Guidelines for the Prevention of Violent Extremism Online and Offline:

Findings from the Expert Conference and the Delphi Consensus Process

Ghayda Hassan | Université du Québec à Montréal

Pablo Madriaza | Université du Québec en Outaouais

Sébastien Brouillette-Alarie | Université de Montréal

Emmanuel Danis | Université du Québec à Montréal

Wynnpaul Varela | Université du Québec à Montréal

Sarah Ousman | Université du Québec à Montréal

Deniz Kilinc | McGill University

Éléa L. Savard | Université de Sherbrooke

Lysiane Lavoie | Université du Québec à Montréal

and the CPN-PREV team

PREV

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

"UNESCO Chair in Prevention of Radicalisation and Violent Extremism", Université de Sherbrooke, Concordia University, Université du Québec à Montréal

Report No 2022-DELPHI-EN

Disclaimer

This publication was funded by Public Safety Canada's Community Resilience Fund. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of Public Safety Canada.

Keywords

Delphi, consensus, evidence-based best practice guidelines, violent radicalization, violent extremism, systematic review, online radicalization, primary prevention, secondary prevention.

To Cite This Report (APA 7th Edition)

Hassan, G., Madriaza, P., Brouillette-Alarie, S., Danis, E., Varela, W., Ousman, S., Kilinc, D., Savard, É. L., Lavoie, L., & the CPN-PREV team. (2022). *Guidelines for the prevention of violent extremism online and offline: Findings from the expert conference and the Delphi consensus process.* Canadian Practitioners Network for the Prevention of Radicalization and Extremist Violence. https://cpnprev.ca/guideline-committees/

Coordinates

Canadian Practitioners Network for the Prevention of Radicalization and Extremist Violence (CPN-PREV)
Université du Québec à Montréal (UQÀM)
Adrien-Pinard Building (SU)—Department of Psychology
PO Box 8888, Downtown Station
Montreal, Quebec, Canada, H3C 3P8
https://cpnprev.ca/

Funded by the Government of Canada

Canada

Table of Contents

Introduction

The field of prevention of violent extremism is relatively new, having experienced significant growth since the 2000s in the wake of a string of attacks that shook the international community (START, 2019). As a result, the actors in the field, especially the practitioners, had to initially base their practices on literature that was either almost absent or had a significant number of conceptual, empirical, and practical inconsistencies (Feddes & Galluci, 2015; Horgan & Braddock, 2010). In light of that, practitioners had to draw from related fields such as psychosocial intervention, mental health, or criminology, from where some of the current practice in the prevention of violent extremism originates.

The lack of clear guidance for practitioners is compounded by scientific and specialized literature predominantly focused on understanding the phenomenon, its definition, manifestations, causes and, more recently, on the evaluation of intervention programs. Consequently, few studies address the actual practice of prevention of violent extremism, be it at the primary, secondary, or tertiary level (Brouillette-Alarie et al., 2022). Moreover, when research is conducted in prevention settings, practitioners are asked to participate but receive little feedback following the publication of the results (usually several years later).

To address the lack of guidance on good practice, networks providing spaces for knowledge/experience sharing, collaboration, and professional growth have been set up—by and for practitioners. Notable examples include the Canadian Practitioners Network for the Prevention of Radicalization and Extremist Violence (CPN-PREV; https://cpnprev.ca/) in Canada, the Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN; https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/networks/radicalisation-awareness-network-ran_en) in Europe, and the Prevention Practitioners Network (https://www.mccaininstitute.org/programs/preventing-targeted-violence/prevention-practitioners-network/) in the USA. These networks are fundamental to improving practice and supporting practitioners frequently operating in silos. In addition, they address an important limitation of the field, that is, the difficulty of proposing practice guidelines rooted in evidence and field expertise.

Indeed, in relatively new areas of research and practice, such as the field of prevention of violent extremism, it is rarely possible to generate evidence-based guidelines due to a lack of studies of high methodological quality capable of distinguishing the effective from the less effective (Brouillette-Alarie et al., 2022). Researchers are therefore advised to combine available (albeit imperfect) evidence and expert opinion using consensus-building methods.

