Girls and Gangs

INTRODUCTION

Girls have been active participants in U.S. gangs since the late 19th century (Asbury, 1927). The early street gangs in New York City typically had female auxiliaries comparable to what Sante (1991) describes as the "farm leagues for boys" in which males advanced to street-level battles.[1] Female gangsters who had ties with the older Five Points gangs helped by serving as lookouts and decoys. Younger members of some of the female gangs acted independently at times, hiring themselves out as errand runners, lookouts, or spies in brothels.

A couple of women in Asbury's (1927) historical accounts of early gangs are renowned for their fighting ability: Hell-Cat Maggie and Battle Annie. Both were active in male gangs in the 1850s. Hell-Cat Maggie fought along the Bowery gang's front line in many of the great battles. Distinguished by her filed teeth and artificial nails constructed of brass, "when Hell-Cat Maggie screeched her battle cry and rushed biting and clawing into the midst of a mass of opposing gangsters, even the most stout-hearted blanched and fled" (p. 30). Battle Annie and other females often positioned themselves on the outskirts of the gang battles, "their arms filled with reserve ammunition, their keen eyes watching for a break in the enemy's defense and always ready to lend a hand or tooth in the fray" (p. 29).

The preceding introduction encapsulates typical early characterizations of female gangs as auxiliaries to male gangs, as tomboys, or as sex objects, and these images, until recently, dominated the literature on female gang members. J. Moore and Hagedorn (2001) explain, "Even when describing female gang members as tomboys, researchers emphasized that the females' motivations were focused on males" (p. 1). Bowker (1978b) adds that as auxiliaries to male gangs, it is assumed that females were much like a "little sisters" group to them. These authors suggest, "In retrospect, the early skepticism about whether female gangs were 'real gangs' seems odd. It seems to have been based on a very narrow view of what a gang really is. Gangs—male and female alike—differ greatly from one another" (p. 2).

FEMALES IN EARLY GANG STUDIES

Pioneering research on female crime involvement in the 1970s set off a firestorm in criminology, specifically in the gang arena. Adler (1975a, 1975b) contended that some important differences in the organization of female gangs and in members'

behavior occurred in the period from 1945 to 1975. The key change, she argued, was the evolution from predominantly auxiliary status—as weapon and drug carriers, lookouts, and girlfriends—to greater autonomy and independent activity. Adler contended that the women's liberation movement fostered a nationwide female crime wave in the 1970s. This claim has been soundly discredited. Rather, Chesney-Lind (1993, 1999) insists that what occurred was a "surge of media interest" in crimes committed by females in that period, particularly slanted stories that stereotyped females as "liberated crooks."

Chesney-Lind (1999) noted a second "media crime wave" of the same sort reported in newspaper and magazine articles published in the 1990s. In "the first crime wave, the liberated 'female crook' was a white political activist, a 'terrorist,' a drug using hippie" (p. 309). In the second crime wave, the "demonized woman is African American or Hispanic, and she is a violent teenager" (p. 309). She is often also presumed to be a gang member (Esbensen & Tusinski, 2007). Based on her meticulous review of the evidence, Chesney-Lind's (1999) assessment is that "in both instances, there was some small amount of truth in the image found in the articles. [But] girls and women have always engaged in more violent behavior than the stereotype of women supports" (p. 309).

Several seminal female gang studies undertaken in the late 1970s and 1980s moved research on female gangsters beyond the auxiliary role, including research on Chicano, Black, Puerto Rican, and other race/ethnicity female gang members. Studies of Mexican American gangs or gang members were carried out in Los Angeles (Harris, 1988; J. Moore, 1991; J. Moore & Long, 1987; Quicker, 1983) and Chicago (Horowitz, 1983), and on Puerto Ricans in New York City (Campbell, 1984/1991). Studies of Black female gangs or gang members were conducted in Philadelphia (Brown, 1977, 1999), Los Angeles (Bowker, 1978a; Bowker & Klein, 1983), and Boston (W. Miller, 1973, 1966/2011). These diverse studies supported two general themes: first, that girls exhibited some independence from boys and, second, that there was a tendency to engage in fighting and more serious criminal activity.

By and large,

> by the mid-seventies descriptions of girl gang roles and activities were less likely to be restricted to the traditionally female (subordinate) role. Gang girls were more often depicted as being actively involved in conflict situations, which, in the past, were believed to be male-dominated; e.g., gang feuds, individual and gang fights. (Fishman, 1999, p. 67)

Interestingly, Campbell's (1984/1991, 1990, 1999) participant observation research drew the most attention with respect to these two themes. Campbell's 1984 book *The Girls in the Gang: A Report From New York City* was pivotal. What is particularly remarkable is that her subjects consisted of only three female gang members (two of whom were Puerto Rican) from four different gangs (one woman was a member of two gangs). Yet Campbell's presentation of their compelling life histories ranked on par with the early Chicago school studies. Make no mistake—despite the fact that the girls' gangs were auxiliaries to male gangs, these were criminally active women, involved in selling

drugs, intergang warfare, organized crime, prostitution, domestic violence, and a variety of property crimes. More important, Campbell insisted that gang girls simply had not been studied as assiduously as boys.

> Instead they had been stereotyped as promiscuous sex objects—segregated in "ladies auxiliary" gangs—or as socially maladjusted tomboys, vainly trying to be "one of the boys." The stereotypes appeared in the social work literature and were strongly imbedded in much of the [gang] research literature. (J. Moore & Hagedorn, 1996, p. 205)

MODERN-DAY STUDIES OF FEMALE GANG MEMBERS

Joan Moore's (1991) Los Angeles study led the way in modern-day studies of female gang involvement. Moore had returned to the barrios of East Los Angeles to see what had changed, if anything, in the Mexican American gangs that she described in her earlier (1978) widely acclaimed study. For her follow-up study, Moore chose two quite large gangs, White Fence and Hoyo Maravilla, that were among those she first studied in the 1970s. These gangs operated within two neighborhoods, Boyle Heights and Maravilla, and both of these large gangs had been in existence for 45 years when Moore returned. Because she was interested in gang behaviors of both females and males, Moore oversampled cliques within the two chosen gangs. She then randomly selected samples of 51 female and 106 male members for intensive study. They were interviewed in 1986–1987. Moore's research is arguably the most important female gang study of the 20th century, for the rigor of her research design, the methodology she used (blending ethnographic and quantitative methods), and her discoveries on female gang involvement. Her research reveals the striking evolution of female gangs to a greater independent status and also the more active criminal involvement of female gang members.

Moore (1991) made several important discoveries in comparing female gang members of the 1970s with those of the 1950s through intensive interviews. First, more of the gang members were female than expected. Although gang cliques with female participants were oversampled, it was surprising that about one-third of the total membership of both very large gangs was female (p. 136). Second, there were more independent female cliques in the 1970s than in the 1950s—particularly in the Hoyo Maravilla gang. Third, the newer female cliques had more rowdy girls who fought, drank, or used drugs heavily. A surprisingly large proportion (80%) of the women defined themselves as *loco*—compared with 65% of men—although few women admitted to *muy loco* behaviors (p. 63). As one young woman recalled:

> I mean things didn't really matter. I mean nobody could explain anything. First we would just go and do it. We wouldn't even think, you know. . . . And then we would go and get in trouble and we'd think about it later on.
> —Anonymous female White Fence gang member
> (J. Moore, 1991, p. 63)

Moore's findings soon were substantiated in other studies of females in a variety of locations across the United States. First, a series of longitudinal studies of male and female gang members revealed extensive female participation in gangs, as Moore's research had suggested. The first such premier studies were the Denver Youth Survey, the Seattle Social Development Project, and the Rochester Youth Development Study. These were the first major longitudinal studies of random samples of high-risk youths in which substudies of gang members were embedded, and the first large-scale U.S. studies to include representative samples of girls. The self-report measure of gang involvement used in these three studies revealed that gang members in large urban samples of adolescents were nearly as likely to be females as males. The Denver Youth Survey found that females constituted between 20% and 46% of the gang members during a 4-year study period, and 18% of the boys and 9% of the girls self-identified as gang members (Esbensen & Huizinga, 1993; Esbensen, Huizinga, & Weiher, 1993). More surprising, in the Rochester Youth Development Study, a *larger* proportion of female (22%) than male (18%) adolescents self-reported gang membership up to age 15 (Bjerregaard & Smith, 1993). In both study sites, female gang members evidenced a higher prevalence rate for delinquency involvement than both nongang girls and nongang delinquent boys, and a higher incidence rate for all types of offenses than for nongang boys in Denver and Rochester. The Seattle longitudinal study was the first to establish risk factors for gang membership in longitudinal studies (Hill, Howell, Hawkins, & Battin-Pearson, 1999).

