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Abstract

Aggression involving groups (versus individuals) can be particularly severe (e.g., hazings). Although an impressive amount of experimental research on the aggression of individuals exists, relatively less experimental research on aggression involving groups exists. We use existing theories of aggression and the available research to present a framework of aggression when groups are involved. We propose a provisional model that suggests that the extent of aggression to be committed depends on the composition of both source (i.e., perpetrators – group or individual) and target (i.e., victims – group or individual) entities. Evidence suggests that groups commit and receive more aggression than individuals. We propose that accessible hostile thoughts and the experience of negative affect contribute to the target effect (i.e., more aggression committed toward groups versus individuals), whereas disinhibition processes and arousal contribute to the source effect (i.e., more aggression committed by groups versus individuals). Our framework can guide future theory and research on aggression involving groups.

Substantial research literature compares group and individual behavior in a variety of areas (e.g., norms, Sherif, 1936; conformity, Asch, 1951; performance, Davis, 1969; see Baron & Kerr, 2004, Forsyth, 2006, Parks & Sanna, 1999, for extensive reviews). Yet, experimental investigations of aggression involving groups versus only individuals are rare despite the often severe nature of this behavior. Many examples illustrate its severity. In one instance, three adolescent boys killed a 55-year-old man confined to a wheelchair. Before he died, the young boys tortured him for 24 hours, stabbed him 40 times, and poured salt into his wounds (Greer & Guthey, 1993). Groups of girls can also commit aggression. In one case, 12 high school girls were charged with misdemeanor battery for throwing buckets of paint, vinegar, and feces at several female high school juniors in a hazing incident (‘15 teens’, 2003; ‘Police may’, 2003).

While these examples highlight examples of groups acting as the source (perpetrator) of aggression, groups can also be the target (victim) of
aggression. The 1984 New York City subway shootings involved a lone man who shot a group of four young boys whom he thought were attempting to rob him (Fletcher, 1990). Furthermore, school-shooting incidents (e.g., Columbine, Virginia Tech) typically involve group targets. While these selected cases highlight aggression involving groups, they do not provide causal mechanisms or explanations for its occurrence.

Examples of aggression involving only individuals are also easy to illustrate, but there is far less experimental research examining aggression with groups. Indeed, a great deal is known about situational and individual difference factors that influence aggression by individuals. For example, situational factors such as provocation, alcohol consumption, and physical pain (Anderson & Huesmann, 2003), and individual difference variables such as gender (Bettencourt & Miller, 1996), hostile attributions (Crick & Dodge, 1994), and impulsivity (Wu & Clark, 2003) increase aggression in individuals. Unfortunately, we know comparatively less about the factors that influence aggression involving groups (Meier & Hinsz, 2004). Although there is existing literature (e.g., Goldstein, 2002), we are unaware of any significant theoretical perspectives.

In this paper, we examine the experimental research on aggression involving groups in order to provide a new theoretical perspective and to provide a basis for future investigations. We define a ‘group’ as two or more interacting individuals with a common identity and mutual goals. We use experimental research that measures aggression committed by, or against, both groups and individuals. To help propose a provisional framework for aggression involving groups, we incorporate the general aggression model (Anderson & Bushman, 2002), which is a model of aggressive behavior formulated from numerous theories.

Theories of Aggression

The term aggression is used to define many behaviors, yet precise definitions are essential for experimental research. We use the definition of aggression proposed by Baron and Richardson (1994), which states that aggression is any behavior intending to harm another living being that desires to avoid such harm. Note that the intent to harm is all that is required to meet this definition; actual harm is not needed.

