Collective violence offenders and offending : the role of individual characteristics
Ham, T. van

Citation

Ham, T. van. (2020, September 29). *Collective violence offenders and offending : the role of individual characteristics*. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/137094

Version:	Publisher's Version
License:	[Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)
Downloaded from:	[https://hdl.handle.net/1887/137094](#)

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page

Universiteit Leiden

The handle http://hdl.handle.net/1887/136915 holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Ham, T. van
Title: Collective violence offenders and offending : the role of individual characteristics
Issue Date: 2020-09-29

01.
Introduction

Background

History provides many examples of seemingly 'ordinary' men who take part in acts of collective violence that support the economic, political or social goals of 'their' group, such as genocide, mass killings, insurgencies and terrorism. For long, social scientists have debated whether engaging in such violence is driven solely by circumstances or whether individual characteristics also are important (e.g. Browning, 1992; De Swaan, 2015; Littman & Paluck, 2014). This goes as well for collective violence that is resorted to by crowds, which is the subject matter of this thesis. This latter form of collective violence may occur around demonstrations, protests, football matches, recreational events and community disturbances, and distinguishes itself from for instance war and state-perpetrated acts (Adang, 2011; WHO, 2002). For the sake of readability, collective violence by crowds in this thesis is simply referred to as collective violence. For the purpose of this thesis, both confronting others physically and the destroying or damaging of objects, or attempts to do so, are listed as under violence.

The first explanations of collective violence date back till the end of the 19th century. Le Bon (1895) assumed that within a group, individuals behave irrationally and may come to act violently because they shift from a conscious to an unconscious personality. This so-called 'classical perspective' on collective violence is linked to the later developed concept of deindividuation: a tempxorary state of reduced self-awareness due to an increased feeling of anonymity and a decreased feeling of individual responsibility (Diener, 1980; Zimbardo, 1969). Furthermore, within the classical perspective on collective violence some authors assume that violent crowd behavior reflects the criminal or deviant nature of the individuals who are a part of it. This latter notion is incorporated in so-called convergence explanations (Ball & Drury, 2012; Reicher, 2001).

The classical perspectives on collective violence have been misused to criminalize crowds and, in turn, as a justification to treat crowds as criminal (Reicher, 2001). Uproars by ethnic minorities in the 1960s and 1970s and the rise of hooliganism in the 1980s refueled scholarly interest in collective violence. Dissatisfied with the absence of context in classical perspectives (decontextualizing), alternative explanations were developed. Turner & Kilian (1987), for instance, argued that group norms are established through joint consultation between individuals within the crowd, witah some having more influence than others. Although this line of reasoning provided a link between individuals and their actions in crowds, their emergent norm theory failed to explain how such crowd unity can be quickly achieved in changing circumstances (Wright, 1978). Furthermore, the context in which collective violence emerged, including its intra- and intergroup dynamics, kept being disregarded (Reicher, 2001).

To address these shortcomings and to illustrate that – for those involved – involvement in collective violence is meaningful behavior, in the 1980s, the concept of social identity was introduced. By arguing that crowd behavior is guided by an individual's self-understanding as a member of a group (social identity) instead of his own goals and desires (personal identity), the focus shifted to the relevance of perceived similarities with the in-group and differences with the out-group. Consequently, the social identity perspective on collective violence maintains that individual behavior in crowds is guided exclusively by social category-based processes (Reicher, 1984, 1987). Over

the past decades, the social identity perspective on collective violence has been further elaborated (Reicher, 2001). One of its main premises is that individual characteristics do not in any way guide individual behavior in crowds: '*there has been precious little success in finding any individual attributes which reliably predict riot participation*' (Reicher, 2001, p. 191). This stance has remained virtually undisputed (Brown, 2000) but, at the same time, has also been insufficiently studied. This introductory chapter intends to explain why sticking to this premise is unsatisfactory and why individual characteristics should be a legitimate component of collective violence research. In addition, in this chapter the thesis' aim, exploring the contribution of individual characteristics to collective violence, and its outline are described.