J. Miller's (2001, 2014) studies of female gang members in St. Louis, Missouri, and Columbus, Ohio, made three important contributions. First, her research described family and neighborhood contexts of gang involvement. Second, the serious family problems girls faced (particularly violence and drug use) pushed them to seek emotional and social support elsewhere. Last, Miller joined others in documenting the strong influence that gang-involved family members have on girls' decision to join (following J. Moore, 1991).

Most recently, Peterson's series of female gang member studies drawing on the two multicity databases of the Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) project has yielded valuable insights on girls' gang involvement in the early-adolescent period—most notably the extensive gender composition of the gangs in which females participate (Peterson, Miller, & Esbensen, 2001; Peterson & Morgan, 2014; Peterson, Taylor, & Esbensen, 2004). This latter topic is discussed below. In addition, Peterson (2012) puts in perspective girls' gang involvement: First, girls' presence and contribution to gangs is significant nationwide. Second, girls' gang activities bring much harm to themselves and society. Third, a better understanding of girls' motivations and risk factors for involvement can inform prevention and intervention initiatives.

LEVEL OF FEMALE GANG INVOLVEMENT AND SERIOUSNESS OF CRIMES

Several important discoveries have been made over the past decade or more regarding the level of female gang involvement and seriousness of crimes (Bjerregaard, 2002a). First, female involvement in gangs promotes delinquency involvement at a higher level

than if females associate with highly delinquent peers who are not gang members. Thus, gang membership facilitates delinquency over and above the effect of delinquent peers for females as well as males (Battin-Pearson, Thornberry, Hawkins, & Krohn, 1998). Comparing the 15-year-old girls who are gang members with nonmembers who are in the highest quartile of delinquent peers shows that the female gang members in Rochester still self-report significantly more involvement in general delinquency, violent delinquency, drug selling, and drug use. Gang involvement has the same facilitating effect for girls as for boys, and Rochester research suggests that this effect is particularly strong with respect to violent delinquency and drug selling (Thornberry, Krohn, Lizotte, Smith, & Tobin, 2003).

Second, gang members of both sexes are significantly more likely to have participated in delinquency, including serious delinquency and substance abuse, and to have committed these acts at much higher frequencies than same-sex nonmembers. Thus, gang membership promotes delinquency and substance use across both sexes (Krohn & Thornberry, 2008; Thornberry et al., 2003).

Third, delinquency among girl gang members, just as among boys, is higher than among opposite-sex nongang members (Deschenes & Esbensen, 1999; J. Miller & Decker, 2001). For example, a multicity survey of eighth graders undertaken in the mid-1990s found that delinquency among girl gang members is up to 5 times higher than among boys who are not members of gangs (Esbensen & Winfree, 1998).

Fourth, female gang members commit similar crimes to those male gang members commit, but Bjerregaard (2002a) and Haymoz and Gatti (2010) conclude that a smaller proportion of girls participate in serious, violent offenses. However, studies vary somewhat with regard to the types of crimes committed; that is, some indicate that girls commit fewer violent crimes than boys, while others show no difference. But the most consistent finding is that, among early adolescents, girl gang members commit crimes that are similar to those committed by boys, including assault, robbery, and gang fights (Esbensen, Peterson, Taylor, & Freng, 2010), although smaller proportions of girls are involved (Bjerregaard, 2002a). Interestingly, Bjerregaard found that within organized gangs, larger proportions of girls than boys were involved in some offenses.

Fifth, Bjerregaard (2002a) suggested that female gang members had become more extensively involved in the more serious and violent offenses by the advent of the new millennium. In the Rochester study, 29% of females in the sample were gang members at some point during the middle and high school period, and they accounted for virtually the entire sample of females' serious delinquencies (88%), for nearly two-thirds (64%) of all female violent offenses, and for almost 8 out of 10 female drug sales (Thornberry et al., 2003). A multicity survey found that more than 90% of both male and female gang members reported having engaged in one or more violent acts in the previous 12 months (Table 6.1). The researchers demonstrated that 75% of female gang members reported being involved in gang fights, and 37% had attacked someone with a weapon (Esbensen et al., 2010). Ness (2010) observed another common situation in some cities when a gang sister or group of them is victimized—or rolled on—by others.

TABLE 6.1

Gang Member's Annual Prevalence and Individual Offending Rates (IORs) by Sex

Violent Act	Male		Female	
	Prevalence (%)	IOR (Mean)	Prevalence (%)	IOR (Mean)
Hit someone	79	7.5[a]	78	6.6
Attacked someone with a weapon	53[a]	5.2	37	4.3
Robbed someone	33[a]	6.0	15	5.2
Participated in a gang fight	81	6.6	75	5.9
Shot at someone	35[a]	4.6	21	4.1
General violence	94	19.6[a]	94	14.2
Serious violence	85	14.0[a]	81	9.8

Source: Esbensen et al. (2010, p. 84).

[a] $p < .05$, gang boys versus gang girls; chi-square test for prevalence; *t*-test for IOR

THE QUESTION OF INCREASING FEMALE GANG INVOLVEMENT

Although the question of increasing female gang involvement cannot be answered with certainty, the limited available evidence suggests that this is the case (Peterson, 2012). Only one nationally representative annual survey gauges female gang membership—the National Youth Gang Survey; however, the respondents in this survey are law enforcement agencies, which typically estimate that only about 10% of the gang members they observe are female.[2] This relatively low estimate should come as no surprise because girls who join gangs tend to leave them at an earlier age than boys and hence have less street presence than boys. Related to this point, law enforcement seems to pay less attention to very young gang members because their attention is properly focused on older, more serious and violent gang members. In a national school survey, Gottfredson and Gottfredson (2001) found that gang joining among boys peaked at the tenth grade, but two years earlier for girls, at the eighth grade.

Nevertheless, the proportion of females among active gang members is undoubtedly larger than in the past century. In the 1997 National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, male versus female differences in the proportion who joined gangs was not as large as previous research had suggested. Snyder and Sickmund (2006) report the male-to-female ratio in this national sample was about 2:1 (11% of males versus 6% of females). This greater discrepancy than seen in recent surveys in multiple cities with gang problems is likely

attributable to sampling. As seen in Chapter 3, much higher proportions of youths join gangs in cities with a history of gang activity. For example, in a multicity sample drawn in gang problem cities, Esbensen, Brick, Melde, Tusinski, and Taylor (2008) found that almost equal proportions of boys (9%) and girls (8%) self-reported gang membership. Also, Black and Hispanic boys have only slightly higher gang membership rates (10.2% each) than girls. By comparison, in known gang problem areas, surveys of students and other adolescent samples show that about one-third of all gang members are female (Bjerregaard, 2002a). In another study, Gottfredson and Gottfredson's (2001) nationwide student survey, 35% of the self-identified gang members were girls.