Our framework for aggression involving groups is based on a well–tested theory of aggression in individuals; therefore, it is necessary to first examine the central aspects of this theory. The frustration-aggression hypothesis (Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer, & Sears, 1939) is typically considered to be the starting point of aggression theory in social psychology. According to this hypothesis, aggression is a consequence of the frustration of an organism when its approach to a goal is thwarted. Research, however, revealed that the frustration-aggression hypothesis had limitations; not all frustration led to aggression and not all aggression resulted from frustration (Berkowitz, 1989).
Berkowitz’s (1989, 1993) proposed a more comprehensive approach that he labeled cognitive neoassociation theory. Berkowitz (1989) contends that negative affect (i.e., a broad category of negative feelings or emotions) produced by social interactions (e.g., a disagreement) or environmental cues (e.g., high temperature) can lead to aggression. Berkowitz (1989) suggests that negative affect can arouse aggressive thoughts and anger, and the stronger the negative affect, the stronger the likelihood of aggression. In Berkowitz’s (1993) theory, aggression-related thoughts and feelings, brought on by negative affect, can automatically evoke aggressive behaviors via associative networks in long-term memory.

Anderson and Bushman (2002; also see Anderson & Huesmann, 2003) developed the general aggression model based on cognitive-neoassociation theory (Berkowitz, 1989, 1993) and theories proposed by others (e.g., Huesmann, 1998; Zillmann, 1983). As shown in Figure 1, the general aggression model has three basic areas: inputs, routes, and outcomes. Inputs include situational variables (e.g., violent media exposure) and person variables (i.e., stable characteristics of a person such as traits). Person and situation factors can interact with one another or lead directly to the routes that influence behavior.

The route portion of the general aggression model reflects the internal state of the individual, defined by cognitions, affect, and arousal. Activating or increasing the level of any one of these variables may spread or prime the activation of the others through associative networks. The increased activation of one of these variables can affect one’s appraisal and decision-making process (an outcome) leading to aggression (Anderson & Bushman, 2002). Importantly, these appraisal and decision-making process can occur automatically without much conscious or deliberate thought.

Numerous studies support the general aggression model (e.g., Anderson, Carnagey, & Eubanks, 2003; Anderson & Dill, 2000; Bushman, 1998;...
Bartholow, Anderson, Carnagey, & Benjamin, 2005; Kirsh, Mounts, & Olczak, 2006; Meier, Robinson, & Wilkowski, 2006; Uhlmann & Swanson, 2004). Because of the acceptance of this comprehensive model as an explanation for aggression committed by individuals, we use it to structure our understanding of aggression with groups. That is, the general aggression model provides a conceptual foundation upon which we can consider mechanisms that may be associated with aggression involving groups.

**Experimental Research on Aggression Involving Groups**

Much of the literature on aggression involving groups has focused on large groups. For example, ethnic conflicts (e.g., Israelis and Palestinians) and minority groups in the USA (Baron & Kerr, 2004; Brewer, 2003) have been extensively examined. Baron and Kerr contend that perceived disagreements or mistreatment relating to fairness and equity are key mechanisms that spur this aggression. Although important in its own right, our theoretical perspective is not concerned with this broad intergroup aggression, but with aggression involving small, interacting groups.

There are a limited number of experimental investigations of aggression involving small groups. Two experimental studies (Jaffe & Yinon, 1979; Jaffe, Shapir, & Yinon, 1981) used the learning paradigm associated with Milgram’s (1965) obedience to authority research to examine aggression with a group source and individual target. In these studies, participants acted as teachers either alone or in three-person groups with the severity of aggression assessed from the participants’ allocated shock intensities. Jaffe and his colleagues found that when confederates failed a task, groups delivered significantly stronger shocks compared to individuals. Jaffe et al. (1981) had participants rate how personally responsible they were for the shock administration. Group members rated themselves as significantly less responsible than individuals acting alone. Although the increased aggression by groups could be explained via this diffusion of responsibility (e.g., Leary & Forsyth, 1987), it was not demonstrated that greater diffusion of responsibility statistically predicted greater shock settings.

Two additional studies (Wolosin, Sherman, & Mynatt, 1975; Yinon, Jaffe, & Feshbach, 1975) used a risky-shift paradigm to investigate aggression involving groups. This paradigm allows groups and individuals to make risky or cautious decisions, contrasting self-interest and altruism. Aggression in these studies was defined as the amount of electrical shock the source gave to a target. Yinon et al. (1975) and Wolosin et al. (1975, Study 1) found that groups gave stronger shocks than individuals when the target was an individual. This finding is consistent with the results of Jaffe and Yinon (1979) and Jaffe et al. (1981). Studies 1 and 2 of Wolosin et al. compared an individual source assigning shocks to either a group or individual target. Neither study found a difference in the amount of shock
assigned to the target, although Study 1 found a marginal difference indicating that groups received higher shocks than individuals. As in Jaffe et al. (1981), Wolosin et al. asked participants to rate their perceived responsibility for the shock administration. No differences in perceived responsibility were found between groups and individuals.

