

Kent Academic Repository

Full text document (pdf)

Citation for published version

Wood, Jane L. (2014) Understanding gang membership: The significance of group processes. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 17 (6). pp. 710-729. ISSN 1368-4302.

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430214550344>

Link to record in KAR

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/55015/>

Document Version

UNSPECIFIED

Copyright & reuse

Content in the Kent Academic Repository is made available for research purposes. Unless otherwise stated all content is protected by copyright and in the absence of an open licence (eg Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher, author or other copyright holder.

Versions of research

The version in the Kent Academic Repository may differ from the final published version.

Users are advised to check <http://kar.kent.ac.uk> for the status of the paper. **Users should always cite the published version of record.**

Enquiries

For any further enquiries regarding the licence status of this document, please contact:

researchsupport@kent.ac.uk

If you believe this document infringes copyright then please contact the KAR admin team with the take-down information provided at <http://kar.kent.ac.uk/contact.html>

Understanding gang membership: The significance of group processes

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Journal: | <i>Group Processes & Intergroup Relations</i> |
| Manuscript ID: | GPIR-14-042.R2 |
| Manuscript Type: | Review |
| Keywords: | Gangs, Group processes, Criminal activity, Social cognition, Psychology |
| Abstract: | Gang researchers have robustly established that gangs facilitate increased delinquency in members – even those who were prolifically delinquent before joining a gang (Klein, Weerman & Thornberry, 2006). This suggests that there is something about gang membership, specifically, that influences individuals in a pro-criminal direction. However, so far it is not clear what this influence is. This paper, taking a social psychological perspective on gang membership considers the potential influence that group processes exert on gang members to conform to group norms, to become cohesive and to strive to acquire group goals - such as status. It further speculates that adherence to group norms may cultivate gang members’ social cognitions such as moral disengagement, offense supportive cognitions and rumination. Conclusions note how group processes deserve closer research attention due to their potential for informing more accurate gang interventions to deter potential members and to reduce existing gang membership. |

Abstract

Gang researchers have robustly established that gangs facilitate increased criminal activity in members – even those who were prolifically delinquent before gang membership (Klein, Weerman, & Thornberry, 2006). This suggests that there is something about gang membership, specifically, that influences individuals' criminality. However, so far it is not clear what this influence is. This paper, taking a social psychological perspective on gang membership considers the potential influence that group processes exert on gang members to identify with a gang, to conform to group norms, become cohesive and to strive to acquire group goals - such as status. It further speculates that adherence to group norms may cultivate gang members' social cognitions such as moral disengagement, offense supportive cognitions and rumination. Conclusions note how group processes deserve closer research attention due to their potential for informing more accurate gang interventions to deter potential members and to reduce existing gang membership.

Analyses of group processes, and how they shape gang member behaviors and are shaped by them are notably absent in recent gang research literature. (Hughes, 2006: p. 44)

Group membership is key to human social existence. Families, ethnic groups, friendship networks provide us with identities that define us, shape our attitudes and beliefs and inspire our behaviors. Gangs are groups that are thought to provide members with positive elements such as protection, support and loyalty. However, they also promote and facilitate violence – resulting in members being disproportionately criminal (Chu, Daffern, Thomas, & Lim, 2012) and disproportionately targeted as victims (Katz, Webb, Fox, & Shaffer, 2011). Currently, we know little about the psychological processes that underpin gang membership (Wood & Alleyne, 2010) and despite the enduring recognition by researchers that group processes play a vital part in gang membership (Klein & Maxson, 2006; Short & Strodbeck, 1965;), little is known about which *specific group processes* underpin gang membership or how they influence *social cognitions* in individual members. Aside from a gap in our knowledge and theories, this leaves programs designed to reduce gang membership under-informed. If we aim to motivate members to leave a gang it is essential to fully understand the nature of what it is a gang offers, culturally and psychologically, and to construct evidence-based programs using this knowledge.

This paper uses the concepts included in unified theory as a backdrop to achieve two main aims. Its first aim is to provide an overview of how certain group processes (e.g. social identity theory, self-categorization theory and uncertainty-identity theory) may function to motivate youth to join a gang. It then moves on to consider how once they are gang members group processes (e.g. reputation enhancement theory, cohesion and pluralistic ignorance) influence youth to adopt and adhere to gang norms. The second aim of this paper is to suggest how group processes function to influence the development of gang members' social cognitions (e.g. moral disengagement, social dominance theory and cognitive schemas) and

1
2
3 their subsequent responses to outgroup others (e.g. displaced aggression, perceptions of
4 entitativity). The purpose of these aims is to make suggestions for future research agendas
5 that include an examination of specific group processes. Conclusions to the paper include
6 suggestions that may be useful for developing future research agendas. Conclusions also
7 point out that if we are to develop interventions that successfully target gang joining and gang
8 membership; there is a critical need for the psychology of group processes to be taken in to
9 consideration when addressing gang members' criminogenic needs.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 The theoretical constructs included in this paper are by no means exhaustive and there
20 is no attempt to concentrate on any one theoretical perspective – since any one theory merits
21 its own paper. Instead the aim is to provide a *broad range* of potential social psychological
22 theories and constructs that have significant potential for informing gang research and
23 consequently develop gang theory. Focusing on one theory alone would not provide an
24 overview of the vast range of possibilities that psychology has to offer this area of research.
25 Instead, the paper's aim is to provide an outline rather than an in-depth evaluation of group
26 processes.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **The promise of gang membership: Perceptions of the group**

39
40 Although many gang researchers do not accept that gangs should be defined by their
41 involvement in criminal activity (see Wood and Alleyne, 2010, for a fuller discussion), there
42 is a growing consensus that a gang's criminal activity (i.e. breaking the law - rather than
43 nuisance behavior) is a defining feature of the group (Weerman et al., 2009). Gangs form just
44 like any other group - because they offer members something that they want or need
45 (Goldstein, 2002), yet so far, we know little about how gangs form (Hughes, 2013). Unified
46 theory of gang involvement (Wood & Alleyne, 2010) posits that youth develop a social
47 perception of gangs – via gang presence in their neighborhoods or via media images and that
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the impression that youth of gangs may be that they offer opportunities that more legitimate
4 life pathways do not. Research supports this proposition by showing that gangs appear to
5 offer the chance for youth to gain status, identity, companionship (Klein, 1995) and respect
6 from others (Anderson, 1999). Media representations of rewards for gang-like behavior may
7 act as a blueprint for aspiring gang members (Przemieniecki, 2005) and have a persuasive
8 influence on youth raised in cultures that strongly associate success with material wealth
9 (Toy & Stanko, 2008). Gangs have also been noted as offering youth power: a coercive
10 power (threat/use of force and violence), a power to pay, buy, and impress, and the power of
11 status within the gang's hierarchy (Knox, 1994). Consequently, unified theory notes how
12 youth motivated to join gangs will be those who feel most alienated from legitimate social
13 controls such as families, education systems, and prosocial community contexts (Marshall,
14 Webb & Tilley, 2005). In an atmosphere where officially recognized means of success often
15 appear to be inaccessible, gangs may appear to offer youth friendship, pride, a sense of
16 identity, improved self-esteem, excitement, and access to financial assets (Goldstein, 2002).
17 Since gangs are groups, their collective compositions appear to offer emotional bonding with
18 other members, a sense of belonging to a group and protection from being victimized by
19 outsiders (Vigil, 1988). As a group, a gang also offers members a strong psychological sense
20 of community by means of an actual and a psychological neighborhood (Goldstein, 1991).
21 Consequently, youth may modify, or even discard their existing legitimate social controls
22 (e.g., school) in favor of the appealing advantages that gang membership seems to offer.

23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 **Gang membership: Identifying with a gang**

49
50 Youth go through an identity formation process during adolescence (Erikson, 1968) and, as
51 unified theory states, will select peer group friendships based on shared similarities. Research
52 shows how, unlike gang youth, youth who have little interest in gangs derive positive feelings
53 from their academic abilities and believe that they will have successful future careers,
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (Dukes, Martinez, & Stein, 1997) and are likely to choose prosocial friendships and activities
4
5 (Wood & Alleyne, 2010). In contrast, youth who join gangs are less confident in their
6
7 academic abilities (Dukes et al., 1997) and so they may, for reasons of underachievement
8
9 and/or loss of interest, begin to disengage with school and scholarly-inclined peer groups. As
10
11 they reject familiar childhood groups and practices, it is likely that they will experience
12
13 feelings of uncertainty about their attitudes, their future, and, importantly, their identity
14
15 (Hogg, Kruglanski, & van den Bos, 2013). *Uncertainty-identity theory* (Hogg, 2000) explains
16
17 that feeling uncertain about personal identity motivates people to identify with a group and,
18
19 in line with *social categorization* tenets (Abrams & Hogg, 2010; Tajfel & Turner, 1986;) use
20
21 their group membership to categorize themselves and others according to sets of attitudes and
22
23 behaviors that epitomize group membership. Since research shows how disrupted school
24
25 bonding is a strong predictor of delinquent behavior (Henry, Knight, & Thornberry, 2012)
26
27 and future gang membership (Henry, 2010), education-disillusioned youth may find that
28
29 joining a gang, provides the positive reinforcement that they need of their views, their self
30
31 and, as a result, reduce their identity uncertainty.
32
33
34
35
36

37 Social identity approaches, including *social identity theory* (Tajfel & Turner, 1986)
38
39 and *self-categorization theory* (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987) maintain
40
41 that once people identify with a group they experience further shaping of their self-view (see
42
43 also Goldman, Giles & Hogg, this volume). As a new gang member strives to live up to gang
44
45 membership expectations, s/he may begin to develop a new personal identity that corresponds
46
47 to the group's overarching identity. Evidence shows how a gang member's personal identity
48
49 may develop from a focus on how their individual needs blend with the group's
50
51 characteristics and function (Vigil, 1988). That is, part of their self-concept (i.e., how they
52
53 *think* about themselves) develops from being a member of their group (Hogg & Reid, 2006).
54
55 As gangs offer the potential for gaining power, status, identity, friendship etc. (as outlined
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 above), then gang membership is likely to help youth forge a more positive self-concept (i.e.,
4
5 people like me, I have a lot of friends, I am worth knowing).
6
7