THE IMPORTANCE OF GANG GENDER COMPOSITION

Only in the past 15 years has widespread attention been given to the gender composition of the gangs in which females participate (Curry, 1998; Peterson et al., 2001). Several studies indicate that mixed-gender gangs are quite common. Student respondents in Esbensen and fellow researchers' (2008) multicity student sample of male and female gang youths, mostly ages 12 to 15, classified the members of their gang as predominantly gender balanced (54% male and 46% female), regardless of racial/ethnic composition.[3] Only 10% of the boys and 4% of the girls said their gang was same gender. These findings are consistent with several other studies that show considerable gender-mixed gang activity.

The greater mix in female gangs would prove to have noteworthy implications for involvement in criminal activity. Peterson and colleagues (2001) found that females in all- or majority-female gangs exhibited the lowest delinquency rates, and females in majority-male gangs exhibited the highest delinquency rates (including higher rates than males in all-male gangs). In general, these studies suggest that criminal activity and violence tend to increase as the proportion of males in the gang increases. Why this is so is not well understood. It is worth noting that in Giordano's (1978) and Warr's (1996, 2002) studies of peer influence on delinquency, the cross-sex groups of delinquents have higher rates. In particular, Warr (1996) found in an analysis of national data that, unlike males, delinquent offenses reported by females are significantly more likely to occur in mixed-sex groups. In 2007, Haynie, Steffensmeier, and Bell's national study confirmed this, finding that "among females, the odds of engaging in violence are greatest when adolescent girls are enmeshed in a highly violent friendship network comprised of a greater proportion of male friends" (p. 249).

Several studies strongly suggest that girls are more likely to be involved in serious offenses when they are members of more organized gangs (Bjerregaard, 2002a). In reference to gangs in general, research on Esbensen, Winfree, He, and Taylor's (2001) multicity sample of students found that members of gangs that are somewhat "organized" (i.e., have initiation rites, symbols or colors, established leaders, and specific rules, and engage in illegal activities) self-report higher rates of delinquency and involvement in more serious delinquent acts than other youths. There may well be few differences between male and female gangs in this regard. In fact, Esbensen, Deschenes, and Winfree (1999) note that, if anything, the gangs in which girls were involved were slightly more organized than those to which boys belonged. Equally important, Decker, Katz, and Webb's (2008) Arizona

study found that the more organized the gang (having initiation rites, established leaders, and symbols or colors), the more likely members were to be involved in violent offenses, drug sales, and violent victimizations—even at low levels of organization.

According to reports of self-nominated gang members in a study conducted in California, Illinois, Louisiana, and New Jersey, both male and female members of young gangs considered their gangs to be relatively well organized; in one report on this study, Bjerregaard (2002a) found that more females reported "having larger gangs, a gang name, a leader, regular meetings, a turf, and special clothing" (p. 91). Once she applied the "organized" requirement to self-identified gang involvement in this multistate sample, Bjerregaard (2002a) found that

> female prevalence rates of gang delinquency are similar to or higher than those reported by the males. . . . This finding is contrary to much of the prior research which reported that females were less likely to be involved in both criminal offenses and that females sometimes acted as inhibitors to such offenses occurring (Campbell, 1990; Fishman, 1995; Klein, 1995). (p. 93)

Nevertheless, girls are significantly less likely to be gang-involved serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders (Baglivio, Jackowski, Greenwald, & Howell, 2014), and girls' violent acts seldom involve firearms or result in death.

FEMALE ASSOCIATES OF GANG MEMBERS: RISKS AND REVICTIMIZATION

A San Antonio study (Av. Valdez, 2007) of girls who associated regularly with gang members in the Mexican barrios on the West Side of San Antonio, in the area of eight public housing projects where some of the city's poorest families live, provides a unique perspective on gang risks and revictimization. Valdez chose to move his research spotlight off the gangs themselves and onto 150 randomly selected girls who associated with male gang members but never joined their gangs.[4] Because gangs were ever present in the West Side barrios, hanging out with gang members became "a daily routine in the lives of many of these adolescent females" (p. 3).

Valdez discovered that girls in these neighborhoods who were continuously exposed to high-risk situations and dangers unwittingly placed themselves "beyond risk" (or at extreme risk) for violent victimization, practically assuring multiple and extremely problematic outcomes. "Their involvement in risky behavior—such as the perpetration of physical fights, early onset of sexual behavior, substance use, and/or other delinquent behavior—is characteristic of growing up in these environments" (p. 3). Valdez isolated the major risk factors that elevated risk for the girls he studied.

First, the family context was extremely detrimental for the females who would later be gang associates. The use of drugs and alcohol, violent acts, and criminal behavior were "normalized" within the family context of the girls in his study, and 8 out of 10 of the girls had a family member who used drugs. More than 6 out of 10 had someone in the house with a drinking problem, typically the father. Many of the young women felt

the impact of family violence in their everyday lives. More than 7 out of 10 of them had family members involved in criminal activity. More than half of them had witnessed their parents physically fighting in the home.

Second, peer relationships increased the girls' risk for violent victimization, particularly their gangs' associations. Each of the female gang associates was "distinctly integrated into the male gangs through their relationships with the male gang members" (Av. Valdez, 2007, p. 87). The girls typically first associated with the gang members before age 12. When interviewed by Valdez, 43% said they currently had a boyfriend in a gang, and 81% said they had a good friend in a gang. The longer the duration of gang affiliation, the greater the girls' participation in male-gang delinquent activities. Not surprisingly, "the data indicate that many of the girls had a history of incarceration that occurred after they became affiliated with the gang" (p. 86).

Third, individual exposure to risky behaviors, including delinquency, violence (particularly physical fights), substance use, and sexual relations, was extensive among the female gang associates. Based on his exhaustive study, Valdez (2007) developed the following typology to categorize nongang females:

- *Girlfriends* are defined as a type of female gang associate who is a current steady partner of a male gang member. Relationships range from being a male gang member's "main chick" or *santita* (saint) to the teenage mother of his child. This type of female is least involved in everyday gang activities, and to some extent these girls are shielded from male gang members (e.g., not sexually harassed), out of respect.

- *Hoodrats* are a more complex type of female gang associate. Although often (but not necessarily) she is sexually promiscuous, she is often seen hanging out and partying with the guys and generally is a heavy polydrug and alcohol user. Male gang members often refer to this type of female as *bitch*, *shank*, *player*, and *whore.* She normally does not develop an emotional relationship with any of the boys, yet among the four female types, she is most actively involved in everyday gang activities.

- *Good girls* include childhood friends of many of the male gang members, often having attended the same schools and having parents who interact with each other. In time, these relationships have come to be based on mutual respect. Males characterize these females as "nice girls." Compared with the other types of female gang associates, this type tends to have conventional lifestyles, very infrequent involvement in criminal activities, and also limited involvement in everyday gang activities.

- *Relatives* refers to girls who are close relatives of gang members, typically sisters and cousins. These kinship ties afford this female type special status within the social network. For example, if one of these girls is dating a gang member, she will be given special status as his main chick and also as a homeboy's sister or cousin. This type of female gang associate also has limited involvement in everyday gang activities.

All types of girls in Valdez's typology were involved in physical street fights, ranging from pushing and shoving to more violent attacks that often resulted in injuries. Hoodrats were most actively involved in everyday gang activities and were "more likely to participate in illegal activities in association with male gang members" (p. 98). Some of the hoodrats were involved in more serious activities such as drug dealing and weapon sales, but often independently of the male gang. In addition, by virtue of their association with a particular male gang, tensions were created with other girls associated with rival gangs. Valdez observed that the female gang associates in the barrios on the West Side of San Antonio "are continuously exposed to high-risk situations and dangers, which are exacerbated when associating with gangs" (p. 180).

Valdez's (2007) classification scheme is very useful, for no other gang research has identified distinguishable subgroups of girls who hang around boys actively involved in gangs. However, some researchers have used other terms to characterize them, including *associates* (Curry, Decker, & Egley, 2002), *wannabes*, and youths who *kick it* (participate in gang social activities; Garot, 2010). But Valdez's classification scheme is far more explicit than others and should prove very useful in distinguishing girls' levels or degrees of gang involvement for research, prevention, and intervention purposes.

