

Tables 1-14.2

**Mail Survey Responses of Criminal
Justice Professionals**

TABLE 1

Survey Responses by County from Department of Probation, Pardon, and Parole (DPPP) and Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ)

County	DPPP Field Staff	DPPP Response	DPPP Response Rate (%)	DJJ Field Staff	DJJ Response	DJJ Response Rate (%)
Abbeville	5	1	20	2	2	100
Aiken	22	7	32	10	6	60
Allendale	2	2	100	2	--	--
Anderson	20	9	45	10	6	60
Bamberg	2	2	100	3	--	--
Barnwell	3	3	100	2	3	*
Beaufort	11	5	45	5	5	100
Berkeley	10	7	70	8	8	100
Calhoun	1	1	100	--	--	--
Charleston	43	20	47	21	10	48
Cherokee	11	--	--	6	3	50
Chester	7	1	14	4	4	100
Chesterfield	5	5	100	3	--	--
Clarendon	4	4	100	3	--	--
Collenton	6	2	33	4	4	100
Darlington	10	8	80	6	6	100
Dillon	5	2	40	4	1	25
Dorchester	11	7	64	5	3	60
Edgefield	3	--	--	--	--	--
Fairfield	3	2	67	2	1	50
Florence	24	18	75	10	5	50
Georgetown	6	5	83	5	4	80
Greenville	61	47	77	20	8	40
Greenwood	15	11	73	7	--	--
Hampton	2	--	--	2	2	100
Horry	22	17	77	12	6	50
Jasper	5	4	80	2	--	--
Kershaw	6	4	67	5	2	40
Lancaster	9	9	100	6	3	50
Laurens	10	9	90	5	--	--
Lee	3	3	100	--	--	--
Lexington	26	16	62	12	1	8
McCormick	1	--	--	--	--	--
Marion	6	6	100	5	--	--
Marlboro	6	--	--	3	--	--
Newberry	7	5	71	3	2	67
Oconee	7	4	57	3	2	67
Orangeburg	13	7	54	11	10	91
Pickens	10	6	60	5	1	20
Richland	52	36	69	20	13	65
Saluda	3	2	67	4	4	100
Spartanburg	48	44	92	17	11	65
Sumter	17	4	24	11	5	46
Union	6	3	50	4	3	75
Williamsburg	5	2	40	2	2	100
York	28	11	39	15	4	27
St. Luke's Ctr. (DJJ only)				8	6	75
Totals	582	361	62	297	156	52

-- indicates zero * indicates more responses than field staff

TABLE 2
SURVEY RESPONSES BY COUNTY FROM POLICE CHIEFS AND SHERIFFS

County	Number of Agencies	Number of Responses	Response Rate (%)
Abbeville	4	2	50
Aiken	9	6	67
Allendale	3	1	33
Anderson	8	4	50
Bamberg	4	2	50
Barnwell	4	3	75
Beaufort	4	3	75
Berkeley	8	2	25
Calhoun	3	1	33
Charleston	12	9	75
Cherokee	3	2	67
Chester	5	2	40
Chesterfield	6	4	67
Clarendon	4	2	50
Collenton	5	4	80
Darlington	5	3	60
Dillon	3	3	100
Dorchester	4	1	25
Edgefield	4	2	50
Fairfield	3	1	33
Florence	10	3	30
Georgetown	4	1	25
Greenville	10	10	100
Greenwood	6	4	66
Hampton	8	5	63
Horry	9	7	67
Jasper	4	4	100
Kershaw	4	3	75
Lancaster	3	2	67
Laurens	4	2	50
Lee	3	2	67
Lexington	12	7	58
McCormick	2	1	50
Marion	5	2	40
Marlboro	4	2	50
Newberry	4	3	75
Oconee	6	3	50
Orangeburg	15	10	66
Pickens	8	4	50
Richland	5	5	100
Saluda	3	0	0
Spartanburg	14	8	57
Sumter	4	3	75
Union	3	4	100
Williamsburg	5	2	40
York	7	7	100

Totals	263	161	59
---------------	------------	------------	-----------

Table 3

Are gangs a problem in your jurisdiction?

Gang “wannabes” are juveniles who mimic the appearance of known gangs by wearing similar dress, adopting signs and symbols, but who are not organized and any crimes committed are not gang related.

Loosely associated gangs are groups of youth who hang together and occasionally commit crimes as part of gang related activity, but who are not highly organized, and criminal activity is not the main activity of the group.

Organized gangs are groups that have a name, a leader, their own turf, special clothes, signs and symbols that indicate a specific affiliation, engage in illegal activities as the primary function of the group.

In your opinion, to what extent are *wannabes*, *loosely associated gangs*, and *organized gangs* present in your jurisdiction and how much of a problem do they pose for law enforcement?

	Not present	Present and not a problem	Present and a minor problem	Present and a moderate problem	Present and a major problem
Gang “wannabes”	1	2	3	4	5
Loosely Associated gangs	1	2	3	4	5
Organized gangs	1	2	3	4	5

Table 3.1

Response of all Criminal Justice Professionals by Mean

	<u>N</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>
Gang “wannabes”	668	2.79	1.27
Loosely associated gangs	666	2.81	1.33
Organized gangs	644	2.22	1.41

Table 3.2

Response of all Criminal Justice Professionals by Percentage

	Not present	Present and not a problem	Present and a minor problem	Present and a moderate problem	Present and a major problem
Gang “wannabes”	23.0% (154/668)	15.8% (106/668)	27.5% (108/668)	25.7% (172/668)	7.7% (52/668)
Loosely Associated gangs	27.0% (180/666)	9.9% (66/666)	26% (177/666)	28.2% (188/666)	8.2% (55/666)
Organized Gangs	50.4% (325/644)	8.8% (57/644)	17.0% (110/644)	15.5% (100/644)	8.0% (52/644)

Response by Agency

	Not present	Present and not a problem	Present and a minor problem	Present and a moderate problem	Present and a major problem
Gang “wannabes”	1	2	3	4	5
Loosely Associated gangs	1	2	3	4	5
Organized gangs	1	2	3	4	5

Table 3.3

Gang “Wannabes”

Agency	<u>N</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>
DPPP	354	2.8	1.3
DJJ	149	3.1	1.1
Criminal Justice	160	2.4	1.1
Total	663	2.8	1.2

Loosely Associated Gangs

Agency	<u>N</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>
DPPP	358	2.8	1.3
DJJ	147	3.2	1.0
Criminal Justice	156	2.3	1.2
Total	661	2.8	1.3

Organized Gangs

Agency	<u>N</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>
DPPP	347	2.3	1.4
DJJ	144	2.5	1.3
Criminal Justice	148	1.4	0.9
Total	639	2.2	1.4

Table 3.4

Response by Metro/Nonmetro

Metro/Nonmetro	Gang Wannabes	Loosely Associated Gangs	Organized Gangs
Metro	2.8	2.8	2.3
Nonmetro	2.6	2.6	1.8

Table 3.5 Response by County

Gang Wannabes

County	Not Present	Present--not a problem	Present-minor problem	Present-moderate problem	Present--major problem	Total
ABBEVILLE		3	1	1		5
AIKEN	7	5	6	1		19
ALLENDALE		2		1		3
ANDERSON	1	3	7	6	2	19
BAMBERG	3				1	4
BARNWELL	4	2	2	1		9
BEAUFORT	1	3	4	4		12
BERKELEY	8	2	3	4		17
CALHOUN	1			1		2
CHARLESTON	12		9	12	6	39
CHEROKEE	2	1		2		5
CHESTER	1	2	4			7
CHESTERFIELD	4	1	2	2		9
CLARENDON		3	3			6
COLLENTON	4	4	2			10
DARLINGTON	4	4	4	3	1	16
DILLON	3	1	1			5
DORCHESTER	3		4	3	1	11
EDGEFIELD			1	1		2
FAIRFIELD		1	1	1		3
FLORENCE	3	2	8	7	3	23
GEORGETOWN	2	2	2	4		10
GREENVILLE	8	6	27	19	5	65
GREENWOOD	4		6	1	3	14
HAMPTON	2	2	2	1		7
HORRY	9	1	9	8	3	30
JASPER	4	3	1			8
KERSHAW	1	2	5		1	9
LANCASTER	3	1	4	6		14
LAURENS	2		3	5	1	11
LEE			3	2		5
LEXINGTON	7	6	3	7	1	24
McCORMICK			1			1
MARION	1	1	1	3	2	8
MARLBORO			1	1		2
NEWBERRY	4	3	2		1	10
OCONEE	1	1	4	3		9
ORANGEBURG	8	6	6	6	1	27
PICKENS	3	4	3	1		11
RICHLAND	10	10	12	16	6	54
SALUDA				6		6
SPARTANBURG	13	9	15	18	7	62
SUMTER	4	1	1	4	2	12
UNION	1	1	3	1	4	10
WILLIAMSBURG		2	1	2	1	6
YORK	4	4	6	8		22
Total	152	104	183	172	52	663

Table 3.6 Response by County

Loosely Associated Gangs

County	Not Present	Present--not a problem	Present--minor problem	Present--moderate problem	Present--major problem	Total
ABBEVILLE		1	2	2		5
AIKEN	9	2	4	4		19
ALLENDALE		2		1		3
ANDERSON	2	3	8	6		19
BAMBERG	2			1	1	4
BARNWELL	5		4			9
BEAUFORT	2	2	2	5	2	13
BERKELEY	7	3	5	2		17
CALHOUN	1		1			2
CHARLESTON	14		4	16	5	39
CHEROKEE	2		1	2		5
CHESTER	3		4			7
CHESTERFIELD	4	2	1	2	1	9
CLARENDON		4	1			6
COLLENTON	7	2	1			10
DARLINGTON	5	1	4	5	2	17
DILLON	3		1	1		5
DORCHESTER	4		2	5		11
EDGEFIELD			1	1		2
FAIRFIELD	1			2	1	4
FLORENCE	3	1	4	12	5	25
GEORGETOWN	2		6	2		10
GREENVILLE	9	4	21	22	9	65
GREENWOOD	3		6	5	1	15
HAMPTON	1	1	4	1		7
HORRY	8	3	6	11	2	30
JASPER	6		2			8
KERSHAW	2	1	4	2		9
LANCASTER	5		4	4		13
LAURENS	2		4	5		11
LEE		1	1	3		5
LEXINGTON	8	5	5	2	3	23
McCORMICK	1					1
MARION	2	1	2	1	2	8
MARLBORO		1		1		2
NEWBERRY	5	3		1	1	10
OCONEE	2	2	3	2		9
ORANGEBURG	9	3	6	5	3	26
PICKENS	5	2	2			9
RICHLAND	9	5	12	22	3	51
SALUDA			4	1	1	6
SPARTANBURG	15	4	22	15	6	62
SUMTER	3	1	2	4	2	12
UNION			5	2	3	10
WILLIAMSBURG	1	1	2	2		6
YORK	6	3	3	8	2	22
Total	178	64	176	188	55	661