Diener (1976) allowed individuals or groups of three to aggress against a lone individual in a study purportedly examining physical activity. Although participants were not told what to do, the activity could involve aggressive actions because newspaper balls, foam swords, pellet pistols, foam bricks, and rubber bands were in the room. In both conditions, participants first viewed a confederate acting aggressively toward the lone individual. Researchers found that individuals acting alone aggressed significantly more against the lone individual than participants in groups.

Diener (1976) found results contrary to those of Jaffe and Yinon (1979), Jaffe et al. (1981), Yinon et al. (1975), and Wolosin et al. (1975), who all found that groups aggressed more than individuals. Furthermore, only Wolosin et al. manipulated the target of aggression (group or individual), which did not significantly affect the amount of aggression committed by a lone individual. As a whole, this research sheds light on aggression involving groups, but it leaves unanswered questions. The research is limited in that it does not manipulate both the source and target and does not examine causal mechanisms. Moreover, the studies by Yinon et al. and Wolosin et al. used a risky-shift paradigm in which participants gained a monetary reward for acting aggressively. Therefore, self-interest possibly confounded the difference in aggression between groups and individuals.

**Manipulating the Source and Target of Aggression**

To address the lack of experimental research on aggression in groups, Meier and Hinsz (2004) conducted an experiment that manipulated both the source and target of aggression while using a paradigm that controlled some confounding variables. That is, aggression was measured so that self-reward (e.g., receiving money for acting aggressive as in the risky-shift paradigm) was not possible. The study included conditions in which the source and target of an aggressive act was either an individual or a group, resulting in four types of experimental interactions: intergroup (group to group), interindividual (individual to individual), group to individual, and individual to group.

Meier and Hinsz (2004) used a hot sauce allocation paradigm to measure aggression (McGregor et al., 1998). In this paradigm, because very spicy hot sauce can be painful to consume, the amount of hot sauce one allocates for another constitutes the measure of aggression. Participants were told that they would taste and rate hot sauce and complete personality measures. In addition, participants were told that, because experimenters...
needed to remain blind, participants would allocate portions of hot sauce for others to consume. After participants sampled a small portion of hot sauce, they moved into private rooms (as three-person groups or as individuals) and were shown a bogus amount of hot sauce that another group or individual supposedly allocated for them to consume (the amount shown was chosen to induce mild provocation – every condition receive the same bogus amount). Participants were then told to allocate an amount of hot sauce for this other group or individual to consume.

Meier and Hinsz (2004) found that the average hot sauce allocation in the intergroup condition was significantly greater than in the interindividual condition; the hot sauce allocation was 60% greater even though participants knew that each member of the group would have to consume the amount of hot sauce allocated. Although group members believed they were less responsible for the hot sauce allocation than participants acting on their own, a responsibility measure did not mediate the relationship between group or individual and the allocated hot sauce amount.

Meier and Hinsz (2004) also found that groups allocated more hot sauce than individuals regardless of the target (i.e., a source main effect), and groups received more hot sauce than individuals regardless of the source (i.e., a target main effect). Although the interaction between source and target was not significant, the two main effects suggest that the extent of aggression committed depended upon whether the source and target was an individual or group. These results reveal that the source and target of aggression might be important factors that can influence the magnitude of aggression. Such factors are similar to the situational inputs (e.g., alcohol consumption) to aggression proposed by the general aggression model. That is, source and target composition appear to be situational variables that can affect aggression.