A social identity perspective on collective violence

From the 1960s onwards, study results indicated that collective violence was not – as proposed by the "classical" theories – irrational, unfocused and uncontrolled (e.g. Reicher, 1984, 1987). Convergence explanations stressing that the crowd reinforces and intensifies the already existing criminal and deviant character of individuals who are a part of it, were also increasingly challenged. For instance, research showed that the majority of those involved in collective violence around protests and demonstrations had no substantial criminal history and did not routinely engage in violent behavior. Furthermore, no other links between individual characteristics and partaking in collective violence could be established (Reicher, 2001). Individual characteristics were argued not to predict or explain individual behavior in social situations at all or, if they did, their influence would quickly diminish in larger crowds (McPhail & Pickens, 1981; McPhail, 1991; Stott & Reicher, 1998a; Turner, 1964).

To offer a counterpart to the classical perspectives on collective violence, scholars aimed to provide a link between individuals, their actions in crowds, and the context in which these actions arise (Reicher, 2001). To this end, Tajfel and Turner's (1979) concept of social identity was adapted to explain collective violence. These scholars assumed that individuals have many social identities (e.g. family, nationality, neighborhood and work), which ensures that individual thoughts, emotions and behaviors are in accordance with the situation at hand (Tajfel & Turner's, 1979; Turner & Kilian, 1987). This concept of social identity is at the core of the Social Identity Model (SIM), which currently is one of the dominant vantage points for explaining collective violence. The SIM maintains that in response to underlying causes and/or precipitating incidents (hereafter: trigger events) individuals in a crowd may shift from a personal to a social identity. Subsequently, situation-specific norms are assumed to guide group and individual behavior, suggesting that an 'us-them' perspective is a main catalyst of collective action (Postmes & Spears, 1998; Reicher, 1984, 1987). From a social identity perspective, partaking in collective violence entails neither irrational, unfocused and uncontrolled behavior nor an influence of pre-existing individual characteristics. Instead, it assumes a shift from individual to categorical bases of behavioral control (Reicher, 2001).

The social identity perspective on collective violence has received extensive empirical support (see Reicher (2001) for an overview). The

categorical level of perceived relationships is particularly well reflected in the dynamics between police action – treating the whole crowd as potentially disruptive – and its consequences for crowd behavior. In such cases previously 'neutral' individuals in the crowd may come to act violently (e.g. Stott & Reicher, 1998b; Drury & Reicher, 1999; Stott & Drury, 2000), reflecting the notion that individuals tend to gravitate to a position minimizing intra-group differences compared to intergroup differences (Haslam & Turner, 1992, 1995; Haslam, Turner, Oakes, McGarty & Hayes, 1992). The results of these and other studies also underscore that collective violence is aimed only at the out-group linked to the trigger event, and that behavioral norms are defined by looking at the behavior of others who are considered to share the same social identity (Drury & Reicher, 2000, 2005; Postmes & Spears, 1998; Reicher, 1984, 1987, 1996). Unlike previously developed theories, the social identity perspective on collective violence explains the rapidity with which consensus within crowds can arise and why any person in a crowd may come to act violently (Reicher, 2001; Terry, Hogg & White, 1999).

Even in the face of trigger events and intergroup dynamics gravitating towards collective violent action however, only a minority of the individuals present actually involve themselves in violent behavior (Adang, 2011). This observation may be explained by differences in the social categories that individuals identify, in the contents of these categories and in the persons prototypical thereof (Herrera & Reicher, 1998; Reicher & Hopkins, 1996a, b; Reicher & Sani, 1998; Sani & Reicher, 1998, 1999). Furthermore, experiencing anger or joy has been pointed to as a factor contributing to intergroup conflict and offensive action tendencies in crowds (Levy et al., 2017; Mackie et al., 2000; Spaaij, 2008; Yzerbyt et al., 2003). Such findings suggest that cognitive processes and resultant emotions may play a key role in collective violence involvement. Consequently this also indicates that individual-level factors may have explanatory value with regard to this matter.

Individual-level explanations for violent behavior

Anger is a strong negative emotional state that is explicitly linked to violent behavior (DeWall, Anderson & Bushman, 2011). Individuals vary in their propensity to experience anger due to the way social information is processed and the emotions this evokes (see Crick & Dodge, 1994). This, in turn, suggests that in a given context chances of behaving violently differ between individuals (Hazebroek, Howells & Day, 2001; Martinko & Zellars, 1998; Owen, 2011). Heightened impulsivity and emotion regulation deficits (ED) are examples of behavioral and psychological characteristics that have been implicated in the etiology of violence, particularly violent behavior disproportionate to the actual situation (Coccaro, 2003; Fetich et al., 2014; Kulper et al., 2015; Puhalla et al., 2016). This goes as well for a hostile attribution bias – the tendency of interpreting others' intent as hostile also in ambiguous or benign situations – which is often present in people suffering from antisocial personality disorder (ASPD) (e.g. Bailey & Ostrov, 2008; Babcock, Green, & Webb, 2008; Douglas & Martinko, 2001).

