

192522

Youth Groups and Gangs in Europe: Research and Policy

(1999-JD-FX-0006)

FINAL REPORT

Finn-Aage Esbensen

Department of Criminal Justice

University of Nebraska at Omaha

February 27, 2001

Table of Contents

Page

Overview	1
The American and European Gang Situation	2
Compressed Gangs	4
Traditional Gangs	5
Specialty Gangs	5
Prevention and Intervention Issues	6
Models of Gang Proliferation	7
Marginalized Populations	7
Street Gang Structures	8
The Eurogang Project	10
Proposed Bulletin	14
Notes	17
Figure 1: The Eurogang Research Design	18
References	19
Appendix A: Agenda for Oslo Meeting	
Appendix B: List of Oslo Participants	

## OVERVIEW

In response to growing concern about the emergence of youth gangs and other violent groups throughout Europe, a series of meetings was convened during 1998, 1999, and 2000. Emerging from these meetings was a consensus about the pressing need for a collaborative and comprehensive strategy to develop a better understanding of the diversity of these emergent youth groups; preliminary reports establish gang or crime-oriented youth groups in European cities from Scandinavia to the Mediterranean. During four consecutive workshops in Germany in 1998, Norway (OJJDP provided funding support form this meeting) and Belgium in 1999, and the Netherlands in 2000, a group of European and American researchers met to discuss what we know and what we do not yet know regarding gangs and delinquent youth groups in the United States and in Europe. An edited volume based on presentations from the first meeting has been published (Klein et al. 2001). Prior to this collection, there had only been scattered studies on certain types of violent youth groups or gangs in some European cities (e.g. Bjørge 1997; van Gemert 1998; Lien & Haaland 1998; Patrick 1973; Tertilt 1996; Werdmolder 1997). There is an obvious need for more comprehensive and comparative approaches. Through the Eurogang meetings, we reached a consensus to develop a joint plan for comparative multi-city, and multi-method empirical research on gangs and delinquent youth groups. A proposal to secure a long-term source for funding the Eurogang project has been submitted to the European Union.

## The American and European Gang Situation: Some Background Material<sup>1</sup>

In the early stages of development, many street gangs emerge as responses of youth groups to both rival groups and constraining authorities (Hagedorn 1988; Klein 1995; Short 1997). Commonly, but not exclusively, this development is accentuated among marginalized or minority youth populations. Decades of research among the burgeoning street gangs in the United States of America has produced a broad database about street gangs - their contexts, structures, demographics, behavior patterns, and group processes (for reviews, see Covey et al. 1997; Klein 1995; Spergel 1995). While this database was slowly accumulated, U.S. gangs proliferated across the nation at an astounding rate, and with an increased propensity for violence. The data have proved to be too little and too late to yield effective control and prevention policies for the nation (Howell 1998; Klein 1995; Thornberry 1998).

Europe, however, is now approaching the point that sufficient street gang formations alert us to a generalized problem at a time when data-based policy formulation may truly be possible, yielding policies relevant to both prevention and control. Recent preliminary investigations by Klein and European colleagues (Klein 1997) suggest both the relevance and limitations of the accumulated American experience to European cities. These investigations also suggest the need for, and guidelines for, research by European scholars on their own situations that should illuminate appropriate European approaches that may also be applicable to the American situation.

Traditionally, the stereotypical gang member has been described as a male, living in the inner-city, and a member of a racial or ethnic minority. Contemporary knowledge, however, questions the accuracy of such a stereotype. In addition to changes in the geographical distribution of American gangs documented by Curry and colleagues (1994, 1996) and the

National Youth Gang surveys (the proliferation into non-urban areas), research of the past 20 years has highlighted the presence of girls in gangs (Bjerregaard and Smith 1993; Chesney-Lind 1997; Curry 1998; and Esbensen and Winfree 1998). There is also some evidence that youth gang membership is not restricted to youths from racial and ethnic minorities.

Youth gangs still tend to be concentrated (but not always) in segregated inner city (and inner-town) areas where persistent and pervasive poverty is accompanied by high youth unemployment, restricted social services, and relatively unorganized social fabrics. Their crime patterns, with the exception to be noted below, tend to be very versatile rather than specialized in a few offense categories. Violence is far greater than among nongang groups, although nonetheless it is only a portion of the overall criminal activities, and the latter in turn comprise a small portion of day-to-day life patterns. Gang member families tend to be deprived or troubled, often single-parent in structure, but not in these regards far different from nongang families in the same neighborhoods.