Valdez (2007) emphasizes violent victimization as a predominant result of high-risk girls' exposure to gangs. Importantly, adolescent girls "are prey for male adolescents and older adults in a street culture that promotes hyper masculinity, sexual conquest, sexual aggression, and sexual objectification of women" (p. 111). Unfortunately, these girls view the gang life as an opportunity for them "to gain autonomy and independence, not only from family oppression, but also from cultural and class constraints" (p. 113). For girls in these circumstances, the gang is very likely to be viewed as a refuge, particularly for those who have been victimized at home. Paradoxically, these vulnerable girls are placing themselves at greater risk of violent victimization as a direct result of their association with gang members, including sexual and physical victimization by boyfriends and also by other male gang members in the context of the gang, such as at parties (pp. 114–128).

Risk Factors for Girls' Gang Joining

In the review that follows, we suggest how certain risk factors for delinquency and gang involvement may well apply to girls and boys alike, and underscore recent research that suggests that certain risk factors may be more influential for girls than for boys (Peterson, 2012; Peterson & Morgan, 2014). Although supporting research on this latter point is thin at present, evidence is accumulating. A brief summary of this research follows (for reviews of risk and protective factors for girls exposed to gangs, see also Gilman, Howell, Hipwell, & Stepp, 2016; Peterson, 2012; Petersen & Howell, 2013). A key finding is that there is considerable gender uniformity across major risk domains—family, school, peer, individual, and community (Thornberry et al., 2003).

Early Problem Behaviors. During childhood, certain risk factors for general delinquency may be elevated that render girls susceptible to gang involvement at a later point. A growing body of research identifies child delinquent girls with an early aggressive history (Pepler et al., 2010). "Some early risks have emerged as more characteristic

of aggressive girls than boys, including estranged mother-daughter relationships, abuse, depression, eating disorders, social aggression, and early sexualized behaviors" (pp. 229–230)—some of which have been linked to gang participation. Hipwell and colleagues (2002) discovered a subgroup of Pittsburgh girls under age 8 who displayed disruptive behaviors, particularly in the most disadvantaged neighborhoods where gangs are most prevalent. In these neighborhoods, girls—just like boys—"are exposed to a greater number of risk factors, including exposure to different forms of community and family violence and an increased likelihood of affiliation with deviant peers" (Kroneman, Loeber, & Hipwell, 2004, p. 117).

A similar group of very troubled young girls was discovered in Toronto based on measurements made with the Early Assessment Risk List for Girls (Augimeri, Walsh, Liddon, & Dassinger, 2011). This validated instrument revealed that more than half the girls who had been referred for clinical treatment under age 12 had displayed aggressive behavior problems before age 7, tended to come from chaotic families with high levels of mother–daughter conflict, and had experienced multiple separations from their primary caregivers. Such early problem behaviors often lead to delinquency involvement, which in turn can increase the likelihood of gang membership.

Neighborhood Characteristics. In her research on a national sample of adolescents, K. Bell (2009) found that neighborhood disadvantage is an especially strong risk factor for gang joining among both girls and boys. In these neighborhoods, gangs fill a void created by weak social institutions (especially families and schools) and government (law enforcement and human services). In disorganized neighborhoods, gangs are virtually unfettered from forging their own wedges amid the concentrated poverty and accompanying social and physical disorder. S. Park, Morash, and Stevens (2010) and J. Miller (2014) underscore the reality that gang presence in neighborhoods is a key contextual factor, particularly where gangs have been institutionalized in neighborhoods. These dynamics are illuminated in Av. Valdez's (2007) research in which he discovered that girls' continuous exposure to high-risk and dangerous situations elevated them "beyond risk," and this circumstance virtually assured multiple negative outcomes, including physical fights, early onset of sexual behavior, substance use, violent victimization, and gang association. Antisocial neighborhoods such as this appear to have as much potency as a risk factor for girls' as for boys' gang joining (Gilman, Hill, Hawkins, Howell, & Kosterman, 2014).

School Factors. School-related problems—such as academic failure, low educational aspirations, negative labeling, and trouble at school—are a key risk factor for gang joining among girls, and these may be more influential for them than for boys (Bjerregaard & Smith, 1993; Peterson, 2012; Thornberry et al., 2003). In addition, school safety concerns are a major factor leading to gang involvement among girls (K. Bell, 2009).

Family Environments. Violent family environments, including parental substance use, domestic violence, and physical and sexual abuse, have been consistently identified among antecedents of female gang involvement (Fleisher, 1998; J. Miller, 2001;

Peterson, 2012). In vivid descriptions, Av. Valdez (2007) reported that girls' families and the West Side streets of San Antonio provided the major risk factors among gang-affiliated females. Drug and alcohol use, violent acts, and criminal behavior were "normalized" within the family context of the girls. Exposure to risky behaviors on the streets, including delinquency, violence (particularly physical fights), substance use, and abusive sexual relations, was common among the female gang associates. Many of these girls viewed the gang life as an opportunity for them "to gain autonomy and independence, not only from family oppression, but also from cultural and class constraints" (p. 113). Child abuse is common among girls who join gangs (Chesney-Lind, 2013). "Girls join gangs, at least in part, because they are suffering abuse at home, their families are deeply troubled, and they are searching for a surrogate family" (p. 123). In addition, living in a family with a gang member is a predictor of gang joining for girls and boys alike (Gilman, Hill, Hawkins, et al., 2014).

> My mom was 21 when I was born and my dad was 15. Dad was in prison for murder when I was born. Dad was bad off, into drugs. He was deranged too.
> —Cara (Fleisher, 1998, p. 61)

Negative Peers.   Youths tend to develop friendships with those with whom they feel comfortable or have much in common. Associating with delinquent peers, called *peer* or *deviancy training* in modern-day terminology, has long been established as a risk factor for gang involvement (Hill et al., 1999), and this factor appears to be as potent for girls as for boys (Gilman, Hill, Hawkins, et al., 2014). Rejection by prosocial peers (being unpopular) is a key factor that pushes children into affiliations with delinquent groups and gangs (Howell & Egley, 2005b). Even though peer relationships can be nuanced between genders in several respects, the negative effects of peers on delinquent behavior are remarkably similar for males and females (Weerman & Hoeve, 2012). Early dating also is a key risk factor for gang joining among girls (Fleisher, 1998; Thornberry et al., 2003). There is evidence indicating a reciprocal relationship between girls' gang involvement and peer victimization across adolescence, a result seen in at least one other study involving a mixed-gender sample (Peterson et al., 2004), and a recent study adds to this finding, revealing that girls who are being victimized by their peers in mid-late adolescence appear to be at an increased risk for gang involvement (Gilman et al., 2016).

In sum, risk factors in these five widely recognized developmental domains can lead to gang joining for girls and boys alike. Moreover, risk factors for violence and gang joining appear to be similar across genders (Peterson & Morgan, 2014). As is the case with boys, the presence of risk factors in multiple developmental domains increases the risk for girls (K. Bell, 2009; Gilman, Hill, Hawkins, et al., 2014; Thornberry et al., 2003). Other research strongly suggests that the cumulative effects of risk factors may be worse for girls than for boys, leading to multiple problem behaviors (Hipwell et al., 2002; Hipwell & Loeber, 2006). And girls also have higher levels of co-occurring problems than boys do. These problems tend to begin emerging at very young ages. A major study of adolescent female offenders identified three high-risk profiles: (1) girls with criminal parents (very high risk), (2) victims of abuse (high risk), and (3) repeat offenders

(high risk) (Van der Put et al., 2014). Gilman and colleagues' (2014) research examined risk and protective factors for girls' and boys' gang involvement from early adolescence into adulthood, finding similarity in the influence of these factors across genders. In their effort to fashion a unique explanation for girls' gang joining, Peterson and Panfil (2017) draw attention to interpersonal interactions in proximal spheres such as neighborhoods, families, schools, and peer groups.