Not only social information processing but also explicit and implicit attitudes towards violent behavior have been pointed to as a contributing factor to actual violence (Anderson & Huesmann, 2007). Explicit attitudes refer to deliberate behaviors that can be traced back to a positive view on

the behavior in question (Gawronski & Bodenhausen, 2006). Examples of positive attitudes towards violent behavior are reflected in the belief that this behavior is acceptable or that it contributes to self-esteem and social image (Huesmann & Guerra, 1997; Slaby & Guerra, 1988). Such attitudes have been found to be more prevalent among individuals suffering from ASPD (Gilbert et al., 2015), indicating again that psychological characteristics may contribute to behaving violently.

Despite negative explicit attitudes towards violence, individuals may still come to act violently due to uncontrolled emotional reactions. The risk of uncontrolled emotional reactions may increase due to a lack of cognitive resources, motivation and/or time to make the cognitive effort required to behave in accordance with explicit attitudes (Dodge, 1993). The extent to which this cognitive effort can be made appears to be linked to an individual's ability to inhibit impulses and regulate emotions. This may explain why heightened impulsivity and ED – as well as ADHD – are associated with an increased risk of displaying violent behavior (Coccaro, Bergeman & McClearn, 1993; Davidson, Putnam & Larson, 2000; Kim & Lee, 2010; Retz & Rösler, 2010).

Due to the course of the scientific debate on collective violence so far, individual agency in crowds has been approached almost exclusively from a group-dynamic vantage point (Van Stekelenburg & Klandermans, 2017). However, the current empirical literature on violent behavior indicates that psychological characteristics a) influence how individuals interpret and evaluate their social environment, b) affect an individual's attitude to violent behavior and c) are vital to the ability to inhibit spontaneous emotional-driven responses. This suggests that individual agency in crowds may not exclusively be affected by trigger events and subsequent social processes as assumed in the social identity perspective. Potential relevant individual characteristics and contributing mechanisms as derived from prior empirical work discussed above on solo violence are displayed in table 1.1.

Table 1.1 Individual characteristics that may contribute to collective violence involvement

Individual characteristic	Contributing mechanism(s)
Emotion-regulation deficits	Deficiencies in inhibition of impulses and regulating emotions
Heightened impulsivity	Deficiencies in inhibition of impulses and regulating emotions
ADHD	Deficiencies in inhibition of impulses and regulating emotions
ASPD	Hostile attribution bias Positive explicit attitude towards violence

Recent theoretical developments

Based on observations of collective violence around football matches and protest events, Adang (2011) introduced the initiation-escalation model of public disorder (hereafter: initiation-escalation model). This model posits that context, intergroup interaction, intergroup relationships and individual differences together may more adequately explain who becomes involved in collective violence and why (Adang, 2011).

To explain the initiation of collective violence, the initiation-escalation model distinguishes between violence that occurs in response to a trigger event (reactive violence) and violence merely requiring the presence of a rival group (proactive violence). The target of reactive violence is usually linked to the trigger preceding the violence. On the other hand, individuals and groups who aim for a confrontation to occur seek violence proactively.

These confrontations may even be preplanned (also see Adang, 2002; Spaaij, 2007). In the initiation-escalation model, two mechanisms explain why individuals decide to involve themselves in collective violence. The first mechanism, an 'us versus them' antagonism, parallels the principles of the social identity perspective as set out in a previous section of this chapter. The second escalation mechanism involves opportunity and (perceived) risk of retaliation. This escalation mechanism is substantiated by observations, which indicate that a) collective violence is more likely when the police are absent, b) confrontations are being avoided or fled from when perceived as unable to win and c) only a minority of those present engages in risky behaviors such as physical fighting. This links to criminological principles central to rational choice and opportunity theory. Rational choice theory, in short, states that an individual will engage in an offense only when the risks associated with offending do not outweigh the perceived benefits. Opportunity theory builds on this assumption by specifically focusing on situational conditions that make committing an offense more or less 'profitable' (Cornish & Clarke, 1986; Clarke, 1995).