The Interindividual–Intergroup Discontinuity Effect

Before proposing our provisional framework for aggression involving groups, we examine research on competition. Even though aggression and competition are distinct (i.e., aggression involves behavior in which harm is intended while competition often does not), this research can point to potential mechanisms involved in aggression with groups. After all, both competition and aggression typically involve antagonistic social interactions with adversarial-like entities. Wildschut, Pinter, Vevea, Insko, and Schopler (2003) reviewed research that focused on interindividual and intergroup interactions through the use of the prisoner’s dilemma game. As shown in Figure 2, the parties involved can make one of two choices that give them a monetary reward. If both parties choose the cooperative choice (choice ‘A’), then both receive a moderate reward. If both parties choose the competitive choice (choice ‘B’), then both receive a small reward. However, if one party chooses to cooperate (choice ‘A’) and the other
party chooses to compete (choice ‘B’), the party choosing to compete
receives a high reward and the party choosing to cooperate receives a
small reward. Over time, both parties benefit the most from choosing the
cooperative option. A consistent finding, however, is that intergroup inter-
actions, consisting of group versus group play, are more competitive and less
cooperative than interindividual interactions, consisting of individual versus
individual play; a difference known as the interindividual–intergroup
discontinuity effect.

According to Wildschut et al. (2003), at least three mechanisms are
responsible for this effect. The first is the distrust/fear explanation, which
proposes that people distrust and fear other groups more than other
individuals, causing them to compete more with a group than with an
individual. The second is the social support or greed explanation.
Wildschut et al. contend that group members can give each other support
for committing an antisocial action (i.e., competition) whereas individuals
cannot. The third is the identifiability explanation, which is based on the
belief that one’s behavior is more easily identified by opponents in
interindividual interactions compared to opponents in intergroup inter-
actions, which causes group members to be more likely to engage in
competitive behavior.

The interindividual–intergroup discontinuity research can inform our
examination of aggression in groups. This research (and research by Meier
& Hinsz, 2004) suggests that the source of action (group or individual)
and the target of action (group or individual) are crucial factors when
predicting the extent of both competition and aggression. Moreover, at
least two mechanisms – distrust/fear and identifiably – proposed for the
interindividual–intergroup discontinuity effect are related to the cognitive
and affective routes from the general aggression model. The distrust

Figure 2  Typical 2 x 2 prisoner’s dilemma game matrix.
associated with groups is one kind of hostile thought that might be primed when people face group targets. Additionally, the fear associated with a group is a type of negative affect that might be experienced when people face group targets. The identifiability explanation for interindividual–intergroup discontinuity rests on cognitions group members have about their responsibility for a group’s behavior. If group members view themselves to be less identifiable and hence less individualized, they might be more likely to engage in antisocial behavior. In summary, accessible hostile cognitions (distrust of groups), cognitions related to identifiability (deindividuation), and negative affect (fear of groups) are mechanisms that are similar in both the general aggression model and the interindividual–intergroup discontinuity research. Such similarities can direct our thinking about aggression in groups.

A Provisional Framework for Aggression Involving Groups

Prior research (e.g., Jaffe, Shapir & Yinon, 1981; Meier & Hinsz, 2004), the general aggression model (Anderson & Bushman, 2002; Anderson & Huesmann, 2003), and the interindividual–intergroup discontinuity research (Wildschut et al., 2003) allow us to propose a provisional framework for aggression involving groups. An important characteristic of aggression appears to be the composition of the source and target. That is, the amount of aggression an entity commits or receives depends on the source (i.e., group or individual) and target (i.e., group or individual) configuration. We contend that in an aggressive context, groups as a source will commit more aggression than individuals, and groups as targets will receive more aggression than individuals. These factors are apparent, but the mechanisms responsible for them are not. Below, however, we offer some theoretical speculation.