We next turn to the issue of interventions for girls versus boys.

GIRLS' UNIQUE TREATMENT NEEDS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR PREVENTION AND TREATMENT

Recently, several scholars have discussed the evolution of terms that are commonly used to reference programs designed exclusively for girls or for both boys and girls. New terminology is now widely promoted that simplifies discourse on this matter (Hubbard & Matthews, 2008; Petersen & Howell, 2013; Peterson & Carson, 2014). The "female-specific" or "female-responsive" philosophy implies that girls have unique treatment needs, and the "what works" or "gender-neutral" philosophy implies that services are equally effective with girls and boys. The female-specific or female-responsive philosophy also suggests that programs for girls should be sensitive to unique treatment needs and also the context in which treatment is provided (e.g., the family context, to address mother–daughter relationships). Even though there is research support for both philosophies, Hubbard and Matthews (2008) insist the two approaches can be integrated to the greater benefit of girls. After highlighting girls' unique treatment needs, we provide examples of programs tailored specifically to girls (see Table 6.2) and others that appear to benefit both genders.

In the past decade or more, research that has focused on the development and outcomes of girlhood aggression has flourished (Pepler et al., 2010). Also, much more is presently known about older females' mental health status and service needs from structured psychiatric assessments of multistate samples on juvenile probation, in detention, and in juvenile correctional facilities (Wasserman, McReynolds, Schwalbe, Keating, & Jones, 2010). Although female gang members were not identified in these populations of juvenile offenders, the findings below regarding treatment needs likely apply to the relatively small proportion of girls among life-course persistent juvenile offenders who are actively involved in gangs.

- Antisocial females show more impairment[5] than antisocial males across a range of co-occurring social, health, or educational domains (McReynolds et al., 2008).

- Girls have higher levels of co-occurring problems than boys do (McReynolds et al., 2008). First, girls' rates of anxiety and affective disorders[6] such as depression are higher than boys, and violent girls are more likely than other groups to have anxiety disorders (Wasserman, McReynolds, Ko, Katz, & Carpenter, 2005; see also Obeidallah & Earls, 1999).

- Females are 10 times more likely to experience sexual assault than boys (McReynolds, Schwalbe, & Wasserman, 2010).

- Girls with substance abuse and affective disorders have higher delinquency recidivism rates than girls and boys with no disorder (McReynolds et al., 2010).

A national study of female-specific predictors of assaultive behavior in the late adolescence period (S. Park et al., 2010)[7] suggests several important targets for intervention (risk factors) and protective measures for "beyond risk" girls who associate with gangs and commit violent assaults themselves.[8] Early-age (before age 13) runaway (from home) girls reported significantly more assaults than other girls who did not display early problem behaviors. The more the gang presence (exposure), the more likely the girls were to assault others. Low hope for the future (as measured by expectations of arrest and victimization) also significantly predicted more assaults, while parental monitoring significantly predicted fewer assaults for girls. Additionally, for each year of school attended, girls' reports of assault were much lower, on average. Finally, girls who successfully adjusted benefited from more parental monitoring and stronger ties to school and religious institutions. Regardless of the age group, interventions need to foster prosocial and relationship-based learning, and encourage the development of a positive gender identity and sense of agency (Hipwell & Loeber, 2006).

Recommended Female-Specific Services

In light of the above research, some girls may be more responsive to cognitively based treatments (CBT)[9] than boys, particularly given that females often exhibit greater skills in perspective-taking and empathy (Pepler et al., 2010). This expectation has been confirmed in the application of CBT for young girls (ages 6 to 11) in the evidence-based Stop Now and Plan (SNAP®) Girls Connection (Augimeri, Pepler, Walsh, & Kivlenieks, in press; Augimeri, Walsh, & Slater, 2011). The program components are similar to the SNAP® Boys program, but there are important differences based on research and best practices for treating girls' aggression. In SNAP® Girls, for example, there is greater emphasis on relationship building. The SNAP® Girls therapeutic regimen showed significant positive changes in girls' problem behavior and parenting skills for the treatment versus the control groups, improved mother–daughter relations and bonding, less parental use of physical punishment and abuse of children (Augimeri et al., in press), and good maintenance of treatment gains (Pepler et al., 2010). Owing to its demonstrated reduction of early problem behaviors and abusive parenting and associated childhood aggression, in the long term, the SNAP® Girls program should produce reductions in gang joining.

Because risk factors for girls' gang involvement span several domains of their lives, for optimal impact, gang prevention and intervention programs not only need to address multiple risk factors, but they also should address a number of risk factors in multiple segments of girls' lives. Chesney-Lind (2013) underscores the importance of addressing issues that are unique to girls and the contexts that can lead them to join a gang. These "strategies and programs include the need to prevent sexual abuse, strengthen family

relationships, provide them with safety in their neighborhoods, help them avoid substance abuse and abusive boyfriends, and improve their skills to delay early sexual activity and parenthood" (p. 121).

Valdez and Petersen's San Antonio research on female affiliates (Petersen & Valdez, 2004; see also Av. Valdez, 2007) and also Peterson (2012) suggest that female violence prevention programs need to address these priorities: parental monitoring, running away from home, school connectedness, substance abuse, hopelessness, victimization, retaliatory violence, and gang exposure. Cultural contexts are particularly important (Chesney-Lind, 2013). In agreement with other research, Peterson and Carson (2014) note the importance of family context for girls, but they provide insights regarding how sex-specific content could improve low parental supervision for females, such as working intensively with caregivers on effective strategies, while working with girls to increase their connections with other adult figures to provide structure and accountability—and for males, to decrease impulsivity.

As Van der Put and colleagues (2014) noted, criminal parents place older girls at particularly high risk; thus, they recommend therapy. This could be provided in such family-oriented programs as Brief Strategic Family Therapy (described below). Van der Put and colleagues also recommend an intensive treatment that focuses on multiple systems for girls who are victims of abuse and further diagnostics to determine specific treatment needs for girls who are repeat offenders.

For girls in the juvenile justice system, the Voice Diagnostic Interview Schedule for Children would serve to identify their mental health and substance use treatment needs, as this assessment tool works equally well for girls and boys (McReynolds et al., 2010). In the context of community settings, Hubbard and Matthews (2008) recommend "strengths-based" supports, "a therapeutic model that allows girls to explore common problems in their lives and develop a sense of self-worth through intimate communication with others" (p. 238). More specifically, these experts support treatment approaches for girls that are (a) based on the interpersonal (relational) model and (b) trauma informed.

A female-specific program, *Movimiento Ascendencia* (Upward Movement) in Pueblo, Colorado,[10] was a promising program for Mexican American girls that operated in the early 1990s for the purposes of preventing them from joining gangs and reducing their gang involvement. Most of the girls served in this program were in need of prevention and intervention services. The average age of participants was 14; most of them were gang-involved and had experienced contact with the juvenile justice system. Project activities centered on three main components: mediation or conflict resolution, social support, and cultural awareness. Williams, Curry, and Cohen (2002) report that the program successfully provided a safe haven for girls in the target area and that the program participants showed significant reduction of delinquency involvement and increases in school achievement. Wolf and Gutierrez (2012) identify several promising services that could meet girls' unique treatment needs, although none of these has been rigorously evaluated.

Chesney-Lind (2013) draws attention to the Female Intervention Team (FIT), which operates within the traditional probation structure of the Maryland Department

of Juvenile Justice. The typical girl for whom FIT is tailored is a 16-year-old African American from a single-parent family who may be gang-involved. FIT focuses on girls' unique challenges (including family trauma) and builds on their need for positive interpersonal relationships. Services include family counseling (designed for 8- to 15-year-old girls, their parents, and in some groups, grandparents) and a Rite of Passage program that gives older teens a positive introduction to womanhood and opportunities for community service.

