

Bouchard4REVIEW

Sun, 11/21 3:45PM 1:12:10

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

gang, people, network, social, organized crime, gang members, person, interactions, data, group, criminal, essay, question, part, crime, member, analysis, phenomenon, italian mafia, conflict

SPEAKERS

Jenn Tostlebe, Martin Bouchard, Jose Sanchez



Jenn Tostlebe 00:14

Hi everyone. Welcome back to The Criminology Academy where we are criminally academic. My name is Jen Tostlebe.



Jenn Tostlebe 00:22

And my name is Jose Sanchez.



Jenn Tostlebe 00:24

And today we have Professor Martin Bouchard on the podcast to talk with us about the social networks of gangs and organized crime groups.



Jenn Tostlebe 00:34

Martin Bouchard is a professor of criminology at Simon Fraser University, where he leads the Crime and Illicit Networks Laboratory. His research focuses on the ways in which social networks relate to gangs, how networks help understand the dynamics of gang violence, who gets into gangs, but also how they may help with gang exit. Dr. Bouchard works with a variety of government agencies and stakeholders interested in using network methods to reduce gang violence. His mentorship has been recognized with the Simon Fraser University's Graduate Studies Award for Excellence in Graduate Supervision. He is also the 2018-2019, recipient of the Western Society of Criminology Fellows Award for individuals associated with the western region who have made important contributions to the field of criminology. Thank you so much for joining us today, Martin. Appreciate it.



Martin Bouchard 01:25

Well, thank you for having me. I'm a big fan of the podcast. So very, very excited, maybe too excited.



Jenn Tostlebe 01:34

Alright, so we're gonna start off by talking about the social nature of gangs, and then move into a brief overview of social network analysis will, which will be useful moving forward in the podcast, then we're going to bridge these two concepts and talk about the social networks of gangs. And lastly, we're going to close by talking about a paper authored by Martin on social network analysis and its relationship with collaboration and boundaries in organized crime. So Jose, why don't you get us started?



Jenn Tostlebe 02:06

Okay, so, our first question, so, when we talk about being social, this word, "social" often conjures up thoughts of, you know, pro-social activities, like after school sports, spending time with non-delinquent peer groups, so like after school clubs, and I think it's safe to say that gangs and gang members aren't necessarily the first things that come to mind when someone says the word social, but that doesn't necessarily mean that they're antisocial. So, could you tell us a little bit more about what the social nature of gangs are?



Martin Bouchard 02:41

Yeah, you're I think you're absolutely right. You know, that's not the first thing that comes to mind. Because we have this bias of pro, you know, thinking of social as pro-social, in the sense of the productive sort of legal activities, and interactions. But yeah, no, I believe that gang members are super social, hyper social, even, like a lot of what, maybe more social than me. I mean, I've never been part of a gang or a large group myself, whether pro social or not, I've been part of hockey teams of sports teams a lot. But as far as hanging out with my friends, you know, on a Friday night, all of this a lot of one on one, like I had no best friends that I was seeing and getting that quality time. But the hanging out part had very gregarious behavior, that I consider gregarious behavior is, you know, it's something that I find gang members are especially inclined to do and pretty good at. So, that's the first thing. The other thing is when we look at criminal behavior, or criminal activity, especially when we think of gang members or criminal enterprises, anything that you need that collaboration from people, this is entirely based on that trust in the other, like, there's no recourse if things go wrong. This is entirely based on the trust that you have that you know that this other person, your co-offender, or your accomplice will do their part of the job and not maybe rat what happened to the police or become a confidential informant. And there's a lot of trust going on. And for me, this is inherently social, deep down. I was even working on drug trafficking, looking at a study and research findings, looking at modus operandi on how people, you know, which routes do people use for drug trafficking and what kind of length you know, what kind of techniques do they use to traffic drugs and deal drugs and a lot of it, you know, basically could come down to well, I knew a guy. I knew a guy at this border. I knew a guy who was driving, you know, a truck, a van, across the country, and I could, you know, potentially have a little space in that van. This is how my route started because you knew someone specifically, that that could facilitate that, that you know, scheme for you. So, wherever I look, I see social behavior when I see a conflict When I see violence, I see a violent conflict that probably emerge from, you know, a social conflict like someone that you know, someone that you in your social environment that, you know, you develop that conflict, because you know that person you care about that conflict, because you know that person, whether it's an enemy of, you know, fellow gang members, someone from your gang that is seen as a traitor or someone that you want to send a message to, it's an entirely social event. So, I see it everywhere from my, from my part.



Jenn Tostlebe 05:30

Alright, so you gave a TEDx talk? Was it last year? I think it was last year.



Martin Bouchard 05:35

It was probably exactly a year ago. Yes.



Jenn Tostlebe 05:39

And it's really good. So, anyone who's interested in more on this topic, go check that out. But it's called the unexpectedly social world of gangs. And during this talk, you, you know, really mentioned this violent behavior that gangs can be a part of, and I think a lot of people typically when they hear the word gang, that's kind of where their mind goes. And so rather than saying that this behavior was like a bad people problem, you said it was actually a social network problem. And so, can you describe what you mean by this?



Martin Bouchard 06:11

Wow, that's a good question. I'm not sure I have the time. No. And to be fair, I may have borrowed this from someone like someone like Andrew, Papachristos, who's been sort of at the forefront of this type of research on social networks and gang violence. You know, I know, it's something that you probably said one day, and it just, you know, that I needed to repeat at a TEDx talk to, to mark the event or the moment, but yeah, no, it's, you know, because I feel that gang members or everything that they do is so centered on these social interactions, and that trust that, you know, I feel that they're a very social and I think we can exploit it, you know, that sociability, for good, I mean, for for gang exit, for example, like if that connection to their fellow gang members is so important to them, and as it is, can we and develop other potential pro-social connections that are equally as important to them, in order to think about gang exit, because gang exit won't happen, you know, just like this in a vacuum, because of a decision that was made, like their entire world is embedded in a social world that's important to them, there are traces of this from potentially their childhood. It's not that easy to get out of this. But network studies have shown that there are pro-social connections in about anyone's network, their entire social life, is not entirely based on what we would call negative, you know, social connections, there is hope. And for many of them, they, you know, if they want to come out, they just don't know how. And if you can imagine yourself wanting to get out of anything, you probably need support, one way or another, you need social support is sort of the best word like any adverse events that happened to us when we're sick. When when COVID starts, you know, the isolation that some people went through, it's very obvious that, you know, things are so much easier, and so much better when we can have that social support. But that social support also happens within the gang. Like gang members are going through stressful events themselves, they may have been close to a shooting they may have, they may have a friend that had been shot at, there's a lot of trauma in that world, but they can rely on each other's they can rely on their brothers who've been through this themselves with them sometimes. So, it creates this social bond, that can be extremely powerful. So, that's sort of my sort of premise to this question of bad people problem. And then I look into the research on this. We have Shannon Reid, who, who's been spending a little bit of time with gang members, incarcerated juvenile gang members, asking them about their friends, you know, are your friends supporting you? Are your friends there for you when you need them? You know, all kinds of questions around social support. And she compared gang members to non-gang members, and there was