Table 3.7 Response by County

Organized Gangs

County	Not Present	Present--not a problem	Present--minor problem	Present--moderate problem	Present--major problem	Total
ABBEVILLE		3	1	1		5
AIKEN	7	5	6	1		19
ALLENDALE		2		1		3
ANDERSON	1	3	7	6	2	19
BAMBERG	3				1	4
BARNWELL	4	2	2	1		9
BEAUFORT	1	3	4	4		12
BERKELEY	8	2	3	4		17
CALHOUN	1			1		2
CHARLESTON	12		9	12	6	39
CHEROKEE	2	1		2		5
CHESTER	1	2	4			7
CHESTERFIELD	4	1	2	2		9
CLARENDON		3	3			6
COLLENTON	4	4	2			10
DARLINGTON	4	4	4	3	1	16
DILLON	3	1	1			5
DORCHESTER	3		4	3	1	11
EDGEFIELD			1	1		2
FAIRFIELD		1	1	1		3
FLORENCE	3	2	8	7	3	23
GEORGETOWN	2	2	2	4		10
GREENVILLE	8	6	27	19	5	65
GREENWOOD	4		6	1	3	14
HAMPTON	2	2	2	1		7
HORRY	9	1	9	8	3	30
JASPER	4	3	1			8
KERSHAW	1	2	5		1	9
LANCASTER	3	1	4	6		14
LAURENS	2		3	5	1	11
LEE			3	2		5
LEXINGTON	7	6	3	7	1	24
McCORMICK			1			1
MARION	1	1	1	3	2	8
MARLBORO			1	1		2
NEWBERRY	4	3	2		1	10
OCONEE	1	1	4	3		9
ORANGEBURG	8	6	6	6	1	27
PICKENS	3	4	3	1		11
RICHLAND	10	10	12	16	6	54
SALUDA				6		6
SPARTANBURG	13	9	15	18	7	62
SUMTER	4	1	1	4	2	12
UNION	1	1	3	1	4	10
WILLIAMSBURG		2	1	2	1	6
YORK	4	4	6	8		22
Total	152	104	183	172	52	663

Table 3.8
Response by County

County	n (GW/LAG/OG) *	Gang Wannabes Mean (SD)	Loosely Associated Gangs Mean (SD)	Organized Gangs Mean (SD)
Abbeville	5	2.6 (.89)	3.2 (.84)	2.0 (1.00)
Aiken	19	2.1 (.97)	2.2 (1.26)	2.0 (1.37)
Allendale	3	2.7 (1.15)	2.7 (1.15)	2.3 (.58)
Anderson	19	3.3 (1.05)	2.9 (.97)	2.8 (1.46)
Bamberg	4	2.0 (2)	2.7 (2.06)	2.0 (2.00)
Barnwell	9	2.0 (1.12)	1.9 (1.05)	1.4 (.88)
Beaufort	12/13/12	2.9 (1)	3.2 (1.36)	1.6 (.67)
Berkeley	17/17/16	2.2 (1.29)	2.1 (1.11)	1.6 (1.26)
Calhoun	2	2.5 (2.12)	2.0 (1.41)	1.0 (.00)
Charleston	39/39/38	3.0 (1.49)	2.9 (1.56)	2.6 (1.59)
Cherokee	5	2.4 (1.52)	2.6 (1.52)	2.4 (1.52)
Chester	7	2.4 (.79)	2.1 (1.07)	1.3 (.49)
Chesterfield	9	2.2 (1.30)	2.1 (1.27)	1.2 (.67)
Clarendon	6/6/5	2.5 (.55)	2.7 (1.21)	1.0 (.00)
Collinton	10	1.8 (.79)	1.4 (.70)	1.3 (.67)
Darlington	16/17/16	2.6 (1.26)	2.9 (1.45)	2.5 (1.32)
Dillon	5/5/4	1.6 (.89)	2.0 (1.41)	1.0 (.00)
Dorchester	11/11/10	2.9 (1.38)	2.7 (1.42)	2.0 (1.33)
Edgefield	2	3.5 (.71)	3.5 (.71)	2.0 (1.41)
Fairfield	3/4/3	3.0 (1.00)	3.5 (1.73)	1.3 (.58)
Florence	23/25/23	3.2 (1.20)	3.6 (1.22)	2.9 (1.39)
Georgetown	10	2.8 (1.23)	2.8 (1.03)	2.3 (1.25)
Greenville	65	3.1 (1.09)	3.3 (1.21)	3.3 (1.40)
Greenwood	14/15/14	2.9 (1.49)	3.1 (1.22)	1.4 (1.16)
Hampton	7/7/6	2.3 (1.11)	2.7 (.95)	1.3 (.82)
Horry	30/30/29	2.8 (1.39)	2.9 (1.36)	2.4 (1.35)
Jasper	8	1.6 (.74)	1.5 (.93)	1.0 (.00)
Kershaw	9	2.8 (1.09)	2.7 (1.12)	1.8 (.97)
Lancaster	14/13/13	2.9 (1.21)	2.5 (1.33)	1.9 (1.12)
Laurens	11/11/10	3.3 (1.27)	3.1 (1.14)	2.2 (1.32)
Lee	5	3.4 (.55)	3.4 (.89)	1.6 (.89)
Lexington	24/23/23	2.5 (1.32)	2.4 (1.41)	1.4 (.89)
McCormick	1	3.0 (--)	1.0 (--)	1.0 (--)
Marion	8	3.5 (1.41)	3.0 (1.60)	1.9 (1.36)
Marlboro	2	3.5 (.71)	3.0 (1.41)	1.0 (.00)
Newberry	10	2.1 (1.29)	2.0 (1.41)	1.2 (.42)
Oconee	9	3.0 (1.0)	2.6 (1.13)	1.8 (.97)
Orangeburg	27/26/24	2.5 (1.25)	2.6 (1.44)	1.6 (1.01)
Pickens	11/9/8	2.2 (.98)	1.7 (.87)	1.4 (1.06)
Richland	54/51/49	3.0 (1.30)	3.1 (1.22)	2.5 (1.49)
Saluda	6	4.0 (.00)	3.5 (.84)	3.7 (.52)
Spartanburg	62/62/60	3.0 (1.32)	2.9 (1.29)	2.5 (1.51)
Sumter	12/12/11	2.9 (1.62)	3.1 (1.51)	2.6 (1.57)
Union	10	3.6 (1.43)	3.8 (.92)	3.3 (1.70)
Williamsburg	6	3.3 (1.21)	2.8 (1.17)	2.2 (1.33)
York	22	2.8 (1.14)	2.9 (1.42)	2.2 (1.37)
Totals	663/661/639	2.8 (1.27)	2.8 (1.33)	2.2 (1.41)

* n is the same for all three unless otherwise noted

Table 4

Approximately how many of each type of gang are there in your jurisdiction?

Table 4.1

Response of All Criminal Justice Professionals

	<u>n</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>
Number of loosely associated gangs	338	5.15	5.98
Number of organized Gangs	287	2.25	3.22

Table 4.2

Response by Agency

Number of Loosely Associated Gangs

Agency	<u>n</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>
DPPP	147	5.2	5.3
DJJ	93	6.3	7.0
Criminal Justice	95	3.8	5.6
Total	335	5.1	6.0

Number of Organized Gangs

Agency	<u>n</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>
DPPP	134	2.8	4.1
DJJ	87	2.3	2.2
Criminal Justice	64	1.0	1.3
Total	285	2.2	3.2

Table 4.3

Metro/Nonmetropolitan Area Means

Metro/Nonmetro	Loosely Associated Gangs	Organized Gangs
Metro	6.1	2.5
Nonmetro	3.4	1.0

Table 5

To the extent there is a gang problem in your jurisdiction, what is the average size of gang?

Table 5.1

Response of all Criminal Justice Professionals

	<u>n</u>	Percent
5-20 members	434	64.1
21-30 members	43	6.4
31-40 members	9	1.3
Over 40 members	5	.7
Total	491	72.5
Missing data	186	27.5
Total	677	100.0

Table 6

To what extent are females involved in gangs?

Table 6.1

Response of All Criminal Justice Professionals

	<u>n</u>	Percent
No involvement	49	7.2
Minor involvement	291	43.0
Moderate involvement	107	15.8
Major involvement	14	2.1
Total	461	68.1
Missing data	216	31.9
Total	677	100.0

Table 6.2

Response by Agency (1=no involvement, 2=minor involvement, 3=moderate involvement, 4=major involvement)

Agency	<u>n</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>
DPPP	240	2.2	.6
DJJ	122	2.2	.6
Criminal Justice	96	2.0	.6
Total	458	2.1	.6

Table 6.3 Response by County
(1=no involvement, 2=minor involvement, 3=moderate involvement, 4=major involvement)

County	<u>n</u>	Female Involvement Mean (<u>SD</u>)
Abbeville	4	2.3 (.50)
Aiken	9	2.0 (.50)
Allendale	1	2.0 (--)
Anderson	12	2.3 (.49)
Bamberg	1	2.0 (--)
Barnwell	4	2.0 (.00)
Beaufort	11	2.1 (.54)
Berkeley	8	2.1 (.35)
Calhoun	1	1.0 (--)
Charleston	26	2.2 (.57)
Cherokee	3	2.7 (.58)
Chester	5	1.4 (.55)
Chesterfield	6	2.3 (.52)
Clarendon	5	2.2 (.45)
Collenton	2	1.5 (.71)
Darlington	13	2.2 (.55)
Dillon	3	2.0 (.00)
Dorchester	7	2.1 (.90)
Edgefield	2	2.0 (.00)
Fairfield	4	2.3 (1.26)
Florence	20	2.2 (.70)
Georgetown	7	2.0 (.58)
Greenville	45	2.3 (.51)
Greenwood	12	2.2 (.58)
Hampton	5	1.8 (.45)
Horry	17	2.5 (.62)
Jasper	4	1.8 (.50)
Kershaw	7	1.9 (.69)
Lancaster	11	2.5 (.52)
Laurens	7	2.1 (.69)
Lee	5	2.4 (.89)
Lexington	15	2.2 (.77)
McCormick	1	1.0 (--)
Marion	7	1.9 (.69)
Marlboro	2	2.0 (1.41)
Newberry	4	1.5 (.58)
Oconee	7	2.1 (.38)
Orangeburg	17	2.0 (.71)
Pickens	7	2.0 (.00)
Richland	42	2.4 (.76)
Saluda	6	1.8 (.41)
Spartanburg	45	2.3 (.67)
Sumter	9	2.2 (.67)
Union	9	2.4 (1.13)
Williamsburg	5	2.2 (.84)
York	15	2.1 (.70)

Total	458	2.2 (.65)
-------	-----	-----------

Table 7

How frequently do the gangs in your jurisdiction engage in the following criminal activities?