Critical to understanding street gang issues is the importance of group process. Gangs are normally not highly structured, nor do they have the clear and long-term leadership depicted in most fictional accounts. Rather, they are only moderately cohesive, and both membership and leadership often manifest rather high turnover rates. But the group is large enough and has sufficient normative structure that it supplies to its members those social psychological properties for which youths join gangs: a sense of identity, peer commitment and loyalty, a sense of belonging, and in many cases the sense of protection against an unfriendly world and rival groups. The group factors, drawing in youth who often have personal, social, intellectual/academic, or family deficits, are constantly reinforced in the peer setting, to the extent that almost every well-

meaning intervention by adults—be they social service practitioners, teachers, or police—is contorted, distorted, perverted, and transformed to reinforce group bonds within the gang.

Recent research in the U.S. illuminates other important facets of the street gang phenomenon. Gangs have proliferated to the extent that, by latest estimates, they may be found in up to 4,000 communities, many of them small rather than stereotypical urban centers. This proliferation has led U.S. scholars to differentiate between "traditional" and "emergent" gang cities. Those European cities now facing street gang and serious youth group development are best classified as "emergent" gang cities. Street gangs, as we use the term here, have reached a "tipping point" in their orientation to or involvement in delinquent and criminal activities such that they are recognized, by themselves and others, as criminally oriented, not just play groups or sports clubs or social groups. Much of their group image revolves around their illegal activities, and is exacerbated by recent increases in specifically youth violence in the U.S. and Europe (Pfeiffer 1998).

Of potential importance to intervention efforts is the discovery that most U.S. street gangs consist of one of five structural forms (Maxson and Klein 1995). Two of these may be transitional—a function of their description prior to emerging into three principal and very distinct forms. The most common of these three forms is the Compressed street gang.

### *The Compressed Gang*

The "Compressed" gang is small—usually in the size range of up to fifty members—and has not formed subgroups. The age range is probably narrow—ten or fewer years between the younger and older members. The small size, absence of subgroups, and narrow age range may

reflect the newness of the group, in existence less than ten years and maybe for only a few years. Some of these Compressed gangs have become territorial, but many have not. In sum, Compressed gangs have a relatively short history, short enough that by size, duration, subgrouping and territoriality, it is unclear whether they will grow and solidify into the more traditional forms, or simply remain as less complex groups, or eventually dissolve.

### *The Traditional Gang*

“Traditional” gangs have generally been in existence for twenty or more years—they keep regenerating themselves. They contain fairly clear subgroups, usually separated by age: O.G.s or Veteranos, Seniors, Juniors, Midgets and various other names are applied to these different age-based cliques. Sometimes the cliques are separated by neighborhoods rather than age. More than other gangs, Traditional gangs tend to have a wide age range, sometimes as wide as from nine or ten years of age into the thirties. These are usually very large gangs, numbering one hundred or even several hundred members. Almost always, they are territorial in the sense that they identify strongly with their turf, hood, or barrio, and claim it as theirs alone. In sum, this is a large, enduring territorial gang with a wide range and several internal cliques based on age or area.

### *The Specialty Gang*

Unlike these other gangs that engage in a wide variety of criminal offenses, crime in this type of group is narrowly focused on a few offenses; the group comes to be characterized by the specialty. The “Specialty” gang tends to be small—on average about 25 members—without any subgroups in most cases (although there are exceptions). It probably has a history of less than ten

years, but has developed a well-defined territory and is more tightly organized than other types. Its territory may be either residential or based on the opportunities for the particular form of crime in which it specializes. The age range of most specialty gangs is narrow, but in others is broad. In sum, the Specialty gang is crime-focused in a narrow way. Its principal purpose is more criminal than social, and its smaller size, organization, and form of territoriality may be a reflection of this focused crime pattern. The most common Specialty gangs are drug-sales groups, burglary or auto-theft groups, and hate groups such as Skinheads. While American gang researchers have shied away from the study of skinhead and racist groups, several European researchers have focused on these hate groups (e.g., Bjorgo 1998; Fangen 1995).