no difference whatsoever. So, the number of friends that gang members had was the same as the other isn't sometimes they have a little bit more, which also, you know, reminds us that they're very social creatures, and they also have options around them. If they make these, you know, if they want to make these connections for friendship purposes as well. But most importantly, they tended to respond to that question of social support in exactly the same ways as non-gang members. So, in my mind, this question of, you know, bad people, is that association that we have with the behavior, the outcomes of gang violence, but the outcome and the violence itself is socially situated as well. You know, it comes from a conflict, the conflict does not necessarily belong to the individuals, but they're caught in it because of the sort of affiliation to a group that has been threatened by another group. You know, a lot of the times the conflicts in which they're involved does not even start from anything that you know, remotely belongs to them personally. It could be a diss. It could be a lack of, you know, a sign of disrespect from that another fellow brother, fellow, gang member experience himself or herself, and then they go and try to help them out. That's also social support, but of a different kind. And we forget that it's still support, it's still a social act. So, you know, for my part, I completely detach to sort of bad people, this sort of personality, and I subscribe to at least the premise that it's a social event. It's a social act that can be perpetrated by people who are not bad themselves, but find themselves in these situations for other, you know, social reasons.



Jenn Tostlebe 10:34

A much more positive way to think about humans and human nature to



Martin Bouchard 10:39

Maybe too optimistic. I don't forget, I don't forget the violence at all. I don't condone it in one way or another. But, I just want to redirect maybe the attention on the socially situated part of that violence as well.



Jenn Tostlebe 10:53

Yeah, also provides more room for like rehabilitation and prevention and all that to



Martin Bouchard 10:58

Exactly, yes, as a Canadian, you know, in that part, too.



Jenn Tostlebe 11:07

So, we've been talking about talking quite a bit for the last few minutes, we have used keywords such as social network, social network analysis. And you know, you mentioned Andy Papachristos, who has quite a bit of work with network analysis. But so have you. Can you briefly describe to us what exactly social network analysis is? And so what are the assumptions that are made using this method?



Martin Bouchard 11:35

Yeah, that's true. And sometimes we forget to define things. And we just, you know, we jump straight to it.

And I think jumping straight to it and still understanding what we're talking about also means like, there's a common sensical aspect of what social networks are, we're all, we all belong to social networks, we don't need to define it, especially nowadays, and especially, you know, post social media and post COVID, where social networks were so important to the way that COVID was, is transmitted. And everybody sort of understands like, Oh, my God, like my interactions, my bubble, like the people around me, this is so important, this is where I'll catch this thing, you know, it's going to be in the air is going to be somewhere that I, you know, my routine activities, and my social activities are happening. And so we have that common sense of what social networks are. And so if you want to define it, and get all academic, or academically criminal, as you both are, we can define a network as you know, nodes and edges, so people and their relations. And when we say people, you know, the definition, what's the entity, because you can also put groups, you know, in interactions together, you can have a country, also, you know, a network of countries, for example, if you're interested in drug trafficking and, and drug routes, you can put the countries together to the extent that people are using these countries in their drug route. So, people and their social relations, their interactions, so the basis of the data itself, is to have people and our relations and to put them together and force them together in a way that we usually don't. We usually try, like, with survey data, we try to separate people, they're independent, we've been recruiting them and you know, we hope that there was no influence from anyone in the house. And we hope that they don't know anyone else from the neighborhood that could have tainted their answers, because it should be all independent, like every good regression would be, of course, in network analysis, when we transfer that to analyze people and their relations, it's the other way around, we just flip everything on its head and say, you know, what people are connected. Let's exploit that interdependence between people. And this is the very first assumption, Jose, for network analysis is that people are generally influenced by their connections around them, their perceptions, their beliefs, the way that they behave the way that they think, is influenced by what they've experienced in their social environment. And sometimes we think of this, you know, and I use this analogy, when I teach about, you know, your family environment as the first social environment that you've experienced. And people think that, you know, because you've been exposed to something, you're, you know, you're going to generally do that same thing, because you've been influenced by it. But this is not what it means. It means, you know, your behavior is influenced by exposure to what people think or do, but it doesn't mean that you'll follow that it means that you know, influences your thinking, if you will. The analogy that I use all the time is my parents, my parents, no, I hope they don't listen. They're both as French speaking, they may not even get to the podcast, even if I sent it to them. But my parents were both cigarette smokers. When I was young, it was just a nightmare to drive in the car and to have them smoking. I think they stopped smoking 20 years ago, you know, to their credit, I just, I don't want to throw them under the bus day, but for a long time, for a long time they were smoking and that was my sort of social exposure to cigarette smoke. And I just vowed when I was young, I said, there's no way I'm going to touch any of that, you know, in my life, and I haven't. really. So, I was influenced by, you know, my family connections and this this exposure, but I was not necessarily following the same behavior. I made a decision for myself, to not do this, it's the same for political views, it doesn't mean that your family, you know, has a certain conservative or liberal position that you'll necessarily, sometimes you'll, you know, it will confront you know, your own values and your own independence as a person and say, you know, what, this is not what I believe in, especially as you get older. But we're influenced by this, it forms, it helps form our views on things. And so that's the very first assumption of network analysis. And of course, we can think of exceptions, you know, we can think of behavior that doesn't seem to be influenced by any of this when you talk about mental health and crime, or, you know, some of these these types of crimes that doesn't seem to have that social connection to them. There's plenty of examples, right? So we, we don't necessarily include everything. And another assumption is that there's something transmitted between people. So, when we say they're connected, they're connected for what? How do we define this connection. And the definition of the connection defines the network. So, if we have a friendship network, like a lot of Add Health data, is based on friendships in school. So, this is a friendship network. This is not a criminal network. And then you have people committing crimes with some of the people in this network. And we could define this as a co-offending network if we limit to the people

committing crimes together in the network. But the Add Health question, initially was a friendship question. So, it becomes a friendship network. So, the thing that is transmitted from one person to another is that friendship, sort of tie, that emotional connection, that intimacy between someone and of course, the differential association theorists out there will recognize some of the key words, you know, Sutherland didn't mean to say that, you know, we know more people who commit crimes, and then people who don't commit crimes, and we'll choose most likely, the criminal route, what he wrote was that the intensity, the frequency, the intimacy, of these relationships matter. And sometimes you may know, one person, one role model that is way more influential to you than the 1000s of pro-social people in your life, and you decide to follow that person. So, it just reminds us that there's something that's transmitted, that is a value to these people. So, we can build friendship networks, co-offending networks, we can also build drug trafficking networks. So, there's drugs exchanged from one hand to another, and we can build a network around that it's a conduit, it's also dynamic, it can change, and it changes all the time, I can be friends with someone, and 95% of my interactions with that person, are social. But sometimes we commit crimes together, we become a co-offender on Friday night, you know, when we make that deal, other than that, we're in a social relationship. So, with network data, you can classify all of those interactions that social, you can switch to a criminal interaction and go back to the social, you can be friends one day and in conflict, the next thing, and that's the dynamic part of the network. And perhaps the last assumption, or the last thing about networks is that, you know, the sum of all of these interactions are greater than each of the parts individually, we learn something from looking at the forest, at the structure of it all, like where are people located, what's around them, in a way that these people themselves may not even see. They just see their relationships around them, they see who they know, but they may not see the larger social structure in which they're embedded. And with network analysis, you know, we're also looking for these more meso and even macro social structure moments to analyze.