Table 7.1

Response of all Criminal Justice Professionals (1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes, 4=often)

Criminal Activity Frequency of:	n Valid (Missing)	Mean	Standard Deviation
Involvement in drug sales	495 (182)	3.5374	.6750
Involvement in drug use	494 (183)	3.5830	.5977
Involvement in graffiti	495 (182)	2.9253	.8468
Involvement in burglary	479 (198)	3.1148	.7271
Involvement in robbery	475 (202)	2.9642	.8349
Involvement in car theft	478 (199)	2.9163	.8500
Fighting other gangs	483 (194)	2.6915	.8461
Involvement in arson	475 (202)	1.8484	.7450
Involvement in retail theft	482 (195)	2.8610	.8955
Involvement in prostitution	474 (203)	1.9156	.8284
Involvement in extortion	475 (202)	1.8989	.8434
Involvement in vandalism	489 (188)	3.1391	.7501
Involvement in illegal gun possession	484 (193)	3.2913	.8113
Involvement in murder	469 (208)	2.0554	.9457
Involvement in assault	482 (195)	3.1328	.7731
Involvement in rape	471 (206)	1.9745	.8375
Involvement in hate/Bias crime	475 (202)	2.2968	.9084

Table 7.2 Response by County (Frequency of Involvement in Arson)
(1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes, 4=often)

County	n	Mean (SD)
Abbeville	5	1.6 (.55)
Aiken	9	1.3 (.50)
Allendale	1	2.0 (--)
Anderson	12	2.1 (.79)
Bamberg	2	1.5 (.71)
Barnwell	5	1.0 (.00)
Beaufort	11	1.3 (.47)
Berkeley	10	1.9 (.57)
Calhoun	1	2.0 (--)
Charleston	28	2.0 (.72)
Cherokee	3	2.0 (.00)
Chester	5	1.4 (.55)
Chesterfield	6	1.3 (.52)
Clarendon	6	1.5 (.55)
Collenton	2	1.0 (.00)
Darlington	13	2.1 (.95)
Dillon	3	1.3 (.58)
Dorchester	7	1.7 (.49)
Edgefield	2	1.0 (.00)
Fairfield	3	1.3 (.58)
Florence	20	2.1 (.85)
Georgetown	8	1.6 (.92)
Greenville	48	2.3 (.82)
Greenwood	11	1.8 (.40)
Hampton	6	1.2 (.41)
Horry	20	1.9 (.55)
Jasper	3	2.0 (.00)
Kershaw	7	1.4 (.53)
Lancaster	9	1.7 (.71)
Laurens	8	1.8 (.46)
Lee	5	1.8 (.84)
Lexington	13	1.8 (.73)
McCormick	1	1.0 (--)
Marion	7	1.9 (.69)
Marlboro	2	1.5 (.71)
Newberry	6	1.3 (.52)
Oconee	7	1.3 (.49)
Orangeburg	19	1.5 (.51)
Pickens	7	1.6 (.53)
Richland	44	2.0 (.68)
Saluda	6	2.2 (.41)
Spartanburg	43	2.2 (.81)
Sumter	8	2.4 (.92)
Union	9	1.7 (1.00)
Williamsburg	6	1.5 (.84)
York	15	1.9 (.59)

Total	472	1.9 (.75)
-------	-----	-----------

**Table 7.3 Response by County (Frequency of Involvement in Assault)
(1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes, 4=often)**

County	n	Mean (SD)
Abbeville	5	2.8 (1.10)
Aiken	9	3.1 (.60)
Allendale	1	3.0 (--)
Anderson	14	2.9 (.83)
Bamberg	2	3.5 (.71)
Barnwell	5	2.4 (1.14)
Beaufort	11	3.0 (.63)
Berkeley	10	2.8 (.42)
Calhoun	1	3.0 (--)
Charleston	28	3.4 (.69)
Cherokee	3	3.3 (.58)
Chester	5	3.2 (.84)
Chesterfield	6	3.3 (.82)
Clarendon	6	3.0 (.63)
Collenton	2	2.0 (1.41)
Darlington	13	3.5 (.66)
Dillon	3	4.0 (.00)
Dorchester	7	3.1 (.69)
Edgefield	2	3.5 (.71)
Fairfield	3	2.3 (1.15)
Florence	21	3.3 (.64)
Georgetown	8	3.3 (.71)
Greenville	51	3.3 (.65)
Greenwood	10	3.3 (.67)
Hampton	6	2.2 (.98)
Horry	20	3.4 (.59)
Jasper	3	2.7 (.58)
Kershaw	7	2.7 (.49)
Lancaster	10	3.3 (.67)
Laurens	8	3.0 (.53)
Lee	5	2.8 (.45)
Lexington	14	3.1 (.92)
McCormick	1	3.0 (--)
Marion	7	3.1 (1.07)
Marlboro	2	2.5 (.71)
Newberry	6	2.5 (.84)
Oconee	6	2.2 (1.17)
Orangeburg	19	2.8 (.86)
Pickens	7	2.6 (.53)
Richland	44	3.4 (.78)
Saluda	6	3.0 (.63)
Spartanburg	43	3.2 (.75)
Sumter	8	3.5 (.53)
Union	9	3.2 (.67)
Williamsburg	6	3.0 (1.10)
York	16	3.1 (.77)

Total	479	3.1 (.77)
-------	-----	-----------

**Table 7.4 Response by County (Frequency of Involvement in Burglary)
(1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes, 4=often)**

County	n	Mean (SD)
Abbeville	5	2.2 (.84)
Aiken	9	3.2 (.67)
Allendale	1	4.0 (--)
Anderson	13	2.9 (.64)
Bamberg	2	3.0 (.00)
Barnwell	5	2.2 (1.10)
Beaufort	11	2.9 (.94)
Berkeley	10	3.4 (.70)
Calhoun	1	3.0 (--)
Charleston	27	3.3 (.61)
Cherokee	3	3.3 (.58)
Chester	5	2.8 (.84)
Chesterfield	6	3.3 (.82)
Clarendon	6	2.8 (.98)
Collenton	2	1.5 (.71)
Darlington	13	3.2 (.69)
Dillon	3	2.7 (1.15)
Dorchester	7	3.1 (.69)
Edgefield	2	2.5 (.71)
Fairfield	3	2.7 (.58)
Florence	21	3.4 (.59)
Georgetown	8	3.0 (.53)
Greenville	49	3.2 (.64)
Greenwood	11	3.0 (.77)
Hampton	6	2.7 (.52)
Horry	20	3.4 (.59)
Jasper	3	3.0 (.00)
Kershaw	7	3.1 (.69)
Lancaster	8	3.3 (.71)
Laurens	8	2.9 (.35)
Lee	5	2.8 (.45)
Lexington	14	3.1 (.92)
McCormick	1	3.0 (--)
Marion	7	3.4 (1.13)
Marlboro	2	1.5 (.71)
Newberry	6	3.0 (.63)
Oconee	7	3.0 (.58)
Orangeburg	19	2.9 (.91)
Pickens	7	2.7 (.49)
Richland	44	3.3 (.59)
Saluda	6	3.8 (.41)
Spartanburg	45	3.2 (.63)
Sumter	8	3.6 (.52)
Union	9	3.0 (1.00)
Williamsburg	6	2.8 (1.17)
York	15	3.0 (.76)

Total	476	3.1 (.73)
-------	-----	-----------

**Table 7.5 Response by County (Frequency of Involvement in Car Theft)
(1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes, 4=often)**

County	N	Mean (SD)
Abbeville	5	2.0 (.71)
Aiken	9	3.1 (1.05)
Allendale	1	4.0 (--)
Anderson	14	3.0 (.78)
Bamberg	2	2.0 (1.41)
Barnwell	5	1.4 (.55)
Beaufort	11	2.7 (1.01)
Berkeley	9	3.2 (.67)
Calhoun	1	3.0 (--)
Charleston	28	3.3 (.61)
Cherokee	3	3.3 (.58)
Chester	5	2.4 (.55)
Chesterfield	6	2.5 (.55)
Clarendon	6	3.0 (.89)
Collenton	2	1.5 (.71)
Darlington	13	3.2 (.93)
Dillon	3	2.7 (1.15)
Dorchester	7	3.3 (.76)
Edgefield	2	2.0 (.00)
Fairfield	3	2.3 (1.15)
Florence	20	3.1 (.69)
Georgetown	8	3.3 (.46)
Greenville	50	3.2 (.78)
Greenwood	11	2.4 (.50)
Hampton	6	2.3 (.52)
Horry	20	3.2 (.59)
Jasper	3	3.0 (.00)
Kershaw	7	2.4 (.79)
Lancaster	9	2.2 (.44)
Laurens	8	2.5 (.76)
Lee	5	2.8 (.84)
Lexington	12	2.8 (1.06)
McCormick	1	1.0 (--)
Marion	7	3.1 (1.07)
Marlboro	2	1.0 (.00)
Newberry	6	2.3 (.82)
Oconee	7	2.4 (.98)
Orangeburg	19	2.6 (.90)
Pickens	7	2.3 (.76)
Richland	43	3.2 (.71)
Saluda	6	3.0 (.00)
Spartanburg	45	3.2 (.77)
Sumter	8	3.4 (.74)
Union	9	2.8 (.83)
Williamsburg	6	2.7 (1.03)
York	15	2.7 (.80)

Total	475	2.9 (.85)
-------	-----	-----------

**Table 7.6 Response by County (Frequency of Involvement in Drug Sales)
(1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes, 4=often)**

County	n	Mean (SD)
Abbeville	5	3.4 (.55)
Aiken	9	3.3 (.71)
Allendale	1	4.0 (--)
Anderson	15	3.4 (.74)
Bamberg	2	4.0 (.00)
Barnwell	5	2.6 (1.14)
Beaufort	11	3.3 (.65)
Berkeley	10	3.4 (.70)
Calhoun	1	4.0 (--)
Charleston	28	3.8 (.52)
Cherokee	3	4.0 (.00)
Chester	5	2.6 (.89)
Chesterfield	6	3.7 (.52)
Clarendon	6	3.8 (.41)
Collenton	2	3.0 (.00)
Darlington	13	3.8 (.38)
Dillon	3	4.0 (.00)
Dorchester	7	3.3 (1.11)
Edgefield	2	4.0 (.00)
Fairfield	4	3.5 (1.00)
Florence	22	3.8 (.53)
Georgetown	8	3.8 (.46)
Greenville	52	3.7 (.54)
Greenwood	12	3.7 (.65)
Hampton	6	3.3 (.52)
Horry	20	3.6 (.60)
Jasper	3	3.3 (.58)
Kershaw	8	2.6 (.74)
Lancaster	10	3.8 (.42)
Laurens	8	3.1 (.64)
Lee	5	3.8 (.45)
Lexington	15	3.4 (1.06)
McCormick	1	4.0 (--)
Marion	7	3.9 (.38)
Marlboro	2	3.5 (.71)
Newberry	6	2.7 (.82)
Oconee	7	3.3 (.76)
Orangeburg	19	3.5 (.84)
Pickens	7	3.4 (.53)
Richland	44	3.6 (.59)
Saluda	6	3.8 (.41)
Spartanburg	47	3.6 (.58)
Sumter	8	3.8 (.46)
Union	9	3.6 (.73)
Williamsburg	6	3.2 (1.17)
York	16	3.4 (.73)

Total	492	3.5 (.68)
-------	-----	-----------

**Table 7.7 Response by County (Frequency of Involvement in Drug Use)
(1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes, 4=often)**

