

ISSR
Working Papers
in the
Social Sciences

1988-89, vol 4, *Number 24*

**Changing Chicano Gangs:
Acculturation, Generational
Change, Evolution of Deviance
or Emerging Underclass?**

by

Joan Moore

ABOUT THE AUTHOR...

Joan Moore is Professor of Sociology at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. She was educated at the University of Chicago and taught and did research in southern California before returning to the Midwest. Most of her research has concentrated on Mexican Americans and other Hispanics in the United States, and in the past 15 years she has focused on the interaction between class and deviance, with field work in Los Angeles. In 1985, she co-edited (with Lionel Maldonado) a Sage Urban Affairs Annual Review, Urban Ethnicity in the United States: New Immigrants and Old Minorities, and her more recent published works have focused on the forces responsible for the emergence of an underclass among Chicano gangs.

A version of this paper was prepared for the UCLA CONFERENCE ON COMPARATIVE ETHNICITY, June 1988. The Conference was coordinated by Institute for Social Science Research and sponsored by The President's Office, Chancellor's Office, College of Letters and Science, Institute of American Cultures, Center for Afro-American Studies, and Department of Geography and Sociology, UCLA; and by the Division of Social Sciences and Communication, the Los Angeles Project and Department of Geography and Political Science, USC.

CHANGING CHICANO GANGS:
ACCULTURATION, GENERATIONAL CHANGE, EVOLUTION OF DEVIANCE
OR EMERGING UNDERCLASS?

JOAN MOORE
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

In many cities, Black and Hispanic youth gangs have appeared and disappeared, almost like fads. But in Los Angeles Chicano neighborhoods, street gangs have existed for forty years. Elsewhere I have drawn on recent research to compare the evolution of these Chicano gangs with what may be the early stages of institutionalization of Black gangs in a midwestern rustbelt city (Moore 1988). But there is no research on the long-lasting Black counterparts of these Chicano gangs, so here I will be focussing on change. We will find that most of the changes are negative. But before I begin, I would first like to say that both the media and the police would have us believe that gangs -- especially Black gangs -- have become drug-dealing criminal conspiracies. But in these Chicano gangs, drug dealing was and remains an activity of individual members and subcliques, and not of the gang as a whole. Further, while both gangs we studied have developed what might be called "branches," in all cases these have emerged locally, typically with no more than friendly or cousinly encouragement from members of the "home" gang, and there is no criminal conspiracy.¹

Our data are drawn from a sample of men and women (157 persons in all) who were members of two major East Los Angeles gangs during their adolescence.² Forty percent of the sample joined the gang during the late 1940s and early 1950s. The remainder were active in more recent years -- the 1970s and 1980s. Those interviewed were selected randomly from rosters of the 635 original participants in these cliques. Following the usual procedure in our research group, all interviews were conducted by staff people who also had been members of the gang (cf. Moore 1977).

In this paper I will focus on changes between the 1950s and 1970s. Few researchers have considered gangs as long-lasting or quasi-institutionalized groups, but when we consider the differences between the two cohorts in family characteristics, behavior and values, at least three distinct interpretations are possible. (Each could be paralleled for Black gangs.)

¹Media and police have been particularly insistent on the criminal conspiracy explanation for the diffusion of gangs, but academic researchers have found little evidence to support this notion. For example, while Milwaukee gangs have taken the names of Chicago gangs, there are no indications of direct links between the gangs in the two cities, and drug-dealing networks in Milwaukee are local, almost totally a neighborhood activity and a part-time hustle rather than a large-scale criminal activity (Hagedorn 1988). Similarly, though some gangs in Columbus have the same names as Los Angeles gangs, Huff, in a multi-city study, strongly disputes the notion that these gangs have organized roots in Los Angeles. Studies in gangs in the Chicago suburb of Evanston (Rosenbaum and Grant 1983) and in Kenosha and Racine (Racine Gang Project 1985; Takata and Zevitz 1987) similarly find no evidence that these gangs are anything but local.

*Data are derived from a study supported by the National Institute on Drug Abuse, grant #DA03114.

First, since the earlier gang members were largely children of Mexican immigrants and the parents of later members were born in the United States, we would expect the older cliques to be more "Mexican" and the younger, more acculturated. To some extent this also implies that the more 'Mexican' families may be more likely to be traditional. The younger ones may be more likely to be disorganized.