8
9 Social identity theory also includes how individuals *feel* about themselves. Self-
10
11 esteem hypothesis notes that people are motivated to hold positive self-views (Hogg &
12
13 Abrams, 1988) and group membership may increase members' self-esteem - even if their
14
15 relationship with the group is limited to basking in reflected glory (e.g., supporting a
16
17 successful football team). The positive emotions derived from group membership then work
18
19 to cement the group-individual relationship (Cialdini et al., 1976). Gang membership may
20
21 enhance members' self-esteem as the support they derive via their membership verifies their
22
23 individual value, and, when the gang's group esteem increases (principally due to successful
24
25 criminal activities), their individual self-esteem will also increase, particularly if they
26
27 previously had low self-esteem (Dukes et al., 1997).
28
29
30

31
32 On joining a gang and intertwining personal identities with gang identities, members
33
34 will have more opportunities for criminal learning and as they identify with the group and its
35
36 delinquent activities, they may put the group's aims before their own. In Hennigan and
37
38 Spanovic's (2012) social identity approach to gang membership findings showed how
39
40 compared to nongang youth, gang youth, who identify with their group, put the group norms
41
42 of criminal activity ahead of their personal concerns regarding punishment for criminal
43
44 activity. As the authors note, "Since crime and violence are normative among gang-involved
45
46 youth, personal estimates of getting caught and punished have little or no influence on their
47
48 criminal and violent behaviors" (Hennigan & Spanovic, 2012, p. 143). Thus, the social
49
50 identity impact of gang membership seems to exert a powerful sway over members to the
51
52 point where they set aside personal needs or concerns in favor of the group and its norms of
53
54 criminal activity.
55
56
57
58
59
60

Group effects in gangs: conforming, cohesion and pluralistic ignorance

As noted above, youth often admire gangs and so it is only to be expected that aspiring gang members will be eager to adopt the group's social norms and communicative practices in order to be accepted (see also Hogg and Giles, 2012). The commanding influence of social norms on individuals has long been known by social psychologists who note that people will conform to others' decisions - even when those others are obviously wrong (e.g., Asch, 1951). Social psychologists have also shown that when individuals want to be accepted by others, they will comply with those others' social norms to gain approval (Cooper, Kelly, & Weaver, 2004). This conformity is even more likely if individuals value or admire the group (David & Turner, 1996). On joining a group, members become especially vulnerable to the group's social influences - particularly if they strongly identify with the group (Cooper et al., 2004). Adherence to ingroup norms will also result from a member's fear of being on the receiving end of social sanctions imposed by the group on norm-violating members (Rimal & Real, 2003) since the potential rejection of friends or admired others is particularly threatening (Baron & Kerr, 2003). Consequently, given the power of ingroup influences and the eagerness with which aspiring gang members accept them, it is likely that gang members, unlike nongang youth, will feel compelled to abide by group norms such as involvement in criminal activity (Viki & Abrams, 2012). This effect may be even more powerful for youth who are vulnerable or isolated because they feel alienated from legitimate social controls such as family or school.

The above does not suggest that group members always *agree* with group norms. The concept of *pluralistic ignorance* suggests that individual group members may privately reject a social norm but still abide by it publicly because they believe (often wrongly) that other group members are in favor of it (O'Gorman, 1986; Reid, Giles & Harwood, 2005). Because each member of the group believes that they are alone in their disagreement with the norm,

1
2
3 they do not publicly oppose it and this serves to perpetuate a belief among the group that the
4 majority accept it. This was demonstrated by findings which showed that even though most
5 university students were not comfortable with the accepted levels of students' drinking habits
6 - they believed that other students were quite happy with the norm (Prentice & Miller, 1993).
7
8
9

10
11
12 Research has noted the existence of pluralistic ignorance in gang members who have
13 expressed privately that they feel extreme discomfort with some of their criminal activities
14 (Matza, 1964). This makes intuitive sense. Some gang members are not delinquent before
15 joining a gang (Thornberry, Krohn, Lizotte, Smith, & Tobin, 2003) and so it is highly likely
16 that new members will experience extreme discomfort at some of the more delinquent norms
17 that the gang subscribes to. It may even be the case that more elite members of a gang
18 anticipate members' pluralistic ignorance and counter it by demanding delinquent acts,
19 particularly from new members, to foster group homogeneity, adherence to norms and self-
20 categorization as a group member. And, as members' identification with their chosen group
21 intensifies, the more likely they are to believe in the group's norms (Reid, Cropley, & Hogg,
22 2005). New gang members may feel compelled to participate in criminal activities that
23 individually they would steer clear of to establish greater similarity to other ingroup members
24 and to prove that they are prototypical group members (see Pickett and Brewer, 2001, for a
25 fuller discussion on maintaining ingroup inclusion). To resolve feelings of cognitive
26 dissonance that are likely to stem from taking part in [more] criminal acts, new members will
27 engage in dissonance reduction by bringing their cognitions and actions into line by changing
28 their attitudes so that they are compatible with their behavior (Festinger, 1962). Hence, as
29 unified theory posits, gang membership will work to influence both the behavior and social
30 cognitive development of individuals and committed gang members who feel rooted to the
31 group (core members) may, over time, grow to *genuinely* endorse group norms that less
32 committed members (peripheral members) may privately reject – at least initially. Either way,
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 gang members are likely to publicly accept and adhere to group norms and where norms
4
5 involve criminal activity, gang members will become more criminal and this may lead to
6
7 greater group cohesion (Klein & Maxson, 2006).
8
9

10 Cohesion is a group process that has received a fair amount of attention from gang
11
12 researchers. Cohesion underpins a gang's social interactions and its behaviors (Klein, 1995)
13
14 and is derived from three main processes. The first is the *attraction* that members feel
15
16 towards the gang and its members. The second is the *motivation* that members have to
17
18 participate in the gang's activities and to contribute to the group's goals. The third is the
19
20 *coordination* of gang member effort (Goldstein, 2002). Social psychological examinations of
21
22 the effects of cohesion date back several decades. For example, Festinger, Schachter, and
23
24 Back (1950) saw cohesion as a "field of forces" that worked on group members, compelling
25
26 them to stay with the group. Cohesion has since been considered as a multi- or bi-
27
28 dimensional construct (see Dion, 2000, for a fuller discussion) where, for example, *vertical*
29
30 cohesion derives from the extent that members trust and respect the group's leaders and
31
32 *horizontal* cohesion derives from the feelings, respect and trust that members have for each
33
34 other. A further conceptualization of cohesion is *perceived* cohesion which is "...an
35
36 individual's sense of belonging to a particular group and his or her feelings of morale
37
38 associated with membership in the group" (Bollen & Hoyle, 1990, p. 482). Thus, perceived
39
40 cohesion seems to reflect the individual's evaluation of his/her relationship with the group
41
42 which derives from cognitive elements (appraisals of experiences) and from affective
43
44 elements (feelings about experiences). However, as Dion (2000) notes, cohesion probably
45
46 holds different meanings for different groups depending on their goals and tasks.
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 A meta-analysis examining cohesion concludes that highly cohesive groups are more
54
55 productive than less cohesive groups (Evans & Dion, 1991) and, as Klein (1995) observes,
56
57 gangs produce crime. Consequently, highly cohesive gangs are presumably more efficient in
58
59
60

1
2
3 mobilizing their membership and accessing commodities such as drugs and weapons
4
5 (Hughes, 2013). Klein (1995) considers cohesion to be "...the quintessential group process"
6
7 (p. 43) and its influence leads members to become loyal, committed and ready to make
8
9 sacrifices for their group which they view with pride and respect (Crocker, Luhtanen, Blaine,
10
11 & Broadnax, 1994). Importantly, this effect is enduring - holding sway with the individual
12
13 even after they have left a gang (Pyrooz, Decker, & Webb, 2010).
14
15

16 In gangs, high levels of cohesiveness may facilitate members' criminal activity
17
18 because highly cohesive members identify strongly with the group, share similar attitudes,
19
20 and are willing to accept and endorse group norms of criminal activity (Hughes, 2013).
21
22 However, cohesion can work both ways. Some findings suggest that high cohesion results in
23
24 high criminal activity, since group offenses – particularly intergang offenses – foster group
25
26 collaboration to satisfy group goals and group productivity, such as violence (Klein, 1971).
27
28 Conversely, other findings suggest that low cohesion also facilitates criminal activity
29
30 amongst gang members, because it prevents the group from adequately regulating members'
31
32 violence to others (Jansyn, 1966), and this increases intragang conflict (Hughes, 2013).
33
34 Indeed, evidence supports that dis-organized groups fails to generate compliance among
35
36 members leading to more gang member murders occurring *within* than *between* gangs
37
38 (Decker & Curry, 2002). Poor gang cohesion also prevents the group from showing unity and
39
40 sending out the message to rival gangs that attacks on the group will be met with certain
41
42 retaliation. Without this certainty of retaliation, rival gangs will see the group as vulnerable
43
44 and attack it (Hughes, 2013). The implications of the above are that to accomplish the
45
46 group's aims, gangs need to be cohesive – just as Klein observed. If they are not cohesive
47
48 then their membership will be more disorderly and likely to direct their violence at one
49
50 another. Consequently, cohesion is an important group process in gang membership
51
52 inasmuch as its presence or absence may be expected to result in violence. The only
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 difference between cohesive and non-cohesive gangs is whether that violence is directed
4
5 outside the group or to its own membership.
6

7 **Gangs, intergroup conflict and status enhancement**

8
9
10 Social psychologists such as Hogg (2004) posit that the reason that groups exist is because
11
12 there are outgroups and this prompts people to sort out where they belong in reference to
13
14 others (Bruner, 1957). An understanding of where one belongs then forms a basis for
15
16 individual action in social contexts. For example, an individual who belongs to a specific
17
18 gang has a meaningful understanding of his/her relationship with members of his/her own
19
20 gang, with members of other gangs, non-gang members and the police (Viki & Abrams,
21
22 2012). To gain an understanding of personal positioning, group members employ basic
23
24 psychological processes such as *social categorization*. Social categorization processes
25
26 facilitate a clear-cut picture of one's own and others' social group membership and enables
27
28 emotional values to be attached to those groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Social psychologists
29
30 have robustly demonstrated how people use social categorization processes as a basis for bias
31
32 - and how these biases can derive from minimal information - even about one's own group.
33
34 For example, classic studies show that forming temporary groups arbitrarily (e.g. grouped
35
36 according to people's over- or under-estimation of total dots on a piece of paper), with no
37
38 history of conflict and no potential for future conflict, can lead to ingroup favoritism when
39
40 allocating money to anonymous ingroup or outgroup others (Tajfel & Turner, 1986).
41
42 Explanations for this minimal group effect include that ingroup favoritism results from what
43
44 people assume others expect of them (Wilder, 1986) or because they anticipate reciprocal
45
46 favoritism from ingroup others (Jetten, Spears, & Manstead, 1996). Whatever the
47
48 explanations, and work is still being conducted to establish the reasons for the minimal group
49
50 effect, (see Hogg, 2013 for a more in-depth discussion), the upshot is that people are prone to
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 create 'them and us' categories and use these as a basis to make distinctions that favor their
4
5 own group.
6
7