#### Prevention and Intervention Issues

Of particular importance for prevention and intervention efforts are relatively recent American findings about levels of gang-member crime and violence. (1) Gang members are demonstrably far more involved in unlawful activities than are nongang delinquents; (2) this results from three factors: the selection of members from youths already prone to unlawful activity, the exposure to a large number of like-minded peers upon joining the gangs, or group processes that exacerbate the likelihood that the first two factors will be enhanced (Battin et al. 1998; Esbensen and Huizinga 1993; Thornberry et al. 1993). This crime amplification process seems particularly to promote a far greater violence involvement. Findings that this amplification process ceases as members drop out of gang life constitute a hopeful sign for those willing to intervene in street gang formation.

Generalizing from the American situation to European cities must be done with great



caution, both because of the differences between the two contexts but also because the European cities themselves differ in many ways. It is significant, in this context, that European youth violence has been increasing much like American youth violence, yet without the accompaniment of crack sales and the proliferation of sophisticated firearms (see Pfeiffer 1998). Yet some useful generalizations are easily drawn; we illustrate this by reference to three broad issues.

### Models of Gang Proliferation

Klein (1995) noted two principal contributions to the recent dramatic expansion of gang cities in the U.S., and these are easily noted as well in Europe. The first is the greater emergence and spread of an urban underclass (Wilson 1987) which yields the base of minority, disorganized communities with large numbers of underemployed, marginalized youths who are the fodder for gang formation. The second is the media-generated diffusion of "gang culture" that makes gang symbols of dress, music, and behavioral styles immediately available to youth groups seeking special identity. Confirmation of both trends is easily available to the observer willing to spend time on the streets of Kreuzberg in Berlin, Rinkeby in Stockholm, Oslo, Moss Side in Manchester, The Hague and Rotterdam in the Netherlands, or similar dense minority housing areas in London, Frankfurt, or Kazan. The spawning grounds of street gangs are becoming more visible.

### Marginalized Populations

In the U.S., the vast majority of gangs are either Black or Hispanic (although in decades past many recent immigrant groups of Irish, Polish, Germans, Italians and others also produced major gang problems). In European cities, the marginalized groups forming gangs consist more

commonly of first and, especially, second generation immigrants, guest workers, and refugee populations: Algerians in Paris; Tatars in Kazan; Afro-Caribbeans as well as Indians, Pakistanis, and Chinese in London and Manchester; and varying proportions of Moroccans, Turks and Kurds, Greeks, Yugoslavs, Chileans and others in Berlin, Stockholm, Zurich, Frankfurt, Stuttgart, Rotterdam, den Haag, and Brussels. It is not the specific national or minority group, but its status as a marginalized and residentially segregated population that is gang-relevant. Unlike the U.S., the location of such groups may as commonly be on the outskirts as in the center of the cities in question.

A measure of the degree to which this connection between ethnicity and gangs is as yet little recognized or acknowledged among European scholars is provided inadvertently by the otherwise superior volume recently edited by Michael Tonry (1997). In it, careful analyses by European scholars including those from Germany, England, Sweden, the Netherlands, Switzerland, and France touch on every aspect of ethnicity and crime ~~except~~ for the gang issue. Only three of over 800 references are to gang materials, and even these are truly tangential. There is, in our view, a pressing need to assess and understand this context of national and ethnic groups among the emerging European street gangs.

#### Street Gang Structures

The three predominant gang structures reported for the U.S. by Maxson and Klein (1995) have proven to be widely applicable in that country, and present strong implications for different approaches to intervention. When the three structures were applied to information available on European cities, the fit seemed surprisingly close. Traditional gangs were reported in Berlin,

Kazan, and other Volga region cities, and den Haag. Compressed gangs were reported in Berlin, Brussels, den Haag, Rotterdam, Frankfurt, and Stockholm. Specialty gangs (primarily drug gangs and Skinhead groups) were found in Manchester, London, Stockholm, Berlin, and Oslo.

In several of these cities, gang emergence is so recent that a number of ambiguous groups are hard to identify as of one type or another. These are perhaps better conceived as youth "networks" (van Gemert 1995; Sarnecki 1986), some of which probably will, while others will not, evolve into gang structures. This process also begs for careful research observation (as is now underway in Stockholm where many such groups are in evidence), in order to place street gangs in the broader context of various categories of youth groups in Europe (Kersten 1995).