J

Jose Sanchez 18:59

So, you gave us a few examples of how we can serve use this approach to study crime. Can you tell us a little bit more about why this is so useful when we're studying crime?

M

Martin Bouchard 19:12

Yeah, I think you know, deep down, I believe that crime is so social, right? Of course, it may be I may be influenced by the type of crimes that I study, you know, you study the phenomenon of gang membership. You're like, okay, I need, I need a good way to measure this to track what's going on. So, that's sort of what what the first utility is like, crime is so social, I would want to use potentially the best method to classify and order things. And of course, some people think social networks would be a quantitative approach, but it's neither quant or qual. It's, it's hybrid. It's both. It's just different. And I think it was, I think, Peter Carrington and from work by Harrison White, one of the fathers of network analysis, that was saying that it's a hybrid. It's a hybrid method. It's not neither quant nor qual. but once you look at these type of phenomenon, I want to know, you know, who's really connected, I don't want to rely on too many assumptions, labels, I really want to see what's going on, you know, for real. And for me, what's going on for real is, what kind of interactions are really happening, you can tell me that someone is a member of a gang, of a group. But, I also potentially want to see it for myself, like, for real, what is the evidence that you have, that this person is a member, does it look like that person is a member, and if it looks like that person is a member, then the network interactions will show it as well. Otherwise, you'll be just a member in name, and it won't mean much, you know, in terms of what's really happening. And you see that all the time with old, organized criminals, old figures, you know, of the Italian Mafia, and all of that they're not involved in the day to day, if you look at their interactions, it's all legitimate, you know, they own this store, here and at the car dealership there, and you know, it's all in the name. So, yes, maybe they were

member, maybe they are a member of this criminal organization, but doesn't really matter in the day to day. And same thing, you know, the utility of network data, it's also to not associate someone who connects once or twice, with someone belonging to a criminal group or a gang, as belonging to the gangs, like, wait a minute, you know, this is a one off thing, you know, it was a social connection, I just saw him at a restaurant. I gave him a hug, because it was, you know, pre-COVID, or I had a mask on, it's just a guy in my life, or a person in my life, it's not someone that, I am not a gang member, I'm not part of this group here. So, with network data, you can have, I guess, this quantitative criterion of do you need a certain type of pattern of connection in order to look like a group. And then you may qualify, you know, quantitatively or with empirical data as belonging to that group. So, it sort of moves away from these labels and try to look at what's really going on. I don't think it's better, technically, because, you know, I will also use that technique, look at the patterns of interactions and wrongly conclude that someone is a member of a group because they interact with them for so much. Right? I also want to know from the inside, what does that person think? Are they a member? What are the other members think about that person? And so I don't want to just rely on the data either, right? I want I want the sort of melting pot of all the different methods and angles of attack. But this one, I think, one piece of it that we that was missing for a long time. So, I see a utility, just for understanding how these, you know, these gangs form and how how the more of how they change and why. So yeah.



Jenn Tostlebe 22:42

Yeah, it does sound really useful for understanding these more dynamic aspects of groups. And so, I've taken a lot of quantitative classes, I definitely would have been one of those people who labeled network analysis as quantitative. But I've never taken a network analysis.



Martin Bouchard 23:00

It doesn't look that part, to be fair. But I just want to remind people and I have a lot of qualitative, you know, students who identify to a qualitative stream, take my course and sort of realize how much how common sensical and more manageable it is, than they thought, you know, almost from a social mechanism perspective that the qualitative approach is trying to capture sometimes the mechanisms behind and I think that data allow us to see that backbone, and for me, it's a very qual sort of take on on things sometimes. But yeah, yeah.



Jenn Tostlebe 23:33

I'm just very curious about your like, personal thoughts as to why network methodological approaches aren't more common in criminology, given how useful they kind of sound for these groups.



Martin Bouchard 23:48

I don't agree with that assessment. It's all over the place. I'm just kidding. I'm just kidding.



Jenn Tostlebe 23:53

Just like, I've never taken a class. Jose I don't think you have either, have you?



Jenn Tostlebe 23:57

No, I haven't. And I mean, I'm kidding. And then the people that I know that use it, I know like, you know, we mentioned Andy Papachristos, Martin uses it. That's who I know, a couple other people have used it. I think Braga has used it a few times.



Martin Bouchard 24:16

David Kennedy, you know, right. A lot of the behind the scene focused deterrence work starts with a network analysis. And sometimes it's not even it's not necessarily published. But but you know, that's starting Well, no, you're right. You're right, Jennifer. It's a small, small world, no pun intended. But we have a conference. We have a workshop every year, the illicit networks workshop, we have about 24 presenters per workshop. We're trying to, you know, create recruits and the, you know, to create like a cult that people would want to follow. And I guess the more we create this cult, the more we paint ourselves in a corner and we don't we don't expand. No, I think, I think one sign that network analysis expanded is its presence in mainstream crim journals. So, you may not have have a faculty member teaching it at your school. But if you look at a few issues of Criminology, Journal of Quantitative Criminology, Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, you'll see a few pieces like, you know, if you follow the trends, you'll see more and more, you know, as time passes and so that's a sign of, you know, the epidemics, you know, that is about to happen, maybe no, no, but yeah, no, it's it is limited. We have like this little group with David Bright in Australia, Aili Malm, Gisela Bichler, California State San Bernardino, Francesco Calderoni, in Milan, also, a bunch of people that are part of that conference, including, you know, Andrew, and this was funded by Carlo Morselli, and you know, back in the day, as well, was a big, big, of course, you know, prominent figure in that world, that we're all trying to sort of make proud, somehow. But, I think part of the difficulty with networks is the data themselves, like how, how to collect and, you know, when it's a cult, you know, there's very little exposure for people to integrate these methods, you know, in their own work. And so people tend to do and reproduce what they learn, and there's nothing wrong with that. But then it's a slow, slow process to integrate network methods, but you have Add Health, for example, integrating in a network questionnaire, standard network questionnaire, network questions. We've done it with Aili Malm and the other people from the Worldwide We Project where we added a questionnaire online, where people were asked, you know, hey, who are your partners, we don't want any names, you know, the names are for yourself, but we just want to make sure you know, that, you know, you use a nickname or somehow like a way to represent that person for you. And do these people that you collaborate with do they know each other, this person A know person B, and trying to get a sense of the embeddedness of that individual in that environment and then extracting individual level measures, like criminal embeddedness like something that David Pyrooz used a lot in his work, you know, how embedded is this person in this sort of social structure of gangs or a certain type of crime? So, it's starting to be integrated like this we have people working in what kind of fight like a spatial analyses like George Tita, you know, Jason Gravel who studied under under him as well. And under me before, also, at now at Temple, like using these methods as well, looking at the gang conflicts in California looking, you know, at the mix of spatial and social, you know, convergence of people in times and places, John Hipp, you know, with ego hoods concept. So, a lot of these people are integrating, and we don't realize sometimes that the kind of work that they're doing is informed by network analysis. So, I think there's a difficulty in collecting the data, and the sort of ethics of it all too, you know, when you ask people about themselves, it's one thing, you know, in terms of consent, but when you ask people to talk about other people, it requires a different type of, you know, ethical review, and it needs to be justified. And it needs to be focused on the perceptions of these people. To the extent that it's a perception of my social environment, you know, the survey still about me, you know,