Second, it might be argued that the gang is a 'deviant,' and hence socially isolated group, with its own subculture. As such, we might expect that deviant group subculture to evolve on its own.

Finally, it may be that today's gangs are developing into a fraction of an emergent underclass in these Chicano communities, parallel to developments in Black communities elsewhere in the nation (cf. Wilson 1987).

To deal with these interpretations we must first describe the major differences we found between older and younger cliques in three basic respects: (1) family background; (2) behavior and values relating to the gang; and (3) current status. Throughout this discussion, 'older members' will mean those cliques of the gang active in the 1950s. The "younger members" are those active in the 1970s.

FAMILY BACKGROUND

Household Composition During Childhood

Generally speaking, there are few differences between the older and younger cliques. Households in this sample were comparatively large. Most of the families, especially among the older cliques, had both fathers and mothers present (see Table 1). There were more fatherless households among the younger cliques than the older ones, and more among women gang members than among men, and fathers tended to disappear as children grew older. Incidentally, contradicting the images of traditional Mexican families, there were very few three-generation families, in either older or younger cliques.

Acculturation Issues

As expected, families of older clique members were substantially more 'Mexican' than those of younger cliques. More than two-thirds of the parents of older males were born in Mexico (67% of fathers, and 72% of mothers), compared with only a third or fewer of the parents of younger males (37% of fathers and 23% of mothers). Similar differences exist between older and younger women, but the level of acculturation among women's families was much higher to begin with. Thus only 44% of older women's fathers and 33% of their mothers were born in Mexico, and a miniscule 9% of parents of younger women were born in Mexico.³ Thus English was less likely to be the normal home language in older cliques: in 15% of the older men's homes and 42% of younger men's homes English was spoken routinely, and English was the normal language in 28% of older women's

3. Overall, two-thirds of the Mexican born parents took on American citizenship -- a rate considerably higher than the usual rate of naturalization. According to McCarthy and Valdez, only 56% of California's Mexican immigrants entering before 1950 were naturalized by 1980 (1986, p. 32). Mexican-born parents of younger clique members were significantly more likely than parents of older clique members to be naturalized: 83% of younger men's fathers, for example, compared with 62% of older men's fathers.

homes compared with 61% of younger women's homes. These differences between males and females, both older and younger, suggest that the gang was more attractive to boys than to girls from Mexican-oriented families. ⁴

In education, most parents were poorly educated. Fewer than a quarter had a high school education, for example. Substantial proportions of parents in the older cliques were functionally illiterate (thus half of the older men's fathers and 44% of the older women's fathers had less than four years of schooling). While younger members' fathers were not quite so poorly educated, still 16% of younger men's fathers and 32% of younger women's fathers had less than four years of school.

Household Economy During Childhood

Were these gang members from desperately poor underclass families? Poor they may have been, but generally, the male gang members, especially in older cliques, grew up in households in which at least one and often more than one person worked (in only a handful was nobody working -- from 2 to 10 percent, depending on age and cohort). When fathers were present, it was fathers who worked. In younger cliques mothers also entered the work force in significant numbers as the respondents grew older. Brothers and sisters contributed to the family income in a quarter of the homes, and in about 8% grandparents also worked. Girls' homes were more frequently broken than boys'. Thus there were higher proportion of girls' homes with no workers (up to 24% in the younger cliques) and fewer fathers and more mothers worked (in younger cliques, a majority of mothers, 61% were working).

Parental occupations show no surprises. A third of the older men's fathers, and fewer than 10% of younger fathers were unskilled laborers. Parents of younger members, both men and women, had higher skill levels. ⁵

Emotional Climate

These were not particularly happy families. A quarter of the men (28%) and a third of the women (34%) reported seeing their fathers beat their mothers, usually only on rare occasions. This was particularly common in the younger cliques (though the differences do not reach statistical significance). And only about half (56% of men and 49% of women) said that their parents got along

4. Seven variables were dichotomized and combined to form a global "Mexican ethnicity" score. These variables were: 1) father was born in Mexico, 2) mother was born in Mexico, 3) Spanish was the normal language at home, 4) use of English was frowned upon, 5) father was considered head of the household with no questions, 6) father controlled mother's visitors, 7) respondent felt "Mexican" (as compared with "Chicano," "Mexican American," "confused," etc.). It should come as no surprise that this global measure showed that younger cliques were significantly less "Mexican," and women were generally less "Mexican" at all ages.