8
9
10 Gangs also engage in social categorization processes. Gang identities are often
11 defined in reference to other gangs - in particular, to those with whom intergroup conflict
12 exists (Papachristos, Hureau, & Braga, 2013). These outgroups are then used as points of
13 reference to assess a gang's actions and status (Decker & Van Winkle, 1996). *Social*
14
15 *dominance theory (SDT: Sidanius & Pratto, 1999 – see also Densley, Cai & Hilal, this*
16
17 *volume)* explains the processes that underpin group competition for status. SDT explains that
18 group members with a high *social dominance orientation (SDO)* feel compelled to enhance,
19 or reinforce, their group's place in a social hierarchy. To achieve status, SDT explains, social
20 hierarchies involving informal groups (such as gangs) may be arbitrarily constructed to
21 respond to situational factors such as competition for valued resources. For example, gangs
22 may endeavor to enhance or reinforce their group's status in comparison to other gangs in an
23 arbitrary-set system where illegal resources (e.g., narcotics) are valued resources. Although
24 research examining group processes such as SDT in the context of gangs is still in its infancy,
25 findings indicate that individuals involved in gang activity have high levels of SDO (Wood,
26 Alleyne, Mozova, & James, 2013).
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42
43 As gangs work to enhance their group's status in an arbitrary-set system, threats to
44 group aims from rival gangs may trigger intergroup violence (Aldridge, Medina, & Ralphs,
45 2008; Decker & Van Winkle, 1996;). As Densley (2013) observes, "Violence is central to
46 gang life..." (p. 118) and gang members see violence as fundamental to protecting territory
47 and/or gang business. Consequently, the currency of a gang's intergroup enmity is violence
48 stemming from competition for power, domination, reputation, respect and status (Harding,
49 2012). Intergroup transgressions cannot be allowed to go unpunished if a gang is to hold on
50 to its status and so status and prior conflict are perhaps the most common reasons for
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 intergang violence (Hughes & Short 2005; Papachristos 2009). In turn, use of violence
4
5 against rivals will help a gang save face, protects its members, and exact revenge on opposing
6
7 groups for transgressions against the gang (Papachristos, et al., 2013). It also sends out a
8
9 message to other groups that this gang is able to look after its interests and its membership –
10
11 which, in turn, enhances the gang's reputation (Papachristos et al., 2013 – see also above
12
13 regarding gang cohesion effects).
14
15

16
17 Gang membership also influences individual members' reputations by providing them
18
19 with the opportunity to enhance their personal status and, as research shows, status is highly
20
21 prized by those involved in prison gang activity (South & Wood, 2006; Wood et al., 2013;
22
23 Wood, Moir, & James, 2009) and by street gang members (Alleyne & Wood, 2010). On
24
25 becoming a gang member individual status will emerge from the reputation acquired as part
26
27 of the group. *Reputation enhancement theory* shows how group membership influences
28
29 individual behavior because members select a self-image to display in front of specific others
30
31 (Emler & Reicher, 1995). These others then provide positive feedback that reinforces the
32
33 individual's image within the group. For gang members, criminal activity will be key to
34
35 developing a personal reputation within the group, since criminal activity is a valued gang
36
37 product. Criminal activity, particularly violence, also works to protect individual members
38
39 from future victimization (Emler & Reicher, 1995). In their study of gangs, Harris, Turner,
40
41 Garratt, and Atkinson, (2011) note:
42
43
44
45

46
47 Not reacting with often extreme violence was experienced as tantamount to
48
49 abject failure. There was a sense of being worse than nothing if a once-held
50
51 status is lost. This was not only due to loss of respect, but also a sense of
52
53 inevitable attacks and victimization from others. (p. 20)
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Research has shown that violence is such an important group norm for gang members
4 that it is even used when committing ‘petty crimes’ (Harris et al., 2011). Evidence further
5 confirms the tenets of reputation enhancement theory by showing how being violent achieves
6 status, enhances reputations and expresses members’ commitment to the group, which, in
7 turn, prevents expulsion from the group (Harris et al., 2011; see also Pickett and Brewer,
8 2001). The implication here is that violence is gang currency which is used by members to
9 negotiate and enhance their position in the gang hierarchy. In his ethnographic study of gang
10 youth, Densley (2013) observes “Interviewees were clear that serious violence was the fastest
11 way to rise to the top.” (p.85). Gang members also consider violence to be necessary for
12 obtaining material possessions and to achieve a comfortable high-status lifestyle (Harris et
13 al., 2011). However, as Densley notes, there may also be caveats to gang members’ use of
14 violence. Gangs often expect certain levels of responsibility from individual members and
15 although violence should be sufficient to enhance both the individual’s and the gang’s
16 reputation, it should not be so severe that it attracts too much police attention and the
17 constraints that police attention imposes on gang threaten gang business since, “A dead body
18 for instance, leaves corroborating forensic evidence and invites the full weight of police
19 investigatory resources.” (Densley, 2013, p. 85).

Gang membership: developing/exacerbating individual social cognitions

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Currently little is known about the specific psychological influence that gang membership has
on individual members’ social cognitions (Wood & Alleyne, 2010). Criminological theories
have so far paid little attention to the social psychology of gang membership (Thornberry et
al., 2003). However, as individual differences gain conceptual importance in gang research, a
more social psychological approach is gradually beginning to emerge. Unified theory (Wood
& Alleyne, 2010) draws on criminological and psychological concepts to explain gang

1
2
3 membership and considers some of the most likely social cognitions and attitudes that will be
4
5 shaped according to involvement gang membership.
6
7

8 **Moral disengagement**

9

10
11 Unified theory explains that to adhere to group norms of criminal activity, gang members
12 may need to adjust their social cognitions and if they do so they may resolve the cognitive
13 dissonance that arises from their increased involvement in criminal activity. One way for
14 gang members to achieve dissonance reduction is to set aside their existing moral standards
15 (morally disengage – see also Alleyne, Fernandes, & Pritchard, this volume). *Moral*
16 *disengagement* is a social cognitive process that enables people to justify harmful acts and
17 resolve the cognitive dissonance and self-condemnation associated with violating personal
18 moral standards (Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara, & Pastorelli, 1996).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Moral disengagement involves eight socio-cognitive mechanisms which function at
31 three levels of social processing. The **first level** allows inhumane acts (e.g., violence) to be
32 reinterpreted. Socio-cognitive mechanisms at this level include: *moral justification* (behavior
33 is in a worthy cause - that it can further gang status), *euphemistic language* (a sanitizing
34 description of harm - e.g. violence may be described as “gang business”), and *advantageous*
35 *comparisons* where individual behavior is favorably compared with others’ worse behavior
36 (e.g. our group only assaults - others kill). The **second level** enables the *displacement of*
37 *responsibility* on to authority figures (individual behavior stems from authority figures’
38 directives - so personal responsibility is negated - see also Hogg & Giles, 2012 for a fuller
39 discussion of leadership effects on individual members), *diffusion of responsibility*
40 (responsibility for the harm done is shared by several perpetrators - thus this absolves
41 individuals from blame), and *distorting the consequences* of harm (ignoring, minimizing, or
42 disbelieving that any harm has been done). The **third level** distorts the way the victim is
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 viewed and denies them victim status via *dehumanization* processes (the victim is considered
4
5 to be subhuman and devoid of accepted human qualities – see also Alleyne et al., this
6
7 volume) or victim *blaming* (they got what they deserved).
8
9

10 Findings show that when youth want to be accepted by a chosen group, they will set
11
12 aside their moral standards (Emler & Reicher, 1995). Evidence further shows that groups
13
14 such as street gangs (Alleyne & Wood, 2010) and groups involved in prison gang activity
15
16 (Wood, Moir, & James, 2009; Wood et al., 2013) set aside, either unconsciously or
17
18 deliberately, their moral standards to engage in illegal behavior. An ability to morally
19
20 disengage has also been empirically linked with an increased use of violence (Bandura et al.,
21
22 1996). Moral disengagement further mediates pathways between impoverished
23
24 neighborhoods strongly associated with gang membership, and anti-social behavior (Hill,
25
26 Lui, & Hawkins, 2001) and between low levels of empathy and anti-social behavior. As
27
28 Hyde, Shaw, and Moilanen (2010) observe,
29
30
31

32
33 In more modern contexts, urban youth living in impoverished homes and
34
35 neighborhoods that offer them little hope or opportunity for socially
36
37 acceptable pathways to success may develop a moral code of behavior
38
39 that is not bound by mainstream prohibitions against committing
40
41 antisocial actions, particularly when such actions are associated with the
42
43 means to obtain financial success (e.g., dealing illicit drugs) or ensuring
44
45 safety (e.g., joining a gang). (p. 198)
46
47
48

49 If they are already criminally active, youth may have begun to employ some moral
50
51 disengagement strategies to justify their criminal activity. However, even if they gained, for
52
53 instance, financially, from their pre-gang crime they are also likely to have been on the
54
55 receiving end of moral condemnation from parents, teachers and others and this may have
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 helped to curb at least some of their criminal activity. In contrast, once they join a gang
4
5 where crime and violence are normative they are likely to receive dual reinforcement - first
6
7 from any material gains such as finance from illicit activities, and second, from the
8
9 communicated approval of other gang members. Positive approval from other group members
10
11 will also serve to reinforce the member's commitment to the group (Esbensen, Huizinga, &
12
13 Weiher, 1993) and help to reduce, if not negate, the effect of outgroup others' (e.g. parents'
14
15 and teachers') moral condemnation for criminal acts. Importantly, positive reinforcement of
16
17 criminal activity by ingroup members may also likely to intensify and expand the use of
18
19 existing moral disengagement processes.
20
21