somehow, but there's all of these hurdles that you need to cross from even a research perspective. So, research ethics perspective, and in order to be to have valid, and you know, ethically responsible, I guess, collected datasets, it's not easy.



Jenn Tostlebe 28:28

Yeah, that was something that David Pyrooz and I, we were, along with some other people putting a survey together for, like a project in the Oregon prison system. And we really wanted to get at like networks. But we were thinking, if we're talking to gang members, and asking them who their best friends are, and here like they're not going to give us the names, probably let alone the ethical considerations to



Martin Bouchard 28:53

Yeah. Yeah.



Jenn Tostlebe 28:55

You mentioned that you ask for, like nicknames. Instead of real names, how do you link people together, then?



Martin Bouchard 29:02

Yeah, so, the nicknames you know, type of design would lead to what we call an egocentric analysis. So, it's an analysis of that person's network only, you never sort of put it together. In the end, you never connect it to other people. And that's a very low hanging fruit for people to integrate to a questionnaire. So, we won't necessarily, you know, put people together and try to match nicknames with other nicknames used elsewhere. But, will at least situate a person within their own social environment, you can be a gang member who works only with fellow gang members. So, when you ask that person about their collaborators, you're telling you 10 other members of the same gang, and no one else, and all of a sudden you ask a member of the same gang or another gang, and maybe that person's a leader, and you as a person and when you ask about the close the last 10 transactions they've done, maybe there's two or three within their own gang, but they also can connected to people outside independent traffickers or other gang members. Because you know, transactions happen with other gangs as well, like you cannot stay within your own gang, and get both the source of the drugs, the customers, and everything that needs to happen. So you know, you have to go and connect outside too. So, you get a sense of how much a person gets out of their own network, how much a person is embedded within their own network, they don't know, they're not exposed to anything else. So, then we talk, you know, about constraints, you know, my network, you know, is sending me a certain picture of life, a certain type of criminal opportunities, and I'm not exposed to anything else, that's all I know, is gang violence, this group, this neighborhood, other people way more cosmopolitan in their approach, in their network, and they're exposed to all kinds of things and opportunities. And then the important part of this is that it becomes a strong predictor of the length of a criminal career. If you're exposed to all kinds of criminal opportunities, and you're making money. You know, one of my favorite podcasts of yours is with Holly Nguyen, talking about you know, earnings, you know, if generating money is about the network itself, you know, what are you exposed to? How can you generate opportunities over and over. And if you're exposed to the same people all the time, you know, you know what they know. And if an opportunity or a drug route dries, dries up, then you're stuck. Like, you have to create something. But, if you know someone, if you have a varied network, so then

then you have access to perhaps more opportunities. So, the egocentric focused on the person is much, much easier to do. And of course, with Derek Kreager and colleagues, we've done the Pens project. So we looked into prisons, we had what is called a roster method to build a network. So 200 people in this unit, here are the 200 names. And we meet with as many of the people who are incarcerated in that unit as possible and ask them who has your back in this unit? If you need something, not necessarily anything criminal or illegal, we don't want you to snitch or rat, anybody, but just talking like, who do you hang out with, you know, who has your back here? And that's, you know, the version of friendship that we have in prison sometimes. So, the roster and the type of question that we had, but we asked, there was nothing about illegal behavior, but it was about being in prison. And having to form your own social grouping allowed us to ask about everybody in the unit, and then connecting everybody together. And the fascinating thing is that some of these relationships are reciprocated, like when, you know, Person A says that, you know, person B has my back. And we asked Person B never mentioned Person A, so oh, go okay, you know, so maybe it goes one way, it doesn't go the other way. And then you start to get a sense of the forces, you know, in this sort of informal hierarchy and prisons, like what's going on here, who's, who tends to be in power? Who has influenced here, who is the person named by the most people, like some people says, like, 70 times the same person is in power in this unit, it's like, okay, you know, so that starts to be the, it starts to become the sort of social structure that we can make sense of. So, that's one context in which we can have all of the names and try to match the same way that Add Health had the rosters of the school, in order to match names to people.



Jenn Tostlebe 33:30

That's cool.



Jenn Tostlebe 33:31

This is either, so we're talking everything at the individual level, what are some of the challenges that you might see, like saying using groups instead of individuals?



Martin Bouchard 33:42

Yeah, that's a great question. Like one of the, I guess, pioneering study of studying groups, because you can study connections between from group to group, and Andrew Papahristos has a great paper from 2009 in AJS, connecting a gang to the extent that this gang had a shooting, one of the members of this gang was involved in a shooting, you know, with another gang. So, the shootings may involve individuals, but you can always aggregate it to the group level, to the extent that the conflict can be represented as you know, belonging to the group, like I acted in the name of my, of my gang, this was a beef that was going on between our two gangs, it doesn't really matter who pulled the trigger, some, you know, in some way. So, that's one way we can do network analysis and in that Papachristos analysis, it was very neat to see, see the networks of 1994 in one year, looking four years later, and that was one of the points of the paper is that these shootings, this violence is socially embedded and culturally embedded. These conflicts do not change, you know, fast and easily. It's not random. As Andrew would say, you know, it's a pattern, it's socially pattern. It is, you know, there's that cultural imprint that when a conflict between these two gangs tend to have occurred over the course of many years, it will continue over the course of many years, because when you join that gang, you'll learn to dislike the members of this other gang. And so this conflict is sort of taught into you, as you integrate the gang itself. So, you can do these group to group analyses as well, you can aggregate individual behavior to the extent that there's a collective component to it, and then form networks in a different way.