The main objective of consensus methods is to define levels of agreement on controversial subjects (Fink, 1984), particularly when there is insufficient or too much information (Jones & Hunter, 1995). Examples of consensus processes include the consensus conference and the Delphi process, providing rigorous and replicable methodologies for reaching expert consensus on an issue (Bourrée et al., 2008). Consensus methods were originally developed in the field of medicine and public health, but over the last 70 years, they have been extended to other disciplines, including mental health (Jorm, 2015), public policy (Rayens & Hahn, 2000), and education (Marques & de Freitas, 2018).

Consensus conferences are face-to-face meetings of experts organized to address particular issues in a field where empirical evidence is either insufficient or contradictory (Waggoner et al., 2016). In most cases, a multidisciplinary approach is suggested so that different perspectives can be obtained. This method has both advantages and disadvantages (Waggoner et al., 2016). In terms of advantages, these meetings a) effectively synthesize the available information, b) increase the likelihood of experts taking ownership of the issues directly affecting them, and c) provide results quickly. Disadvantages include a) the cost of organizing the conference, b) potential biases brought about by power relations in face-to-face meetings, and c) lack of substantial empirical evidence on the reliability and validity of the results of these conferences.

The Delphi process (https://www.rand.org/topics/delphi-method.html) is a flexible, iterative, and anonymous methodology whereby a group of experts can reach a consensus on specific topics through at least three rounds of consultation (Fink et al., 1984). It was developed by the RAND Corporation in the late 1940s, and due to its low cost and easy implementation via online means, it remains one of the most widely used consensus methods, particularly in the clinical field. Besides the cost, the anonymization of responses helps reduce the bias inherent in the power relations of consensus conferences.

In order to contribute to the development of practice guidelines in the field of prevention of violent extremism—an area with relatively little empirical literature—the CPN-PREV adopted a three-step strategy. Firstly, to ground the discussions in the synthesized empirical literature, the CPN-PREV scientific team conducted two systematic reviews on the online and offline prevention of violent radicalization. Second, 111 experts and practitioners from the Canadian and international community (https://cpnprev.ca/guideline-committees/) were invited to a consensus conference, where they were offered the opportunity to discuss and refine CPN-PREV's systematic review recommendations in order to transform them into practice guidelines. Finally, a three-wave Delphi process was set up to anonymously evaluate the guidelines generated during the consensus conference.

Methods

1) Systematic Reviews

To address knowledge gaps in the available literature on good practices in online and offline prevention of violent radicalization, the CPN-PREV conducted two systematic reviews, the recommendations of which served as the basis for the Delphi process. The first review focused on the relationship between exposure to online extremist material and violent radical attitudes and behaviors, and the second on the outcomes of primary and secondary prevention programs for violent radicalization. The results of these systematic reviews are available at https://cpnprev.ca/systematic-review-1/ and https://cpnprev.ca/systematic-review-2/ respectively, in a variety of formats: detailed reports, scientific articles, pamphlets, and outreach videos.

2) Consensus Conference

In November 2018, two expert committees were formed: the Canadian Consensus Guidelines Committee (CCGC) and the International Consensus Guidelines Committee (ICGC). These committees included a total of 111 experts and practitioners who were invited to participate in the consensus-building processes for the development of practice guidelines on preventing violent extremism. Membership on the Canadian and International committees required (a) considerable experience in the prevention of violent extremism, both in research and practice, and (b) fluency in English or French. Several sources of information were used to identify potential committee participants: a) be an author of a study identified in the systematic reviews that served as the empirical basis for the Delphi process; b) be one of the practitioners interviewed in a previous international study (Madriaza et al., 2017); and c) have been recommended by researchers, practitioners, and government officials considered to have extensive experience in the field. Although a clear effort was made to have representation beyond Western countries, the sample was still characterized by an overrepresentation of North American countries, with one of the committees being composed solely of Canadian participants. Descriptive statistics of the committee members can be found in Table 1.