A nongang program, Safe Dates, is an exemplary program for preventing dating violence that can help reduce girls' violent sexual victimizations, and would be equally valuable to girls at risk of violent victimization in the gang context. Geared to girls' and boys' interactions, the goals of this dual-gender program are to change adolescent dating violence norms, improve conflict-resolution skills for dating relationships, promote victims' and perpetrators' beliefs in the need for help and awareness of community resources for dating violence, promote help-seeking by victims and perpetrators, and improve peer help-giving skills. Foshee and colleagues (2005) found program effectiveness in the areas of psychological abuse perpetration, moderate physical violence perpetration, and sexual

TABLE 6.2

Promising Programs for Girls

Gang Programs	
Program Name	**Key References**
Gang Resistance Education and Training	Esbensen, Osgood, Peterson, Taylor, and Carson (2013); Esbensen, Osgood, Taylor, Peterson, and Freng (2001)
Safe Dates	Foshee et al. (2005)
Aggression Replacement Training	Goldstein, Glick, and Gibbs (1998)
Brief Strategic Family Therapy	Nickel, Luley, Nickel, and Widermann (2006)
Delinquency Programs	
SNAP® Girls Connection	Augimeri, Pepler, Walsh, and Kivlenieks (in press) Augimeri, Walsh, Sewell, and Woods (2017)
Multisystemic Therapy	Henggeler and Schoenwald (2011)
Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care—Adolescents	https://www.crimesolutions.gov/ ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=141
Strengthening Families Program: For Parents and Youth 10–14	https://www.crimesolutions.gov/ ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=199
Generic services: cognitive-behavioral therapy, family therapy, counseling, and interpersonal skills development	Lipsey (2009)

violence perpetration. Intended for middle and high school students, the Safe Dates program can stand alone or fit easily within health education, family, or general life-skills curricula. It should be provided in communities with acknowledged gang activity.

Recommended Gender-Neutral Services

At this time, four gender-neutral programs have demonstrated effectiveness with gang-involved females; three were designed to prevent gang joining, and the remaining one, for intervention with girls and boys who are actively involved in San Antonio gangs. Although none of these programs was designed specifically for girls, they have demonstrated effectiveness with girls as well as boys. First, the Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) program (Chapter 9) is the only program specifically focused on reducing gang membership that has been rigorously evaluated and proven effective, and no gender differences have been reported to date. Second, the Comprehensive Gang Program Model (Chapter 10) also appears to be effective for girls and boys alike. Third, the evidence-based Aggression Replacement Training (ART) program has shown positive results when tested with gang-involved youths in Brooklyn, New York. ART (Chapter 10) is designed to target youths with a history of serious aggression and other antisocial behavior. It appears effective for females as well as for males (Lipsey & Wilson, 1998). ART consists of a 10-week, 30-hour cognitive-behavioral program administered to groups of 8 to 12 adolescents ages 11 to 17 (Goldstein & Glick, 1994). During these 10 weeks, youths typically attend three 1-hour sessions per week on skill streaming, anger control, and moral reasoning training. A condensed version of ART for adolescents placed temporarily in a short-term residential facility (a runaway shelter) who had exhibited signs of antisocial behavior also was effective with girls (Nugent, Bruley, & Allen, 1999).

Fourth, Brief Strategic Family Therapy (BSFT) is an evidence-based program for preventing, reducing, or treating adolescent behavior problems such as drug use, conduct problems, delinquency, sexually risky behavior, aggressive/violent behavior, and association with antisocial peers.[11] BSFT serves female and male children and adolescents between 8 and 17 years of age who display (or are at risk for developing) these risky and harmful behavior problems. BSFT directly addresses symptoms of dysfunctional family patterns by promoting positive parenting, parental monitoring, effective parental discipline, and family cohesion. A modified version of BSFT, tailored to cultural values of Hispanic groups as well as contextual factors (frequent gang affiliation, high-crime neighborhoods), demonstrated effectiveness in reducing behavioral problems with gang members and was equally effective with girls and boys (Valdez, Cepeda, Parrish, Horowitz, & Kaplan, 2013)—and earlier, with aggressive bullying girls using the basic BSFT model (Nickel et al., 2006).

Three other gender-neutral programs hold considerable promise for reducing delinquency and victimization among gang-involved girls. Zahn, Day, Mihalic, and Tichavsky's (2009) review of juvenile justice programs for girls identified two model programs that have produced comparable cross-gender outcomes, Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care (MTFC) and Multisystemic Therapy (MST). MTFC is an alternative to group or residential treatment, incarceration, or hospitalization for

adolescents who have problems with chronic antisocial behavior, emotional disturbance, and delinquency, and this program has demonstrated effectiveness with girls as well as boys (Chamberlain, Leve, & DeGarmo, 2007; Leve & Chamberlain, 2007). This program holds excellent potential for effectiveness with gang-involved girls confined in residential juvenile correctional facilities. The Strengthening Families Program: For Parents and Youth 10–14 is a gender-neutral program for parents and their adolescent children. The adapted program aims to reduce substance use and behavior problems during adolescence through improved social skills and nurturing (see http://www .extension.iastate.edu/sfp10-14/).

Further research is quite likely to demonstrate the effectiveness of MST and Functional Family Therapy (FFT) with girls who are involved in gangs. Research on the tailoring of these programs for gang members, including girls, is relayed in Chapter 10. In a study of the efficacy of MST with gang members, Boxer (2011) found lower treatment completion rates for gang members, not only when clients self-admitted gang membership but also when youths had strong gang associations. However, Boxer's research also revealed that girls are less likely to experience negative case closures than boys, suggesting that programs such as FFT and MST can be effective with gang-involved girls.

Lipsey (2009) identified numerous generic services that, with few exceptions, are equally effective with girls and boys, including cognitive-behavioral therapy, family therapy, counseling, and interpersonal skills development. In an important new study, family therapy and mixed and group counseling are very effective treatments for substance abuse for girls and boys (Tanner-Smith, Wilson, & Lipsey, 2013).

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

Girls have been participants in U.S. gangs from the earliest point of recorded gang activity. Many years passed, however, before gang researchers took note of their active involvement. To be sure, the early research reduced their involvement to auxiliary roles with strong emphasis on subservience to males. But female gang studies undertaken in the late 1970s and 1980s moved research on female gangsters beyond these subservient and auxiliary roles. In time, girls would blend with boys in gangs and increase their criminal involvement and also their vulnerability to violent victimization.

Providing specialized prevention and treatment programs for girls and young women is a relatively new frontier. Evidence-based services for male gang members have a much longer history (Chapter 10).

Many of those programs can be used advantageously with females. The challenge, however, is secondary prevention on behalf of girls, targeting services in a manner that insulates high-risk girls from gang involvement and personal victimization in gang-ridden cities. Both mothers and daughters in these areas underscore general safety concerns (Popkin, Leventhal, & Weismann, 2010). Girls begin experiencing sexual harassment and pressure from older boys and adult men during early adolescence, typically by ages 12 or 13 (Popkin, Leventhal, & Weismann, 2008). The protection of vulnerable girls is of utmost importance—especially as they move into the pubescent period.

A federal housing program aptly demonstrates this pressing need. In the large-scale Moving to

Opportunity for Fair Housing demonstration sponsored by the U.S. Housing and Urban Development agency, the life chances of very poor families with children were improved by enabling them to move out of the disadvantaged environments that contribute to undesirable outcomes (Popkin et al., 2008). Although boys' behaviors did not improve, both mothers and girls achieved a "dramatic reduction" in "female fear" (Popkin et al., 2010, p. 735). As for the girls, "compared with their counterparts still living in high-poverty neighborhoods, female experimental-group participants reported less harassment from men and boys, less pressure to engage in sexual behavior, and, as a result, said they were less fearful" (Popkin et al., 2008, p. 2). Experimental-family girls reported significantly less psychological distress and anxiety and fewer problem behaviors than did girls in the control-group families that did not move out. In addition, girls in the families that moved out experienced lower exposure to gangs and drug trafficking.