County	n	Mean (SD)
Abbeville	5	3.4 (.55)
Aiken	10	3.6 (.52)
Allendale	1	3.0 (--)
Anderson	15	3.7 (.46)
Bamberg	2	4.0 (.00)
Barnwell	5	2.6 (1.34)
Beaufort	11	3.5 (.52)
Berkeley	10	3.4 (.70)
Calhoun	1	4.0 (--)
Charleston	28	3.8 (.52)
Cherokee	3	3.7 (.58)
Chester	5	2.6 (.89)
Chesterfield	6	3.7 (.52)
Clarendon	6	3.8 (.41)
Collenton	2	3.0 (1.41)
Darlington	13	3.8 (.44)
Dillon	3	4.0 (.00)
Dorchester	7	3.7 (.76)
Edgefield	2	4.0 (.00)
Fairfield	3	3.7 (.58)
Florence	22	3.7 (.55)
Georgetown	8	3.6 (.52)
Greenville	52	3.8 (.41)
Greenwood	11	3.7 (.47)
Hampton	6	3.2 (.41)
Horry	20	3.6 (.50)
Jasper	3	3.3 (.58)
Kershaw	7	3.0 (.00)
Lancaster	10	3.6 (.52)
Laurens	8	3.3 (.71)
Lee	5	2.8 (.84)
Lexington	16	3.5 (.82)
McCormick	1	4.0 (--)
Marion	7	3.7 (.49)
Marlboro	2	3.0 (.00)
Newberry	6	3.5 (.55)
Oconee	7	3.4 (.53)
Orangeburg	19	3.4 (.83)
Pickens	7	3.3 (.49)
Richland	44	3.7 (.47)
Saluda	6	3.8 (.41)
Spartanburg	47	3.6 (.58)
Sumter	8	3.6 (.52)
Union	9	3.7 (.50)
Williamsburg	6	3.2 (1.17)
York	16	3.6 (.51)

Total	491	3.6 (.60)
-------	-----	-----------

**Table 7.8 Response by County (Frequency of Involvement in Extortion)
(1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes, 4=often)**

County	n	Mean (SD)
Abbeville	5	1.4 (.55)
Aiken	8	1.8 (.89)
Allendale	1	2.0 (--)
Anderson	14	1.9 (.73)
Bamberg	2	1.0 (.00)
Barnwell	5	1.0 (.00)
Beaufort	11	1.2 (.40)
Berkeley	10	1.5 (.53)
Calhoun	1	1 (--)
Charleston	28	2.1 (.92)
Cherokee	3	2.0 (.00)
Chester	5	2.6 (.55)
Chesterfield	6	1.2 (.41)
Clarendon	6	1.3 (.52)
Collenton	2	1 (.00)
Darlington	13	2.1 (1.04)
Dillon	3	2.0 (1.00)
Dorchester	7	1.9 (.69)
Edgefield	2	2.0 (1.41)
Fairfield	3	1.0 (.00)
Florence	20	2.0 (.69)
Georgetown	8	2.1 (1.12)
Greenville	48	2.5 (.77)
Greenwood	11	1.7 (.65)
Hampton	5	1.0 (.00)
Horry	20	2.1 (.85)
Jasper	3	2.7 (.58)
Kershaw	7	1.4 (.53)
Lancaster	9	1.8 (.83)
Laurens	8	1.5 (.76)
Lee	5	1.4 (.55)
Lexington	13	1.5 (.52)
McCormick	1	1.0 (--)
Marion	7	1.7 (.76)
Marlboro	2	1.0 (.00)
Newberry	6	1.3 (.52)
Oconee	7	1.4 (.53)
Orangeburg	19	1.6 (.69)
Pickens	7	1.6 (.79)
Richland	43	2.0 (.84)
Saluda	6	2.2 (.41)
Spartanburg	43	2.3 (.95)
Sumter	8	2.6 (.74)
Union	9	2.0 (1.0)
Williamsburg	6	1.2 (.41)
York	16	1.9 (.72)

Total	472	1.9 (.84)
-------	-----	-----------

**Table 7.9 Response by County (Frequency of Involvement in Fighting Other Gangs)
(1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes, 4=often)**

County	n	Mean (SD)
Abbeville	5	3.2 (.84)
Aiken	10	3.2 (.79)
Allendale	1	2.0 (--)
Anderson	14	2.6 (.84)
Bamberg	2	2.0 (.00)
Barnwell	5	2.0 (.71)
Beaufort	11	2.4 (.92)
Berkeley	10	2.8 (.92)
Calhoun	1	3.0 (--)
Charleston	27	2.9 (.78)
Cherokee	3	2.0 (.00)
Chester	5	2.4 (.55)
Chesterfield	6	2.2 (.75)
Clarendon	6	2.2 (.41)
Collenton	2	2.5 (.71)
Darlington	13	2.9 (.76)
Dillon	3	3.3 (1.15)
Dorchester	7	2.4 (1.27)
Edgefield	2	2.0 (1.41)
Fairfield	3	2.7 (1.53)
Florence	21	2.8 (.62)
Georgetown	8	2.5 (.93)
Greenville	50	3.0 (.75)
Greenwood	12	3.0 (.95)
Hampton	6	2.7 (1.21)
Horry	20	2.7 (.80)
Jasper	3	2.3 (.58)
Kershaw	7	2.0 (.82)
Lancaster	10	2.7 (.67)
Laurens	8	2.8 (1.04)
Lee	5	2.8 (1.10)
Lexington	14	2.6 (.94)
McCormick	1	2.0 (--)
Marion	7	2.1 (.69)
Marlboro	2	3.0 (.00)
Newberry	6	2.2 (.75)
Oconee	7	2.1 (1.07)
Orangeburg	19	2.5 (.84)
Pickens	7	2.1 (.69)
Richland	44	2.8 (.75)
Saluda	6	3.7 (.52)
Spartanburg	43	2.8 (.78)
Sumter	7	3.0 (.82)
Union	9	3.0 (.87)
Williamsburg	6	2.0 (1.26)
York	16	2.5 (.63)

Total	480	2.7 (.84)
-------	-----	-----------

Table 7.10 Response by County (Frequency of Involvement in Graffiti)
(1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes, 4=often)

County	n	Mean (SD)
Abbeville	5	3.2 (.45)
Aiken	9	3.4 (.53)
Allendale	1	3.0 (--)
Anderson	15	3.0 (.76)
Bamberg	2	3.0 (.00)
Barnwell	5	1.6 (.55)
Beaufort	11	1.9 (.70)
Berkeley	10	2.8 (.92)
Calhoun	1	3.0 (--)
Charleston	28	3.2 (.72)
Cherokee	3	2.3 (.58)
Chester	4	2.5 (1.00)
Chesterfield	6	2.5 (1.05)
Clarendon	6	1.5 (.55)
Collenton	2	2.5 (.71)
Darlington	13	3.1 (.76)
Dillon	3	3.0 (1.00)
Dorchester	7	2.9 (.90)
Edgefield	2	2.5 (.71)
Fairfield	3	2.0 (.00)
Florence	21	3.3 (.73)
Georgetown	8	2.9 (1.13)
Greenville	54	3.6 (.60)
Greenwood	11	2.9 (.70)
Hampton	6	2.2 (.75)
Horry	20	2.7 (.59)
Jasper	3	2.7 (.58)
Kershaw	7	3.3 (.76)
Lancaster	11	3.1 (.70)
Laurens	8	2.5 (.76)
Lee	5	2.4 (.55)
Lexington	16	2.9 (.89)
McCormick	1	3.0 (--)
Marion	7	2.9 (1.07)
Marlboro	2	2.0 (1.41)
Newberry	6	2.0 (.89)
Oconee	7	2.6 (.79)
Orangeburg	20	2.5 (.83)
Pickens	7	2.3 (.95)
Richland	44	3.0 (.76)
Saluda	6	2.8 (.41)
Spartanburg	46	3.3 (.70)
Sumter	8	2.9 (.83)
Union	9	3.4 (.53)
Williamsburg	6	2.5 (.122)
York	17	2.8 (.44)

Total	492	2.9 (.84)
-------	-----	-----------

**Table 7.11 Response by County (Frequency of Involvement in Illegal Gun Possession)
(1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes, 4=often)**

County	n	Mean (SD)
Abbeville	5	3.2 (.45)
Aiken	9	3.2 (.67)
Allendale	1	4.0 (--)
Anderson	13	3.5 (.88)
Bamberg	2	3.5 (.71)
Barnwell	5	2.4 (1.14)
Beaufort	11	2.7 (.79)
Berkeley	10	2.7 (.67)
Calhoun	1	3.0 (--)
Charleston	28	3.4 (.69)
Cherokee	3	4.0 (.00)
Chester	5	2.8 (1.30)
Chesterfield	6	3.2 (1.17)
Clarendon	6	3.0 (.63)
Collenton	2	2.5 (.71)
Darlington	13	3.5 (.66)
Dillon	3	3.7 (.58)
Dorchester	7	3.1 (.69)
Edgefield	2	3.5 (.71)
Fairfield	4	3.0 (1.41)
Florence	21	3.5 (.75)
Georgetown	8	3.5 (.76)
Greenville	51	3.5 (.70)
Greenwood	12	3.3 (.87)
Hampton	6	3.2 (.75)
Horry	20	3.5 (.83)
Jasper	3	2.7 (.58)
Kershaw	7	3.0 (1.15)
Lancaster	9	3.6 (.73)
Laurens	8	3.0 (.53)
Lee	5	3.0 (.71)
Lexington	13	2.9 (1.12)
McCormick	1	3.0 (--)
Marion	7	3.7 (.49)
Marlboro	2	3.0 (1.41)
Newberry	6	2.7 (1.03)
Oconee	6	2.8 (.75)
Orangeburg	19	3.2 (.96)
Pickens	7	2.9 (.69)
Richland	44	3.4 (.72)
Saluda	6	4.0 (.00)
Spartanburg	46	3.5 (.75)
Sumter	8	3.4 (.74)
Union	9	3.4 (.53)
Williamsburg	6	2.7 (1.51)

York	15	3.3 (.72)
Total	481	3.3 (.81)

**Table 7.12 Response by County (Frequency of Involvement in Murder)
(1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes, 4=often)**

County	n	Mean (SD)
Abbeville	5	1.2 (.45)
Aiken	8	1.5 (.76)
Allendale	1	2.0 (--)
Anderson	13	2.2 (.90)
Bamberg	2	1.0 (.00)
Barnwell	5	1.0 (.00)
Beaufort	11	1.2 (.40)
Berkeley	9	1.9 (.93)
Calhoun	1	1.0 (--)
Charleston	28	2.6 (.91)
Cherokee	3	2.0 (.00)
Chester	5	1.2 (.45)
Chesterfield	6	2.0 (.89)
Clarendon	6	2.5 (1.22)
Collinton	2	1.0 (.00)
Darlington	13	2.2 (1.24)
Dillon	3	2.0 (1.00)
Dorchester	6	1.8 (.75)
Edgefield	2	2.0 (1.41)
Fairfield	3	1.7 (1.15)
Florence	20	2.2 (.70)
Georgetown	8	2.4 (.74)
Greenville	45	2.6 (.84)
Greenwood	11	1.8 (.75)
Hampton	6	1.0 (.00)
Horry	20	2.3 (1.02)
Jasper	3	2.0 (.00)
Kershaw	7	1.6 (.79)
Lancaster	9	2.1 (.78)
Laurens	8	1.9 (.64)
Lee	5	1.4 (.55)
Lexington	13	1.8 (.83)
McCormick	1	1.0 (--)
Marion	7	2.4 (1.13)
Marlboro	2	1.5 (.71)
Newberry	6	1.0 (.00)
Oconee	6	1.2 (.41)
Orangeburg	19	1.8 (.83)
Pickens	7	1.1 (.38)
Richland	43	2.3 (.92)
Saluda	6	2.0 (.63)
Spartanburg	43	2.4 (.98)
Sumter	8	2.8 (1.17)
Union	9	1.2 (.44)
Williamsburg	6	1.5 (.55)
York	16	2.3 (1.06)

