



CREaTE

Canterbury Research and Theses Environment

Canterbury Christ Church University's repository of research outputs

<http://create.canterbury.ac.uk>

Please cite this publication as follows:

Raby, Carlotta and Jones, F. W. (2016) Identifying risks for male street gang affiliation: a systematic review and narrative synthesis. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry and Psychology*. ISSN 1478-9949.

Link to official URL (if available):

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14789949.2016.1195005>

This version is made available in accordance with publishers' policies. All material made available by CReaTE is protected by intellectual property law, including copyright law. Any use made of the contents should comply with the relevant law.

Contact: create.library@canterbury.ac.uk



Appendix D: Coded list of risks

Key to allocated codes:

Overall percentage score based on Kmet et al. (2004)	Utilised longitudinal cohort?	Code	Explanation
90% or over	Yes	C1	High level paper, utilising a longitudinal cohort
70%-90%	Yes	C2	Medium level paper, utilising a longitudinal cohort
50%-70%	Yes	C3	Medium-Low paper, utilising a longitudinal cohort
			There were no low quality studies using a longitudinal cohort
90% or over	No	C4	High level paper, non-longitudinal cohort
70%-90%	No	C5	Medium level paper, non-longitudinal cohort
50%-70%	No	C6	Medium-low level paper, non-longitudinal cohort
50% or below	No	C7	Low level paper, non-longitudinal cohort

Findings broken down into six categories, based on codes:

Cumulative Code	Findings
C1	N/A
C2	Cumulative stress mediated by race, family, financial difficulties and pre-teen stress exposure all integrate to predict gang affiliation (Eitle, 2004)
C3	Cumulative risk presents separate risk (Hill et al., 1999)
C4	N/A
C5	Same risks as violent offending, but cumulative nature of risks is independent risk for gang affiliation (Esbensen et al., 2009) Tipping point at seven, twelve and fourteen risks-significant for peers (Esbensen et al., 2009)
C6	N/A
C7	N/A

Family Code	Findings
C1	Genetic MAOA gene (Beaver et al, 2009) Family income Poverty (Lahey et al., 1999; Pyrooz, 2015) Parental supervision (Lahey et al., 1999; Pyrooz, 2015) Less educated parents (Pyrooz, 2014) Parental involvement in gangs (Gilman et al., 2014) Genes and environment interaction (Barnes et al., 2001)
C2	Family problems in adulthood is a consequence of gang affiliation (Krohn et al., 2011), potentially creating a depressing intergenerational cycle of gang affiliation risk.
C3	Family (Hill et al., 1999)
C4	It was suggested that maltreatment (physical and sexual) increased risk of gang affiliation by four times, and was the highest risk indicator (Thompson & Braaten-Antrum, 1998). Parental monitoring seemed an important factor in gang affiliation (Alleyne & Wood, 2011; Pederson, 2014) Parental attachment is not a significant correlate of gang membership (Brownfield, 2003)
C5	Parental control (Ngai et al., 2007); Less parental monitoring (Yoder et al., 2003) Parent or close relative die in last year (Farmer & Hairston, 2013) Poor parental relationships (Friedman et al., 1975; Walker-Barnes & Mason, 2001-see int with ethnicity) Family legal problems (Yoder et al., 2003) More severe abuse (Yoder et al., 2003) From broken homes (Hope & Damphousse, 2002) More running away from home (Yoder et al., 2003) Poverty (Friedman et al., 1975) Youth experiencing less distress will benefit more from familial belongingness (inc support for distress might limit the effect of delinquent peers) (Baskin et al., 2014) Strong family involvement is protective factor (Li et al., 2002) Gang membership was found to independently affect delinquency beyond the effects of having delinquent criminal family members (Kakar, 2005)
C6	Low parental monitoring and parental deviance (Freng et al., 2012) Neg rel. with parental parental monitoring or coping (McDaniel, 2012) Less male role models and no positive parent (Wang et al., 1994) Growing up in foster care (Danyko et al., 2002) Maternal substance use (Danyko et al., 2002) Historic abuse (Danyko et al., 2002)

Appendix D: Coded list of risks

	<p>Low family relationships (Florian-Lacy et al., 2002) Lack of relationship with family-gang fills need (Lui & Fung, 2005) Parental criminality and drug use enhances gang membership (Sirpal, 2002) Parental criminality and drug use enhanced gang membership and drug use (Sirpal, 2002) Parental criminality and drug use enhanced gang membership, drug use, and delinquency (Sirpal, 2002) These conclusions indicate that family criminality significantly enhanced the probability of youth getting involved in criminal and gang activities (Sirpal, 2002) Large families (Salaam, 2011) Sense of belonging related to antisocial behaviour (Lachman et al., 2013)</p>
C7	N/A