A community- or neighborhood-based strategy is required to preserve girls' healthy social and personal development without the necessity of moving out of established homesteads and away from family ties and friendship networks. Fleisher (1998) recommends supervised residential centers as the centerpiece of such a strategy. These centers, as Fleisher envisions them, would serve to shelter and protect girls, and link them with a variety of supports and services (including job training and placement), as well as help ensure a healthy start for gang girls' children. Community safety issues must be addressed, of course, including curbing gang activity. Social and life skills training (Botvin, Griffin, & Nichols, 2006) should also be provided for girls to buffer them from negative influences and victimization. In short, these centers would serve as a one-stop resource for a variety of services and sources of assistance. Access to good quality education is also vital (Weber, 2010). "In totality, research on the quality of schooling available to girls in gang-saturated neighborhoods argues for school-based initiatives that support girls' resilience and promote their attachment to school"

(Chesney-Lind, 2013, p. 127). Even schooling is a barrier for many gang-involved girls.

> I ain't been to school in a long time and ain't so good in math. And anyways, I don't have no new clothes. I don't have sneakers; all the other kids are gonna laugh at me.
> —Cara (Fleisher, 1998, p. 162)

At this juncture, no female-specific gang programs have proven effective, but three are very promising. Just one program has been tailored specifically to girls at risk of gang involvement: *Movimiento Ascendencia* (Upward Movement). This program has been shown to reduce girls' delinquency involvement and improve school achievement. Safe Dates, an exemplary program for preventing dating violence, is very promising for reducing girls' violent victimization and perhaps helping them distance themselves from sexually exploitative males. Though not yet tested for prevention of gang joining, the SNAP® Girls Connection holds strong potential for this purpose because it is an evidence-based program that tempers early problem behaviors and aggression while increasing child–mother bonding among very young girls. The SNAP® program is described in Chapter 9.

To date, four gender-neutral programs have demonstrated effectiveness with females who are either at risk of joining gangs or actively involved in gangs. The G.R.E.A.T. gang prevention program is discussed in Chapter 9, and the Comprehensive Gang Program Model is presented in Chapter 10. Both programs have been thoroughly evaluated and appear to be effective for girls and boys alike. Aggression Replacement Training has demonstrated effectiveness with girls as well as boys when tested with gang-involved youths in Brooklyn, New York. Last, Brief Strategic Family Therapy has demonstrated effectiveness with gang members and appears to be equally effective with girls and boys. Other evidence-based gender-neutral services for preventing and reducing delinquency and gang involvement also hold promise for girls (see Table 6.2).

DISCUSSION TOPICS

1. Why was gang research so slow to notice the active involvement of girls in gangs?

2. Explain the more serious criminal activity of modern-day female gangs. Do these factors also apply to male gangs?

3. Why does a mixture of males and females in gangs elevate the criminal involvement of the group as a whole?

4. Explain why female-specific programs are needed, and also why these are effective.

5. Class exercise: Develop a strategy for insulating girls from community conditions that lead to violent victimization and gang involvement. What programs would you select?

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER READING

Proliferation of Female Gangs in the 1980s

Brotherton, D. C. (1996). The contradictions of suppression: Notes from a study of approaches to gangs in three public high schools. *Urban Review, 28,* 95–117.

Chesney-Lind, M., & Hagedorn, J. (Eds.). (1999). *Female gangs in America.* Chicago, IL: Lake View Press.

Fleisher, M. S. (1998). *Dead end kids: Gang girls and the boys they know.* Madison: University of Wisconsin.

Moore, J. W. (1991). *Going down to the barrio: Homeboys and homegirls in change.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Moore, J. W., & Hagedorn, J. M. (1999). What happens to girls in the gang? In M. Chesney-Lind & J. Hagedorn (Eds.), *Female gangs in America: Essays on girls, gangs, and gender* (pp. 176–186). Chicago, IL: Lake View Press.

Moore, J. W. (2007). Female gangs: Gender and globalization. In J. M. Hagedorn (Ed.), *Gangs in the global city* (pp. 187–203). Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Moore, J. W., & Hagedorn, J. M. (2001). *Female gangs* (Juvenile Justice Bulletin. Youth Gang Series). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Taylor, C. S. (1993). *Girls, gangs, women, drugs.* East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Early Sexual Victimization of Girls Who Affiliate With Gangs

Cepeda, A., & Valdez, A. (2003). Risk behaviors among young Mexican American gang associated females: Sexual relations, partying, substance use, and crime. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 18,* 90–106.

Joe, K. A., & Chesney-Lind, M. (1995). Just every mother's angel: An analysis of gender and ethnic variations in youth gang membership. *Gender & Society, 9,* 408–430.

Miller, J. A. (2001). *One of the guys: Girls, gangs and gender.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Moore, J. W. (1991). *Going down to the barrio: Homeboys and homegirls in change.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Moore, J. W., & Hagedorn, J. M. (1996). What happens to girls in the gang? In C. R. Huff (Ed.), *Gangs in America* (2nd ed., pp. 205–218). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schalet, A., Hunt, J., & Joe-Laidler, K. (2003). Respectability and autonomy: The articulation and meaning of sexuality among the girls in the gang. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 32,* 108–143.

Valdez, A. (2007). *Mexican American girls and gang violence: Beyond risk.* New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Yoder, K. A., Whitbeck, L. B., & Hoyt, D. R. (2003). Gang involvement and membership among homeless and runaway youth. *Youth and Society, 34,* 441–467.

Level of Female Involvement and Seriousness of Crime

Adamshick, P. Z. (2010). The lived experience of girl-to-girl aggression in marginalized girls. *Qualitative Health Research, 20,* 541–555.

Batchelor, S. (2009). Girls, gangs and violence: Assessing the evidence. *Probation Journal, 56,* 399–414.

Bjerregaard, B. (2002). Operationalizing gang membership: The impact measurement on gender differences in gang self-identification and delinquent involvement. *Women and Criminal Justice, 13,* 79–100.

Erickson, P. G., Butters, J. E., Cousineau, M., Harrison, L., & Korf, D. (2006). Girls and weapons: An international study of the perpetration of violence. *Urban Health, 83,* 788–801.

Esbensen, F., Winfree, L. T., He, N., & Taylor, T. J. (2001). Youth gangs and definitional issues: When is a gang a gang, and why does it matter? *Crime and Delinquency, 47,* 105–130.

Haymoz, S., & Gatti, U. (2010). Girl members of deviant youth groups, offending behavior and victimisation: Results from the ISRD2 in Italy and Switzerland. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research, 16,* 167–182.

Jones, N. (2008). Working the "Code": On girls, gender, and inner-city violence. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology, 41,* 63–83.

Ness, C. D. (2004). Why girls fight: Female youth violence in the inner city. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 595,* 32–48.

Peterson, D. (2012). Girlfriends, gun-holders, and ghetto-rats? Moving beyond narrow views of girls in gangs. In S. Miller, L. D. Leve, & P. K. Kerig (Eds.), *Delinquent girls: Contexts, relationships, and adaptation* (pp. 71–84). New York, NY: Springer.

Gender-Mixed Gang Activity

Fleisher, M. S. (1998). *Dead end kids: Gang girls and the boys they know.* Madison: University of Wisconsin.

Miller, J. A. (2001). *One of the guys: Girls, gangs and gender.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Miller, J. A., & Brunson, R. (2000). Gender dynamics in youth gangs: A comparison of males' and females' accounts. *Justice Quarterly, 17,* 419–448.