Referring to the so-called young male syndrome – a high prevalence of risk-taking and criminal behaviors in young males, particularly in the presence of like-minded peers – sex (male) and age (young) are identified as individual characteristics, which may contribute to collective violence involvement (Adang, 2011). This line of thought fits with the notion that pronounced changes in personality occur in adolescence, with changes being partly attributable to social demands and experiences (Specht, Egloff & Schmukle, 2011). As most young males do not display antisocial and criminal behavior, the demographic characteristics central to the young male syndrome, however, are rather unspecific. Given the key role of cognitive processes and resultant emotions in collective violence involvement, psychological characteristics associated with violent behavior may contribute to participating in collective violence.

A need for further research

Although psychological characteristics are likely to affect an individual's interpretation and evaluation of a given situation, his or her attitude to violence and the ability to inhibit spontaneous emotional-driven responses, scholars adhering to a social identity perspective on collective violence have put forward various arguments for not taking psychological characteristics into account. For instance, it has been argued that – if individual characteristics contribute – this contribution is insignificant in large groups. As violent behavior is not displayed continuously, it also has been stated that the violent behavior of individuals who participate in collective violence relates specifically to the situation at hand. Finally, it has been posited that in the empirical literature no indications can be found that substantiate a contribution of individual characteristics to engaging in collective violence (Reicher, 2001). There is something to be said of these arguments. First, some lack empirical evidence. To our knowledge, it has, for instance, not been examined whether the influence of individual characteristics on collective violence indeed diminishes when crowd size increases. Second, some arguments contrast prior empirical work. For instance, risk factors for solo and collective violence offending have been found to largely overlap.

Furthermore, subgroups of violent offenders have been identified who frequently display violent behavior both alone and in groups (e.g. hooligans) (Piquero et al., 2015; Van de Valk & Linckens, 1988). These findings oppose, at least to some extent, the argument that underlying causes of solo and collective violence behavior differ significantly from one another. Third, several studies have indicated a link between psychological characteristics and an increased chance of participating in collective violence (Arms & Russell, 1997; Mustonen et al., 1996; Russell, 1995). In addition, empirical studies that do not find evidence for a contribution of individual characteristics are in fact very limited with a focus on US ghetto riots and do not include the – from the point of view of this thesis – 'right' individual characteristics. This suggests that currently dominant explanations of collective violence may fail to adequately address the full scope of potentially relevant characteristics when it comes to understanding collective violence.

All over consideration leads to the conclusion that the social identity perspective emphasizes that trigger events and subsequent social processes exclusively guide partaking in collective violence, whereas convergence explanations stress the contribution of individual characteristics. The empirical literature that has evolved over the past decades indeed suggests that the social processes central to social identity are at the core of explaining collective violence (Reicher, 2001). At the same time, however, it seems that individual characteristics play their part in the etiology of participating in collective violence. Research indicates that the individual characteristics at play may affect the perception of social relations (e.g. in-group and out-group), the evaluation of events (e.g. it being experienced as a provocation) and the responses considered to be appropriate (e.g. considering violence as justified or being unable to suppress an aggressive response). This suggests that a common ground, between the social identity perspective and the convergence explanations it so eagerly dismisses, may be found in their interaction with one another.

Current study and research questions

As was argued above, the common ground between the social identity model and theories implicating individual characteristics in explanations of (collective) violence, relates to questions like a) whether trigger events or opportunities are perceived, b) how these events and opportunities are evaluated, and c) how these events and opportunities are subsequently responded to. Personal cognitions and emotions influence perceptions, evaluations and responses to social events and can therewith be expected to contribute to an individual becoming involved in collective action, including collective violence.