22
23
24 Group processes in gangs may also facilitate the use of *additional* moral
25
26 disengagement strategies. Compared to nongang youth, gang members are more likely to be
27
28 violently victimized, sexually assaulted (males or females), to suffer serious injuries from
29
30 fighting (Taylor, Freng, Esbensen, & Peterson, 2008) and be targeted by rival gangs (Sanders,
31
32 1994). Being on the receiving end of increased victimization may increase members'
33
34 inclination to justify their violence to others such as rival gang members. Evidence supports
35
36 this idea by showing how street gang members, compared to nongang youth, employ more
37
38 victim blaming strategies (Alleyne & Wood, 2010). Peripheral gang members, compared to
39
40 nongang youth, also use more *displacement of responsibility* strategies to justify their
41
42 criminal activity (Alleyne & Wood, 2010). In a group which has a hierarchy of members
43
44 peripheral members, eager to establish their worth, will strive to establish greater similarity to
45
46 other ingroup members "...in order to achieve greater ingroup prototypicality." (Pickett &
47
48 Brewer, 2001, p. 101). To achieve this prototypicality they are likely to be eager to follow the
49
50 lead and/or instructions of those higher up the chain of the group's hierarchy. In other words,
51
52 they follow orders - or at least they believe they are doing so (Alleyne & Wood, 2010). Either
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 way, it seems that the group processes involved in gang membership and gang hierarchies are
4
5 likely to endorse and further widen members' moral disengagement strategies.
6
7

8 **Offence supportive cognitions**

9

10
11 Unified theory posits that on becoming involved in a gang, members' pro-aggression
12
13 cognitions, beliefs and attitudes will be fostered/generated. *Cognitive schemas* are cognitive
14
15 structures that enable individuals to screen, encode and evaluate social stimuli (Beck, 1964).
16
17 Essentially they are mental structures that hold previous knowledge, and contain attitudes,
18
19 beliefs and assumptions about oneself, others and the world (Mann & Beech, 2003). They
20
21 are, in short, categories of information that have been generated from past experiences. Some
22
23 theorists refer to cognitive schema as *implicit theories* (ITs) since they claim this more
24
25 accurately explains how people develop explanatory theories of the world, and generate and
26
27 test hypotheses to predict future events – just as scientific theories do (Ward, 2000). ITs
28
29 function on two main psychological constructs: beliefs and desires (Polaschek, Calvert, &
30
31 Gannon, 2009) and are implicit because holders seldom explicitly express them (Ward,
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
2000).

If new information suggests that an IT is wrong then it may be revised (Polaschek et al., 2009). However, people are highly motivated to interpret information in an IT-consistent manner, which means that ITs are often deeply entrenched and resistant to change (Ward, 2000). This makes it more likely that inconsistent incoming information will be re-interpreted so that it is consistent with existing ITs (Polaschek et al., 2009). To achieve consistency people skew or *cognitively distort* incoming information. Evidence shows, for example, that people who hold ITs that other people are generally hostile and self-serving will interpret an accidental bump from another as stemming from malevolent intentions (Epps & Kendall, 1995).

1
2
3 On joining a gang, accepting its norms, striving to achieve status via criminal activity,
4
5 and assimilating the necessary ingroup/outgroup biases associated with the new group,
6
7 members may use cognitive distortions to support personal involvement in pro-gang, pro-
8
9 criminal activity. As noted above, positive reinforcements communicated from other gang
10
11 members for acts of aggression on behalf of the gang, are likely to encourage a new member
12
13 to develop additional pro-aggressive cognitive distortions. These will then be assimilated in
14
15 to the gang member's memory and corresponding ITs to act as a guide for future behavior.
16
17

18
19 The value of ITs has been amply demonstrated in research with sexual offenders
20
21 (Polaschek & Ward, 2002; Ward & Keenan, 1999). An IT approach has also been used to
22
23 examine intimate partner violence (Gilchrist, 2008; Weldon & Gilchrist, 2012; see also
24
25 Pornari, Dixon, and Humphreys, 2013, for a review), and firesetting (Ó Ciardha & Gannon,
26
27 2012). Although ITs among gang members have not been directly investigated, research has
28
29 examined the ITs of violent offenders. Taking a grounded theory approach, Polaschek et al.,
30
31 (2009) found four primary ITs that violent offenders hold. The first, and arguably the most
32
33 important, as it underpins several of the others, is a *normalization of violence* as an effective
34
35 form of communication, to resolve conflicts and to generate respect from others. Personal
36
37 victimization and consequences for victims – either physical and/or psychological are also
38
39 minimized by violent offenders. This IT is especially relevant to what we know about gang
40
41 members. As already noted, violence is a gang norm and, just as violent offenders do, gang
42
43 members use violence to resolve conflicts, and to gain respect and status from others. They
44
45 also, like violent offenders, minimize the importance of personal victimization (see Hennigan
46
47 & Spanovic, 2012, above), and as will be discussed below, they hold views of their victims
48
49 consistent with a lack of concern.
50
51
52
53
54

55 The second IT identified in violent offenders is *beat or be beaten*, and includes two
56
57 subtypes (*self-enhancement* and *self-preservation*). The underlying assumption here is that
58
59
60

1
2
3 the individual sees a need to strike first in the violence stakes – otherwise others may gain an
4
5 advantage in what s/he perceives is a violent world. Because gang worlds are peppered with
6
7 violence, their intergroup conflict may well function on members' beliefs that they need to
8
9 strike first. The self-enhancement subtype seems particularly relevant to the group norms of
10
11 gangs because it states that violence is necessary to achieve and/or maintain status and to
12
13 demonstrate one's dominance over others. The self-preservation subtype relates to a mistrust
14
15 of others and how violence is seen as necessary to prevent people 'walking all over them.' As
16
17 noted above, in the world of intergroup conflict that gangs inhabit, retaliation is a group norm
18
19 that members are expected to adhere to if they want to gain and maintain status and respect
20
21 for the group and for the self.
22
23
24

25
26 The third IT is *I am the law* and refers to violent offenders' beliefs in personal
27
28 superiority and an entitlement or even obligation to discipline others by assaulting or harming
29
30 them. Violence is also seen by violent offenders as necessary to protect others or the social
31
32 order from the perceived harm caused by outsiders. This IT is also relevant to gang members'
33
34 retaliatory attacks against opposing gangs and it may also be relevant to how gangs award
35
36 and maintain hierarchies within their groups (e.g., core and peripheral membership). That
37
38 gangs also use violence to protect the social order is supported by evidence showing how
39
40 gangs have been known to protect the social order by "policing" neighborhood events - even
41
42 better than the police (Patillo, 1998).
43
44
45

46
47 The final violent offender IT identified by Polaschek et al., was *I get out of control*.
48
49 This refers to problems with self-control and self-regulation which stems from rage or
50
51 uncontrollable anger. Links between gang membership and a lack of self-control have been
52
53 well-established in theories such as Gottfredson and Hirschi's, (1990), general theory of
54
55 crime, and empirical findings support that a lack of self-control is a key predictor of gang
56
57 membership (Esbensen & Osgood, 1999). Evidence also shows how gang youth use their
58
59
60

1
2
3 group membership as a coping strategy for negative emotions such as anger, frustration, and
4
5 anxiety (Eitle, Gunkel, & van Gundy, 2004; Klemp-North, 2007). Recent findings further
6
7 show that gang members suffer from high levels of anxiety disorder and psychosis (Coid et
8
9 al., 2013), which are also associated with a lack of self-control (e.g., Novaco, 1997).

10
11
12 Although ITs have not been examined directly in gang members, the similarities noted
13
14 between violent offenders' ITs and gang group norms suggest that becoming a gang member
15
16 is likely to nurture and/or develop offense supportive cognitions – or ITs. Since research
17
18 regarding the psychology of gang membership is still in its infancy, we do not yet have the
19
20 evidence to decide whether the group norms of gangs play a causal role in the development of
21
22 members' pro-delinquent ITs. However, the evidence we have so far suggests that even if
23
24 gang membership does not *cause* pro-delinquent ITs, it is likely to strengthen any that already
25
26 exist as youth adopt and assimilate the pro-crime group norms and values of a gang.
27
28
29

30 31 **Group loyalty and anti-authority attitudes**

32
33
34 As members adopt gang norms and their social cognitive processes are developed and/or
35
36 exacerbated by their group membership they may develop a group and individual
37
38 “oppositional culture” where the group is set in opposition to legitimate authorities (Moore &
39
40 Vigil, 1987). This process begins as members begin to reject legitimate social institutions
41
42 such as school and identify with the gang, as noted above. However, becoming a gang
43
44 member seems to nurture and extend this rejection of legitimate roles. As Short and
45
46 Strodbeck, (1965) observe, “.... gang members are less favorably disposed toward adult
47
48 incumbents of legitimate roles such as teacher, religious leader, policeman, businessman and
49
50 politician than are their non-gang, lower class counterparts.” (p. 275-276, see also Drury,
51
52 2010).
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Findings examining the psychology of gang membership show how street gang
4 members (Alleyne & Wood, 2010), and those involved in prison gang activity (Wood et al.,
5 2013), hold strong anti-authority attitudes. Although anti-authority attitudes may be adopted
6 by many adolescents (Drury, 2010) and are therefore not unique to gang members, the
7 targeting of gangs in gang suppression programs are likely to bring gang members into
8 frequent and negative contact with authority figures more often than nongang adolescents.
9 The effect of this is that gangs may come to view themselves as unfairly targeted victims of
10 oppression (Lien, 2005) which, in turn, will help to reinforce their gang identities (McAra &
11 McVie, 2005; Ralphs, Medina, & Aldridge, 2009), strengthen their oppositional culture
12 (Klein & Maxson, 2006) and may even increase the number of gangs and associated criminal
13 activities (Hagedorn, 2008) as gangs become even more criminal to defend their group
14 identity (Ayling, 2011). Members may consider themselves as defenders of their group which
15 they see as being victimized by society. Identifying how gang members view this effect in an
16 Oslo sample, Lien (2005) notes:

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35 He develops ideas of compassion, love, and sacrifice in relation to his
36 friends, and he (*sic*) explains his acts through a construction of himself as a
37 victim of society. The victimization point is necessary in order to justify
38 the criminal act. He cannot be blamed, the act is heroic rather than evil,
39 and the victims get what they deserve. (p. 121)

40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47 As Lien explains, gang members develop 'heroism' on behalf of their group and from
48 what they see as their personal victimization by society. Victimization of opponents is then
49 justified as each gang member strives to demonstrate loyalty to the group and to fulfil his/her
50 perceived obligation to other members, and, as Pickett and Brewer, (2001) note, this effect is
51 more likely to occur amongst the zealous new-comers to the group. Violent victimization of
52 outgroup members will be considered as necessary and deserved - particularly if selected