Total	466	2.1 (.95)
-------	-----	-----------

Table 7.13 Response by County (Frequency of Involvement in Prostitution)
(1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes, 4=often)

County	n	Mean (SD)
Abbeville	5	1.6 (.55)
Aiken	8	1.3 (.46)
Allendale	1	3.0 (--)
Anderson	13	1.8 (.69)
Bamberg	2	1.5 (.71)
Barnwell	5	1.2 (.45)
Beaufort	11	1.2 (.40)
Berkeley	10	1.5 (.71)
Calhoun	1	1.0 (--)
Charleston	28	2.1 (.76)
Cherokee	3	2.7 (.58)
Chester	5	1.8 (.45)
Chesterfield	6	1.7 (.82)
Clarendon	6	1.2 (.41)
Collenton	2	1.0 (.00)
Darlington	13	2.2 (.73)
Dillon	3	1.3 (.58)
Dorchester	7	1.7 (.49)
Edgefield	2	2.5 (2.1)
Fairfield	3	1.0 (.00)
Florence	20	2.3 (.72)
Georgetown	8	2.0 (1.20)
Greenville	48	2.4 (.89)
Greenwood	11	1.9 (.70)
Hampton	6	1.2 (.41)
Horry	20	2.4 (.75)
Jasper	3	2.0 (.00)
Kershaw	7	1.3 (.49)
Lancaster	9	2.1 (.93)
Laurens	8	1.8 (.89)
Lee	5	1.4 (.55)
Lexington	13	1.8 (.83)
McCormick	1	1.0 (--)
Marion	7	1.9 (.69)
Marlboro	2	2.0 (1.41)
Newberry	6	1.3 (.52)
Oconee	7	1.4 (.79)
Orangeburg	19	1.6 (.68)
Pickens	7	1.7 (.76)
Richland	43	2.1 (.87)
Saluda	5	2.8 (.45)
Spartanburg	43	2.2 (.78)
Sumter	8	2.0 (.00)
Union	9	1.4 (.73)
Williamsburg	6	1.8 (1.17)

York	16	1.7 (.87)
Total	471	1.9 (.83)

**Table 7.14 Response by County (Frequency of Involvement in Rape)
(1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes, 4=often)**

County	n	Mean (SD)
Abbeville	5	1.2 (.44)
Aiken	8	1.4 (.51)
Allendale	1	2.0 (0)
Anderson	13	2.0 (.70)
Bamberg	2	1.5 (.70)
Barnwell	5	1.2 (.44)
Beaufort	11	1.3 (.46)
Berkeley	10	1.9 (.56)
Calhoun	1	2.0 (0)
Charleston	28	2.6 (.79)
Cherokee	3	2.3 (.57)
Chester	5	1.4 (.54)
Chesterfield	6	1.3 (.51)
Clarendon	6	2.0 (.89)
Collenton	2	1.0 (.0)
Darlington	13	2.2 (.92)
Dillon	3	1.7 (.57)
Dorchester	6	1.8 (.75)
Edgefield	2	2.0 (1.4)
Fairfield	3	1.3 (.57)
Florence	19	2.3 (.73)
Georgetown	8	1.8 (.88)
Greenville	48	2.5 (.89)
Greenwood	10	1.7 (.67)
Hampton	6	1.2 (.40)
Horry	20	1.9 (.74)
Jasper	3	2.0 (.0)
Kershaw	7	1.6 (.78)
Lancaster	9	1.9 (.92)
Laurens	8	1.9 (.83)
Lee	5	1.4 (.54)
Lexington	13	1.6 (.76)
McCormick	1	1.0 (.0)
Marion	7	1.9 (.69)
Marlboro	2	1.5 (.70)
Newberry	6	1.2 (.40)
Oconee	6	1.3 (.81)
Orangeburg	19	1.8 (.63)
Pickens	7	1.3 (.48)
Richland	43	2.3 (.73)
Saluda	6	1.8 (.40)
Spartanburg	43	2.4 (.85)
Sumter	8	2.1 (.64)
Union	9	1.5 (1.0)

Williamsburg	6	1.8 (.98)
York	16	2.1 (.77)
Total	468	2.0 (.83)

Table 7.15 Response by County (Frequency of Involvement in Retail Theft)
(1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes, 4=often)

County	n	Mean (SD)
Abbeville	5	2.6 (1.14)
Aiken	9	3.2 (.67)
Allendale	1	3.0 (--)
Anderson	14	3.2 (.80)
Bamberg	2	2.5 (.71)
Barnwell	5	1.6 (.55)
Beaufort	11	2.6 (.92)
Berkeley	10	2.1 (.99)
Calhoun	1	4.0 (--)
Charleston	28	2.9 (.86)
Cherokee	3	2.7 (.58)
Chester	5	3.2 (1.10)
Chesterfield	6	2.5 (.55)
Clarendon	6	2.7 (1.51)
Collenton	2	3.0 (.00)
Darlington	13	2.9 (1.04)
Dillon	3	2.7 (.58)
Dorchester	6	2.8 (.75)
Edgefield	2	3.0 (1.41)
Fairfield	3	2.7 (.58)
Florence	20	3.2 (.70)
Georgetown	8	2.9 (.83)
Greenville	50	3.2 (.69)
Greenwood	11	3.1 (1.14)
Hampton	6	2.2 (1.17)
Horry	20	2.9 (.97)
Jasper	3	2.7 (.58)
Kershaw	7	1.9 (.69)
Lancaster	9	3.0 (1.00)
Laurens	8	2.6 (.92)
Lee	5	2.8 (.45)
Lexington	14	2.9 (1.00)
McCormick	1	1.0 (--)
Marion	7	2.7 (1.25)
Marlboro	2	2.0 (1.41)
Newberry	6	2.5 (1.22)
Oconee	7	2.6 (.79)
Orangeburg	19	2.6 (1.07)
Pickens	7	3.0 (.58)
Richland	44	2.9 (.91)
Saluda	6	2.5 (.84)
Spartanburg	45	3.0 (.71)
Sumter	8	2.8 (.71)
Union	9	3.0 (1.00)
Williamsburg	6	2.5 (1.22)
York	16	3.0 (.73)

Total	479	2.9 (.90)
-------	-----	-----------

Table 7.16 Response by County (Frequency of Involvement in Robbery)
(1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes, 4=often)

County	n	Mean (SD)
Abbeville	5	2.2 (.84)
Aiken	9	2.9 (.60)
Allendale	1	4.0 (--)
Anderson	13	2.8 (.93)
Bamberg	2	2.5 (.71)
Barnwell	5	1.8 (.84)
Beaufort	11	2.5 (.93)
Berkeley	8	3.3 (.71)
Calhoun	1	3.0 (--)
Charleston	28	3.2 (.77)
Cherokee	3	4.0 (.00)
Chester	5	1.8 (.45)
Chesterfield	6	3.3 (.52)
Clarendon	6	3.2 (1.33)
Collenton	2	1.5 (.71)
Darlington	13	3.2 (.73)
Dillon	3	3.0 (1.00)
Dorchester	6	2.7 (1.03)
Edgefield	2	2.5 (.71)
Fairfield	3	2.3 (1.15)
Florence	21	3.1 (.79)
Georgetown	8	3.1 (.64)
Greenville	49	3.3 (.61)
Greenwood	11	2.8 (.75)
Hampton	6	2.3 (.82)
Horry	20	3.4 (.67)
Jasper	3	3.0 (.00)
Kershaw	7	2.4 (1.27)
Lancaster	9	2.7 (.87)
Laurens	8	2.8 (.46)
Lee	5	2.6 (.89)
Lexington	13	2.8 (1.17)
McCormick	1	2.0 (--)
Marion	7	3.3 (1.11)
Marlboro	2	2.5 (.71)
Newberry	6	2.7 (.82)
Oconee	7	2.3 (1.11)
Orangeburg	19	2.7 (.87)
Pickens	6	2.5 (.55)
Richland	44	3.1 (.80)
Saluda	6	3.2 (.41)
Spartanburg	43	3.1 (.71)
Sumter	8	3.3 (.71)
Union	9	2.9 (.93)
Williamsburg	6	2.3 (.82)
York	16	3.0 (.63)

Total	472	3.0 (.84)
-------	-----	-----------

Table 7.17 Response by County (Frequency of Involvement in Vandalism)
(1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes, 4=often)

County	n	Mean (SD)
Abbeville	5	3.0 (.71)
Aiken	9	3.3 (.71)
Allendale	1	4.0 (--)
Anderson	14	3.1 (.66)
Bamberg	2	3.5 (.71)
Barnwell	5	1.8 (.45)
Beaufort	11	2.5 (.82)
Berkeley	10	2.8 (.63)
Calhoun	1	4.0 (--)
Charleston	28	3.2 (.83)
Cherokee	3	3.3 (.58)
Chester	5	3.4 (.89)
Chesterfield	6	2.7 (.52)
Clarendon	6	2.7 (.82)
Collenton	2	3.0 (.00)
Darlington	13	3.2 (.60)
Dillon	3	3.3 (.58)
Dorchester	7	3.4 (1.07)
Edgefield	2	3.0 (.00)
Fairfield	3	2.3 (.58)
Florence	20	3.6 (.51)
Georgetown	8	2.8 (.89)
Greenville	53	3.6 (.57)
Greenwood	11	3.2 (.75)
Hampton	6	2.7 (.52)
Horry	20	3.2 (.77)
Jasper	3	2.7 (.58)
Kershaw	7	2.9 (.69)
Lancaster	10	3.3 (.82)
Laurens	8	3.1 (.64)
Lee	5	2.6 (.55)
Lexington	15	3.0 (.76)
McCormick	1	2.0 (--)
Marion	7	3.6 (.53)
Marlboro	2	3.0 (.00)
Newberry	6	3.2 (.41)
Oconee	7	3.0 (.58)
Orangeburg	19	2.5 (.84)
Pickens	7	2.9 (.69)
Richland	44	3.2 (.71)
Saluda	6	3.7 (.52)
Spartanburg	45	3.2 (.77)
Sumter	8	3.6 (.52)
Union	9	3.4 (.53)
Williamsburg	6	3.0 (.63)
York	17	2.8 (.66)

Total	486	3.1 (.75)
-------	-----	-----------

Table 8

In your community, what are the two or three most important problems or impacts caused by gangs?

Table 8.1

Response of all Criminal Justice Professionals

	n Valid (Missing)
Drugs (sale, use, distribution)	242 (174)
Property crimes, theft	141 (275)
Violent Crime/Assault	136 (280)
Vandalism	70 (346)
Fear, intimidation	64 (352)
Guns/Weapons	47 (369)
Graffiti	43 (373)
School disruption	33 (383)
Negative influence on youth	27 (389)
Other	23 (393)
Community annoyance	20 (396)
School dropout	16 (400)
Negative effect on families	16 (400)
Disrespect authority	7 (409)
Elderly victimized	5 (411)
Organization of gangs	3 (413)

Table 9

To what extent are youth gangs in your jurisdiction active in local schools?