These three major issues—the urban underclass and cultural diffusion sources of gang formation, marginalized population bases, and gang structures—are strong evidence that the American gang database can provide useful starting points for research that might well yield policy directions for the European situation. Other American patterns would presumably apply to some degree as European data become available—crime patterns, the relationship to drug distribution, age and sex patterns, sources of gang cohesion, leadership, turnover, and so on. Certainly there is enough here to guide multinational exploratory research.

We are hesitant at this point to delve too far into the issues of appropriate interventions in the arena of youth gangs. U.S. and European juvenile justice and welfare approaches differ in some very important respects. Generally, European countries place far more emphasis on early prevention and social welfare interventions than do American jurisdictions. The latter have moved increasingly away from community development and detached worker approaches to far greater reliance on law enforcement, special gang legislation, and correctional alternatives.

American policies reflect greater concern for gang violence and drug sales involvements, less common in the emergent European gang scene. American law enforcement is moving more toward regional and national information systems, but the European gang situation does not currently seem to call for this emphasis.

What we do know about American intervention approaches (see e.g., Klein 1995) is that community empowerment success with local gangs has not been demonstrated; that detached worker programs have been either ineffective or actually counter-productive to gang reduction; and that gang enforcement programs have proliferated in the absence of independent assessments, with many anecdotal statements of success but no empirical confirmation. The lengthy literature on gang prevention, intervention, and control in the U.S. can and should be shared with European policy makers, but prototype programs must be very carefully contextualized by country-specific research in the European settings.

### The Eurogang Project

The Eurogang project was initiated by some of the leading American gang researchers who were interested in whether crime-oriented youth groups in European countries were similar to or different from American street gangs, and whether American policy and research experiences could be of any relevance to Europe (Klein 1997). An initial meeting in Leuven, Belgium, on May 15, 1997 served as a precursor to the first meeting of the Eurogang network that was held in Schmitten, Germany during October, 1998. OJJDP provided funding assistance for the second workshop convened in Oslo, Norway during September, 1999. One month following the Oslo meeting, a subset of participants met for three days in Leuven, building on the

progress made at the Oslo meeting. A fourth meeting was held in September, 2000 in Egmond aan Zee in the Netherlands.

The grant from OJJDP provided funding for a number of American researchers to participate in the Eurogang workshop held in September, 1999, in Oslo, Norway (Appendix A provides a copy of the agenda for that meeting). Forty-six researchers and policy makers from the United States and Europe attended the meeting (Appendix B provides a list of all the participants). The OJJDP contribution to this large effort, while modest in the overall scheme, facilitated the continued progress of this undertaking. To date, the Eurogang Project has benefitted from the financial support of the following agencies and institutions:

- The Dutch Ministry of Justice
- The Dutch Ministry of the Interior
- The German Ministry of Justice
- The Municipality of Oslo
- The National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice
- The Norwegian Ministry of Children and Family
- The Norwegian Ministry of Justice
- The Norwegian Research Council
- The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice
- The University of Illinois - Chicago
- The University of Nebraska at Omaha
- The University of Southern California

The Eurogang network is a cross-disciplinary group of researchers that includes

criminologists, sociologists, social anthropologists, (social) psychologists, political scientists, economists, and historians. More than 100 researchers and agency representatives are currently part of the mailing list. Approximately 90 different individuals representing nineteen different nations (Albania, Belgium, Canada, Croatia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Russia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, the United States of America) have participated in one or more of the four Eurogang workshops; 29 have been present at three of meetings; and a small core of six individuals has participated in all four meetings. All of these individuals have shown a professional interest in the issue of gangs and youth groups; many are actively involved in research concerning some aspect of the issue; others represent ministries, police forces, or crime prevention agencies. Some countries are represented by only one person, other countries with well-established teams of gang researchers.