School	
Code	Findings
C1	N/A
C2	School failure (Dishion, 2005; Dishion, 2010)
C3	School (Hill et al., 1999)
C4	Commitment to school low (Alleyne & Wood, 2011)
C5	Negative attitudes to teachers (Ngai et al., 2007) Suspended (Farmer & Hairston, 2013; Yoder et al., 2003)
C6	School attainment / LD not an issue (Florian-Lacy et al., 2002; Hermann et al., 1997) Relationship with teacher predictive (Wang, 1994)
C7	Perceived academic ability (Dukes et al., 1997)

Individual	
Code	Findings
C1	<p>CD/ ASBD (Lahey et al., 1999; Dmitrieva et al., 2014) Ethnicity (Tapia, 2011; Prooz, 2015) Gender (Pyrooz & Sweeten, 2015) Age 13-15 (Pyrooz, 2014) Low self-esteem/ Status(Dmitrieva et al., 2014) Diff perspective taking (Dmitrieva et al., 2014) Low responsibility (Dmitrieva et al., 2014)</p>
C2	<p>Antisocial behaviour and delinquency (Dishion et al., 2005); Hispanic and Black individuals were associated with lower self-control when studied longitudinally (DeLisi et al., 2009; Gatti et al., 2005). Males associated with greater continuity in gangs and having lower self-control when studied longitudinally (Sweeten & Piquero, 2013) Genetic factors and environment are uniquely experienced by the individual (Barnes et al., 2012) Individual Violent victimisation is a consequence of gang affiliation, when personal characteristics have been controlled for (DeLisi, 2009; Barnes et al., 2012). Joining gangs for protection (Melde et al., 2012) but increased violent victimisation after joining gang and increased delinquency results in stable gang membership. Weak conventional bonds (Weerman et al., 2015) and need to belong (Gatti et al., 2005) Although some longitudinal papers highlighted that increased delinquency (Weerman et al., 2015) predicted gang membership, it was found that a delinquency increase is often facilitated by gang affiliation (Barnes et al., 2010) Increased substance use predictor (Weerman et al., 2015; Gatti et al., 2005). Economic hardship is a consequence of gang affiliation (Krohn et al 2011). Individuals motivated to join gangs for financial gain were found to desist within one year (Melde et al., 2012) Ethnicity is not significant over time and immigration status is also not a predictor (Esbensen & Carson, 2012) Drugs (Bjerragaard, 2010)</p>
C3	<p>Hispanic and Black individuals were associated with lower self-control when studied longitudinally (Pyrooz, Sweeten & Piquero, 2012) More fighting behaviour, hyperactivity, inattention and oppositional behaviour, and self-reported delinquent activities (drug and alcohol use, stealing and vandalism). Peers rated gang members as more aggressive than non-gang members (Craig et al., 2002) ASB increased post gang affiliation but only to a modest degree in comparison to the effect of gang affiliation on drug use (Zhang et al., 1999) Males, Hispanics, and Blacks were associated with greater continuity in gang membership as well as those with low self-control (Pyrooz et al., 2012) Substance use increases when joining gang (Zhang et al., 1999) Complex mediating factors (Winfrey et al., 2001)</p>
C4	<p>Violent victimisation (Katz et al 2011; Rufino et al., 200) which remained even when gang affiliation had been controlled for (Katz et al 2011) Rufino et al., 200 noted that gang affiliated individuals tend to be alone under the influence of substances when assaulted. Gang affiliated individuals experience a fear of further violence (Coid et al., 2013) and have high mental health needs; particularly trauma symptomology (Coid et al., 2013) Anti-authority attitudes were noted (Alleyne & Wood, 2013)</p>

