group is reconvened to announce the results of the tabulations, which makes up the Annual Children's Legislative Agenda.

**Following the Fall Forum**

As executive director of OICA, the senior author took the lead in presenting the items on the agenda to various legislators. Many of these legislators were those who had participated in the related workgroup at the Forum, most of whom were asked to sponsor legislation accordingly. This was a manageable approach when the legislative agenda was four to six issues. The senior author kept advocates across the state apprised of the progress of the Agenda and encourages their attendance at committee hearings and floor votes. She was able to prepare fact sheets, action alerts, and briefing papers to assist advocates in their efforts to communicate with their own Senators or Representatives.

In 1997, however, the Agenda contained ten items—clearly too many for one person to accomplish effectively. A method was needed to keep advocates more actively involved with the legislative process, and to identify and recruit advocates who would assume the responsibility for some of the detailed issue work. Subsequently, the OICA hosted an informal follow-up meeting about one month after the Forum to accomplish this task. It was anticipated that 50-75 people would attend this first of its kind event. Instead, nearly 200 people demonstrated their enthusiasm and commitment by attending. At this meeting, participants were once again separated into workgroups reflecting the issues on the Agenda. Each workgroup had a facilitator and instructions for planning a legislative campaign to accomplish their Agenda item. Within each group, participants assumed specific tasks, such as developing talking points, preparing mailing labels, writing a sample letter to the editor, and setting up meetings with
various legislators.

Workgroups were asked to make a commitment to remain engaged in the process as Issue Task Forces. They were asked to elect a chair, develop a communications tree, and divide the work to be done. Further, they were asked to meet regularly throughout the legislative session to check progress and continue their work. The OICA staff provided as much assistance as possible, including monitoring the progress of individual legislation, handling mailing, preparing alerts, booking meeting rooms at the Capitol, and recruiting legislators to join, rather than just attend, the different meetings.

This venture was also successful in that approximately 150 advocates remained actively engaged, both in the legislative process and in building a grassroots network throughout the state that was capable of responding to calls for action. As a result, all ten items on the 1997 Children's Agenda were passed by the Legislature and signed by the Governor—providing long-term positive changes for Oklahoma's children, youth and families. There were eight items on the 1998 Children's Agenda, one failed, seven passed, but two were vetoed by the Governor. The 1999 Children's Agenda contained 13 major issues, with 12 of those successfully being passed. Out of ten major bills, eight on the 2000 Children's Agenda were enacted into law (OICA 2000). None of these successes would have been possible without the concerted efforts of child advocates who were willing to stay engaged in the process.

Lessons Learned

With the hard won successes of child advocates in the State of Oklahoma, four significant lessons have been learned:

1. There is strength in numbers.

Although OICA has become a trusted and well-respected source of information and advice on children's issues, legislators must hear from their own constituents concerning these important issues. Through the Fall Forum, OICA has been able to develop a network of trained and motivated advocates from across the state to help promote the Children's Agenda.

2. Experiential learning is unrivaled.

The Fall Forum provides a "learn-by-doing" vehicle for advocacy training that is available to any interested individuals or groups, regardless of their experience, skill level, or resources. No particular membership or affiliation is required. All that is needed is a sincere interest in children and youth. It is a great way to recruit and energize new advocates.

3. People support what they help to create.

In other states, child advocacy organizations work from an Agenda created by their Board of Directors, or from priorities set by the Executive Director. For parents and other private citizens, this method may create a barrier to their involvement, creating a myth that advocacy can only be done by experts. Oklahoma is a populist, pioneer state whose citizens have a long-standing distrust of centralized authority and prefer to take things into their own hands. The Fall Forum provides an opportunity, not only for public input, but also for the actual hands-on building of a unified Agenda.

4. Legislative change can be a multi-year process.

Child advocates must be there for the long haul. We must establish credibility, expand our network, continually sharpen our political skills, and know the legislative process. As Winston Churchill said, "Never, never, never, never, never give up!"

Conclusion

As a result of the annual Fall Forum and the process Oklahoma child advocates use to build and promote a unified agenda, the "world has changed" for Oklahoma children and youth. In the past ten years, funding has increased dramatically for programs to prevent child abuse, teen pregnancy, and domestic violence. The Medicaid program has expanded eligibility to cover children in families whose income is up to 185% of the federal poverty level. The child welfare and juvenile court systems have been strengthened, making the decisions about custody, child placement, and termination of parental rights based on specific criteria as compared to the
more global, nonspecific premise of the “best interests of the child.” Oklahoma now boasts the first statewide system of alternative education programs, as well as a statewide Child Care Resource and Referral Network. All of these accomplishments were achieved through cooperation and mutual support, rather than division and competition.

According to Schneider and Lester (2001), mutual support or coalition building is a basic principle in advocacy, which helps to broaden the base of support necessary to result in change. They also posit that the use of a forum where issues and concerns are articulated before lawmakers is a cornerstone of legislative advocacy. The Fall Forum accomplishes this by raising awareness about specific issues and providing a structured opportunity for stakeholders to make decisions, negotiate, compromise, and agree on an agenda for children.

The agenda-building process and training opportunities provided at the Fall Forum works for Oklahoma. It is a clear example of a win-win situation—for advocates, for issues, for policy makers, and most importantly, for the children, youth, and families that comprise Oklahoma’s future.
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