The American participants in the Eurogang meetings represent a broad spectrum of past and present research efforts in the United States. The Americans urged the Europeans not to repeat the mistakes made by American gang research; do *not* only study single gangs in single cities with only one type of method! By doing so, one produces potentially incomplete and biased findings. One of the failings made by American gang researchers was to focus mainly on certain limited types of gangs – typically large, relatively structured, and consisting predominantly of black and Hispanic males. This served to perpetuate popular stereotypes of American street gangs and contributed to the Europeans response that “we do not have such gangs here.” However, more recent American gang research, using different survey methodologies and comparative approaches, has revealed a much greater variety in gang structures and membership composition. Using the Maxson and Klein (1995) typology of gangs, only 15 percent of

American street gangs conform to the stereotype of “traditional gangs” (large, long-existing, age-segregated, and territorial). The most prevalent type (almost 40 %) is the “compressed gangs” (less than 50 members, narrow age range, not necessarily territorial, and having a short history). However, this was also the least researched type, and probably the type most commonly found in Europe (Klein 1997; Maxson and Klein 1995). Females and ethnic majority members (“whites”) turned out to be much more frequently involved with gangs than previously believed (Esbensen and Huizinga 1993; Esbensen and Winfree 1998).

Based on this advice from the American researchers, the search has been for a research strategy that would reduce the potential biases inherent in some of the American efforts. This has resulted in a research design that will combine several different methodologies to capture the variety of gang types within each selected site, and make a point of including different types of groups among those selected for closer ethnographic studies. By employing the same research designs and instruments to study the phenomena in a number of European cities – as well as some American cities – the Eurogang network will build a common base of data which will facilitate unique opportunities for comparative analysis. (See Figure 1 for an overview of this design<sup>2</sup>.)

A direct result of the first three Eurogang meetings identified above was the development of a proposal that was submitted to the European Union. This proposal requested funding to establish a formal network of researchers to undertake a comparative assessment of youth gangs in Europe. If the EU proposal is funded, collaborative multi-site, multi-method, multi-disciplinary research may well occur in Europe at a level that has not been achieved in the United States, in spite of decades of gang research.

## Proposed Bulletin

It was anticipated that in addition to providing a summary of grant activity, OJJDP would receive a Bulletin-type report discussing gang prevention efforts in Europe. While this appeared a reasonable activity at the outset, it has proved to be substantially more difficult than initially anticipated. Reasons for this difficulty can be framed around two primary issues: definitional and socio-cultural differences. With respect to the term "gang", there is a distinct lack of consensus among European researchers and policy makers about the existence of gangs in Europe, not all that dissimilar to the debate that occurred in many American jurisdictions during the early 1990s. At the first Eurogang meeting in Schmittgen, Germany, it became quite apparent that there was considerable disagreement about the use of the term "gang". Comments such as, "we don't have gangs like you do in America" were quite common. Concern was expressed about creating a moral panic if the "g" word was used in a public discourse. Similarly, concern was raised that certain groups (i.e., ethnic immigrants in particular) would be unduly stereotyped. Others, however, were equally vocal in their sentiments that Europe was experiencing youth gang activity similar to that found in the United States. Graffiti and clothing styles mimicking American gangs were evident throughout a number of cities. This same debate about the presence or absence of gangs in Europe has resurfaced at each of the subsequent Eurogang meetings in Norway, Belgium, and most recently the Netherlands. While no resolution to this debate has been achieved, a working agreement has been reached. The emphasis is on an empirical definition rather than on a nominal one. That is, as research is undertaken, gang-like characteristics in terms of behavior and other group attributes will be used to determine whether a group is a gang, rather than relying upon the actual use of the word gang. This approach will allow for researchers to



focus on the nature of youth groups and to be able to classify groups as gangs if specified criteria are met.

This resolution of the definition issue, however, does not allow us to address the issue of prevention and intervention programs at this particular point in time. Underlying most prevention programs is a base of knowledge about the nature and extent of the targeted behavior or problem. The nascent stage of gang research in Europe precludes the existence of such knowledge and contributes to another debate about the existence of gang-specific programs. In addition to definitional issues associated with the term gang, we have encountered socio-cultural and political differences that compound the difficulty of discussing prevention programs. There appears to be considerable disagreement about what constitutes a program. Some commentators indicated that there are no prevention programs in their country; the social welfare system provides safety nets and services that make specific programs irrelevant. Others, however, countered this position with the fact that some aspects of the overall strategy were driven by responses to local or time-specific problems such as right-wing extremist youth groups. But the discussion of prevention/intervention did not proceed along the lines of specific programs; rather, the tendency was to discuss types of approaches (i.e., community organization, community-oriented and problem solving approaches to policing).