⁵ Fewer of the older than the younger men's fathers were semi-skilled (36% vs. 53%) and fewer were skilled (29% vs. 35%). The pattern of occupations among women's fathers is similar. Among mothers who worked, older mothers were also more likely to have been unskilled and younger mothers to have been factory workers.

well together. About the same proportions felt that their mothers and fathers were happy. 6

About half of these men and women said that they were afraid of their fathers when they were growing up. 7 Importantly, 29% of the women report that some member of the family made sexual advances to them. This was more common among the older women (39% compared with 24% of the younger women) even though the age differences are not statistically significant. 8

There is also a rather high incidence of other family traumas, with little difference by age. In a quarter of the men's homes and in 46% of the women's homes somebody was handicapped or chronically ill. Most often this was a parent. In 47% of the men's homes and 69% of the women's homes somebody died when the respondent was growing up. Most often this was a grandparent (in 33% of the cases), but quite often it was a parent (a father in 30% of the homes, and a mother in 11% of the homes) or a brother (in 26% of the homes). Many of these families included somebody the respondent defined as an "alcoholic" -- most often the father, and 20% of the men and 45% of the women grew up with a heroin addict in the home -- most often a brother. Finally, 57% of the men and 82% of the women saw somebody in their homes arrested when they were children. In 56% of these homes, it was a respondent's brother that was arrested, and in 28% his or her father. In 17% of the cases, respondents reported their own arrests during early adolescence.

In sum, even though most of these families were reasonably conventional and hard-working, there seem to be a disproportionate number of "problem families" in the sample. It is noteworthy that there are very few statistically significant differences between the older and younger cliques in the frequency of such problems. Thus the hint that older families might have had stronger traditional controls does not hold water. Then, as now, the members came from troubled families.

BEHAVIOR AND VALUES RELATING TO THE GANG

Over the years these gangs became something of a fixture in the neighborhoods. Even so, it is important to notice that they have not "taken over" their neighborhoods, as newspaper myth would have it. Nor are they paramilitary organizations, as police gang intelligence frequently suggests. New cliques start up every few years: each has a name, and a separate identity. Though most members know members of the clique ahead of them in the gang, and generally tend to look up to them, each clique is totally autonomous. Occasionally, members of older cliques respond to requests for help, mostly in gang fights. Leadership is situational and informal, not hierarchical. For a member to claim leadership, for example, violates gang norms.

6. Among the men, this included 52% of the fathers and 68% of the mothers. Among the women it included 65% of the fathers and 59% of the mothers.

7. 59% of the men and 53% of the women, and statistically significantly the younger women, said they feared their fathers.

8. In most cases, the assailant was the father, but uncles, brothers and even grandfathers were among the culprits, and at all ages, ranging from 5 to 17. However, only a few reported incest as a persistent, long-lasting feature of their childhoods.

Joining the Gang

Most of these men and women joined the gang in their very early teens -- between 13 and 14 on the average. Men in the older cliques joined at significantly earlier ages -- a median of 13, compared with 14 for the younger cliques (there is also much more variation in younger cliques in the age of joining, with a significant fraction joining when they were 16 or over). Both older and younger women joined at a median of 13.5 years.

Is gang membership "inherited?" About half of the men and women had at least one relative in the gang (44% of the men vs. 59% of the women). A third had 3 or more relatives. Younger members were significantly more likely than the older ones to have a relative (among the men, it was 52% vs. 35% and among the women, 67% vs. 44%). But does this mean "inheritance?" Succinctly, "inheritance" really is lateral, rather than direct. In the older generation, very few had fathers or mothers in the gang; comparatively more had uncles: 48% of younger men and 13% of older men had an uncle in a gang, and 18% of younger women compared with 38% of older women. Most of the relatives, in fact, were cousins. More than 80% of the respondents -- older and younger -- with any relative had a cousin. Next most common were brothers, accounting for 63% of older males and 32% of younger males, and for 47% of the women -- older as well as younger. A further argument against "inheritance" is that most relatives belonged to gangs outside the two we studied. This should come as no surprise, given the fact that most relatives were outside the immediate family.