J Jose Sanchez 35:29

Yeah, I think one of the coolest things that I've seen, I don't know if you've heard of Jeffrey Brantingham, at UCLA, so I had the pleasure of working with Jeff a little bit, he was brought on to the Gang Reduction and Youth Development Program in Los Angeles, and as part of their research team. And one of the things that Jeff's are brought to the table, because you know, he's kind of a genius, when it comes to quantitative methods, it's actually kind of surprising how much he blew everybody's mind when he introduced this idea of using network analysis, or some other stuff that we wanted to see in the city. Because, so, one of the questions that somebody had, one of the administrators of the program was, should we be devoting equal effort across everybody? Right? So basically, we're treating all gangs as equal, but then, using the data that we had, and LAPD data, what Jeff ended up finding was that they're not that some gangs are a lot smarter than others, of course, but some gangs get victimized more than others, sometimes, like the size of the gang didn't really matter as to how much that gang got victimized. And so we started seeing, so this variation in how the gangs interact with each other throughout the city of Los Angeles. And I can maybe we should spend a little bit more resources, trying to address these hyper aggressive gangs, because they're the ones that are seemingly really driving the violence at this point in time. So yeah, I think there's looking at groups can also be pretty helpful.

M Martin Bouchard 37:08

I think so too, it's a good example. And with network analysis, what we would try to do, you know, in theory is to merge this violent behavior, and with the network positioning that these gangs have. So, to the extent that you're isolated, not connected to anyone, but you're violent, as a group, maybe you're less of a worry than if you're, you know, central to the network, and you're right in the middle of everything. So, that, say, an intervention that would touch your gang, the message, you know, if you're interested in a deterrence message with diffuse to more people, and perhaps more impact on the violence in the community. I think that's a good example.



Jenn Tostlebe 37:52

And when we're sort of on this topic, and you sort of touched on this a little bit on your TED Talk, too, we're just gonna keep plugging that TED talk.

M Martin Bouchard 38:02

My tour, my tour a year later, yeah.



Jenn Tostlebe 38:08

How can we use this of what we know about this social nature of gangs to address the gang problem?

M Martin Bouchard 38:16

That's a great question. I think, I think once we understand the patterns, and once we define it as a

network, like, you know, as Andy Papachristos would say, or do like if you follow the shootings from one year to the next in any city, and we've replicated this work in, in British Columbia, where I live, and it's the same thing, even on the small scale, the smaller scale of conflicts that we have, we have a few shootings a year we don't have, like maybe the one year that we use was 23, shootings, gang shootings. So, we don't have hundreds like Chicago or, you know, the Boston area that Andy analyzed. But once you start to follow these shootings, you realize that there's a pattern. And there's a predictive element that, you know, that comes into play. Like if there's a pattern and if a conflict follows from one victim to the next, if there's a retaliation pattern, and that the victims are selected almost, you know, if you look at the network, you can almost predict like who are the likely victims on the other side of that conflict that are likely to be targeted, given, you know, the prior connections that these people have. So, you start to see patterns. So, you can start to think in terms of prevention. And the way that we've defined the prevention part using networks in here in British Columbia is in a Duty to Warn type of program. So, Duty to Warn says, well, based on our data, some of these people are the most central in a gang victim network. So, you can build a network around victims of gang violence, all of their interactions. And all of a sudden, you have a social structure of victims and their interactions. And you have people that are more central in this network. So, what does it mean to be central? In a gang victim network? It means that you're connected to more people who have been shot than others. You know, maybe you're connected to one or two gang victims, or maybe you're connected to 10. Maybe you don't even realize that because it's an indirect connection. So the centrality, the network positioning of people in a gang victim network can help us make predictions. And, I use that very loosely, like I don't want to make predictions in the hard sort of science way of making predictions, but just getting an idea of who's at risk, and have a better idea of who's at risk of getting shot. And so applying these methods in this context can be really beneficial. So, Duty to Warn is, well, we get people that are extremely central in a gang violence that work, in a gang victim network, at least we can knock on their door, and let them know, you know, based on our information, and police officers do this all the time. Gang squads do this all the time. But the thing with network analysis is you can help support that work that often comes from criminal intelligence. We also have a little bit of data that tell us, you know, that you may be at risk, you seem to be right in the middle, right in the line of fire, if you will. And so that's one way in which this work can be used for gang violence specifically, and try to prevent the violence from happening if we understand the pattern of violence going from one person in the network, to potentially a bunch of others, that seem to be the most likely future victims.



Jenn Tostlebe 41:24

Alright, so shall we move into the paper then, I think that kind of gives us a good foundation to work off of. So, the paper we're talking about is authored by our guest, Martin. It's called collaboration in boundaries and organized crime and network perspective. It was published in Crime and Justice in 2020. And this paper really provides kind of a fantastic overview regarding social network analysis and its relationship with organized crime. In the heart of this essay, Martin discusses four areas of inquiry that he believes could leverage social network analysis to shed light on organized crime. So first, he discusses the difficulties with determining membership in criminal organizations. Second, the boundaries of group membership, including who is a member and who is not as discussed. Third, Martin discusses the issue of using ethnic homogeneity as a descriptor for crime organizations. And finally, recruitment into organized crime is discussed focusing on the boundaries of current members and potential members, is that a decent enough kind of summary?



Martin Bouchard 42:33

Much better than what I would have done. So yes. Thank you.



Jenn Tostlebe 42:39

So kind of our first question, one, if you've listened to our episode, you've heard this question multiple times. When we asked everyone, what was the goal in writing this paper or the motivation behind the paper?

M

Martin Bouchard 42:51

Well, it was a trip to Bologna, Italy, offered by the Crime and Justice editor. It was a dream of mine. Ever since I was doing my PhD to publish in this journal, I didn't know how, like, can we submit? Are we invited and so yeah, I received an invitation to write an essay on networks and organized crime. And I was so surprised to see that the invitation included a workshop around the people in the issue, to meet in Bologna, Italy, pre-COVID, to discuss the essays and try to get better. So, the peer review process is not just the two or three reviewers when you actually write the paper, but also the 12 to 20 people in the room that read the essay and ask questions and try to refine your your thinking. So, that was amazing. And just saying it, like I'm just filled with nostalgia of travel, and everything that we haven't done in the past two years, like oh, my god, it seemed to be so much easier to do these sorts of things. But in any case, the motivation behind the paper was to, I guess, debunk a lot of myths around organized crime. And what I wanted to do is I wanted to just use the network methods and the literature on network methods to try to debunk these, you know, these ideas that we have about organized crime that may not be accurate, and show how network data can potentially help us move away from these misconceptions. But I was also cautious of not using too much speculation, because Crime and Justice essays are meant to be sort of a, you know, state of the art review of the things that we know about a field. So, when choosing these four sort of boundaries, I also wanted to make sure that there was enough material behind a lot of them. In order for me to summarize that literature and be confident, you know, about the assertions, I guess. The statements on the literature that I would make. So, that was one of my sort of aims and objective was to properly represent where we're at. But I also wanted to have a cool sort of angle of attack. So, I use the the boundary issue, because I find that the network data is really that's where, that's where it's a little bit different, that's sort of its competitive edge over others is that we're not limited to a little box that is fixed in time, a box of membership, a box of, well, this is a criminal interaction when 95% of the interactions between these two people are social in nature. It's not because we're friends with someone that we're never in conflict with them. And so that fluidity of network data, helps answer and just provide this complimentary view on what I find are the fixed boundaries of a lot of that research. So that was my goal, that was the aims try to have these misconceptions, and try to see and show how network data can help us sort of overcome and understand better.