Appendix D: Coded list of risks

	<p>Moral disengagement and weak prosocial values were identified (Alleyne & Wood, 2013; Pederson, 2014) It appeared that social status was of importance (Alleyne & Wood, 2013) but that ethnicity, reflected community demographics and wasn't of unique significance (Alleyne & Wood, 2011) Gender also didn't emerge as significant (Alleyne & Wood, 2011) in this section</p>
<p>C5</p>	<p>Gang association linked to drug use familiarity and drug use (Volkman et al., 2013) Drug use interacts with violence (Valdez et al., 2006) Drug use associated with gang affiliation (Volkman et al., 2013). Thornberry et al (1993) found that individuals did not have higher rates of drug use prior to gang membership Greater gang involvement directly associated with greater alcohol and marijuana use over a lifetime (Harper et al., 2008) Increased alcohol and drug use (Yoder et al., 2003) Gang membership is associated with increased risk of psychological difficulties (Li et al., 2002) Gang membership associated with increased violence (Griffin & Hepburn, 2006) Melde & Esbensen (2011) would support that gang affiliation affects emotions, attitudes and social controls in a way that facilitates anti-social behaviour Anti-social behaviour and gang association link (Yoder et al., 2003) More involved in antisocial behaviour. Self-control was a strong predictor of gang membership, and appears to be in place prior to gang membership and remaining stable after gang membership (Hope & Damphousse, 2002) Gang affiliated individuals experience a fear of further violence (Lurigio et al, 2008) Gang affiliated individuals were also more likely to be stopped and searched, and have negative attitudes to the police (Lurigio et al., 2008). Those who are motivated to join gangs for a sense of belonging are less involved in antisocial behaviour than those who join for instrumental purposes (Lachman et al., 2013). PTSD Limited time perspective (Liu & Fung, 20) Ethnicity interacts with arrests (Black and lower class) but not gang affiliation (Brownfield et al., 2001) More complex than ethnicity alone (Winfrey et al., 2001) Gang members are more likely to be non-white (Hope & Damphousse, 2002) Violent victimisation associated with gang affiliation (Taylor et al., 2008) (Yoder et al., 2003) Violent street victimisation Riskier sex (King et al., 2013) Anti-authority (Alleyne & Wood, 2010) Need for social status (Alleyne & Wood, 2010) Less socially mature (Lyon & Hall, 1992). Less opportunity for success (Friedman et al., 1975) Blame victim (Alleyne & Wood, 2010) Morals (Ngai et al., 2007) Mental health difficulties higher (Harper et al., 2008) Depression (Harper et al., 2008) Suicidal (Yoder et al., 2003) Anxiety (Harper et al., 2008) Antisocial behaviour (Harper et al., 2008; Lyon & Hall, 1992; Friedman et al., 1975; Egan & Beaderman, 2011-linked to degree of gang embeddedness) Bullying associated with gang affiliation, mediated by moral disengagement (Wood et al., 2009) Excitement (Friedman et al, 1975) Low self-esteem ((Farmer & Hairston, 2013; Friedman et al., 1975) Gender male (Farmer & Hairston, 2013) Male (Hope & Damphousse, 2002) Poverty (free lunch) (Farmer & Hairston, 2013) Hope & Damphousse, (2002) lower social class. Gang members had more negative perceptions about authority law enforcement and laws and are more enthusiastic about engaging in illegal activities. They are more likely to justify terrorist acts than non gang-affiliated youth (Kakar, 2008)</p>
<p>C6</p>	<p>Criminological need profiles look same gang and non-gang except peer delinquency (Chu et al., 2011) Gang affiliation linked to antisocial behaviour (McDaniel, 2002; Bsiwas, 2011) Increased violence (Olate et al., 2012) Lack of self-control insignificant (Kissner et al., 2009) Pre-gang delinquency not predictive but more delinquent once in gang (Curry & Spergal, 1992) Rumination in males leads to displaced aggression directed towards innocent others and rumination best predictor of aggression (Vasquez et al., 2012), Antisocial behaviour only variable that divides two groups after controlling for mental health (Corcoran et al, 2005) Alcohol and drug use associated with gang affiliation (McDaniel, 2002; Danyko et al., 2002; Lyon & Hall, 1992) Gender male (Hermann et al., 1997) There is no significant difference between gender and gang relationship (Brownfield, 2012) Low future orientation (Biswas et al., 2011) Low self-esteem (Florian-Lacy et al., 2002) More sexualised behaviour (Biswas et al., 2011; Palmer & Tilley, 1995) More positive attribution scores associated with gang affiliation (Taylor et al., 2003) Manic smartness (Cartwright et al., 1970) Less self-realisation (Cartwright et al., 1970) Less suicidal ideations and suicide attempts (Evans, 1996)</p>

Appendix D: Coded list of risks

	<p>Lack of empathy (Valdez et al, 2000) Lower psychopathy than forensic group but higher than control group (Valdez et al., 2000) PTSD (Danyko et al., 2002) low future orientation (Olate et al., 2012) Mental health difficulties higher (Harper et al., 2008; Corcoran et al, 2005-only item dividing two groups except antisocial behaviour-and self-destructiveness) Poverty and police corruption were cited as experiences youths had had prior to joining gangs. Joining gangs was an attempt to 'improve their lot in life' (Salaam, 2011) Gang members report more mental health symptoms, more external behaviour problems including delinquency and self-destructiveness and thought problems than non-gang members. When mental health symptoms were statistically controlled, gang members were indistinguishable from non-gang members on all variables except for antisocial behaviours (Corcoran et al., 2005)</p>
C7	<p>Low self-esteem (Dukes et al., 1997) Low psychosocial health (Dukes et al., 1997) Negative attitudes to institutions (Dukes et al., 1997) More unprotected sex (Brooks et al., 2011)</p>