How, then, did members join? The plurality of men (30%) got in by being reared in the neighborhood, taking it for granted that living there is how you get in (in fact, the majority of both older and younger members -- 76% of the men and 57% of the women -- did live in the neighborhood when they were in their early teens). This mode of entry, however, was far less common among women (only 10%); the plurality were brought in by friends (33% compared with 14% of the boys). A quarter of the men said that they actively sought to join the gang (compared with 18% of the women). Only a handful -- 9% of men and women -- said that they were actively recruited. Significantly more of the younger members were "jumped into" the gang -- a ritual in which the recruit is tested for his/her ability to stand up in a fight.

Deviant Activities: Drugs and Fighting

Gang members spend most of their time together just in "hanging around" or in smaller friendship cliques. But the real interest for researchers and policy makers is the degree to which the gang becomes a milieu for deviant behavior, especially drugs and violence.

First, drug use. "Partying" for these gang members, as for many adolescents, has always been associated with getting high. Most commonly, this meant alcohol and marijuana, with PCP and barbiturates common among the younger groups (these gangs have generally been very conservative about adopting new drugs: acid and mescaline, for example, never became popular, and cocaine and crack were trivial when we interviewed). Usually, and especially in the younger cliques, some member of the clique obtained the drugs. Even though drugs were common at parties, respondents uniformly reported that abstainers were tolerated and not pressured. The ethos of individualism and tolerance for individual differences survived in these gangs.

Heroin has been the most serious drug of abuse. Younger men and women were significantly more likely than older members to have used heroin at some time during their lives (78% of younger men, compared with 61% of older men, and 55% of younger women, compared with 22% of older women). Although a few began the

drug in their early teens, heroin did not become significant till the late teens, when more than half of the men and a quarter of the women used. (There is no cohort difference among the men during the teen years, but younger women were significantly more likely to use the drug at that age.) It is during the 20s that the cohort differences become significant for men as well as women. This means that the younger members, currently in their 20s, were more likely to use heroin than older cliques at comparable ages. It should also be obvious that this pattern has implications for job-holding (see below).

Next, violence (cf. More 1988). Even though we found considerable variation in the levels of lethal violence from one clique to another, younger cliques were significantly more violent than older ones (the range is from zero [in one clique] to a high of almost three).⁹ In recent years, gangs acquired "serious" guns, and the weapons were often used impersonally, in the infamous drive-by shootings, rather than in hand-to-hand inter-gang fights. The escalation of violence also seems to have something to do with intergenerational dynamics. Younger members often want to match or outdo the reputations of their predecessors. There is also a significant correlation between the level of violence in a clique and the proportion who define themselves as "loco" or "my loco." "Locura," or wildness, is a value in the gang subculture which focuses on drug use in some cliques and violence in others. Obviously, it is how locura is defined at the clique level that counts in explaining variations in violence. Thus over the years there seems to have been an increase in the level of violence both in terms of the number of members killed and in terms of the subculture of violence.

How Exclusively are Members Committed to the Gang?

Overwhelmingly, these men and women hung out more with gang than with non-gang friends, in both older and younger cliques. Rather surprisingly, only a minority of either the older or the younger men, 40%, took their girlfriends from the gang, although a large majority of the women, 75%, found their boyfriends in the gang. The younger women were especially gang-bound. Older men reported that their non-gang girlfriends were likely to approve of their gang membership (34%) or be indifferent (39%). But younger men reported that their non-gang girlfriends were likely to oppose their gang membership (50%, with only 12% approving and 17% being indifferent). This echoes the difference in parents' attitudes toward the gang. The parents of younger members were more likely to express disapproval than parents of the older group.

⁹We asked respondents about the deaths suffered by clique members in gang fighting. Members of the same clique often report different numbers. Since respondents had just refreshed their memories by checking over a roster of all other members, unreliable memory is not the obvious answer to such disparities. The most common reason is that a killing may have occurred before the respondent joined the clique or after he/she left. The larger cliques, in particular, have lasted a long time, and include a diverse group of very different ages. The number of deaths is significantly correlated with the date of the clique's origin (using Spearman's $r = -.68$), with younger cliques experiencing more deaths.

The Gang and the Self

Younger men and women were significantly more likely to say that the gang was 'very important' to them during their period of peak activity (82% of younger men compared with 72% of older men, and 79% of younger women compared with 50% of older women). There are some indications that older members were attached more to the gang-as-barrio organization and the younger ones more attached to the gang-as-gang. Thus the psychological salience of gangs may increase at the expense of neighborhood attachments and, perhaps, neighborhood controls.