1
2
3 victims are members of a rival gang who are seen as meriting retribution (Klein & Maxson,
4
5 1989). However, what this suggests is that gang members do not have to experience *personal*
6
7 victimization in order to retaliate with violence. Moreover, gang members may feel beholden
8
9 to retaliate on *behalf* of their gang and the victimization of *any* of its members. In turn, this
10
11 suggests that group process effects will increase gang members' use of violence as they strive
12
13 to act for the group's best interests.
14
15

16 17 **Rumination**

18
19 There are, of course, psychological processes that support the development of this 'heroic'
20
21 obligation to the group. The intensity of a provocation positively relates to the experience of
22
23 *rumination* (Horowitz, 1986). *Response styles theory* (Nolen-Hoeksema, 1991) explains that
24
25 rumination involves repetitive thinking about something that has caused distress. Rumination
26
27 can involve persistent thoughts about personal beliefs and feelings and/or about the
28
29 provoking event (Bushman, Bonacci, Pedersen, Vasquez, & Miller, 2005). It may also help
30
31 maintain negative affect long after the provocation (Lyubomirsky & Nolen-Hoeksema, 1995)
32
33 since its focus is on hostile and vengeful thoughts. As Bandura et al., (1996) note, hostile
34
35 rumination heightens feelings of aggression, which may or may not be acted on. However,
36
37 people who have set aside their normal moral constraints by employing moral disengagement
38
39 strategies (see above) are more likely to respond with aggression to perceived wrongs
40
41 (Bandura, et al., 1996). As Bandura et al., note, "Effective moral disengagement creates a
42
43 sense of social rectitude and self-righteousness that breeds ruminative hostility and retaliatory
44
45 thoughts for perceived grievances." (p. 366).
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 Perceptions that the gang is being victimized are likely to lead members to ruminate
53
54 individually and, potentially collectively as they communicate their ruminative thoughts to
55
56 other group members (see also Goldman et al., this volume). Because provoking events such
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 as victimization of group members may be considered to be crisis events for gangs, quick
4
5 decisions need to be made, which in turn, may then lead to *groupthink* (Janis, 1972).
6

7 Groupthink effectively suppresses dissent and/or adequate appraisal of potentially more
8
9 sensible alternatives and so more moderate group members may feel unable/unwilling to
10
11 voice objections to group decisions (see also pluralistic ignorance – above). Consequently,
12
13 gang members, motivated by feelings of self-righteousness, are likely to ‘dwell’ individually
14
15 and collectively on the perceived harms done to their group – and make hasty decisions
16
17 regarding retaliation – which will generally involve violence.
18
19

20
21 Evidence examining rumination in gang members suggests that gang members engage
22
23 in more rumination than do nongang youth (Vasquez, Osman, & Wood, 2012). Research
24
25 comparing male gang members’ and violent men’s (i.e. violent but not in a gang) psychiatric
26
27 morbidity also highlights the importance of rumination in gang members (Coid et al., 2013).
28
29 Coid et al., found that even though both violent men and gang members reported positive
30
31 attitudes to violence, gang members were more likely to be violently victimized, were more
32
33 likely to engage in violent ruminations and were more inclined to respond to perceived
34
35 disrespect with violence. Interestingly, Coid et al.’s research further demonstrated how
36
37 violent ruminations, when combined with violent victimization and fears of future
38
39 victimization, explained the association between gang membership and anxiety disorders and
40
41 psychiatric morbidity (Coid et al., 2013). However, what is not certain yet is the causal
42
43 relationships between these factors. That is, gang membership may result from those with
44
45 higher levels of psychiatric morbidity becoming gang members or, equally, psychiatric
46
47 morbidity may be caused by gang membership – where gang members’ experiences cause
48
49 them to be subjected to psychiatric symptoms. More work is needed to establish the exact
50
51 nature of this relationship.
52
53
54
55
56

57 **Displaced aggression and entitativity**

1
2
3 Even if gang members are motivated to retaliate against their transgressor(s), this may not
4
5 always be possible, and so they may direct their aggression at a substitute victim. This is
6
7 known as *displaced aggression* - aggression targeting either an innocent victim (Dollard,
8
9 Doob, Miller, Mowrer, & Sears, 1939), or a victim who has done little to provoke the levels
10
11 of aggression meted on them (Pedersen, Gonzales, & Miller, 2000). Findings so far suggest
12
13 that gang members are more inclined than other individuals to engage in displaced aggression
14
15 (Vasquez, Lickel, & Hennigan, 2010). For example, on the streets, gangs are likely to come
16
17 in to contact/conflict with authority figures, especially if those authority figures use gang
18
19 suppression tactics. However, retaliation against justice officials risks arrest and so gang
20
21 members may displace their aggression on to innocent others such as passers-by or even
22
23 family members such as siblings.
24
25
26
27

28 The effects of the initial provocation may also exacerbate and amplify levels of
29
30 displaced aggression. A meta-analysis shows that the more negative the setting of the
31
32 interaction between the aggressor and the victim of displaced aggression and the greater the
33
34 similarity between the original provocateur and the displaced aggression target, then the more
35
36 the target will be considered to deserve his/her victimization which, in turn, increases the
37
38 magnitude of aggression (Marcus-Newhall, Pedersen, Carlson, & Miller, 2000). Also, if the
39
40 original provocation occurs in the presence of others then it will exacerbate the aggressive
41
42 response to the displacement target. This may be because the individual feels humiliated and
43
44 is motivated to 'save face' with important others (Vasquez et al., 2013). Because gangs are
45
46 street oriented groups their altercations are likely to occur in front of others such as ingroup
47
48 and outgroup gang members (Weerman et al., 2009) and so street codes which communicate
49
50 a gangster identity must be adhered to (see also Goldman et al., this volume). Consequently,
51
52 individual gang members may be motivated to use extreme violence to protect and/or
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 enhance their status and reputation with their own and other gangs. Thus, group process
4
5 effects may intensify the levels of aggression that gang members direct at others.
6
7

8 A further reason why gang members may use elevated levels of violence and indeed,
9
10 be more at risk of being on the receiving end of violence is *entitativity*. Entitativity refers to
11
12 the extent to which a group is perceived of as an entity (i.e., it possesses unity and
13
14 coherence). Campbell (1958) coined the term to differentiate between real groups and mere
15
16 gatherings of individuals. For example, intimate groups such as a family have entitativity,
17
18 whilst a group of people waiting at a bus stop do not (Lickel et al., 2000). Campbell argued
19
20 that groups could be considered to have entitativity if they moved together, resembled one
21
22 another, were close to each other and formed a coherent figure. Extending Campbell's ideas,
23
24 researchers have since proposed five antecedents to entitativity: the importance of the group
25
26 to its members; the similarity of group members; the degree to which members interact with
27
28 each other; the extent to which members share common goals; and the extent to which
29
30 members experience common outcomes (Lickel et al., 2000). The idea that high similarity
31
32 leads to perceptions that a group has high entitativity has also been confirmed by research
33
34 evidence (Hamilton, Sherman, & Rogers, 2004).
35
36
37
38
39

40 It is easy to see why gangs might be considered as being high in entitativity. They
41
42 share patterns of age (members are often adolescent), they are predominantly male, and
43
44 ethnically homogeneous (Klein, Weerman, & Thornberry, 2006) - although in the U.K. both
45
46 street (Mares, 2001) and prison (Wood, 2006) gangs tend to form along regional rather than
47
48 ethnic lines. Gangs also often adopt identifying features. For instance they may wear colors,
49
50 clothing, argot, tattoos, hand signals, and emblems to emphasize their unique identity (Klein
51
52 et al., 2006). In short, by adopting what they see as a *unique* identity, the group effectively
53
54 communicates its entitativity. In turn, this may lead others, particularly provoked rivals, to
55
56 believe that they are justified in violently targeting any member of the gang – even if that
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 individual member has done nothing to deserve victimization. Random targeting of an
4
5 opposing gang member is even more likely when it is difficult to identify the original
6
7 provocateur (e.g. in a drive-by shooting). In short, group membership raises the potential that
8
9 *any and all* members of a rival gang are justified targets of violence - since they are all the
10
11 same.
12

13
14
15 It seems, from the above, that gang membership has the potential to significantly
16
17 influence the social cognitive perspectives of individual members. When they join a gang,
18
19 and adopt a gang's group norms and behavior, this will in turn, as unified theory states, help
20
21 shape members' social cognitions. The influence of gang membership – or even the potential
22
23 for membership - may prompt the setting aside of existing moral standards so that the
24
25 individual's social cognitions fit with what they perceive as gang membership requirements.
26
27 They then adopt or develop pro-gang, pro-crime cognitive schemas or implicit theories
28
29 which, in turn, are fuelled by distorted cognitions and ruminative thinking. As their social
30
31 cognitions continue to be shaped by their gang membership they are more likely to believe
32
33 that violence is justified. The more that they see violence as justified then the more likely
34
35 they are to use it even displacing it on to undeserving others to save face and
36
37 maintain/acquire status. Entitativity will help feed the pro-violent conduct of gang members
38
39 since the similarity of rival gangs justifies the targeting of any its membership. Work
40
41 examining the social cognitions of gang members is still in its infancy, but there is a wealth
42
43 of potential for research to examine more closely the above factors to further our
44
45 understanding of the social cognitions of gang members and the role that their group
46
47 membership plays in the development of those thought processes.
48
49
50
51

52 53 **Conclusions** 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

1
2
3 The idea of this paper was not to provide an in-depth analysis of the psychology of group
4 processes – or even an in-depth analysis of any one theory. Rather its rationale was to
5 promote a closer consideration of the psychology of group processes in gang membership. To
6 achieve this; it has boiled down theoretical detail in favor of a broader approach. The
7 theoretical propositions and empirical evidence outlined above, are therefore simply
8 snapshots aimed to flag the potential that the psychology of group processes has to offer the
9 study of gangs. It has not, however, attempted to include the *entire* wealth of theoretical
10 propositions that could be used to examine gangs and so some important work has,
11 reluctantly, been omitted. For instance, some of the theories with potential for studying gangs
12 not covered in this paper include: *realistic group conflict theory; social learning theory;*
13 *leadership theories; deindividuation; intergroup emotions theory; hostile attribution bias and*
14 *optimal distinctiveness theory* – to name a few.

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

However, to deliver some theoretical coherence, this paper used as its backdrop unified theory which highlights how the pathway into gang membership is littered with psychological constructs that, with a few exceptions, remain mostly untapped in gang research. This is puzzling since social psychologists have robustly demonstrated for many years how, for instance, social identity, social categorization, uncertainty-identity, and self-esteem all play a role in group affiliation and that group membership, in turn, impacts the way that members think and feel about themselves.