Peterson, D. (2012). Girlfriends, gun-holders, and ghetto-rats? Moving beyond narrow views of girls in gangs. In S. Miller, L. D. Leve, & P. K. Kerig (Eds.), *Delinquent girls: Contexts, relationships, and adaptation* (pp. 71–84). New York, NY: Springer.

Valdez, A. (2007). *Mexican American girls and gang violence: Beyond risk.* New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Revictimization

Fleisher, M. S. (1998). *Dead end kids: Gang girls and the boys they know.* Madison: University of Wisconsin.

Hunt, G., & Joe-Laidler, K. (2001). Situations of violence in the lives of girl gang members. *Health Care for Women International, 22,* 363–384.

Miller, J. A. (2001). *One of the guys: Girls, gangs and gender.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Miller, J. A. (2008). *Getting played: African American girls, urban inequality, and gendered violence.* New York: New York University Press.

Moore, J. W. (1991). *Going down to the barrio: Homeboys and homegirls in change.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Moore, J. W. (1994). The *chola* life course: Chicana heroin users and the barrio gang. *International Journal of Addictions, 29,* 1115–1126.

Moore, J. W., & Hagedorn, J. M. (1996). What happens to girls in the gang? In C. R. Huff (Ed.), *Gangs in America* (2nd ed., pp. 205–218). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Moore, J. W., & Hagedorn, J. M. (1999). What happens to girls in the gang? In M. Chesney-Lind & J. Hagedorn (Eds.), *Female gangs in America: Essays on girls, gangs, and gender* (pp. 176–186). Chicago, IL: Lake View Press.

Moore, J. W., & Hagedorn, J. M. (2001). *Female gangs* (Juvenile Justice Bulletin. Youth Gang Series). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Valdez, A. (2007). *Mexican American girls and gang violence: Beyond risk.* New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Risk Factors for Girls

Bell, K. E. (2009). Gender and gangs: A quantitative comparison. *Crime and Delinquency, 55,* 363–387.

Esbensen, F., Deschenes, E. P., & Winfree, L. T. (1999). Differences between gang girls and gang boys: Results from a multi-site survey. *Youth and Society, 31,* 27–53.

Esbensen, F., Peterson, D., Taylor, T. J., & Freng, A. (2010). *Youth violence: Sex and race differences in offending, victimization, and gang membership.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Gilman, A. B., Howell, J. C., Hipwell, A. E., & Stepp, S. D. (2016). The reciprocal relationship between gang involvement and victimization by peers: Findings from the Pittsburgh Girls Study. *Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology, 3*, 241. doi:10.1007/s40865-016-0046-1

Hill, K. G., Howell, J. C., Hawkins, J. D., & Battin-Pearson, S. R. (1999). Childhood risk factors for adolescent gang membership: Results from the Seattle social development project. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 36,* 300–322.

Petersen, R. D., & Howell, J. C. (2013). Program approaches for girls in gangs: Female specific or gender neutral? *Criminal Justice Review, 38,* 491–509.

Peterson, D., & Morgan, K. A. (2014). Sex differences and the overlap in youths' risk factors for onset of violence and gang involvement. *Journal of Crime and Justice, 37,* 129–154.

Peterson, D., & Panfil, V. R. (2017). A unified conceptual framework of girls' gang involvement. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, *40*(3), 337–357. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0735648X.2017.1341970

Thornberry, T. P., Krohn, M. D., Lizotte, A. J., Smith, C. A., & Tobin, K. (2003). *Gangs and delinquency in developmental perspective.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Valdez, A. (2007). *Mexican American girls and gang violence: Beyond risk.* New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Effective Services for At-Risk Females and Gang Members

Augimeri, L. K., Pepler, D., Walsh, M., & Kivlenieks, M. (in press). Addressing children's disruptive behavior problems: A thirty-year journey with SNAP (Stop Now and Plan). In P. Sturmey (Ed.), *Handbook of violence and aggression: Assessment, prevention, and treatment of individuals* (Vol. 2). New York, NY: Wiley.

Boxer, P. (2011). Negative peer involvement in Multisystemic Therapy for the treatment of youth problem behavior: Exploring outcome and process variables in "real-world" practice. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 40,* 848–854.

Chesney-Lind, M. (2013). How can we prevent girls from joining gangs? In T. R. Simon, N. M. Ritter, & R. R. Mahendra (Eds.), *Changing course: Preventing gang membership* (pp. 121–133). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Curry, G. D. (1999). Responding to female gang involvement. In M. Chesney-Lind & J. Hagedorn (Eds.), *Female gangs in America: Essays on girls, gangs, and gender* (pp. 133–153). Chicago, IL: Lake View Press.

Petersen, R. D., & Howell, J. C. (2013). Program approaches for girls in gangs: Female specific or gender neutral? *Criminal Justice Review, 38,* 491–509.

Peterson, D. (2012). Girlfriends, gun-holders, and ghetto-rats? Moving beyond narrow views of girls in gangs. In S. Miller, L. D. Leve, & P. K. Kerig (Eds.), *Delinquent girls: Contexts, relationships, and adaptation* (pp. 71–84). New York, NY: Springer.

Peterson, D., & Morgan, K. A. (2014). Sex differences and the overlap in youths' risk factors for onset of violence and gang involvement. *Journal of Crime and Justice, 37,* 129–154.

Valdez, A., Cepeda, A., Parrish, D., Horowitz, R., & Kaplan, C. (2013). An adapted Brief Strategic Family Therapy for gang-affiliated Mexican American adolescents. *Research on Social Work Practice, 23,* 383–396.

Williams, K., Curry, G. D., & Cohen, M. (2002). Gang prevention programs for female adolescents: An evaluation. In W. L. Reed & S. H. Decker (Eds.), *Responding to gangs: Evaluation and research* (pp. 225–263). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Wolf, A. M., & Gutierrez, L. (2012). *It's about time: Prevention and intervention services for gang-affiliated girls.* Oakland, CA: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

NOTES

1. Key fighting female auxiliary gangs of the late 1800s were the Lady Locusts, the Lady Barkers, the Lady Flashers, the Lady Truck Drivers, and the Lady Liberties of the Fourth Ward (Sante, 1991, p. 220).

2. See the National Youth Gang Survey online analysis: http://www.nationalgangcenter.gov/Survey-Analysis/Demographics#anchorgender

3. The students were in 15 public school systems in nine survey cities in 2002–2004. The numbers of Black and multiracial groups were too small to be valid.

4. To be eligible, the young women needed to be Mexican American, be between 14 and 18 years of age, and know of a male in one of the 27 male gangs in Valdez's previous study on gang violence in San Antonio (see Petersen & Valdez, 2005).

5. Meaning cognitively deficient, and displays impulsive and externalizing behaviors (Vaughn, DeLisi, Beaver, & Wright, 2009).

6. Mental illnesses, which predominantly affect mood and also have an effect on thoughts, behaviors, and emotions, including mania (Hayes, McReynolds, & Wasserman, 2005).

7. Based on National Longitudinal Survey of Youth data, risk and protective factors were measured on a sub-sample of youths ages 12 and 13 years in 1997, and assaultive behaviors (how many times they assaulted or attacked someone) were measured in 2001 and 2002.

8. Each year from 1997 to 2001, respondents were asked (yes or no) about gang membership in the last year. Gang presence or exposure was measured by affirmative responses to questions about (a) how many years youths had lived in a neighborhood with gangs and (b) how many years they had friends or siblings who had been in gangs between 1997 and 2001. These two items were combined to form an index of gang presence in the youth's environment (S. Park et al., 2010, p. 319).

9. A form of psychotherapy that emphasizes the importance of thinking about how persons feel and behaviors that follow.

10. It should be noted that this program is no longer in operation.

11. National Registry of Evidence-Based Programs and Practices, accessible at http://www.nrepp.samhsa.gov/AllPrograms.aspx