This inference is supported by the fact that younger members -- and especially younger women -- were significantly more likely than older ones to identify themselves as "loco" or "my loco" (wild or very wild) and that younger men were more likely to define their locura in terms of violence.

In sum, the gang does show signs of evolution as a deviant group. It was psychologically significant to more of the younger members, who were more likely to find boyfriends and girlfriends from within the gang. There was more drug use and more violence in younger cliques, and more members who subscribed to a subcultural emphasis on violence.

CURRENT STATUS

Work and Family Status at Time of Interview

At the time these respondents were interviewed, there were significant differences between older and younger cliques in job status and family characteristics. Sixty-one percent of the older men and 44% of the older women were working, as compared with only 48% of the younger men but 61% of the younger women. About a third of the working men (33.3%) and women (37.5%) were in semi-skilled factory jobs, with no significant difference between older and younger clique members. About a third (37.5%) of the working women and only a small fraction of the men (17.5%) were unskilled workers. Men showed considerably more diversity in occupations than women, with significant fractions holding skilled (17.5%) and semi-professional jobs (12.3%).

Men earned a median of \$1200 a month, with older men significantly more likely to earn higher incomes than younger men (the median was approximately the same for women, with no difference between older and younger women).¹⁰ Most of the younger working men (55%) and women (75%) had held their jobs for less than a year at the time of interview. Among the men, the highest paid quartile (earning more than \$1800 a month) were those who had held their jobs for the longest period of time -- mostly older men -- and included skilled and semi-skilled workers as well as the few professionals and entrepreneurs. The lowest paid quartile (earning less than \$799 a month) were significantly more likely to be part-time workers (21% of the total sample were part-timers).

¹⁰ Older men were significantly more likely to work in firms with just a few employees (30% as compared with 15% of the younger men), and older women as well as older men were more likely to have worked at their jobs for more than 5 years (54% of older men and 62% of older women as compared with 14% of younger men and 12% of younger women).

Most of these men and women had been married (87% of the men and 96% of the women).¹¹ However, at the time of the interview, only a third of the young men and slightly more than half of the older men were living with a spouse. These men do not maintain families: 43% of the young men and a fifth of the older men were living at home with their mothers. Women showed a different pattern: almost half of the young women but only a third of the older women were living with spouses, but very few were living at home with parents -- only 24% of the younger women and 6% of the older women.

The majority had children: 94% of the women and 84% of the men. While three quarters of the women were still living with their children, only a third of the men were doing so. Very few (38% of the men and 23% of the women) raised their children along with their spouse, even though most of the women (85%) did bring up their own children, either alone or with another relative. Most of the men (57%) ceded their children to their wives or other relatives.

A fairly high proportion of these men and women had rather serious family problems, especially the women. Thus in 13% of the men's but 22% of the women's households (especially the older women) a member of the household was chronically ill or handicapped. While the same proportions of men and women (17%) had a household member defined as an "alcoholic" -- usually the man of the house -- in a quarter of the men's households, but in 43% of the women's there was a heroin addict -- most often the respondent himself or herself. Almost half of the men's households had somebody who had been arrested (57% of the younger men and 33% of the older men). But in more than two-thirds of the women's households somebody had been arrested.¹² In most cases it was the spouse who got arrested -- but a full third of the women said that they themselves had been arrested.

Work, Prison and Family in the 20s

In many respects the contrasts just discussed are unrealistic: one would expect the older men and women to differ from the younger ones in job attainment and many family characteristics. Let us then look at the work and family status of these people at comparable ages, the early and late 20s, in particular. Because prison is so relevant to employment during young adulthood, we will also look at the incarceration experiences of these gang people.

First, jobs for the men. There are some surprises here. Younger men were almost as likely to have worked during their early 20s as are older men, and even more likely to have worked during their late 20s.¹³ Thus the fact that significantly more of them were unemployed at the time of interview does not mean that they were out of the labor market. Were they imprisoned? High proportions of the men, 41% report some period of incarceration during their early 20s, but younger men were no more likely to have been in prison than the older. Interestingly, younger men were less likely than older ones to have been

11. Only a minority of men and older women (about a third) had ever married or lived with a member of their gang, but a majority of the younger women had (61%). As noted earlier, women tend to be more socially bound to the gang than men.