If we are to develop a research agenda into gang membership that includes psychological theoretical propositions, then the group and social cognitive processes outlined above may help to lay the foundations for a psychological research and intervention agenda. An agenda for psychological research into gangs is large. Many important areas of gang membership require attention. As a start, any examination of group processes in gangs must, from necessity begin with a clear definitional perspective of what is meant by a gang.

1
2
3 Definitional issues have clouded gang research for most of the past century and been re-
4
5 visited many times (see also Maxson & Esbensen, 2012). However, the Eurogang definition
6
7 (Weerman et al., 2009) is the nearest we have to a consensual definition that is accepted
8
9 internationally by many scholars and practitioners (see Wood & Alleyne, 2010 for a more in-
10
11 depth discussion) and enables attention to be paid to comparative research – which, as Klein
12
13 (2006) notes is a crucial element of gang research. An equally crucial factor of psychological
14
15 research into gang membership will be methodology. Whilst psychometric evaluations may
16
17 provide an extremely useful methodological pathway for a psychology of gang
18
19 membership, as psychological enquiry into gangs is in its infancy there is also a real need for
20
21 systematic qualitative analyses to be conducted. For example, grounded theory (Strauss &
22
23 Corbin, 1994) may provide in-depth insight from gang members since participants will not be
24
25 constrained by the limits imposed by questionnaire items. Qualitative approaches would also
26
27 be useful to devise hypotheses to test quantitatively regarding group processes in gangs.
28
29
30
31
32 Triangulation methods which employ both quantitative and qualitative methods would further
33
34 provide multi-method evaluations of research questions and potentially yield rich data bases
35
36 which generate further hypotheses.
37
38

39
40
41 Psychological research may also help to develop problem focused and action oriented
42
43 approaches to enhance gang prevention and gang intervention programs. As an example, if
44
45 uncertainty-identity factors are found to contribute significantly to youth motivations to join a
46
47 gang – then these could be added to gang prevention programs to focus on identity issues
48
49 with vulnerable youth. Also, as gang youth continuously enter penal systems it seems
50
51 erroneous that rehabilitation programs address their criminogenic needs without examining
52
53 the stem of those needs. For instance, it seems insufficient to address a gang member's anger
54
55 issues and hope that this will encourage them to give up their gang membership and
56
57 offending lifestyles. Without also addressing the loyalty, commitment and emotional
58
59
60

1
2
3 attachment that members feel for their gang - all potentially developed via the group
4
5 processes of gang membership - then only part of the problem will have been tackled within
6
7 treatment. As Pyrooz et al., (2010) note, gang members often continue to feel bound to their
8
9 gangs - even after leaving the group. Issues of friendship, support and personal identity are
10
11 group processes intertwined with gang membership and potentially derive from the group
12
13 processes that underpin that membership. With so little psychological involvement in gang
14
15 research, it is difficult to pinpoint an accurate psychology of group processes in gangs and,
16
17 without psychological input, it will be difficult to develop comprehensive and fully effective
18
19 interventions to reduce gang membership. To be truly effective, treatment and gang
20
21 prevention programs need to be informed by a fuller understanding of the extent, strength and
22
23 specific nature of the group processes that influence individual gang members. To achieve
24
25 this critical understanding of gang membership more psychological and group process
26
27 oriented gang research is vital.
28
29
30
31

32
33 Clearly a great deal of work is necessary before we can know the exact role of group
34
35 processes in gang membership specifically – or how membership in a gang facilitates social
36
37 cognitive development (and for that matter, mental ill health) but psychology has an
38
39 infrastructure, that so far remains largely inert in this area of research. As seasoned gang
40
41 researchers such as Klein, Short, Strodbeck, Maxson - to name a few - have emphasized,
42
43 group processes lie at the heart of gang membership - and psychology has much to offer in
44
45 the context of group process research.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. (2010). Social identity and self-categorization. *The SAGE handbook of prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination*, (pp.179-193).
- Aldridge, J., Medina, J., & Ralphs, R. (2008). Youth gangs in an English city: Social exclusion, drugs and violence. *Manchester, University of Manchester research report ESRC RES-000-23-0615*.
- Alleyne, E., & Wood, J. L. (2010). Gang involvement: Psychological and behavioural characteristics of gang members, peripheral youth and non-gang youth. *Aggressive Behavior*, 36, 423-436. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2009.08.005>
- Anderson, E. (1999). *Code of the street: Decency, violence and the moral life of the inner city*. New York, NY: Norton and Company.
- Asch, S. E. (1951). Effects of group pressure upon the modification and distortion of judgment. In H. Guetzkow (Ed.), *Groups, leadership and men*. (pp. 222-236). Pittsburgh, PA: Carnegie Press.
- Ayling, J. (2011). Gang change and evolutionary theory. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, 56, 1-26. doi:10.1007/s10611-011-9301-x
- Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (1996). Mechanisms of moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 364-374. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.71.2.364
- Baron, R. S., Kerr, N. L. (2003), *Group process, group decisions, group action*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Beck, A. T. (1964). Thinking and depression: II. Theory and therapy. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 10, 561-571. doi:10.1001/archpsyc.1964.01720240015003
- Bollen, K., & Hoyle, R.H. (1990). Perceived cohesion: A conceptual and empirical examination. *Social Forces*, 69, 479 - 504). doi: 10.1093/sf/69.2.479