In March 2019, 72 of the 111 members of the Canadian and international consensus guideline development committees participated in a consensus conference entitled "Preventing Violent Radicalization: Evidence-Based Guidelines to Promote Effective Interventions." At the conference, experts were invited to evaluate the practice recommendations from the CPN-PREV systematic reviews. Participants were asked to rate the recommendations based on their research or intervention expertise, the scientific literature they were familiar with, or, if neither applied, their professional experience. The 72 experts were then divided into round tables of approximately eight participants to ensure good representation from each practice area. The experts were given a notebook to write down their thoughts, and a CPN-PREV moderator and note-taker were assigned to each table to record the discussions. This process allowed the CPN-PREV systematic review practice recommendations to be transformed into 19 practice guidelines that were then submitted to the participants during the Delphi process.

Table 1
Sociodemographic Characteristics of Canadian and International Consensus Guideline Development Committee Members (N = 111)

Gender	
Male	63 (57%)
Female	48 (43%)
Continent	
Africa	17 (15%)
Asia	1 (1%)
Europe	32 (29%)
North America	52 (47%)
Oceania	2 (2%)
International	6 (5%)
Occupation	
Researcher	57 (51%)
Practitioner	26 (23%)
Project manager	17 (15%)
Practitioner/Researcher	6 (5%)
Consultant	2 (2%)
Police Officer	1 (1%)
Language spoken	
English	64 (58%)
French	34 (31%)
English/French	12 (11%)

3) The Delphi Process

We conducted a three-wave Delphi process through online surveys on the LimeSurvey platform. Unlike in the consensus conference, participants did not have access to each other's responses, so the work was done independently and individually. In each of the three Delphi waves, participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement with every guideline: 1) totally disagree, scrap the guideline; 2) disagree, the guideline needs to be modified to become usable; 3) agree, but improvements could be made to the guideline; 4) totally agree, leave the guideline as is. If participants chose 2 or 3, they were then given the opportunity to suggest how the guideline could be modified. Because our participants spoke both English and French, the CPN-PREV team prepared the materials in both languages and sent participants a survey in the language of their choice.

For a guideline to be considered consensual, 80% or more of the participants had to indicate full agreement (4) with the recommendation in its current form. In accordance with our acceptance criterion, we decided to exclude any guideline that reached a total disagreement rate (1) of 20% or more. When a guideline reached the 80% adoption threshold, but relevant minor changes were suggested, they were incorporated into the final wording by the CPN-PREV team. When a guideline did not reach 80% agreement, but was not rejectable either, the CPN-PREV team would compile the suggested changes from participants and then modify the guideline to submit an updated version in

the next Delphi wave. Guidelines that did not achieve 80% agreement by the third wave of consultations were excluded from the final list of guidelines.

In the first wave, participants were asked to suggest new guidelines, which were then evaluated in the second and third waves. It was not possible to suggest new guidelines after the first wave.

Of the 111 individuals who served on the Canadian and international committees for the development of the consensus guidelines, 61 participated in the first wave of the Delphi process, 49 in the second wave, and 57 in the third wave. Descriptive statistics of the 61 professionals that participated in the first Delphi wave can be found in Table 2. Appendix A lists all experts that took part in the Delphi process and gave us authorization to display their names in the report.

Table 2

Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Participants Who Took Part in the First Wave of the Delphi Consultation

	All experts (N = 61)	Experts who completed the survey in English (n = 42)	Experts who completed the survey in French (n = 19)
		M (SD) / n (%)	
Age	44.6 (10.6)	43.5 (10.8)	47.1 (9.9)
Gender			
Female	27 (44.3%)	16 (38.1%)	11 (57.9%)
Male	34 (55.7%)	26 (61.9%)	8 (42.1%)
Education			
Cegep (general and vocational college)	1 (1.6%)	1 (2.4%)	0 (0%)
Bachelor's degree	5 (8.2%)	5 (11.9%)	0 (0%)
Master's degree	23 (37.7%)	12 (28.6%)	11 (57.9%)
Doctoral degree	32 (52.5%)	24 (57.1%)	8 (42.1%)
Profession[1]			
Psychologist	8 (13.1%)	6 (14.3%)	2 (10.5%)
Psychiatrist	1 (1.6%)	0 (0%)	1 (5.3%)
Criminologist	6 (9.8%)	6 (14.3%)	0 (0%)
Social worker	4 (6.6%)	1 (2.4%)	3 (15.8%)
Teacher	11 (18%)	7 (16.7%)	4 (21.1%)
Police officer	1 (1.6%)	1 (2.4%)	0 (0%)
Manager	9 (14.8%)	5 (11.9%)	4 (21.1%)
Other	30 (49.2%)	20 (47.6%)	10 (52.6%)
Experience of working with people involved in violent radicalization dynamics			
No	15 (24.6%)	11 (26.2%)	4 (21.1%)
Yes	46 (75.4%)	31 (73.8%)	15 (78.9%)