The Eurogang participants have formed five smaller working groups that are focused on specific methodological and/or topical issues: definitional and conceptual; ethnography; school and community survey; city- and local-level descriptors; professional groups survey; and prevention and intervention studies. This last group is assuming the task initially considered an appropriate topic for a Bulletin, including conducting an assessment of the nature and extent of

specific and general prevention and intervention efforts that exist in the various European nations. At this point, it is perhaps appropriate to acknowledge the extent to which our naivete allowed us to consider a Bulletin on European gang prevention strategies a viable topic. With so little knowledge available about the prevalence of gangs in Europe and associated risk factors of gang emergence and joining, it is simply premature to discuss specific "gang prevention" strategies.

## NOTES

1. Some materials in this report have been published earlier in works by Malcolm W. Klein and Cheryl L. Maxson whose permission to reprint is gratefully acknowledged.
2. This summary of the Eurogang Research Design was presented by Tore Bjorgo at a Eurogang Roundtable session at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology, November, 2000, San Francisco, CA.

# THE EUROGANG RESEARCH DESIGN

## Processes

### Gang emergence and joining

### Gang maintenance and transformation

### Gang dissolution and disengagement

City Level	Factors and circumstances causing, facilitating or preventing emergence of gangs in a specific city. <i>Instruments: CLD, SCS, PGS, ES</i>	How grave is the city's gang problem? Emerging or chronic? How does it influence life in the city? <i>Instruments: SCS, PGS, CLD, ES</i>	Development, implementation and outcomes of prevention and intervention policies on gangs. Evaluation. <i>Instruments: PIS, SCS, PGS</i>
Group level	How and why did specific gangs emerge? Around which issues did the group crystallise? <i>Instruments: ES, SCS, PGS</i>	How do gangs maintain / reinforce group cohesion? How do they sometimes transform into another type of group? <i>Instruments: ES, PGS</i>	How and why do gangs dissolve? What are the mechanisms and processes leading to group disintegration? <i>Instruments: ES, PGS</i>
Individual level	Why do some young people join these groups? What needs do these groups fulfil to them? <i>Instruments: ES, SCS</i>	How does gang membership influence individual members? Changes in values, behaviour, image, external relations, etc. <i>Instruments: ES, SCS</i>	How, why and when do gang members disengage from the group? What are the motives, circumstances and obstacles? <i>Instruments: ES, SCS</i>

#### *Instrument abbreviations:*

- City level descriptions (CLD)
- Professional groups survey (PGS)
- School and community survey (SCS)
- Ethnographic studies (ES)
- Prevention and intervention studies (PIS)

## REFERENCES

- Battin, S., K.G. Hill, R. Abbott, R.F. Catalano, and J. D. Hawkins. 1998. "The Contribution of Gang Membership to Delinquency Beyond Delinquent Friends." *Criminology* 36:93-115.
- Bjerregaard, B. and C. Smith. 1993. "Gender Differences in Gang Participation, Delinquency, and Substance Use." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 4:329-355.
- Bjorgo, T. 1997. *Racist and Right Wing Violence in Scandinavia*. Tano Aschenhoug.
- Bjorgo, T. 1998. "Recruitment and Disengagement from Extreme Groups: The Case of Racist Youth Subcultures." Paper presented at the 7<sup>th</sup> International Seminar on Environment Criminology and Crime Analysis, Barcelona, Spain.
- Chesney-Lind, M. 1997. *The Female Offender; Girls, Women, and Crime*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Covey, H.G., S. Menard, and R.J. Franzese. 1997. *Juvenile Gangs* (second edition). Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas.
- Curry, G.D. 1998. "Female Gang Involvement." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 35: 100-118.
- Curry, G.D., R.A. Ball, and R.J. Fox. 1994. *Gang Crime and Law Enforcement Recordkeeping. Research in Brief*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Curry, G.D., R.A. Ball, and S.H. Decker. 1996. *Estimating the National Scope of Gang Crime from Law Enforcement Data: Research in Brief*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Esbensen, F.-A. and D. Huizinga. 1993. "Gangs, Drugs, and Delinquency in a Survey of Urban Youth." *Criminology* 31:565-89.