J

Jose Sanchez 45:48

So like, you know, it's in the title or, organized crime? Can you tell us what exactly you mean by organized crime? And how, how does a gang fit under this term?

M

Martin Bouchard 46:01

I can't Jose, I can't, come on. You know, this is so, this is a term with such history, right? And with it, you know, you can it's easy to go wrong, if you go to even too rigid, and what for organized crime represent, you know, for you, if you go too broad, then everything can be organized crime, like as soon as you organize yourself somehow, it becomes organized crime. So, I don't want to get into any of that. I don't

think I wanted in the paper to get into any of that, either. But I do want to answer your question. And one of the terms that I prefer myself that I think is it's very related, but it's a bit more precise for me, and it's criminal enterprise. And for me, the criminal enterprise definition puts the emphasis on an ongoing activity, you know, that you make for profit. And these ongoing activities, and as opposed to spontaneous or impulsive criminality, have a little bit of organization because you need a source, you know, of supply, you need co-offenders, people to sell to, there's a little bit of it that, that, so for me, that ongoing component is really important, regardless of what you call organized crime, or gangs. And the other thing that I like is that continuity over time, and I'm always reminded, and I don't know, like one of my mentor was Peter Reuter. Still, still, Peter Reuter is still a mentor, I did a postdoc at the University of Maryland, with him. And I don't know if he even uses that definition. But in 1984, he published a definition of organized crime that was focused on the capacity of a group. And that applies to gangs too. The capacity of a group to survive the loss of its first leader, right. So if you are, you know, enough of a group, of an entity that can be recognized as a group, the initial sort of charismatic leader won't matter. If you lose that person to incarceration, you know, or death, it won't matter, you'll still exist as an entity. But if you if you fold, as soon as you're challenged, you know, at the top, then you may not qualify, although the phenomenon of organized crime, so it gives us a sense of what what do we mean by continuity? Well, maybe it's not a quantitative criterion of one year, six months, like it's ongoing. So, we're trying to build something for the longer haul, not spontaneous. But what if we, if we lost that initial person that, you know, brought us all together? Maybe that wouldn't be a big deal. And for me, that's a sign of you know, you've crossed, you know, a certain threshold. But I like criminal enterprise, a bit more, because it's specific to the business and organized crime has this, this political, almost also media, movie cultural, you know, elements that people will identify to. And I don't think it's necessarily wrong. Right? You know, and in many ways, you know, organized crime is what you think is organized crime. But from an academic perspective, if we want to be a little bit more precise, we can focus on one or two of these criteria, like ongoing activity for money generating purposes, you know, with more than one person or two, right, so so there's this element of a group that seems to be important. So, it's fairly broad. But at the same time, it allows us to think and talk about a lot of these phenomenon related to both gangs and organized crime without being sort of stomped every step of the way, like, are we, are we talking about the same thing or not? And then I think I subscribe to The David Pyrooz and Scott Decker continuum of gangs to organized crime like that as belonging to the same sort of family of ongoing sort of grouping activity around a purpose that involves the illegality, among other things. I think it would all sort of fit under that phenomenon. And in that essay, I tried to go away from gangs, street gangs, in order to go into of the more adults or you know, older school, but some people would call traditional organized crime examples with keeping in mind gangs are sort of part of that continuum nonetheless, you know, as far as their ongoing, and for money generating purposes, and also trying to, you know, see how network data does not necessarily force us into the criminal aspect of gangs. But we're also going to consider the social interactions that are, you know, sometimes are the most the majority of interactions within even the Italian Mafia. Some people would say this, like, this is family, this is my family. Come on, is it a mafia is that a criminal organization? Like, come on, those are my brothers and sisters and cousins. And there's always that element and that mix of social family and criminal and, and I think with network data, we can sort of make sense of the criminal element code for the respite can remove it, from the data at will in order to speak of the criminal organization aspect of a network. So long winded answer, but I think the question requires, you know, the long winded answer.



Jose Sanchez 50:59

Alright, so I'm gonna keep going on with the definition questions Martin. Hope you have a dictionary handy. But, so you, you build this essay around this core issue of boundary specification. What exactly does this mean? Like, what is boundary specification?

M

Martin Bouchard 51:17

Yeah, it's a great question, you know, a boundary will give us where a phenomenon start and end, you know, where a country, where a neighborhood started. And so at the boundary, when it comes to organized crime is we're trying to figure out who's a member of this organization, and it seems to be a useful sort of label for law enforcement agencies, and even to describe a phenomenon to be able to tell, what are we talking about? Are we talking about 100 people? 200, who's a member? What do they do? Are we looking at the right people? And so that's the sort of first boundary is who's a member who's not? And the other boundary that I see is, with the social and the criminal? Like, where does the criminal start? And where does the socialization and and is it one in the same? Or should we try to separate the two. And what I tried to argue in the essay is that, at least potentially, to the extent that you have good data, you can, you can separate the social from the criminal, a lot of the people around gangs and gang members will have only social ties to the gang. And we need to be able to tell them apart. And that's the goal with network data, at least potentially.



Jenn Tostlebe 52:31

That ties in with like, one of the first areas for this core part of the essay. And so we're going to go through the four things separately. The first area involves exactly what you were just talking about the difficulty of determining membership in criminal organizations. And this essay you talk about, like the blurred social and criminal boundaries in organized crime. So, can, you just talked about this, but can you talk about it just a little bit more, and provide an example? And then, describe how a network approach can add clarity to this problem, which you kind of already did. But.