Table 9.1

Response of all Criminal Justice Professionals

Valid	n	Percent
No activity	18	2.7
Little activity	150	22.2
Some activity	292	43.1
Great deal of activity	47	6.9
Total	507	74.9
Missing data	170	25.1
Total	677	100.0

*Those who said there was no gang activity in their community did not answer

Table 9.2

Response by Agency (1=No Activity, 2=Little Activity, 3=Some Activity, 4=Great Deal of Activity)

Agency	<u>n</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>
DPPP	260	2.7	.6
DJJ	134	2.8	.6
Criminal Justice	110	2.4	.7
Total	504	2.7	.6

Table 9.3

Response by Metro/Nonmetropolitan Area (1=No Activity, 2=Little Activity, 3=Some Activity, 4=Great Deal of Activity)

Metro/Nonmetro	Mean	Std. Error
Metro	2.7	.0
Nonmetro	2.6	.0

Table 9.4 Response by County (1=No Activity, 2=Little Activity, 3=Some Activity, 4=Great Deal of Activity)

County	N	Gang Activity in Schools Mean (SD)
Abbeville	5	3.0 (.00)
Aiken	11	2.8 (.75)
Allendale	3	2.3 (.58)
Anderson	16	2.7 (.79)
Bamberg	2	2.0 (1.41)
Barnwell	5	2.4 (.89)
Beaufort	12	2.6 (.90)
Berkeley	10	2.6 (.52)
Calhoun	1	4.0 (--)
Charleston	28	2.8 (.55)
Cherokee	3	3.0 (.00)
Chester	5	1.8 (.45)
Chesterfield	6	2.2 (.41)
Clarendon	6	2.8 (.41)
Collenton	2	2.0 (.00)
Darlington	13	3.1 (.28)
Dillon	3	3.0 (.00)
Dorchester	7	2.7 (.49)
Edgefield	2	2.0 (.00)
Fairfield	3	3.0 (1.00)
Florence	21	2.7 (.58)
Georgetown	8	2.4 (.74)
Greenville	55	2.9 (.56)
Greenwood	12	2.7 (.49)
Hampton	5	2.8 (.84)
Horry	20	2.7 (.59)
Jasper	4	2.5 (.58)
Kershaw	8	2.5 (.93)
Lancaster	11	3.1 (.83)
Laurens	9	2.7 (.50)
Lee	4	2.5 (.58)
Lexington	16	2.4 (.81)
McCormick	1	2.0 (--)
Marion	7	2.3 (.76)
Marlboro	2	3.0 (.00)
Newberry	6	2.2 (.75)
Oconee	6	2.8 (.75)
Orangeburg	18	2.6 (.92)
Pickens	7	2.7 (.49)
Richland	44	2.8 (.59)
Saluda	6	3.2 (.41)
Spartanburg	48	2.9 (.63)
Sumter	9	3.0 (.71)
Union	10	2.9 (.88)
Williamsburg	6	2.5 (.84)
York	18	2.6 (.61)

Total	504	2.7 (.67)
-------	-----	-----------

Table 10.

In your opinion, to what extent do community leaders in your jurisdiction deny the gang problem?

NO DENIAL 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 HIGH DENIAL

Table 10.1

Response of all Criminal Justice Professionals

	N	Mean	<u>SD</u>
Community leaders denial of gang activity	512	5.95	2.45

Table 10.2

Response by Agency

Agency	<u>n</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>
DPPP	266	6.0	2.3
DJJ	133	5.9	2.3
Criminal Justice	110	5.6	2.6
Total	509	5.9	2.4

Table 10.3

Response by Metro/Nonmetropolitan Area

Metro/Nonmetro	Mean	Std. Error
Metro	5.8	.1
Nonmetro	5.7	.1

Table 11

Please rank order (1=highest priority, 2=middle priority, 3=lowest priority) where you think resources should be placed to address gang-related problems in your jurisdiction.

- _____ Prevention programs (such as gang awareness programs for all youths)
- _____ Intervention programs (such as after school programs, mentoring, etc. for at-risk youths and current gang members)
- _____ Suppression programs (anti-gang law enforcement efforts)

Table 11.1**Response of all Criminal Justice Professionals**

Funding Priority—Prevention

Valid	<u>n</u>	Percent
Highest priority	110	16.2
Middle priority	200	29.5
Lowest priority	134	19.8
Total	444	65.6
Missing data	233	34.4
Total	677	100.0

Funding Priority—Intervention

Valid	<u>n</u>	Percent
Highest priority	219	32.3
Middle priority	161	23.8
Lowest priority	64	9.5
Total	444	65.6
Missing data	233	34.4
Total	677	100.0

Funding Priority—Suppression

Valid	<u>n</u>	Percent
Highest priority	115	17.0
Middle priority	83	12.3
Lowest priority	246	36.3
Total	444	65.6
Missing data	233	34.4
Total	677	100.0

Table 11.2**Response by Agency**

Agency	Prevention % (n)	Intervention % (n)	Suppression % (n)
DPPP	23.8 (56)	45.5 (107)	30.6 (72)
DJJ	23.7 (28)	59.3 (70)	16.9 (20)
Criminal Justice	28.6 (26)	46.2 (42)	25.3 (23)
Total	24.8 (110)	49.3 (219)	25.9 (115)

Table 11.3**Response by Metro/Nonmetropolitan Area**

Funding Priority

Metro/Nonmetro	Prevention % (<u>n</u>)	Intervention % (<u>n</u>)	Suppression % (<u>n</u>)
Metro	25.2 (70)	45.7 (127)	29.1 (81)
Nonmetro	23.9 (39)	55.2 (90)	20.9 (34)

Table 11.4 Response by County

County	N	Prevention Programs % (n)	Intervention Programs % (n)	Suppression Programs % (n)
Abbeville	4	25.0 (1)	75.0 (3)	---
Aiken	11	27.3 (3)	54.5 (6)	18.2 (2)
Allendale	3	66.7 (2)	---	33.3 (1)
Anderson	16	31.3 (5)	31.3 (5)	37.5 (6)
Bamberg	2	---	50.0(1)	50.0 (1)
Barnwell	4	50.0 (2)	25.0 (1)	25.0 (1)
Beaufort	10	20.0 (2)	80.0 (8)	---
Berkeley	7	28.6 (2)	57.1 (4)	14.3 (1)
Calhoun	1	100.0 (1)	---	---
Charleston	23	26.1 (6)	39.1 (9)	34.8 (8)
Cherokee	3	---	100.0 (3)	---
Chester	4	25.0 (1)	25.0 (1)	50.0 (2)
Chesterfield	6	16.7 (1)	66.7 (4)	16.7 (1)
Clarendon	3	---	66.7 (2)	33.3 (1)
Collenton	2	50.0 (1)	50.0 (1)	---
Darlington	14	21.4 (3)	42.9 (6)	35.7 (5)
Dillon	2	---	100.0 (2)	---
Dorchester	6	33.3 (2)	50.0 (3)	16.7 (1)
Edgefield	1	---	100.0 (1)	---
Fairfield	4	---	100.0 (4)	---
Florence	17	29.4 (5)	47.1 (8)	23.5 (4)
Georgetown	7	---	85.7 (6)	14.3 (1)
Greenville	53	24.5 (13)	41.5 (22)	34.0 (18)
Greenwood	9	22.2 (2)	55.6 (5)	22.2 (2)
Hampton	5	20.0 (1)	60.0 (3)	20.0 (1)
Horry	16	31.3 (5)	43.8 (7)	25.0 (4)
Jasper	3	33.3 (1)	33.3 (1)	33.3 (1)
Kershaw	7	42.9 (3)	28.6 (2)	28.6 (2)
Lancaster	9	22.2 (2)	66.7 (6)	11.1 (1)
Laurens	8	25.0 (2)	37.5 (3)	37.5 (3)
Lee	4	---	75.0 (3)	25.0 (1)
Lexington	16	12.5 (2)	68.8 (11)	18.8 (3)
Marion	7	---	71.4 (5)	28.6 (2)
Marlboro	1	---	---	100.0 (1)
Newberry	5	60.0 (3)	20.0 (1)	20.0 (1)
Oconee	6	50.0 (3)	50.0 (3)	---
Orangeburg	14	7.1 (1)	64.3 (9)	28.6 (4)
Pickens	6	33.3 (2)	50.0 (3)	16.7 (1)
Richland	38	15.8 (6)	60.5 (23)	23.7 (9)
Saluda	6	---	100.0 (6)	---
Spartanburg	43	30.2 (13)	34.9 (15)	34.9 (15)
Sumter	8	12.5 (1)	25.0 (2)	62.5 (5)
Union	8	62.5 (5)	25.0 (2)	12.5 (1)
Williamsburg	5	40.0 (2)	40.0 (2)	20.0 (1)
York	14	35.7 (5)	35.7 (5)	28.6 (4)
Total	441	24.7 (109)	49.2 (217)	26.1 (115)

Table 12

How knowledgeable are you about the gang problem in your jurisdiction?

1=Not at all Knowledgeable 2= Somewhat Knowledgeable 3=Very Knowledgeable

Table 12.1

Response of all Criminal Justice Professionals

	<u>n</u>	Percent
Not at all knowledgeable	52	7.7
Somewhat knowledgeable	398	58.8
Very knowledgeable	68	10.0
Total	518	76.5
Missing data*	159	23.5
Total	677	100.0

* Only asked if respondents indicated that there was some gang presence in their community.

Table 12.2

Response by Agency

Agency	<u>n</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>
DPPP	270	1.9	.4
DJJ	135	2.0	.4
Criminal Justice	110	2.3	.5
Total	515	2.0	.4

Table 12.3

Response by Metro/Nonmetropolitan Area

Metro/Nonmetro	Mean	Std. Error
Metro	2.1	.0
Nonmetro	2.0	.0

Table 13.

Over the last few years, how has the problem in your jurisdiction changed?