- Esbensen, F.-A. and L.T. Winfree, Jr. 1998. "Race and Gender Differences Between Gang and Non-gang Youth: Results From a Multi-site Survey." *Justice Quarterly*, 15, 505-526.
- Fangen, K. 1995. *Skinheads i rodt, hvitt, og blaatt: En sosiologisk rapport fra "innsiden*. Oslo, Norway: UNGforsk Rapport No 4.
- van Gemert, F. 1995. "Marokkaanse Jeugdbendes in Rotterdam-Zuid?" In E. Rood-Pijpers, B., Rovers, F. van Gemert, and C. Fijnaut (eds.), *Preventie van Jeugdcriminaliteit in een Grote Stad*. Sanders Instituut, Faculteits der Rechtsgeleerdheid, pp. 265-300.
- van Gemert, F. 1998. *Ieder Voor Zich; Kansen, Cultuur en Criminalitet van Marokkaanse Jongens*. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis (thesis).
- Hagedorn, J.M. 1988. *People and Folks*. Chicago: Lakeview Press.
- Howell, J.C. 1998. "Promising Programs for Youth Gang Violence Prevention and Intervention." In R. Loeber and D. Farrington (eds.), *Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders: Risk Factors and Successful Interventions*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage.
- Kersten, J. 1995. "Kriminalität and Jugendkriminalität in Deutschland." Paper presented at the Goethe Institute Chicago Symposium, Youth Cultures in Complex Societies.
- Klein, M.W. 1995. *The American Street Gang: Its Nature, Prevalence, and Control*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Klein, M.W. 1997. "Gangs in the United States and Europe." *European Journal on Crime Policy and Research* 4(2):63-80.
- Klein, M.W., H.J. Kerner, C.L. Maxson, and E.G.M. Weitekamp (eds). 2001. *The Eurogang Paradox: Street Gangs and Youth Groups in the U.S. and Europe*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- Lien, I. and T. Haaland. 1998. *Vold og gjengatferd. En pilotstudie av et ungdomsmiljø*. Oslo, Norway: NIBR/UMV-samarbeidsrapport.
- Maxson, C.L. and M.W. Klein. 1995. "Investigating Gang Structures." *Journal of Gang Research* 3(1):33-40.
- Patrick, J. 1973. *A Glasgow Gang Observed*. London: Eyre Methuen.
- Pfeiffer, C. 1998. "Juvenile Crime and Violence in Europe." In M. Tonry (ed.), Volume 23 of Crime and Justice Series, *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sarnecki, J. 1986. *Delinquent Networks*. Report #1986:1. Stockholm: National Council for Crime Prevention.
- Short, J.F. 1997. Presidential address, American Society of Criminology, San Diego.
- Spergel, I. A. 1995. *The Youth Gang Problem: A Community Approach*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tertilt, H. 1995. *Turkish Power Boys: Ethnographie einer Jugendbande*. Frankfurt: Shurkamp.
- Thornberry, T.P. 1998. "Membership in Youth Gangs and Involvement in Serious and Violent Offending." In R. Loeber and D.P. Farrington (eds.), *Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders: Risk Factors and Successful Interventions*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage.
- Thornberry, T.P., M.D. Krohn, A.J. Lizotte, and D. Chard-Wierschem. 1993. "The Role of Juvenile Gangs in Facilitating Delinquent Behavior." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 30:55-87.
- Tonry, M. (ed.). 1997. *Ethnicity, Crime, and Immigration: Comparative and Cross-National Perspectives*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Werdmolder, H. 1997. *A Generation Adrift*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Press.

Wilson, W.J. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.



APPENDIX A: Agenda for Eurogang II

Oslo, Norway

September 9 - 12, 1999

Funding for this workshop has been provided by the Norwegian Ministry of Justice, the Norwegian Ministry of Children and Family, the Norwegian Research Council, the Municipality of Oslo, the Dutch Ministry of Justice, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, United States Department of Justice, the University of Nebraska at Omaha, and the University of Illinois, Chicago.