M

Martin Bouchard 53:07

Yeah, yeah. And you're right. You know, I think we've touched on this, because that's one of the main sort of these utility of these data. But, you know, I think a lot of the Italian Mafia scholars, you know, over the 30 years, 40 years, I've always argued that it's so hard to separate the family, the politics of Italian mafia families with the crime, like it's all intertwined, like, it's not clear, you know, what's going on here, a lot of people have trouble understanding this, you know, and that, you know, because you are a convicted criminal, because you commit illegal activities, doesn't mean that all of your interactions will be criminal, or the other people around you should be associated with your organization if you have one. So, the, the simple argument that I'm trying to make is, let's try to differentiate this by focusing on a different unit of analysis, and not giving a label to someone, but giving a label to an interaction from that person to someone else. Because that's what we're doing. When we qualify an interaction as criminal social conflictual business, we're giving it a label, but we're more likely to be accurate. You know, based on that one moment in time, this is what these guys were doing together. And I always remind my students and everyone's like, even with family members, the interaction context that you're coding is not for a family interaction unless it's a funeral, maybe. But it's a social event between two brothers, two cousins, they're socializing. You can be, you can socialize with your brother. You can also co-offend with your brother. But we can make the distinction clear with network data. And when it comes to time to determine who's part of this criminal organization potentially, let's remove all of the social interactions, including the social interactions within, you know, the gang itself if we want and focus on the criminal, and then we'll discuss cover a lot of one off relationships, a lot of customers, a lot of people who do not qualify as member of the organizations, even if they call a friend, or to have one transaction, one deal with them. Because to qualify as a member of a group, you need to have that frequency, that consistency of interaction. So, then we can apply a quantitative criteria. And if we want, like this, in order for this to look like a group, the cohesion,

the density of the group needs to be at a certain level. And the people who do not fit within the set of people at a certain density can be excluded. They're not part of this organization from a network data perspective, which is not the only perspective, again, but it's complimentary to the intelligence, the information that we have, and even the self identification of gangs as gang members, that's important to like, ideally, we want it all, you know.



Jenn Tostlebe 55:56

Triangulation.



Martin Bouchard 55:57

Yes, yes, exactly.



Jenn Tostlebe 56:01

Okay. So the second area that you talk about in this essay, is this question of membership? who is a member? Who's an outsider? How can we tell the difference? And he talks about how we typically rely on official data to, sort of, make these assertions, but that there might be, there's issues with using official data. And this is something that we've talked about before on the podcast, specifically with gang members. But can you elaborate on why official data may be misleading for determining who a group member is?



Martin Bouchard 56:38

Yeah, no, it's a great question. I think, you know, to be fair, official data, sometimes, that's the only access that we have to any sort of idea of whether that person is remotely connected to the gang phenomenon, or to a group. I think a lot of police officers in the field have very good knowledge of what's going on. So, personally, I don't start from the premise that this is useless. It's quite the opposite. But I do want to caution everyone using them, and even myself, when I come across these data that have one of the issues of official gang labels, is the sort of permanence in time of it all. Where does it come from? Based on what information? And is it still the case? One year, two years, three years later? Is this person still a member of this gang? Like, where did that start? So I think it's useful maybe for law enforcement person, you know, purposes, if maybe it's useful. And maybe it comes from good information at the time of original coding. But from a research perspective, when it comes when it comes to time to use it, it's that indefinite aspect of the label, that can be problematic. So, that's one thing. So, with network data, potentially, you could have a set of interactions over the course of many years involving a set of people. And to the extent that they tend to interact always together with the same people, and that they fit a criterion, a threshold of cohesion, that, you know, look like a group, if you're going to be a group, you need to interact, at least consistently and closely with a certain set of people. And then we can apply these criteria. And we can play with, I guess, our labels with a little bit more of a dynamic aspect, like it can change, like this person was labeled as a member of this gang, but in 2021, that person is nowhere to be found around this gang or group. So, is it still fair to maintain that label for that person? So, a network approach would say, well, in 2021, I don't see that person as having network behavior that is conducive or amenable to this label, you know, and so I think that's a, you know, a complimentary piece of information. It's not the silver bullet, I think you need it all. But at least it gives us another criterion upon which to evaluate whether or labeling seems to be matching a reality in the field.



Jenn Tostlebe 59:02

And that would help determine when someone left a gang to which is important for attitudes, behaviors, everything else.



Martin Bouchard 59:10

Yeah, exactly. Exactly.



Jenn Tostlebe 59:13

All right. So it's pretty common to hear the terms like Mexican Mafia or Italian Mafia, like we've actually had Cecilia Meneghini on the podcast talking about the Italian Mafia before. And these classifications that are used in public discourse, as well as criminal intelligence databases. And this is really the topic of this third part you talk about in the essay. Yeah, which is ethnic boundaries and whether they exist in organized crime. Can you talk a little bit about this? And you do mention that they're useful for like a local context, but not necessarily outside of that?



Martin Bouchard 59:53

Yeah, no, it's a great, it's a great question. You know, I struggled with writing that part because I wanted to make clear, first and foremost, I don't think there's anything wrong with referring to a phenomenon as the Italian Mafia, I think it exists on a cultural level. And it probably is distinctive, you know, in many ways, like it works differently as a phenomenon, trying to sort of describe it, it's like, well, this is not the same as the kind of criminal groups that we have in British Columbia, you know, outside of that sort of Italian context, of course, so that's very useful. I also think that there's a tendency for gang members and people in general to associate with people who are like them, you know, we call this homophily, you know, all the time. And so we tend to connect and to be attracted to people that almost, you know, look like us. And so that's not made, my argument to sort of discredit this idea that's deeply rooted, if you look at people from a certain ethnicity, and who they work with, you know, when you look at the ethnicity of their Co-offenders, you probably won't find a majority, that belongs to the same thing. So yes, so that as well is not something you know, that I contest. But I think, once you're past the sort of Italian mafia or the very culturally specific phenomenon here like you're, you can be limited by calling your type of organized crime based on an ethnic sort of grouping. Very, very quickly, once you follow the data and the network data, you'll find that Italian Mafia collaborate with a bunch of groups from other ethnicities, because they have to do business internationally, to import and export that cocaine to other countries, they tend to work with all kinds of people that may not be Italian. And all of a sudden, you find yourself trying to describe this phenomenon like, well, is it? Is it still the Italian Mafia, if they're working with people from from elsewhere? It's like, no, it's a network, it's business. So, as soon as you focus on the transactions in the business, you what you see is more diversity than you expected, if you have followed, the labels have a sort of unique ethnicity, like for something to be called, you know, Mexican, Russian based, East European based mafia, it needs to be so distinctive, that is an actual helpful way to classify the phenomenon, and we can actually complete the classification using purely ethnicity. So, what happens, you know, and it doesn't work, you know, you just reached that dead end very quickly. So, I think it works, you know, for Italian Mafia, or something very culturally distinct, that also influences the way that they do illegal business. So, then you're into a type, maybe, you know, that sort of intertwined family roots, you know, recruitment needs to