12. This was especially true for younger women -- 80% compared with 56% of the older women.

13. Thus 57% of younger men and 63% of older men worked during their early 20s and 81% of younger men but 65% of older men worked during their late 20s.

imprisoned during their late 20s -- 33% vs 46% -- which may explain why so many more of them were employed during that period of their lives.

It looks, then, as if it might be something about the job situation itself rather than about changed characteristics of the gang or the men that accounts for higher current rates of unemployment. It is not that younger men were more likely to be out of the labor market nor were they more likely to be imprisoned. It's that they could not get full-time, stable jobs. Among the women, however, there were no significant employment differences between the older and younger.¹⁴ Imprisonment is unimportant for most women: fewer than 6% went to prison during their 20s.

Turning to family status, older men married at a median age of 20, and the younger at a median age of 19. But the marriages did not last very long. Only a small minority -- and even fewer of the younger men -- reported that they lived with their spouses during most of their 20s.¹⁵ In fact, a majority of men in their early 20s and almost half in their late 20s lived at home with their mothers.¹⁶ Among the women, both younger and older women were married at a median age of 18. But only a third were living with a husband when they were in their early 20s, though two-thirds were doing so in their late 20s. There was no difference between younger and older women.

In short, while the job situation of today's men may be quite different, this is not the case for women. But in both older and younger cohorts, and for both men and women, family formation remains a precarious proposition, with many disruptions.

DISCUSSION

Let me return to the problem of interpreting these data. In general, things have gotten worse in these Chicano gangs. But I think it is apparent that there is no one simple explanation for the differences between older and younger cliques. Clearly, contemporary gang youth came from families which were considerably more acculturated and less "Mexican" than in the '50s, but the families were almost as likely then as now to show signs of stress and problems. Traditionalism does not mean family security and cohesiveness.

Further, it is clear that the gang's deviant subculture has evolved. Even though gang membership was not passed from father to son in the media-stereotyped sense, membership was more a family matter now than it was in the past. In addition, the gang commanded more of its members' attention and loyalty now than in the past. Members tended to be more exclusively involved with the gang. Drug use was more common; violence has escalated over the years. It is important to note that these increases in deviant behavior have been gradual, not abrupt, and have attracted only sporadic media attention. For example, gang homicides were the major cause of teen death for Los Angeles' Hispanics during the 1970s, when they were trivial as a cause of death among

14. About 55% were working during their early 20s and 60-67% were working during their late 20s.

15. Only 37% of the older men and 25% of the younger men lived with a spouse during most of their early 20s and only 35% of the older men and 30% of the younger ones did so during their late 20s.

16. During the early 20s it was 63% -- 67% of the younger men and 56% of older ones; during the late 20s it was 43% with no difference by age.

Blacks, but the situation is reversed, now. In the '70s there was virtually no media uproar about the situation; now there is.

Is there evidence that today's gangs are a fraction of an emerging underclass? I think so. Despite the fact that the vast majority of younger men were actively in the labor market and worked recently, most could not get or keep a stable job. The vast majority did not establish families or bring up their children. In this last respect, they did not differ from the older cliques. A significant fraction (a fifth) of the older men -- usually those who have been involved with heroin and prison -- were still unable to form independent households or sustain jobs. But higher proportions of the older men appear to have been able to secure decent jobs and, even if a little late, to form reasonably stable families. This means that a change of some sort has taken place.

It seems to me that an increasingly large fraction of each gang clique moves off into an underclass life style, surviving from month to month by alternating between temporary pick-up jobs, spells of unemployment insurance, living with mothers or girlfriends, and petty hustling. They often remain in or return to the neighborhood after spells of imprisonment. The barrio is familiar, and housing -- especially with older parents -- may be available. The youth gang itself plays a role in the perpetuation of this underclass fraction, but it is not the simple role that the media attribute to it.

There is another perhaps unexpected issue in the data that I have presented. Even though there are not very many women in the gangs, our data make it clear that gang women are generally much more problematic than men. They came from homes which were even more troubled than those of the men. Even among the older women their families were more likely to have a tradition of gang membership. Women were more likely to join the gang because of friendship -- usually with other gang girls -- and were more likely to be "gang-bound" in their friendships with both boys and girls. It is not surprising, then, that a majority of the younger women married a man from the gang. Most of the women did rear their own children, and in most of their homes there were addiction and arrests. Women members have been neglected in the literature on gangs, but when gang researchers consider questions about the perpetuation of an underclass lifestyle, it is clear that such neglect cannot continue.