- 1
2
3 Bruner, J. S. (1957). On perceptual readiness. *Psychological Review*, *64*, 123-152. doi:
4
5 10.1037/h0043805
6
7
8 Bushman B. J., Bonacci, A. M., Pedersen, W. C., Vasquez, E. A. Miller, N. (2005). Chewing on it
9
10 can chew you up: Effects of rumination on triggered displaced aggression. *Journal of*
11
12 *Personality and Social Psychology*, *88*, 969–983. doi: [10.1037/0022-3514.88.6.969](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.6.969)
13
14
15 Campbell, D. T. (1958). Common fate, similarity, and other indices of the status of aggregates of
16
17 person as social entities. *Behavioral Science*, *3*, 14–25. doi:10.1002/bs.3830030103
18
19
20
21 Cialdini, R. B., Borden, R. J., Thorne, A., Walker, M. R., Freeman, S., & Sloan, L. R. (1976).
22
23 Basking in reflected glory: Three (football) field studies. *Journal of Personality and Social*
24
25 *Psychology*, *34*, 366-375. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.34.3.366
26
27
28
29 Chu, C. M., Daffern, M., Thomas, S., & Lim, J. Y. (2012). Violence risk and gang affiliation in
30
31 youth offenders: a recidivism study. *Psychology, Crime and Law*, *18*, 299-315.
32
33 doi:10.1080/1068316X.2010.481626
34
35
36 Coid, J. W., Ullrich, S., Keers, R., Bebbington, P., DeStavola, B. L., Kallis, C., Yang, M., Reiss, D.,
37
38 Jenkins, R., Donnelly, P. (2013). Gang membership, violence, and psychiatric morbidity.
39
40 *American Journal of Psychiatry*. doi: 10.1176/appi.ajp.2013.12091188
41
42
43 Cooper, J. Kelly, K. A., & Weaver, K. (2004). Attitudes, norms, and social groups. In M. B. Brewer
44
45 & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Social cognition* (pp. 244-267). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
46
47
48
49 Crocker, J., Luhtanen, R., Blaine, B., & Broadnax, S. (1994). Collective self-esteem and
50
51 psychological wellbeing among White, Black, and Asian college students. *Personality and*
52
53 *Social Psychology Bulletin*, *20*, 503-513. doi: 10.1177/0146167294205007
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 David, B., & Turner, J. C. (1996). Studies in self-categorization and minority conversion: Is being a
4 member of the out-group an advantage? *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 35, 179-199).
5
6 doi:10.1111/j.2044-8309.1996.tb01091.x
7
8
9
10 Decker, S. H., & Curry, G. D. (2002). Gangs, gang homicides, and gang loyalty: organized crimes or
11 disorganized criminals? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30, 343–352.
12
13 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2352\(02\)00134-4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2352(02)00134-4)
14
15
16
17 Decker, S. H., & Van Winkle, B. (1996). *Life in the gang: Family, friends, and violence*. New York,
18 NY: Cambridge University Press.
19
20
21
22 Densley, J. A. (2013). *How gangs work: An ethnography of youth violence*. Oxford, UK: Palgrave
23 Macmillan.
24
25
26
27
28 Dion, K. L. (2000). Group cohesion: From "field of forces" to multidimensional construct. *Group*
29 *Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 4, 7. doi: 10.1037/1089-2699.4.1.7
30
31
32
33 Dollard, J., Doob, L., Miller, N., Mowrer, O., & Sears, R. (1939). *Frustration and aggression*. New
34 Haven, CT: Yale University Press
35
36
37
38 Drury, J. (2010). Identity dynamics in adolescent-adult communication. In H. Giles, S. A. Reid, & J.
39 Harwood (Eds.), *The dynamics of intergroup communication* (pp. 53-64). New York, NY:
40 Peter Lang.
41
42
43
44
45
46 Dukes, R. L., Martinez, R. O., & Stein, J. A. (1997). Precursors and consequences of membership in
47 youth gangs. *Youth and Society*, 29, 139-165. doi: 10.1177/0044118X97029002001
48
49
50
51 Eitle, D., Gunkel, S., & van Gundy, K. (2004). Cumulative exposure to stressful life events and male
52 gang membership. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 32, 95-111.
53
54 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2003.12.001>
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Emler, N., & Reicher, S. (1995). *Adolescence and delinquency*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
4
5
6 Epps, J., & Kendall, P. C. (1995). Hostile attributional bias in adults. *Cognitive Therapy and*
7
8 *Research, 19*, 159-178. doi: 10.1007/BF02229692
9
10
11 Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity, youth and crisis*. New York: W.W. Norton, Inc.
12
13
14 Esbensen, F.-A., Huizinga, D., & Weiher, A. W. (1993). Gang and non-gang youth: Differences in
15
16 explanatory factors. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 9*, 94-116. doi:
17
18 10.1177/104398629300900203
19
20
21 Esbensen, F.-A., & Osgood, D. W. (1999). Gang resistance education and training (GREAT):
22
23 Results from the national evaluation. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 36*,
24
25 194-225. doi: 10.1177/0022427899036002004
26
27
28
29 Evans, C. R., & Dion, K. L. (1991). Group cohesion and performance: A meta-analysis. *Small Group*
30
31 *Research, 22*, 175–186. doi: 10.1177/1046496491222002
32
33
34 Festinger, L. (1962). *A theory of cognitive dissonance* (Vol. 2). Stanford, CA: Stanford University
35
36 Press.
37
38
39 Festinger, L., Schachter, S., & Back, K. (1950). *Social Pressures in Informal Groups: A study of*
40
41 *human factors in housing*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
42
43
44
45 Gilchrist, E. (2008). Implicit thinking about implicit theories in intimate partner violence.
46
47 *Psychology, Crime and Law, 15*, 131–145. doi: 10.1080/10683160802190863
48
49
50 Goldstein, A. P. (1991). *Delinquent gangs: A psychological perspective*. Champaign, IL: Research
51
52 Press.
53
54
55 Goldstein, A. P. (2002). *The psychology of group aggression*. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons
56
57 Ltd.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Gottfredson, M. R., & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford
4
5 University Press.
6
7
8 Hagedorn, J.M. (2008). *A world of gangs: Armed young men and gangsta culture*. Minneapolis, MN:
9
10 University of Minnesota Press.
11
12
13 Hamilton, D. L., Sherman, S. J., & Rodgers, J. S. (2004). Perceiving the groupness of groups:
14
15 Entitativity, homogeneity, essentialism, and stereotypes. In V. Yzerbyt, C. M. Judd, & O.
16
17 Corneille (Eds.), *The psychology of group perception: Perceived variability, entitativity, and*
18
19 *essentialism* (pp. 39-60). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
20
21
22
23 Harding, S. (2012). *Unleashed: The phenomena of status dogs and weapon dogs*. Bristol, UK: The
24
25 Policy Press.
26
27
28 Harris, D., Turner, R., Garratt, I., & Atkinson, S. Ministry of Justice, National Offender Management
29
30 Service. (2011). *Understanding the psychology of gang delinquency: Implications for*
31
32 *defining effecting violence interventions*. Retrieved from Ministry of Justice website:
33
34 [http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/publications/research-and-analysis/moj-](http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/publications/research-and-analysis/moj-research/research-gang-violence.pdf)
35
36 [research/research-gang-violence.pdf](http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/publications/research-and-analysis/moj-research/research-gang-violence.pdf)
37
38
39
40 Hennigan, K., & Spanovic, M. (2012). Gang dynamics through the lens of social identity theory. In
41
42 Esbensen, F. A., & Maxson, C. L. (Eds.), *Youth gangs in international perspective* (pp. 127-
43
44 149). New York, NY; Springer..
45
46
47
48 Henry, K. L. (2010). Academic achievement and adolescent drug use: An examination of reciprocal
49
50 effects and correlated growth trajectories. *Journal of School Health, 80*, 38-43.
51
52 doi:10.1111/j.1746-1561.2009.00455.x
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Henry, K. L., Knight, K. E., & Thornberry, T. P. (2012). School disengagement as a predictor of
4 dropout, delinquency, and problem substance use during adolescence and early adulthood.
5 *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *41*, 156-166. doi: 10.1007/s10964-011-9665-3
6
7
8
9
10 Hill, G. H., Lui, C., & Hawkins, J. D. (2001). *Early precursors of gang membership: A study of*
11 *Seattle youth*. Juvenile Justice Bulletin, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office
12 of Justice Program, OJJDP.
13
14
15
16
17
18 Hogg, M. A. (2000). Subjective uncertainty reduction through self-categorization: A motivational
19 theory of social identity processes. *European review of social psychology*, *11*(1), 223-255.
20 doi: 10.1080/14792772043000040
21
22
23
24
25 Hogg, M. A. (2004) Social categorization, depersonalization, and group behavior. Self and social
26 identity. In M. B. Brewer & M. Hewstone (Eds.). *Self and social identity: Perspectives on*
27 *Social Psychology* (pp. 203-231). Malden, UK: Blackwell.
28
29
30
31
32
33 Hogg, M. A. (2013). Intergroup relations. In J. DeLamater & A. Ward (Eds.), *Handbook of social*
34 *psychology* (pp. 533-561). Springer Netherlands.
35
36
37
38 Hogg, M. A., & Abrams, D. (1988). *Social identifications: A social psychology of intergroup*
39 *relations and group processes*. London, UK: Routledge.
40
41
42
43 Hogg, M. A., & Giles, H. (2012). Norm talk and identity in intergroup communication. In H. Giles
44 (Ed.), *The handbook of intergroup communication* (pp. 373-387). New York, NY:
45 Routledge.
46
47
48
49
50
51 Hogg, M. A., Kruglanski, A., & Bos, K. (2013). Uncertainty and the roots of extremism. *Journal of*
52 *Social Issues*, *69*, 407-418. DOI:10.1111/josi.12021
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Hogg, M. A., & Reid, S. A. (2006). Social identity, self-categorization, and the communication of
4
5 group norms. *Communication Theory*, *16*, 7-30. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2885.2006.00003.x
6
7
- 8 Horowitz, M. J. (1986). *Stress response syndromes* (2nd ed.). Northvale, NJ: Aronson
9
10
- 11 Hughes, L. A. (2006). Studying youth gangs: The importance of context. In J. F. Short & L. A.
12
13 Hughes (Eds.), *Studying youth gangs*, (pp. 37-45). Oxford, UK: AltaMira Press.
14
15
- 16 Hughes, L. A. (2013). Group cohesiveness, gang member prestige, and delinquency and violence in
17
18 chicago, 1959–1962. *Criminology*, doi: 10.1111/1745-9125.12020
19
20
- 21 Hughes, L. A., & Short, J. F., Jr. (2005). Disputes involving youth street gang members: Micro-
22
23 social contexts. *Criminology*, *43*), 43-76. doi:10.1111/j.0011-1348.2005.00002.x
24
25
- 26 Hyde, L. W., Shaw, D. S., & Moilanen, K. L. (2010). Developmental Precursors of Moral
27
28 Disengagement and the Role of Moral Disengagement in the Development of Antisocial
29
30 Behavior. *Journal of abnormal child psychology* *38*, 197–209. doi: 10.1007/s10802-009-
31
32 9358-5
33
34
- 35 Janis, I. L. (1972). *Victims of groupthink: A psychological study of foreign-policy decisions and*
36
37 *fiascoes*. Oxford, UK: Houghton Mifflin.
38
39
- 40 Jansyn, L. R., Jr. (1966). Solidarity and delinquency in a street corner group. *American Sociological*
41
42 *Review*, *31*, 600–614.
43
44
- 45 Jetten, J., Spears, R., & Manstead, A. S. R. (1996). Intergroup norms and intergroup discrimination:
46
47 Distinctive self-categorization and social identity effects. *Journal of Personality and Social*
48
49 *Psychology*, *71*, 1222-1233. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-0992(199709/10)27:5<603::AID-
50
51 EJSP816>3.0.CO;2-B
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Katz, C. M., Webb, V. J., Fox, K., & Shaffer, J. N. (2011). Understanding the relationship between
4
5 violent victimization and gang membership. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *39*, 48-59.
6
7 doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.10.004
8
9
- 10 Klein, M. W. (1971). *Street gangs and street workers*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
11
12
- 13 Klein, M. W. (1995). *The American street gang: Its nature, prevalence, and control*. New York, NY:
14
15 Oxford University Press.
16
17
- 18 Klein, M. W. (2006). The value of comparisons in street gang research. In J. F. Short & L. A.
19
20 Hughes (Eds.), *Studying youth gangs* (pp. 129-143). Oxford, UK: Altamira Press.
21
22
- 23 Klein, M. W., & Maxson, C. K. (1989). Street gang violence. In N. Weine & M. Wolfgang, (Eds.),
24
25 *Violent crime, violent criminals* (pp. 198-234). Newbury Park, CA: Sage
26
27
- 28 Klein, M. W., & Maxson, C. L. (2006). *Street gang patterns and policies*. New York, NY: Oxford
29
30 University Press, Inc.
31
32
- 33 Klein, M. W., Weerman, F. M., & Thornberry, T. P. (2006). Street gang violence in Europe.
34
35 *European Journal of Criminology*, *3*, 413-437. doi: 10.1177/1477370806067911
36
37
- 38 Klemp-North, M. (2007). Theoretical foundations of gang membership. *Journal of Gang Research*,
39
40 *14*, 11-26.
41
42
- 43 Knox, G. W. (1994). *An introduction to gangs*. Bristol, IN: Wyndham Hall Press.
44
45
- 46 Lickel, B., Hamilton, D. L., Wierzchowska, G., Lewis, A., Sherman, S. J., & Uhles, A. N. (2000).
47
48 Varieties of groups and the perception of group entitativity. *Journal of Personality and Social*
49
50 *Psychology*, *78*, 223-246. doi: [10.1037/0022-3514.78.2.223](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.78.2.223)
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Lien, I.-L. (2005). The role of crime acts in constituting the gang's mentality. In S. H. Decker & F.
4
5 M. Weerman (Eds.) *European street gangs and troublesome youth groups: Findings from the*
6
7 *Eurogang research program* (pp. 35–62). Oxford, UK: AltaMira Press.
8
9
10 Lyubomirsky, S., & Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (1995). Effects of self-focused rumination on negative
11
12 thinking and interpersonal problem solving. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,
13
14 69, 176-190. doi: [10.1037/0022-3514.69.1.176](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.69.1.176)
15
16
17
18 Mann, R., & Beech, A. R. (2003). Cognitive distortions, schemas and implicit theories. In T. Ward,
19
20 D. R. Laws, & S. M. Hudson (Eds.), *Theoretical issues and controversies in sexual deviance*
21
22 (pp. 135– 153). London, UK: Sage.
23
24
25 Mares, D. (2001). Gangstas or lager louts? Working class street gangs in Manchester. In M. W.
26
27 Klein, H. J. Kerner, C. L. Maxson, & E. G. M. Weitekamp (Eds.), *The Eurogang paradox*
28
29 (pp. 153-164). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.
30
31
32
33 Marcus-Newhall, A., Pedersen, W. C., Carlson, M., & Miller, N. (2000). Displaced aggression is
34
35 alive and well: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78,
36
37 670–689. doi: [10.1037/0022-3514.78.4.670](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.78.4.670)
38
39
40 Marshall, B., Webb, B., & Tilley, N. (2005). *Rationalisation of current research on guns, gangs and*
41
42 *other weapons: Phase 1*. London, UK: University College London Jill Dando Institute of
43
44 Crime Science.
45
46
47
48 Matza, D. (1964). *Delinquency and drift*. New York, NY: Wiley
49
50
51 Maxson, C. L., & Esbensen, F. A. (2012). The intersection of gang definition and group process:
52
53 concluding observations. In *Youth Gangs in International Perspective* (pp. 303-315).
54
55 Springer New York.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 McAra L, McVie S. (2005). The usual suspects?: Street-life, young people and the police. *Criminal*
4
5 *Justice*, 5, 5-36. doi: 10.1177/1466802505050977
6
7
- 8 Moore, J., & Vigil, J. D. (1987). Chicano Gangs: Group Norms and Individual Factors related to
9
10 Adult Criminality. *Aztlan*, 18, 27-44.
11
12
- 13 Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (1991). Responses to depression and their effects on the duration of depressive
14
15 episodes. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 100, 569-582. doi: [10.1037/0021-](https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.100.4.569)
16
17 [843X.100.4.569](https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.100.4.569)
18
19
- 20 Nolen-Hoeksema, S., Wisco, B. E., & Lyubomirsky, S. (2008). Rethinking rumination. *Perspectives*
21
22 *on Psychological Science*, 3, 400–424. doi: 10.1111/j.1745-6924.2008.00088.x
23
24
25
- 26 Novaco, R. W. (1997). Remediating anger and aggression with violent offenders. *Legal and*
27
28 *Criminological Psychology*, 2, 77–88. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8333.1997.tb00334.x
29
30
- 31 Ó Ciardha, C., & Gannon, T. A. (2012). The Implicit Theories of Firesetters: A Preliminary
32
33 Conceptualization. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 17, 122-128.
34
35 doi:10.1016/j.avb.2011.12.001
36
37
- 38 O’Gorman, H. (1986). The Discovery of Pluralistic Ignorance: An Ironic Lesson. *Journal of the*
39
40 *Historic and Behavioral Sciences*, 22, 333-347. doi: 10.1002/1520-
41
42 6696(198610)22:4<333::AID-JHBS2300220405>3.0.CO;2-X
43
44
45
- 46 Papachristos, A. V. (2009) Murder by structure: the social structure of gang homicide. *American*
47
48 *Journal of Sociology*, 115, 74–128. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/597791>
49
50
- 51 Papachristos, A. V., Hureau, D. M., & Braga, A. A. (2013). The corner and the crew: the influence of
52
53 geography and social networks on gang violence. *American Sociological Review*, 78, 417-
54
55 447. doi: 10.1177/0003122413486800
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Patillo, M. E. (1998). Sweet mothers and gang-bangers: Managing crime in a black middle-class
4 neighborhood. *Social Forces*, 76, 747-774. doi: 10.1093/sf/76.3.747
5
6
7
8 Pedersen W. C., Gonzales C., & Miller N. (2000). The moderating effect of trivial triggering
9 provocation on displaced aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 78, 913–
10 27. doi: [10.1037/0022-3514.78.5.913](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.78.5.913)
11
12
13
14
15 Pickett, C. L., & Brewer, M. B. (2005). The Role of Exclusion in Maintaining Ingroup Inclusion. In
16 D. Abrams, M. A. Hogg, & J. M. Marques (Eds.), *The social psychology of inclusion and*
17 *exclusion* (pp. 89-111). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
18
19
20
21
22
23 Polaschek, D. L. L., Calvert, S. W., & Gannon, T. A. (2009). Linking violent thinking: Implicit
24 theory-based research with violent offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24, 75-96.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32 Polaschek, D. L. L., & Ward, T. (2002). The implicit theories of potential rapists: What our
33 questionnaires tell us. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 7, 385-406.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Pornari, C. D., Dixon, L., & Humphreys, G. W. (2013). Systematically identifying implicit theories
in male and female intimate partner violence perpetrators. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*,
18, 496-505. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2013.07.005>
- Prentice, D. A., & Miller, D. T. (1993). Pluralistic ignorance and alcohol use on campus: Some
consequences of misperceiving the social norm. *Journal of Personality and Social
Psychology*, 64, 243–256. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.64.2.243
- Przemieniecki, C. J. (2005). Gang behavior and movies: Do Hollywood gang films influence violent
gang behavior? *Journal of Gang Research*, 12, 41-71.