Hostile cognitions and negative affect as target mechanisms

Our previous discussion suggests that hostile cognitions and negative affect are two potential mechanisms for the target effect. We contend that interacting with a group increases one’s hostile cognitions and negative affect, which would likely influence subsequent behavior. Although this proposition has not been directly tested, there is tentative evidence. For example, Hoyle, Pinkley, and Insko (1989) found that participants anticipating an interaction with a group expected it to be more hostile than an anticipated interaction with an individual. Similarly, the distrust associated with groups found in the interindividual–intergroup discontinuity research (Wildschut et al., 2003) suggests that an interaction with an external group may be another type of aggressive cue much like the presence of weapons or high temperatures. That is, when a person is about to interact with an external group, hostile thoughts and feelings may be
activated. In support of this contention, Pinter and Insko (2003) found that people have implicit associations between the concepts of, on the one hand, ‘group’ and ‘abrasiveness’, and on the other hand, ‘individuals’ and ‘agreeableness’. Regardless of whether an individual or a group is the source of aggression, because external groups would have this hostile association, aggression could be greater for groups-as-targets than individuals-as-targets.

Why might external groups be viewed as hostile? One may consider evolutionary factors as a possible reason. Some evolutionary psychology approaches to group interactions suggest that humans might have an evolved reaction to perceive other groups as threatening (e.g., Brewer, 2003). Among early humans, the arrival of an unknown group likely meant a serious threat to resources. Consequently, it is possible that a potential interaction with an unknown group would have been perceived as hostile. Moreover, responses to this potential threat would include preparing to act aggressively to repel the opposing group.

Based on these considerations, we view it likely that hostile thoughts and feelings are responsible for a target effect in which groups receive more aggression than individuals. The studies by Hoyle et al. (1989) and Pinter and Insko (2003) tentatively support such a contention. This research, however, involved the assessment of attitudes, not behavior. Therefore, a full test of this mediation hypothesis (i.e., target composition → hostile thoughts/feelings → aggressive behavior) is required.

**Disinhibition as a source mechanism**

Wildschut et al. (2003) found that group members who feel less identifiable are more likely to engage in competitive behavior. When individuals are less identifiable, they may experience deindividuation, which is defined as the loss of one’s individuality, self-awareness, or self-evaluation apprehension when joining a group (Diener, 1980). Some researchers suggest that deindividuation causes individuals to commit aggression or antisocial behavior (Le Bon, 1960; Mullen, 1986; Zimbardo, 2004), but we are reluctant to accept this general consensus for two reasons. First, although deindividuation is typically used as an explanation for why groups can be more aggressive than individuals, few studies have examined deindividuation and aggression in group and individual contexts. Second, while deindividuated individuals might be expected to automatically commit aggression or antisocial behavior, a meta-analysis did not find a robust link (Postmes & Spears). Instead, Postmes and Spears (1998) conclude that deindividuation, or the conditions expected to cause deindividuation (e.g., group size), leads individuals to commit situation-specific behavior, which can include antisocial or pro-social actions (Johnson & Downing, 1979). That is, ‘deindividuating circumstances induce increased responsiveness to the situation’ (Postmes & Spears, 1998, 252).
Postmes and Spears (1998) contend that group members will behave according to situation-specific norms. We interpret this conceptualization to mean that individuals in a group can be expected to be disinhibited, committing whatever behavior is expected in the present social situation. In prisoner's dilemma contexts (Wildschut et al., 2003), disinhibition prompted by group membership likely results in competitive behavior. Similarly, it is likely that in an aggressive context, a disinhibited group member will commit more aggression than he or she would if acting as a lone individual. That is, direct involvement in a group in an aggressive context might release individuals’ social constraints against aggression.

A disinhibition process gains prominence when considering that a group source includes multiple members who might make a hostile argument in favor of aggression. Because there are multiple members in a group, the chance of at least one member favoring aggression increases exponentially. Based on the binomial expansion, with a group of $r$ residents in which the probability of any individual making a hostile argument is $p$, the probability of the group hearing at least one argument for hostile action becomes $P_G = 1 - (1 - p)^r$. Moreover, because all group members are likely to be disinhibited, an argument by one member to respond aggressively may serve as a trigger that could further release them from inhibition (cf. Wegner, 2002).