Thursday, September 9

Arrival and evening welcome reception

Friday, September 10

8:30 - 9:00 Welcome, Introductions, and Logistics - Finn Esbensen and Tore Bjorgo

9:00 - 10:15 Review of Eurogang I: Conceptual and definitional issues - Mac Klein

10:30 - 11:15 Overview of Eurogangs based on Schmitten reports - Elmar Weitekamp

11:15 - 12:00 Open discussion and general response to Mac and Elmar's presentations

LUNCH

1:00 - 3:00 Presentations on "new" gang cities (not represented at Schmitten)

"Oslo as a gang city" - Inger-Lise Lien and Thomas Haaland

Manchester - Dennis Mares

Stockholm - Michael Johnson

Joensuu - Vesa Puuronen

London - Ian Toon

3:15 - 4:30 Small break-out groups to discuss policy issues including the following topics: ethical issues in conducting gang research, prevention programs, role of school in prevention, role of the community, intervention versus prevention.

4:30 - 5:30 Plenary - each group report back to the entire group.

DINNER

Saturday, September 11

8:30 - 12:00 Gang Research Designs and Methodologies

Ethnography - Mark Fleisher, Peter Frick, and Kjersti Varang

Archival: police, courts, prisons - Cheryl Maxson and Frank van Gemert

Survey : school, community, - Mons Bendixen, David Huizinga, and Ben Rovers

Speakers will be invited to make presentations on each of these methodologies. Each speaker will be provided an outline of specific topics to be included - for example, ethics, sampling, access, cross-site applications, time, policy issues, etc. The thought was to devote an hour or so to each methodology. This would allow for the specific presentations and group discussion.

LUNCH

1:00 - 2:30 The Research/Policy Nexus

Historical perspective - Jim Short

Gang prevention research - Finn Esbensen

American gang interventions - Scott Decker

"Changing policies on racist youth gangs in Norway: From moral panic to intervention guided by research" - Tore Bjorgo

"Researchers as advisors in handling social gang problems" - Yngve Carlson

A report from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) and the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) - Phelan Wyrick and Winnie Reed

A report from the Dutch Ministry of Justice - Mieke Kleiman

3:00 - 4:30 Small Break-out groups to discuss research and policy issues that will need to be considered in the eventual production of grant proposals for conducting cross-national gang research. Topics to include: role of immigration in gang formation and interventions, gang processes, gang organization and structure, gender issues, minority groups, role of underclass, extent of illegal activities, territoriality, age of members, etc.

4:30 - 5:30 Plenary

DINNER and SITE VISIT OF GANG TERRITORY

Sunday, September 12

8:30 - 12:00 Proposal development - who is really interested and ready to make a commitment to get involved in cross-national gang research?

LUNCH and FAREWELL

Departure

APPENDIX B: The list of attendees.

Jens Christian Andvig, Norway  
Willian Basson, South Africa  
Mons Bendixen, Norway  
Tore Bjorgo, Norway  
Ragnhild Bjornebekk, Norway  
Yngve Carlson, Norway  
Scott Decker, USA  
Bojan Delkleva, Slovenia  
Finn Esbensen, USA  
Katrine Fangen, Norway  
Mark Fleisher, USA  
Peter Frick, Sweden  
Margaret Gatz, USA  
Frank van Gemert, Netherlands  
John Hagedorn, USA  
Paivi Harinen, Finland  
David Huizinga, USA  
Mac Klein, USA  
Peter van der Laan, Netherlands  
Inger-Liese Lien, Norway  
Dana Lynskey, USA  
Dennis Mares, Netherlands  
Cheryl Maxson, USA

Lars Meling, Ministry of Justice, Norway  
Jody Miller, USA  
Anila Nauni, Albania and Norway  
Sini Perho, Finland  
John Pitts, England  
Vesa Puuronen, Finland  
Winnie Reed, USA  
Ben Rovers, Netherlands  
Alexander Salagaev, Russia  
Greg Scott, USA  
David Shannon, Sweden  
Jim Short, USA  
Arne Stevn, Denmark  
Arne Teslie, Norway  
Ian Toon, England  
Herman von der Lippe, Norway  
Conny Vercaigne, Belgium  
Kjersti Verang, Norway  
Lode Walgrave, Belgium  
Elmar Weitekamp, Germany  
Monica Whitlock, USA  
Tom Winfree, USA  
Phelan Wyrick, USA