be important, if you're not part of the family, maybe you marry, you know, within the family, and then you become part of our family as well. Or, like, you know, the Sicilian Cosa Nostra would be a little bit more stringent on these criteria than others, but so I don't, I recognize that that exists. But I find that once I'm past the two or three, I cannot classify everything else as also ethnic based, I feel there's a dead end. And I feel that if we're a little bit more open on the way that they do business, in general, maybe we can call it like a family base, we can call it something about, you know, the way that they tend to operate beyond the ethnicity so that we can recognize that most of these deals are happening across ethnicities in the first place. And just previewing your next question, maybe on, you know, the network data that allow us to do that, like, let's follow the transactions. Let's just follow who they do business with. And very soon, you find yourself going across the ethnic boundary. And so isn't that useful to classify it like that? Because we can forget and not even see that this is happening? Because we're so focused on getting the Italians or the Mexicans? And so what about, you know, what about the Caucasians here in BC that are doing business with them? Like, where are they in your investigation? I think it's a dangerous way to start, you know, analyzing a phenomenon. And it's easy to be wrong, and to be blind to a lot of the details that happened. And I think that a lot of the details on the transactions and interactions. That's what network data allow us to do and to see. And some of the studies that have been done looking at transactions across ethnicities here in BC with Aili Malm, for example, because Gisela Bichler were absolutely fascinating sort of diversity of ethnicity involved in the same transactions, like even the biker gangs who are not supposed to cross ethnic boundaries here are doing business, you know, all across the ethnic, you know, ethnicity range of people that are available for business. And so it's just a caution of the potential dead end once we're past the very sort of examples that we know. So, nothing against that, because that's the probably the prototype good example Italian Mafia, maybe. Yeah.



Jenn Tostlebe 1:04:50

Okay. So the final area that you talk about is recruitment into organized crime. And you describe this as thinking about how and when outsiders cross over this boundary into the world of organized crime, because if you don't start in organized crime, right, like at some point you have to get brought in.



Martin Bouchard 1:05:15

Well, even when you're born into the family, you still need to prove yourself, like a potentially good co-offender, I guess, or.



Jenn Tostlebe 1:05:23

Maybe I should, because I don't know much about about organized crime. But can you talk to us a little bit more, can you describe what recruitment might look like into one of these groups?



Martin Bouchard 1:05:34

Yeah, I mean, in this section of the paper, I wanted to highlight the fact that recruitment is also a process. And sometimes, you know, we sample based on the moment that a person, you know, becomes a member, like officially, and we tend to not see everything that happened behind the scenes, like if you see this as the iceberg, the iceberg is a I'm a member, I'm a prospect, I'm a new recruit. But the iceberg is, how did that person get to that place of being recruited? That person was observed, you know, sometimes for years, when we talk about Italian Mafia, or some of these organizations in order to for that person to be

deemed reliable and trustworthy? You know, that person is a contact of someone in the organization that is vouching for them. You know, so that contact, you know, it does not happen overnight, you know, this is something that could happen over the course of years and years of assessing reliability and sometimes doing it proactively, sometimes passively. Sometimes, you know, it happens, this recruitment very organically, you know, we converge in the same places in the same areas, we do a deal together, we sort of like each other, when we do the deal, the deal went well, we all made money. It's like, hey, you know, are you looking to become part of this organization, you know, I think you could be a good guy, I don't know. And then they see each other at the bar again, and, you know, it's organic. And it's not a moment, a spontaneous moment in time. That iceberg is where I see the benefits of social network analysis is that if we follow the interactions of Joe, a member of this organization, made member, veteran, and we look at it, you know, the interactions of Joe over the course of many years, and we look at the recruits that are brought in that Joe vouched for, you know, we can sort of find his sort of roots and pathways, and notice phenomenon that's really hard to get into, it's not available to everyone. So, you need to be part of that social world. And what I call for in dissection is just to map this social world. This recruit was one of many contacts of Joe, you know, and there's a reason why that person potentially was recruited over another. And I think the network of Joe and everybody else, you know, can give us some answers that we don't have right now. Because we can only sample once we see that person as a member, but that person comes from somewhere in the social world of Joe. And so, so this is one of the things that I wanted to highlight with that section is that it's a process and it's a social process like Edward Clemons, and [Inaudible] 1999 call this like a snowball social snowball effect, like these things happen organically, David Pyrooz talked a lot about late onset gang membership, how to come to adults, you know, that seem to emerge out of nowhere, you know, join a gang or become part of this phenomenon. Well, you know, maybe it happened organically in their social lives, you know, they happen to be in touch or exposed to people who were part of this gang, and they happen to have some skill set in some expertise, one thing that the gang or group was potentially looking for, but initially, you know, it's a social tie that started this, the trustworthiness of that person, you know, you don't bring just about anyone. You need to be vouched for, you need to be trustworthy. And this process of assessing trust is a social network process. And that's what I wanted to, to highlight there.



Jenn Tostlebe 1:08:59

Yeah, that's cool. And it takes time to I'm sure, yes. would be interesting to trace it back all the way to see all of the different interactions. Yeah, yep.



Martin Bouchard 1:09:10

Yeah, absolutely.



Jose Sanchez 1:09:13

Do you have any other comments that you'd like to leave us with? That maybe we didn't ask.



Martin Bouchard 1:09:22

No, well, I'm going to be disappointed when this episode, you know, air because I want you know, get to learn something new from another of your guests. I really enjoy the podcast myself. And it's always appearing on my phone as soon as you have a new episode. So I just want to commend you for the work

that you do, and you're doing a service to the field. And I think it's recognized. I think people people get it and people appreciate it. But I just want to thank you for inviting me and thinking of me for today.



Jenn Tostlebe 1:09:51

Yeah, well, thank you, from us to you for being on the podcast and being a guest and sharing what you know, with And everyone who will listen. Is there anything that you'd like to plug anything related to this that might be coming out?



1:10:19

But no, I think you've plugged in TEDx. I appreciate your reading even the paper so closely as well, it's a pleasure. No, I just want to give a shout out to my students at the CaIN lab at SFU. And, you know, none of that work and that of that knowledge would, you know, amount to anything, or if they were not there to inspire me and motivate me. So that's it. I just want to say hi, hi to them if they listen.



Jenn Tostlebe 1:10:45

And then our last question is, where can people find you? Whether that's Twitter, email, whatever.



Martin Bouchard 1:10:53

Yeah, I'm on Twitter. I don't necessarily participate, or am very active, but I am on there. I like to follow the field and what's going on? I think it's a great way. It's a great complementary way to learn about the field and what's going on. So, so that's definitely one way to contact me and see what's going on. Yes.



Jenn Tostlebe 1:11:11

I think you're more active than I am. All right. Well, thank you again. It's been a pleasure having you on.



Martin Bouchard 1:11:21

Yeah. Thanks for having me. Appreciate it. Bye, guys. Bye to your little guy. It was a it was a great. Yeah. Bye.



Jenn Tostlebe 1:11:30

Bye. The criminology Academy is available wherever you listen to podcast. Make sure to follow us on Twitter, Facebook and Instagram at the crime Academy. If you're on Apple podcasts, please rate review and subscribe. Alternatively, let us know what you think of the episode by leaving us a comment on our website, the criminology academy.com And lastly, share the chrome Academy episodes with your friends and family