Throughout this paper I've referred to media exaggerations of the gang problems we have been studying. Most of that media attention has been devoted to Black gangs. Gangs may have gotten worse in the barrios in the past 20 years, but, as I have argued elsewhere (More 1988), they may well be encapsulated or contained within Hispanic communities to a greater extent than they are in Black communities. Neighborhood institutions in Chicano communities -- church, family, and even the small neighborhood businesses -- have remained vital. And in most of our gang communities census data show that the majority of residents are working-class. By contrast, according to Wilson, neighborhood institutions have been vitiated in Black inner city communities by a combination of economic blight and the exodus of stable middle and working class residents. Thus it is not only a question of changing patterns of acculturation or the evolution of deviancy, but truly a question of how the underclass is forming in poor minority communities throughout the nation. At bottom the question of changes in Hispanic and Black gangs is a question of a changing nation and changing communities, and of changing national priorities that can permit such deterioration to go unchecked.

REFERENCES

- Hagedorn, John (ed.). 1988. *People and Folks: 'Gangs, Crime, and the Underclass in a Rustbelt City*. Chicago: Lake View Press.
- McCarthy, Kevin and B. Valdez. 1986. *Current and Future Effects of Mexican Immigration in California*. Santa Monica: Rand Corp.
- More, Joan. 1977. "A Case Study of Collaboration: The Chicano Pinto Research Project." *Journal of Social Issues*, 33:144-158.
- _____. Forthcoming (1988). "Variations in Violence among Hispanic Gangs," in Proceedings, *Violence and Homicide in Hispanic Communities*. Los Angeles: UCLA.
- _____. 1988. "Gangs and the Underclass: A Comparative Perspective," in *People and Folks*, edited by John Hagedorn. Chicago: Lake View Press.
- _____. 1988. "An Assessment of Hispanic Poverty: Is There a Hispanic Underclass?" Presented at the Tomas Rivera Center, Seminar on Persistent Poverty among Hispanics" April, 1988.
- Racine Gang Project. 1985. *Summary of Findings*.
- Rosenbaum, Dennis P. and Jane Grant. 1983. "Gang and Youth Problems in Evanston: Research Findings and Policy Options." Evanston: Northwestern University, Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research.
- Takata, Susan and Richard Zevitz. 1987. "Youth Gangs in Racine: An Examination of Community Perceptions," *Wisconsin Sociologist* 24:132-139.
- Wilson, William J. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

TABLE 1
Household Composition during Childhood,
Older Compared with Younger Cliques

Cohort of Gang	When Respondent was Aged:		
	0-5 (N)	6-10 (N)	11-15 (N)
<u>A. Father Present</u>			
Male			
Older Cliques	82.6% (38)	82.6% (38)	71.7% (33)
Younger Cliques	73.3 (44)	76.7 (46)	63.3 (38)
Female			
Older Cliques	77.8 (14)	83.3 (15)	61.1 (11)
Younger Cliques	57.6 (19)	69.7 (23)	63.6 (21)
<u>B. Mother Present</u>			
Male			
Older Cliques	93.5% (43)	91.3% (42)	87.0% (40)
Younger Cliques	95.0 (57)	95.0 (57)	88.3 (53)
Female			
Older Cliques	94.4 (17)	94.4 (17)	94.4 (17)
Younger Cliques	97.0 (32)	87.9 (29)	87.9 (29)
<u>C. Grandfather Present</u>			
Male			
Older Cliques	6.5% (3)	8.7% (4)	6.5% (3)
Younger Cliques	8.3 (5)	8.3 (5)	8.3 (5)
Female			
Older Cliques	5.6 (1)	5.6 (1)	5.6 (1)
Younger Cliques	9.1 (3)	6.1 (2)	9.1 (3)

continued on the following page

D. Grandmother Present

Male

Older Cliques	6.5% (3)		13.0% (6)		8.7% (4)
Younger Cliques	18.3	(11)	15.0	(9)	13.3 (8)

Female

Older Cliques	22.2	(4)	22.2	(4)	22.2 (4)
Younger Cliques	9.1	(3)	9.1	(3)	9.1 (3)

E. Median Household Size

Male

Older Cliques		7.5	7.0
Younger Cliques	6.0	6.0	7.0

Female

Older Cliques	6.0	7.0	7.0
Younger Cliques	6.0	7.0	7.0

*Kendall's tau significant >.05