1=Getting Better 2=Staying the Same 3=Getting Worse

Table 13.1

Response by all Criminal Justice Professionals

	<u>n</u>	Percent
Getting better	25	3.7
Staying the same	225	33.2
Getting worse	261	38.6
Total	511	75.5
Missing data	166	24.5
Total	677	100.0

Table 13.2

Response by Agency

Agency	<u>n</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>
DPPP	272	2.5	.5
DJJ	129	2.5	.5
Criminal Justice	107	2.2	.7
Total	508	2.4	.5

Table 13.3

Response by Metro/Nonmetropolitan Area

Metro/Nonmetro	Mean	Std. Error
Metro	2.4	.0
Nonmetro	2.3	.0

Table 13.4 Response by County 1=Getting Better 2=Staying the Same 3=Getting Worse

County	n	Gang Change Over Years, Mean (SD)
Abbeville	5	2.8 (.45)
Aiken	11	2.4 (.67)
Allendale	3	2.3 (.58)
Anderson	18	2.7 (.59)
Bamberg	2	2.0 (1.41)
Barnwell	5	2.2 (.45)
Beaufort	9	2.1 (.60)
Berkeley	10	2.3 (.48)
Calhoun	1	3.0 (--)
Charleston	27	2.5 (.58)
Cherokee	3	3.0 (.00)
Chester	5	2.2 (.45)
Chesterfield	6	2.3 (.82)
Clarendon	5	2.0 (.00)
Collenton	3	2.5 (.58)
Darlington	13	2.0 (.52)
Dillon	3	2.0 (1.00)
Dorchester	7	2.1 (.38)
Edgefield	2	2.0 (.00)
Fairfield	4	2.8 (.50)
Florence	23	2.5 (.51)
Georgetown	7	2.3 (.49)
Greenville	56	2.6 (.59)
Greenwood	12	2.5 (.52)
Hampton	6	2.5 (.55)
Horry	22	2.6 (4.9)
Jasper	4	2.3(.50)
Kershaw	8	2.4 (.52)
Lancaster	11	2.3 (.65)
Laurens	9	2.7 (.50)
Lee	5	2.4 (.50)
Lexington	17	2.1 (.60)
McCormick	1	2.0 (--)
Marion	7	2.4 (.79)
Marlboro	2	2.0 (.00)
Newberry	6	1.8 (.75)
Oconee	7	2.6 (.53)
Orangeburg	19	2.4 (.61)
Pickens	8	2.4 (.74)
Richland	43	2.7 (.48)
Saluda	6	3.0 (.00)
Spartanburg	45	2.6 (.54)
Sumter	8	2.3 (.46)
Union	10	2.1 (.88)
Williamsburg	6	2.2 (.75)
York	18	2.4 (.50)

Total	508	2.5 (.58)
-------	-----	-----------

Table 14.

In the course of your duties, how much contact do you have with juveniles and gang members?

1=No Contact 2=Very Little Contact 3=Moderate Contact 4=A Great Deal of Contact

Table 14.1

Response by Agency, Contact with Juveniles

Agency	<u>n</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>
DPPP	267	2.0	.9
DJJ	137	3.6	.7
Criminal Justice	111	3.1	.8
Total	515	2.7	1.0

Table 14.2

Response by Agency, Contact with Gangs

Agency	<u>n</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>
DPPP	268	2.3	.8
DJJ	133	2.5	.8
Criminal Justice	110	2.6	.7
Total	511	2.4	.8

Tables 15-30.1

Interviews with juveniles at the SC Department of Juvenile Justice

Table 15**In your community, what are the biggest problems caused by adolescents?****Percentage (and number) Responding**

	Florence (<u>n</u> = 5)	Charleston (<u>n</u> = 15)	Greenville (<u>n</u> = 15)	Richland (<u>n</u> = 15)	Total* (<u>N</u> = 50)
Drugs	60.0% (3)	80.0% (12)	66.7% (10)	80.0% (12)	74.0% (37)
Stealing	80.0% (4)	40.0% (6)	33.3% (5)	60.0% (9)	48.0% (24)
Fights	20.0% (1)	40.0% (6)	13.3% (2)	33.3% (5)	28.0% (14)
Violence	0	6.7% (1)	33.3% (5)	20.0% (3)	18.0% (9)
Gangs	20.0% (1)	13.3% (2)	13.3% (2)	13.3% (2)	14.0% (7)
Guns	40.0% (2)	0	6.7% (1)	13.3% (2)	10.0% (5)
Vandalism	0	13.3% (2)	0	20.0% (3)	10.0% (5)
Shootings	20.0% (1)	0	13.3% (2)	6.7% (1)	8.0% (4)
Sexual activity	0	0	6.7% (2)	13.3% (2)	6.0% (3)
Associating with the wrong people	0	6.7% (1)	0	6.7% (1)	4.0% (2)
Other	20.0% (1)	20.0% (3)	20.0% (3)	0	14.0% (7)

*Totals do not equal 100% because up to three answers were coded for each respondent.

Table 16**What sorts of things do you think lead adolescents to get involved in delinquent activity?****Percentage (and number) Responding**

	Florence (<u>n</u> = 5)	Charleston (<u>n</u> = 15)	Greenville (<u>n</u> = 15)	Richland (<u>n</u> = 15)	Total* (<u>N</u> = 50)
Peer influences/ Pressure	80.0% (4)	73.3% (11)	66.7% (10)	66.7% (10)	70.0% (35)
Drugs/Drug dealers	0	13.3% (2)	6.7% (1)	13.3% (2)	10.0% (5)
Family problems/ Childhood issues	20.0% (1)	6.7% (1)	26.7% (4)	6.7% (1)	14.0% (7)
Lack of attention	40.0% (2)	0	26.7% (4)	6.7% (1)	14.0% (7)
Too much leisure time/Lack of activities	0	6.7% (1)	6.7% (1)	26.7% (4)	12.0% (6)
Poverty/Low income	0	6.7% (1)	26.7% (4)	0	10.0% (5)
Truancy	0	0	20.0% (3)	6.7% (1)	8.0% (4)
Substance abuse	20.0% (1)	0	0	13.3% (2)	6.0% (3)
Lack of employment opportunities	0	6.7% (1)	6.7% (1)	6.7% (1)	6.0% (3)
TV/Music	0	6.7% (1)	0	6.7% (1)	4.0% (2)
Intimidation/ Bullying	20.0% (1)	20.0% (1)	0	0	4.0% (2)
Other	0	4.0% (2)	6.7% (1)	0	6.0% (3)

*Totals do not equal 100% because up to three answers were coded for each respondent.

Table 17

Types of peer pressure/influences mentioned in answers to previous question.

Percentage (and number) Responding

	Florence (<u>n</u> = 5)	Charleston (<u>n</u> = 15)	Greenville (<u>n</u> = 15)	Richland (<u>n</u> = 15)	Total (<u>N</u> = 50)
“Peer pressure”	40.0% (2)	26.7% (4)	26.7% (4)	33.3% (5)	30.0% (15)
To fit in	0	13.3% (2)	20.0% (3)	13.3% (2)	14.0% (7)
To be like older kids/Adults	20.0% (1)	20.0% (3)	13.3% (2)	6.7% (1)	14.0% (7)
Importance of image	0	6.7% (1)	6.7% (1)	13.3% (2)	8.0% (4)
Friends	0	6.7% (1)	0	0	2.0% (1)
Hanging out with the wrong crowd	20.0% (1)	0	0	0	2.0% (1)

Table 18**What sorts of problems within families make it more likely that adolescents will get involved in delinquent activity?****Percentage (and number) Responding**

	Florence (<u>n</u> = 5)	Charleston (<u>n</u> = 15)	Greenville (<u>n</u> = 15)	Richland (<u>n</u> = 15)	Total* (<u>N</u> = 50)
Lack of parental attention/Support	60.0% (3)	33.3% (5)	53.3% (8)	46.7% (7)	46.0% (23)
Abusive family member(s)	20.0% (1)	6.7% (1)	33.3% (5)	26.7% (4)	22.0% (11)
Alcohol/Drugs in the family	40.0% (2)	26.7% (4)	6.7% (1)	20.0% (3)	20.0% (10)
Divorce/Separation	20.0% (1)	6.7% (1)	0	33.3% (5)	14.0% (7)
Family members fighting/Arguing	0	20.0% (3)	20.0% (3)	13.3% (2)	16.0% (8)
No father/Single parent	0	26.7% (4)	6.7% (1)	20.0% (3)	16.0% (8)
Financial problems/ Poverty	0	6.7% (1)	20.0% (3)	13.3% (2)	12.0% (6)
Disagreements over children's behavior	0	6.7% (1)	0	6.7% (1)	4.0% (2)
Other	0	13.3% (2)	13.3% (2)	0	8.0% (4)
No opinion/No response	20.0% (1)	13.3% (2)	13.3% (2)	13.3% (2)	14.0% (7)

*Totals do not equal 100% because up to three answers were coded for each respondent.

Table 19

Nature of the lack of parental involvement/support mentioned in question 7.

Percentage (and number) Responding

	Florence (<u>n</u> = 5)	Charleston (<u>n</u> = 15)	Greenville (<u>n</u> = 15)	Richland (<u>n</u> = 15)	Total (<u>N</u> = 50)
Lack of attention	20.0% (1)	20.0% (3)	26.7% (4)	6.7% (1)	18.0% (9)
Parents don't care	0	0	26.7% (4)	6.7% (1)	10.0% (5)
Children feel abandoned/ Not supported	0	6.7% (1)	0	20.0% (3)	8.0% (4)
Too little parental supervision	20.0% (1)	6.7% (1)	0	6.7% (1)	6.0% (3)
Parents don't take children places	20.0% (1)	0	0	6.7% (1)	4.0% (2)

Table 20

What sorts of problems with peers (other adolescents) make it more likely that adolescents will get involved in delinquent activity?

Percentage (and number) Responding

	Florence (<u>n</u> = 5)	Charleston (<u>n</u> = 15)	Greenville (<u>n</u> = 15)	Richland (<u>n</u> = 15)	Total* (<u>N</u> = 50)
Peer pressure	60.0% (3)	66.7% (10)	93.3% (14)	66.7% (10)	74.0% (37)
Bullying	20.0% (1)	6.7% (1)	20.0% (3)	6.7% (1)	12.0% (6)
Fights	0	0	13.3% (2)	20.0% (3)	10.0% (5)
Substance abuse	0	6.7% (1)	6.7% (1)	13.3% (2)	8.0% (4)
Jealousy	0	0	6.7% (1)	20.0% (3)	8.0% (4)
Gangs	0	6.7% (1)	13.3% (2)	6.7% (1)	8.0% (4)
Attitude	0	6.7% (1)	0	6.7% (1)	4.0% (2)
Associating with the wrong crowd	20.0% (1)	0	0	6.7% (1)	4.0% (2)
Offensive physical appearance	0	13.3% (2)	0	0	4.0% (2)
Other	20.0% (1)	20.0% (3)	6.7% (1)	20.0% (3)	16.0% (8)
No opinion/No response	20.0% (1)	6.7% (1)	6.7% (1)	0	6.0% (3)

*Totals do not equal 100% because up to three answers were recorded per respondent.

Table 21

Types of peer pressure described in question 8.

Percentage (and number) responding

	Florence (<u>n</u> = 5)	Charleston (<u>n</u> = 15)	Greenville (<u>n</u> = 15)	Richland (<u>n</u> = 15)	Total (<u>N</u> = 50)
“Peer pressure”	40.0% (2)	46.7% (7)	53.3% (8)	46.7% (7)	48.0% (24)
Want to fit in	20.0% (1)	13.3% (2)	26.7% (4)	13.3% (2)	18.0% (9)
Need to prove something	0	0	6.7% (1)	6.7% (1)	4.0% (2)
Want to be popular	0	0	6.7% (1)	0	2.0% (1)
Afraid to be different	0	6.7% (1)	0	0	2.0% (1)

Table 22

What sorts of problems related to school make it more likely that adolescents will get involved in delinquent activity?