- 1
2
3 Pyrooz, D. C., Decker, S. H., & Webb, V. J. (2010). The ties that bind: Desistance from gangs.
4
5 *Crime and Delinquency*. doi: 10.1177/0011128710372191
6
7
- 8 Ralphs, R., Medina, J., & Aldridge, J. (2009). Who needs enemies with friends like these? The
9
10 importance of place for young people living in known gang areas. *Journal of Youth Studies*,
11
12 12, 483–500. doi:10.1080/13676260903083356
13
14
- 15 Reid, S. A., Cropley, C. J., & Hogg, M. A. (2005). *A self-categorization explanation of pluralistic*
16
17 *ignorance*. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Santa Barbara.
18
19
- 20 Reid, S. A., Giles, H., & Harwood, J. (2005). A self-categorization perspective on communication
21
22 and intergroup relations. In J. Harwood & H. Giles (Eds.), *Intergroup communication:*
23
24 *Multiple perspectives* (pp. 241-263). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
25
26
- 27
28 Rimal, R. N., & Real, K. (2003). Understanding the influence of perceived norms on behaviors.
29
30 *Communication Theory*, 13, 184–203. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2885.2003. tb00288.x
31
32
- 33 Sanders, W. B. (1994). *Gangbans and drive-bys: Grounded culture and juvenile gang violence*.
34
35 New York, NY: Aldine de Gruyter
36
37
- 38 Short, J. F., Jr., & Strodbeck, F. L. (1965). *Group process and gang delinquency*. Chicago, IL:
39
40 University of Chicago.
41
42
- 43
44 Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
45
46
- 47 South, R., & Wood, J. L. (2006). Bullying in prisons: The importance of perceived social status,
48
49 prisonization and moral disengagement. *Aggressive Behavior*, 32, 490-501.
50
51 doi:10.1002/ab.20149
52
53
- 54 Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1994). Grounded theory methodology. *Handbook of qualitative research*,
55
56 (pp. 273-285).
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel &
4 W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago, IL: Nelson-
5 Hall.
6
7
8
9
10 Taylor, T. J., Freng, A., Esbensen, F-A., & Peterson, D. (2008). Youth gang membership and serious
11 violent victimization: The importance of lifestyles and routine activities. *Journal of*
12 *Interpersonal Violence*, 23, 1441-1464. doi: 10.1177/0886260508314306
13
14
15
16
17
18 Thornberry, T. P., Krohn, M. D., Lizotte, A. J., Smith, C., & Tobin, K. (2003). *Gangs and*
19 *delinquency in developmental perspective*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
20
21
22
23 Toy, J. and Stanko, B. (2008) *Die another day: A practitioner's review with recommendations for*
24 *preventing gang and weapon violence in London in 2008*. Retrieved from
25 <https://lemosandcrane.co.uk/resources/forum/218/dieanotherday.pdf>
26
27
28
29
30
31 Turner, J. C.; Hogg, M.; Oakes, P. J.; Reicher, S. D.; Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the*
32 *social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
33
34
35
36 Vasquez, E. A., Lickel, B., & Hennigan K. (2010). Gangs, displaced, and group-based aggression.
37 *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 15,130–140. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2009.08.001>
38
39
40
41 Vasquez, E. A., Osman, S., & Wood, J. L. (2012). Rumination and the displacement of aggression in
42 United Kingdom gang-affiliated youth. *Aggressive Behavior*, 38, 89- 97.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49 Vasquez, E. A., Pedersen, W. C., Bushman, B. J., Kelley, N. J., Demeestere, P., & Miller, N. (2013).
50 Lashing out after stewing over public insults: The effects of public provocation, provocation
51 intensity, and rumination on triggered displaced aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 39, 13 - 29.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Vigil, J. D. (1988). *Barrio gangs: street life and identity in southern California*. Austin, TX:
4
5 University of Texas Press.
6
7
8 Viki, G. T., & Abrams, D. (2012). The social influence of groups on individuals. In Wood, J. L. and
9
10 Gannon, T. A. (Eds.) *Crime and crime reduction: The importance of group processes* (pp. 3-
11
12 33). East Sussex, UK: Routledge.
13
14
15 Ward, T. (2000). Sexual offenders' cognitive distortions as implicit theories. *Aggression and Violent*
16
17 *Behavior*, 5, 491-507. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1359-1789\(98\)00036-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1359-1789(98)00036-6)
18
19
20
21 Ward, T., & Keenan, T. (1999). Child molesters' implicit theories. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*,
22
23 14, 821-838. doi: 10.1177/088626099014008003
24
25
26 Weerman, F. M., Maxson, C. L., Esbensen, F., Aldridge, J., Medina, J., & van Gemert, F. (2009).
27
28 *Eurogang program manual background, development, and use of the Eurogang instruments*
29
30 *in multi-site, multi-method comparative research*. Retrieved from the Eurogang Network
31
32 website: http://www.umsl.edu/~ccj/eurogang/Eurogang_20Manual.pdf
33
34
35
36 Weldon, S., & Gilchrist, E. (2012). Implicit Theories in Intimate Partner Violence Offenders *Journal*
37
38 *of Family Violence*, 8, 761-772. doi: 10.1007/s10896-012-9465-x
39
40
41 Wilder, D. A. (1986). Social categorization: Implications for creation and reduction of intergroup
42
43 bias. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 19, pp. 293-
44
45 355). New York, NY: Academic Press
46
47
48 Wood, J. L. (2006). Gang activity in English prisons: The prisoners' perspective. *Psychology, Crime*
49
50 *& Law*, 12, 605_617. doi:10.1080/10683160500337667
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Wood, J. L., & Alleyne, E. (2010). Street gang theory and research: Where are we now and where do
4
5 we go from here? *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 15, 100-111.

6
7 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2009.08.005>
8
9

10 Wood, J. L., Alleyne, E., Mozova, K., & James, M. (2013). Predicting involvement in prison gang
11
12 activity: Street gang membership, social and psychological factors. *Law and Human*
13
14 *Behavior*. doi: 10.1037/lhb0000053
15
16

17
18 Wood, J. L., Moir, A., & James M. (2009). Prisoners' gang-related activity: the importance of
19
20 bullying and moral disengagement. *Psychology Crime and Law*, 15, 569 – 581.

21
22 doi:10.1080/10683160802427786
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60