From the premise that stable psychological characteristics contribute to collective violence involvement, it follows that those found to participate in collective violence can be expected to display violent behavior outside of collective settings as well. Likely, their cognitions and emotions will apply to their social interactions in general, so both within and outside crowd situations. The large majority of those involved in collective violence however has been found to rarely behave violently outside collective settings and to do so in crowd settings only under very specific conditions (Reicher, 2001). A small subgroup of collective violence offenders may

however be an important exception to these findings: members of hard-core hooligan groups. Several studies indicate that these individuals are frequently and perpetually involved in both solo and collective violence, and to be so from early age on (Lösel & Bliesener, 2003; Piquero et al., 2015). Moreover, prior research suggests that their psychological characteristics may indeed contribute to their violent behavior. Hard core hooligans, for instance, have been found to suffer disproportionally from psychological disorders such as ADHD and ASPD (Lösel & Bliesener, 2003; Piquero et al., 2015). In addition, they have been implicated to participate in mutually arranged confrontations, indicating that – for some of them – the mere presence of a rival group is sufficient to engage in collective violence (Adang, 2011; Cleland & Cashmore, 2016; Giulianotti & Armstrong, 2002; Marsh & Harré, 1978).

In sum, the current empirical literature suggests that the majority of young men who are involved in collective violence only act violently on a one-off basis in a specific setting, without having repeated police contacts. Their violent behavior may be explained by antagonistic group relationships, which emerge due to a specific course of events (Reicher, 2001). On the other hand, a small subgroup of individuals can be identified whose violent behaviors – alone and as part of a collective – have an early onset and continue well into adulthood. Their (collective) violence may even be preplanned. Rather than contextual factors, their violent behavior seems to be driven by psychological characteristics associated with violent behavior (Piquero et al., 2015; Lösel & Bliesener, 2003), which may make them more susceptible to participating in collective violence (Russell, 2004).

Although there is a subtle difference between violent behavior and offending (not all offending entails violent behavior), the individual differences in frequency of and persistence in violent behavior may be interpreted and explained by means of Moffitt's (1993, 1997) dual taxonomy. She identified two developmental offending pathways: the adolescence-limited trajectory and a life-course persistent pathway.[1] Adolescence-limited offenders display risky behavior and minor offending particularly in groups. They generally have a regular childhood and mostly desist from offending shortly after initiating it. Their offending behavior may be attributed to feeling a need to belong and to the relevance adolescents assign to social status (Wilson & Daly, 1985; Weerman et al., 2015; Young & Weerman, 2013). Life-course persistent offenders, however, suffer from inborn deficiencies in neurological functioning and display behavioral problems already from an early age on. Their behavioral and psychiatric characteristics and the inability of others (e.g. parents) to adequately cope with these during childhood, in turn, are linked to their early age of onset of and persistence in offending (Moffitt, 1993, 1997). The dual taxonomy thus offers different explanations for different groups who, during adolescence, are engaging in rather similar behaviors.

Thus far, studies taking a typological vantage point to interpret the contrasting offending patterns of individuals involved in collective violence suffer from various methodological shortcomings. These shortcomings for instance concern sample size (relatively small) and sample inclusion criteria, which are biased towards individuals resembling Moffitt's life-course persistence offenders (e.g. Farrington, 1994; Lösel & Bliesener, 2003;

---

1 Although more recent studies identify more offending trajectories, the heart of this line of thought remains undisputed (Moffitt, 2007; Monahan et al., 2009; Piquero, 2007).

Piquero et al., 2015). Consequently, these studies stress individual-level explanations without considering prior empirical work from the social identity perspective. The current study aims to provide empirical data to bridge differences between convergence and social identity explanations and seeks to find a common ground between opposing explanations for collective violence. To this end, the current studies aim at answering the following research questions:

(1) Do developmental pathways in delinquency and crime differ across individuals up to the moment they become involved in collective violence?
(2) Are individual characteristics linked to persistence in collective violence offending and, if so, which ones?
(3) Does the contribution of contextual and individual determinants differ between various types of collective violence (reactive vs. proactive) and, if so, in what way?

Methods
Study Focus

By looking at collective violence around football matches and recreational events in the Netherlands, this thesis' focus is upon collective violence that is, at least by outsiders, perceived as issue-irrelevant and hedonistic (Marx, 1970). Therefore, structural, political/ideological and cultural aspects of collective violence (see Waddington, 2010) are not explicitly considered. The social identity perspective has been utilized to explain collective violence irrespective of the situation in which it occurs. So, given this thesis' aim, the specific situation in which collective violence is studied therefore does not seem theoretically relevant.