**Group accentuation as a source mechanism**

Research shows that information processing by groups tends to accentuate beliefs that are prevalent among individuals (Hinsz, Tindale, & Nagao, forthcoming). One example of this would be the hostile-attribution bias, which reveals that some individuals are biased toward appraising social interactions in a hostile manner (Crick & Dodge, 1994). If some individuals process information in a biased fashion, leading to an attribution that a target is hostile, then group accentuation would exaggerate this belief, causing groups to view targets as more hostile than individuals. Such an accentuation would be similar to the process of group polarization (Myers & Lamm, 1978), which occurs when groups accentuate the preexisting beliefs or attitudes of individual group members.

**Arousal as a source mechanism**

The general aggression model suggests that arousal is one mechanism that can intensify aggression (Anderson & Bushman, 2002; see also Berkowitz, 1993). Aroused individuals are expected to commit more aggression than nonaroused individuals given an aggressive context. There is a unique form of arousal in groups associated with social facilitation (Zajonc, 1965). Action and coaction in groups is known to increase the arousal of group
members (Aiello & Douthitt, 2001; Bond & Titus, 1983; Guerin, 1986; Zajonc, 1980). Consequently, when groups are the source of action, one potential result is greater arousal compared to individuals. Further research will be necessary to determine if this arousal contributes to the degree of aggression committed by groups, but the general aggression model suggests that it could be a reason why groups might be more aggressive than individuals given an aggressive situation.

**Individual differences variables**

The general aggression model considers individual differences (e.g., trait aggression) to be a factor in aggression. Considering one individual difference variable, trait aggression, Meier and Hinsz (2004) found that it positively correlated with the amount of hot sauce allocated in the individual source condition, but not in the group source condition (using the average of the three group members’ scores). In addition, Meier and Hinsz did not find significant relationships between the lowest, middle, and highest group member’s trait aggression score with the amount of hot sauce allocated by their group. These results reveal that the trait aggressiveness of group members as a whole, or as individuals, did not affect the group’s aggression. We suggest that individual differences are predictive for aggression involving individual sources, but they might not be predictive for aggression involving group sources. That is, strong group situations may overwhelm the influence of individual differences in contexts where groups act as a source (e.g., Ross & Nisbett, 1992). This intriguing prediction reveals that it is possible that a group does not need an aggressive member to act aggressively (for extended views, see Berkowitz, 1999; Fiske, Harris, & Cuddy, 2004).

**Summary and Implications**

Our provisional framework leads us to contend that source and target composition is a central aspect when considering aggressive behavior. Specifically, we suggest that when a context favors aggression, group sources of action will commit more aggression than individuals, and group targets of action will receive more aggression than individuals.

The target effect can occur because the anticipation of interaction with external groups produces hostility (Hoyle et al., 1989). That is, we predict that interacting with an external group (versus an individual) will increase the level of hostile thoughts and negative affect, which will mediate the relationship between target condition (group or individual) and the extent of aggression received. As already mentioned, however, an empirical test of this mediation hypothesis is necessary.

Considering the source effect, we hypothesize that groups commit more aggression than individuals because of disinhibition processes and
arousal. We believe that conventional constraints against aggression are disinhibited by membership in an interacting group (Postmes & Spears, 1998). Furthermore, because arousal increases aggression (Anderson & Bushman, 2002), and intragroup interaction increases arousal (Zajonc, 1980), when a situation favors aggression, groups are likely to be more aggressive than individuals because of arousal. Like our other predictions, however, this hypothesis requires empirical examination.

Our framework reveals that not all factors associated with aggression by individuals will have similar affects on aggression by groups. That is, if a group situation is powerful, individual differences might not influence aggression by groups (e.g., Ross & Nisbett, 1992). One testable inference from this speculation is that groups of females may act just as aggressively as groups of males, in contrast to the finding that males are typically more physically aggressive than females (Bettencourt & Miller, 1996).

Our framework provides a basis for developing numerous hypotheses about aggression involving groups as well as a better understanding of the potential mechanisms. Many incidents of aggression are committed by, or directed toward, groups. Although one can just as easily illustrate examples of aggression involving individuals, there is little experimental research devoted to aggression involving groups. Aggression is a complex behavior that can be difficult to experimentally examine. If research continues to focus only on aggression committed by individuals, however, we will lack a comprehensive understanding of this detrimental behavior.
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