Percentage (and number) Responding

	Florence (<u>n</u> = 5)	Charleston (<u>n</u> = 15)	Greenville (<u>n</u> = 15)	Richland (<u>n</u> = 15)	Total* (<u>N</u> = 50)
Fighting/Fights over girls	60.0% (3)	46.7% (7)	33.3% (5)	13.3% (2)	34.0% (17)
Peer pressure/ Acceptance	20.0% (1)	13.3% (2)	26.7% (3)	13.3% (2)	16.0% (8)
Treatment by teachers	0	26.7% (3)	6.7% (1)	26.7% (4)	16.0% (8)
Truancy/Skipping classes	0	13.3% (2)	13.3% (2)	26.7% (4)	16.0% (8)
Not able to keep up/Too much work	0	0	33.3% (5)	26.7% (3)	16.0% (8)
Dislike of school/ Forced to attend	40.0% (2)	26.7% (3)	13.3% (2)	0	14.0% (7)
Drugs at school	20.0% (1)	6.7% (1)	13.3% (2)	6.7% (1)	10.0% (5)
Bored at school	0	6.7% (1)	26.7% (3)	6.7% (1)	10.0% (5)
Weapons at school	20.0% (1)	6.7% (1)	6.7% (1)	0	6.0% (3)
Problems at home	20.0% (1)	0	0	6.7% (1)	4.0% (2)
Gangs at school	0	0	13.3% (2)	0	4.0% (2)
Kids being disobedient	0	6.7% (1)	0	6.7% (1)	4.0% (2)
Other	0	13.3% (2)	13.3% (2)	26.7% (4)	16.0% (8)
Don't know/no response	0	13.3% (2)	0	13.3% (2)	8.0% (4)

*Totals do not equal 100% because up to three answers were recorded per respondent.

Table 23

What sorts of problems in neighborhoods make it more likely that adolescents will get involved in delinquent activity?

	Florence (<u>n</u> = 5)	Charleston (<u>n</u> = 15)	Greenville (<u>n</u> = 15)	Richland (<u>n</u> = 15)	Total* (<u>N</u> = 50)
Drugs/Drug houses /Money from drug dealers	40.0% (2)	53.3% (8)	26.7% (4)	46.7% (7)	42.0% (21)
Witnessing violence	0	26.7% (4)	13.3% (2)	26.7% (4)	20.0% (10)
Break-ins	20.0% (1)	6.7% (1)	26.7% (4)	6.7% (1)	14.0% (7)
Peer pressure	0	6.7% (1)	13.3% (2)	26.7% (4)	14.0% (7)
Gangs	40.0% (2)	6.7% (1)	6.7% (1)	13.3% (2)	12.0% (6)
Fights over girls, turf, money	0	13.3% (2)	20.0% (3)	6.7% (1)	12.0% (6)
Poverty/Low employment	0	6.7% (1)	20.0% (3)	0	8.0% (4)
Lack of community activities	0	13.3% (2)	6.7% (1)	6.7% (1)	8.0% (4)
Seeing the benefits of illegal activity/Not getting caught	0	0	20.0% (3)	0	6.0% (3)
None	20.0% (1)	6.7% (1)	13.3% (2)	6.7% (1)	10.0% (5)
No response	20.0% (1)	0	0	0	2.0% (1)
Other	20.0% (1)	13.3% (2)	13.3% (2)	13.3% (2)	14.0% (7)

*Totals do not equal 100% because up to three answers were recorded per respondent.

Table 24

Presence/Problem of Gang “Wannabes,” Loosely Associated Gangs, and Organized Gangs in Community

Mean Scores (& standard deviations)*

	Florence	Charleston	Greenville	Richland	Total
Gang “wannabes”	3.5 (<u>SD</u> =1.3) (<u>n</u> = 4)	2.8 (1.1) (<u>n</u> = 14)	2.4 (1.4) (<u>n</u> = 14)	2.5 (1.3) (<u>n</u> = 13)	2.6 (1.3) (<u>N</u> = 45)
Loosely associated gangs	3.0 (1.2) (<u>n</u> = 5)	3.0 (1.0) (<u>n</u> = 14)	2.8 (1.5) (<u>n</u> = 14)	2.8 (1.4) (<u>n</u> = 14)	2.9 (1.3) (<u>N</u> = 47)
Organized gangs	3.8 (1.9) (<u>n</u> = 4)	2.8 (1.8) (<u>n</u> = 13)	2.2 (1.5) (<u>n</u> = 11)	2.5 (1.5) (<u>n</u> = 11)	2.6 (1.6) (<u>N</u> = 39)

* Based on a scale of 1-5, where 1 = “not present,” 2 = “present but not a problem,” 3 = “present and a minor problem,” 4 = “present and a moderate problem,” and 5 = “present and a major problem.”

Table 25

Over the last few years, how has the gang problem in your community changed?

Percentage (and number) responding

	Florence (<u>n</u> = 4)	Charleston (<u>n</u> = 15)	Greenville (<u>n</u> = 13)	Richland (<u>n</u> = 14)	Total (<u>N</u> = 46)
Getting worse	0	20.0% (3)	7.7% (1)	21.4% (3)	15.2% (7)
Staying the same	50.0% (2)	66.7% (10)	46.2% (6)	21.4% (3)	45.7% (21)
Getting better	50.0% (2)	13.3 % (2)	30.8% (4)	35.7% (5)	28.3% (13)
I don't know	0	0	15.4% (2)	21.4% (3)	10.9% (5)

Table 26

In your community, what are the most serious problems caused by gangs?

Percentage (and number) Responding

	Florence (<u>n</u> = 5)	Charleston (<u>n</u> = 15)	Greenville (<u>n</u> = 15)	Richland (<u>n</u> = 15)	Total* (<u>N</u> = 50)
Property theft	40.0% (2)	40.0% (6)	33.3% (5)	40.0% (6)	38.0% (19)
Drugs/Drug sales	60.0% (3)	20.0% (3)	26.7% (4)	33.3% (5)	30.0% (15)
Fights	40.0% (2)	26.7% (4)	20.0% (3)	33.3% (5)	28.0% (14)
Shootings	40.0% (2)	33.3% (5)	6.7% (1)	26.7% (4)	24.0% (12)
None	0	13.3% (2)	26.7% (4)	20.0% (3)	18.0% (9)
Violence	20.0% (1)	13.3% (2)	13.3% (2)	0	10.0% (5)
Vandalism	20.0% (1)	13.3% (2)	13.3% (2)	0	10.0% (5)
Defending their turf	0	6.7% (1)	6.7% (1)	6.7% (1)	6.0% (3)
No response	0	0	6.7% (1)	0	2.0% (1)
Other response	0	13.3% (2)	20.0% (3)	6.7% (1)	10.0% (5)

*Totals do not equal 100% because up to three answers were recorded per respondent.

Table 27

To what extent are youth in your community active in local schools?

Mean Scores (and standard deviations)

	Florence (<u>n</u> = 5)	Charleston (<u>n</u> = 13)	Greenville (<u>n</u> = 12)	Richland (<u>n</u> = 14)	Total (<u>N</u> = 44)
Level of activity	2.4 (1.3)	2.2 (.8)	2.5 (1.0)	2.1 (1.2)	2.3 (1.0)

Scale: 1 = “no activity at all,” 2 = “little activity,” 3 = “some activity,” and 4 = “great deal of activity”

Table 28**In your community what are the most effective programs to reduce juvenile delinquency?****Percentage (and number) of responses**

	Florence (<u>n</u> = 5)	Charleston (<u>n</u> = 15)	Greenville (<u>n</u> = 15)	Richland (<u>n</u> = 15)	Total ¹ (<u>N</u> = 50)
None	60.0% (3)	13.3% (2)	20.0% (3)	26.7% (4)	24.0% (12)
Recreational programs	0	80.0% (6)	13.3% (2)	20.0% (3)	22.0% (11)
Boys and Girls clubs	20.0% (1)	6.7% (1)	13.3% (2)	6.7% (1)	10.0% (5)
School sports	40.0% (2)	13.3% (2)	6.7% (1)	0	10.0% (5)
Jobs programs/ Jobs	0	6.7% (1)	20.0% (3)	0	10.0% (5)
Drug programs/ Drug court	0	20.0% (3)	0	6.7% (1)	8.0% (4)
Church programs/ Church	0	6.7% (1)	6.7% (1)	6.7% (1)	6.0% (3)
Community center	0	6.7% (1)	6.7% (1)	0	4.0% (2)
Anger management programs	0	6.7% (1)	0	6.7% (1)	4.0% (2)
Boy scouts	0	0	13.3% (2)	0	4.0% (2)
Volunteering/ Community service	0	13.3% (2)	0	0	4.0% (2)
No response	0	0	20.0% (3)	13.3% (2)	10.0% (5)
Other general approach ²	0	20.0% (3)	6.7% (1)	6.7% (1)	10.0% (5)
Other specific program ³	13.3% (2)	6.7% (1)	20.0% (3)	13.3% (3)	18.0% (9)

¹ Totals do not equal 100% because up to three answers were recorded per respondent.² Examples of other approaches: "prevention," "have neighbors call the police"³ Examples of specific programs: "Save our Sons," "the Bridge Program"

Table 29. In your community, what needs to be done to reduce juvenile delinquency?

Percentage (and number) of Participants Responding

	Florence (<u>n</u> = 5)	Charleston (<u>n</u> = 15)	Greenville (<u>n</u> = 15)	Richland (<u>n</u> = 15)	Total ¹ (<u>N</u> = 50)
More activities to occupy kids' time	60.0% (3)	6.7% (1)	26.7% (4)	46.7% (7)	30.0%
Jobs for youth	20.0% (1)	20.0% (3)	20.0% (3)	20.0% (3)	30.0% (10)
More recreation programs	20.0% (1)	6.7% (1)	20.0% (3)	26.7% (4)	18.0% (9)
More positive role models/mentors	0	13.3% (2)	13.3% (2)	6.7% (1)	10.0% (5)
Family counseling	40.0% (2)	6.7% (1)	0	0	6.0% (3)
Programs where youth can talk about their problems	40.0% (2)	6.7% (1)	0	0	6.0% (3)
Crime watch programs	0	6.7% (1)	0	6.7% (1)	4.0% (2)
Programs to keep kids in school	0	6.7% (1)	0	6.7% (1)	4.0% (2)
No response/ No opinion	0	33.3% (5)	40.0% (6)	6.7% (1)	24.0% (6)
Other response ²	0	20.0% (3)	20.0% (3)	20.0% (3)	18.0% (9)

¹ Totals do not equal 100% since up to three answers were recorded per respondent.

² Examples of other responses: "more police patrols," "summer camps," "after-school programs."

Table 30

In your community, which types of programs should receive the most resources?

Percentage (and number) of Participants Responding

	Florence (<u>n</u> = 5)	Charleston (<u>n</u> = 15)	Greenville (<u>n</u> = 14)	Richland (<u>n</u> = 14)	Total (<u>N</u> = 48)
Prevention programs	80.0% (4)	40.0% (6)	71.4% (10)	57.1% (8)	58.3% (28)
Intervention programs	20.0% (1)	40.0% (6)	21.4% (3)	35.7% (5)	31.3% (15)
Suppression programs	0	20.0% (2)	7.1% (1)	7.1% (1)	8.3 (4)

Table 30.1

In your community, which types of programs should receive the most resources?

Examples of rationales:

“A lot of 12, 13, 14, and 15 year-olds are growing up watching the others and trying to be the same as older kids who are in trouble. It is best to help them not get in trouble” (17-year-old participant).

“Many teens can’t control drugs once they’re into it, so prevention is best” (16-year-old participant).

“Kids need diversion from boredom after school. Need to keep them occupied” (15-year-old participant).

“We need [prevention programs] in schools where most of the problems occur” (16-year-old participant).

Appendices