There are however several practical reasons for focusing on collective violence around football matches and recreational events. First, although the Netherlands have known times in which protests and demonstrations got out of hand repeatedly – for instance during the squatters' riots in the 1980s (Rosenthal &' t Hart, 1990) – collective violence in the Netherlands occurs most frequently around football matches. Second, over the past years, with the aim of identifying those involved, the Dutch police have extensively investigated multiple cases of collective violence around football matches. This, in turn, increased the chance that a representative sample of collective violence offenders can be obtained (see Ball & Drury, 2012). Third, as individuals involved in collective violence around football matches and recreational events are central to this thesis, it is relevant to know that between 1997 and 2014 the Dutch government developed and implemented various policies aiming to increase security around football matches. Particularly relevant is that reducing football violence by targeting those repeatedly involved in football violence and facilitating 'neutral' supporters became standard policy during this period. This resulted in setting up a database in which known hooligans are registered by means of the 'Hooligans in Beeld' approach (see Ferwerda & Adang, 2007). The presence of such policies, which pay attention to individuals and groups at high risk for partaking in collective violence, increases the availability of suitable data.

Pursuing these policies has resulted in a gradual decline in serious violent incidents and a decrease of police deployment around football matches in the Netherlands (Ferwerda et al., 2014). At the same time, violent confrontations between hooligan sides still occur from time to time. Over the past five years, several incidents of collective violence around football matches have taken place, with some being investigated by an external commission due to their vehemence (Auditteam Voetbal & Veiligheid, 2012a, 2012b). Furthermore, arranged confrontations between sides outside match days and away from the stadium surroundings are an upcoming phenomenon (Ferwerda et al., 2014). This indicates that collective violence around football matches is still a current topic, assuring not only this thesis' scientific merit but also its societal relevance.

Research methods and data sets

A multimethod study consisting of quantitative and qualitative research methods was conducted to answer the research questions prominent to this thesis. For quantitative research purposes, various samples were used.

(1) Crime and delinquency sample (n=438)

In absolute numbers collective violence is a rarely occurring event, and when it does occur, usually only a minority of individuals who partake in the violent behavior is identified and arrested (Ball & Drury, 2012). In order to determine developmental pathways in delinquency and crime of individuals involved in collective violence, a representative sample of collective violence offenders (n=438) was identified and criminal career data were gathered.

Collective violence offenders were identified based on two sources. The first source was a hooligan database managed by the Dutch National Football Intelligence Point (Dutch: *Centraal Informatiepunt Voetbalvandalisme*, CIV). A side note regarding the CIV-database is that registered individuals are well known due to their prominence in hooliganism, increasing the risk of bias towards individuals more frequently and perpetually involved in collective violence. Therefore, in addition, individuals apprehended due to their involvement in a recent collective violence incident were included in the study. Only incidents where the police had made a great deal of effort to arrest those involved – including extensive analysis of available camera footage as well as sharing footage with the public to facilitate identification of involved individuals – were selected. This way it was ensured that arrested individuals did not merely consist of individuals already known to the police due to their prior offending (see Ball & Drury, 2012). Between 2011 and 2017, this applied to three collective violence incidents: two cases of collective violence erupting around a football match (Auditteam 2012a, 2012b) and one case of collective violence around a spontaneous recreational event (Cohen Commission, 2013). The latter incident was not football-related. However, as this disturbance was 'non-political' and, just like football-related incidents, could be characterized as issue-irrelevant, it was included in the current thesis.

Criminal career data included arrests up to the moment of involvement in collective violence as well as data from the national police registration system BVH (Dutch: *Basisvoorziening Handhaving*). Records in the BVH include all incidents that police officers have been concerned with during

their shifts over the past five years and also cover non-arrested persons. This offered the possibility to gain insight into incidents in which individuals were involved, also when their involvement was not followed by an arrest.

(2) Persistence sample (n=438)