Peers	
Code	Findings
C1	Peer influence (Lahey et al., 1999; Dmitrieva et al., 2014)
C2	Increased negative peer pressure (Weerman et al., 2015; Evans et al., 1999)
C3	N/A
C4	Peer pressure seemed to be a significant factor (Alleyne & Wood, 2011)
C5	<p>Rejected by peers (Farmer & Hairston, 2013) Deviant peers (Yoder et al., 2003) Needing companionship and contact from heterosexual males-motivator for gang involvement (Friedman, 1975) Peer gang involvement (Walker-Barnes & Mason, 2001) Gang membership was found to independently affect delinquency beyond the effects of having delinquent friends (Kakar, 2005)</p>
C6	Lack of relationship with family -gang fills need for belonging (Lui & Fung, 2005)
C7	N/A

Community	
Code	Findings
C1	<p>Neighbourhood disadvantage (Pyrooz, 2014) Urban (Pyrooz, 2014) Antisocial neighbourhood (Gilman et al., 2014)</p>
C2	<p>Neighbourhood instability (Dupure et al., 2007) Presence of and exposure to gangs in the community (Evans et al., 1999) Threat to personal safety (Evans et al., 1999)</p>
C3	Neighbourhood predictive feature (Hill et al., 1999)
C4	Presence of and exposure to gangs in the community (Alleyne & Wood, 2013)
C5	<p>Gang presence (Luyt & Foster, 2001) Perceived neighbourhood as unsafe ((Farmer & Hairston, 2013) Need for protection (Friedman et al, 1975)</p>
C6	<p>Neighbourhoods have nontrivial effects on social development (Cadwallader & Cairns, 2002) Rural/ urban migration (Salaam, 2011)</p>
C7	N/A

Appendix D: Coded list of risks

Findings from literature review papers of gang literature

Howell & Egly	Offers a summary of studies focussing on risks utilising longitudinal cohorts and concludes with a developmental explanation of gang/ risk interactions.
Vittori, 2006	Large populations of young males, high levels of juvenile delinquency, drug use, high numbers of criminals in the population high poverty rates and a large number of single parent, mother-led families were factors contributing to countries associated with the emergence of gang activities.
Stinchcomb, 2002	The programs that appear to be unsuccessful are ones with detached street workers and police suppression strategies. The programs that appear to be promising are programs relevant to local needs, proactive strategies aimed at discouraging youths from joining gangs, school-based intervention and support programs, and comprehensive community programs. A key factor is pursuing a comprehensive, holistic approach that addresses multiple facets of the problem.
Sela-Shayovitz, 2011	Initial formations of moral panic derived from a profound concern about changes in the social and moral order of society due to immigration.
Sharkey, Shekhtmeyster, Chavez-Lopez, Norris & Sass, 2011	Schools can compensate for the attraction of gangs by addressing the hierarchical needs of at-risk youth.
Ulloa, Dyson & Wynes, 2012	Individuals from violent homes, violent communities, poor communities, and with previous abuse histories are at risk for both gang involvement and intimate partner violence. The literature suggests that this overlapping risk is multiplicative in its relationship to the experience of intimate partner violence. Taken alone, each risk factor can have damaging consequences, however, for those individuals with these risk factors who are involved in gangs, the risk for IPV is unmanageable.
Smith, 2011	The review identified various intelligence gaps but the small sample size meant that research recommendations were hard to find.
Kelly, 2010	Little research has focused on adolescents' exposure to gang violence and its effects on adolescents' mental health. Adolescents develop internalizing symptoms and externalizing behaviours after exposure to violence. More research on gang involvement and mental health consequences is called for.
O'Brien, Daffern, Meng Chu & Thomas, 2013	The characteristics, dynamics, and motivation to engage with peer networks emerged as a significant risk factor for gang affiliation. Therefore, gang intervention programs need to be multimodal and must address risk factors across multiple domains. There are a number of significant deficits and numerous methodological limitations in the extant literature. The field has only recently started to examine or formulate the psychological processes involved in gang affiliation and activities.
Palmer & Tilley, 1995	Gang-affiliated males had more sexual partners than non-gang-affiliated males. Male gang members have greater status and are more attractive to women and also have more access to women.