To be able to determine whether and, if so, which individual characteristics are linked to persistence in collective violence additional criminal career data (up to 2016) were gathered for the crime and delinquency sample. In addition, behavioral and psychiatric characteristics data were obtained. Because Dutch legislation does not allow researchers to independently approach former arrestees with the request to complete psychological tests or cooperate with an interview, existing data needed to be relied on. Three sources of information were consulted. First, forensic reports written by the Netherlands Institute of Forensic Psychiatry and Psychology (Dutch: *Nederlands Instituut voor Forensische Psychiatrie en Psychologie*, NIFP) on request of the magistrate or the Public Prosecution Service (PPS). Such forensic reports are, however, prepared only in cases of very serious offending and were often not present for individuals who participated in collective violence. Second, police data were utilized for gathering information on psychological characteristics. The police may make references to psychological characteristics in the registration system BVH, which entails verbatim elaborations of interrogations and suspect and witness statements. BVH records of collective violence offenders therefore were consulted. Third, we consulted Dutch Probation Service data recorded in a recidivism risk assessment instrument (the RISc) – which has been used for suspects who are fifteen years and older since 2004 (Hildebrand & Bosker, 2011). To increase the validity of the data gathered, a coding list aimed to identify references to psychological characteristics was used. The presence of psychological characteristics was recorded only when, in the sources consulted, either the individuals included in the study themselves, their educators or professionals aware of the individual's personal circumstances a) mentioned that disorders had been diagnosed or there had been pronounced suspicions thereof without psychological examination, b) made references to the required use of specific medication or c) described a behavioral pattern indicative of the psychological characteristics this study focuses upon.

(3) Reactive violence sample (n=108)

Data on a subgroup of the crime and delinquency sample (n=108) were utilized for case study purposes. In addition to police registration data on their prior offending up to becoming involved in collective violence, BVH data up to that moment were utilized to record the presence of psychological characteristics.

(4) Mutually arranged confrontation sample (n=40) and reactive football-related collective violence sample (n=76)

Despite the regular occurrence of arranged confrontations, obtaining case files proved to be difficult due to an absence of criminal investigations. In the end, only two recent case files (2012 and 2015) concerning instances of collective violence that could be classified as mutually arranged

confrontations could be studied. A dataset consisting of individuals (n=40) who, as established by these two recent case files, had been involved in a mutually arranged confrontation were included in this sample. Available data concern involvement in delinquency and crime as apparent from police registration data about offending up to 2016. In addition, psychological characteristics data were obtained from police and Dutch Probation Service data. Suspects in the studied case files were compared to individuals who had been involved in collective violence in a non-arranged football-related setting with regard to their criminal career and psychological characteristics. Data were recorded in a way similar to the two former samples.

Next to these quantitative datasets, qualitative information was gathered. For the case study of a reactive collective violence incident 105 interviews with authorities, police officers and municipal workers (of which 94 face-to-face) were conducted, and written documentation and audio-visual materials of a collective violence incident in a recreational setting were analyzed. Findings were, where appropriate, complemented with the results of other studies conducted in response to this incident (Van Dijk et al., 2013; Van den Brink et al., 2013). To gain insight into mutually arranged confrontations, two recent case files were studied and additional face-to-face interviews with police representatives involved in both investigations were held. In addition, a questionnaire was sent out to international and Dutch police professionals (the latter working covertly and non-covertly) involved in football and safety. With several international and Dutch police professionals who responded, subsequent semi-structured interviews were held.

Aim and outline of the thesis

This introductory chapter described developments in the field of collective violence research and the theoretical stance to which this has led are described. By bringing together prior empirical work from a variety of disciplines, a potential common ground between the social identity perspective and the convergence explanations that scholars adhering to the first point of view so vividly dismiss was identified. This thesis' aim is to empirically substantiate this common ground by examining whether, and if so how and for whom, individual determinants of collective violence can be identified.

In chapter 2 of this thesis, the criminal career trajectories of 438 individuals who have been involved in collective violence are examined by using group-based models. The main aim of the study reported in this chapter is to provide a detailed description of the criminal careers of those involved in collective violence (onset, frequency, and diversity of offending), their developmental pathways in delinquency and crime, and the extent to which other violent offenses are committed.

In chapter 3, persistence in collective violence offending and behavioral and psychiatric characteristics of those involved are described and analyzed. This chapter, therefore, is centered on the question whether individual determinants of collective violence can be identified and, if so, which psychological characteristics are associated with collective violence offending.

A case study of the so-called 'Haren Facebook riot' in September 2012 is provided in chapter 4. This riot is analyzed by means of the initiation-escalation model. The questions this chapter aims to answer is how events escalated, what contextual and individual factors played a role and why the police were eventually attacked.

The notions of contextual and individual contributing factors are further elaborated in chapter 5, which focuses on mutually arranged confrontations between hooligan groups. To date, no empirical studies into this matter have been conducted. Chapter 5 aims to provide a detailed description about the significance of arranged confrontations to those who participate and to explore determinants of becoming involved in such fights.

The sixth and final chapter provides a summary of all findings and a discussion of their theoretical and practical implications.