Assessment of one's own level of expertise in the prevention of violent extremism			
Novice	3 (4.9%)	2 (4.8%)	1 (5.3%)
Average	12 (19.7%)	7 (16.7%)	5 (26.3%)
Substantial	37 (60.7%)	26 (61.9%)	11 (57.9%)
Among the best	9 (14.8%)	7 (16.7%)	2 (10.5%)

Note. [1] The percentages of occupations may exceed 100%, as some participants indicated more than one occupation.

Results

This section contains the results of the consensus process undertaken to develop the Prevention of Violent Extremism Guidelines. Table 3 contains a brief description of the results of the Delphi process. Appendix B contains the guidelines suggested by participants in the first wave. For a more detailed account of each initial version of the guidelines, the comments made, and the modified and eventually adopted/rejected versions, see Appendix C.

Next, we present the approved consensus guidelines (total agreement of 80% or more in one of the three waves). These guidelines are divided into four categories: 1) general guidelines for the prevention of violent extremism; 2) guidelines for online prevention of violent extremism; 3) guidelines for primary and secondary prevention of violent extremism; and 4) guidelines suggested by participants not specifically derived from systematic reviews. Then, nonconsensual guidelines are presented.

The Delphi process began with 19 guidelines derived from the recommendations of the two systematic reviews and the consensus conference. Of these, nine were adopted in the first wave of consultation[1] and 10 required revision. In the second wave, of the 10 recommendations, one was merged with very similar recommendations (O4 into O1 and O2), six were adopted, and three were revised. The three revised recommendations did not achieve consensus in the third wave. Of the seven guidelines suggested by committee members in the first Delphi wave, all but one were adopted in the second wave.

[1] Two of the nine recommendations (G6 and G9) were merged after being adopted, as they were very similar.

Table 3

Results of the Delphi Process by Evaluation Wave

Guideline code	Categories of agreement	**Wave 1**		**Wave 2**		**Wave 3**	
		Agreement %	Result	Agreement %	Result	Agreement %	Result
GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR THE PREVENTION OF VIOLENT EXTREMISM							
G1	Strongly disagree	0.0%	**ADOPTED**				
	Disagree	0.0%					
	Agree	6.6%					
	Strongly agree	93.4%					
G2	Strongly disagree	3.3%	REVISION REQUIRED	0.0%	**ADOPTED**		
	Disagree	3.3%		0.0%			
	Agree	26.2%		10.2%			
	Strongly agree	67.2%		89.9%			
G3	Strongly disagree	1.6%	REVISION REQUIRED	0.0%	**ADOPTED**		
	Disagree	8.2%		6.1%			
	Agree	16.4%		6.1%			
	Strongly agree	73.8%		87.8%			
G4	Strongly disagree	1.6%	**ADOPTED**				
	Disagree	0.0%					
	Agree	9.8%					
	Strongly agree	88.5%					
G5	Strongly disagree	0.0%	**ADOPTED**				
	Disagree	1.6%					
	Agree	9.8%					
	Strongly agree	88.5%					

G6	Strongly disagree	0.0%	**ADOPTED**				
	Disagree	1.6%					
	Agree	13.1%					
	Strongly agree	85.2%					
G7	Strongly disagree	1.6%	**ADOPTED**				
	Disagree	3.3%					
	Agree	13.1%					
	Strongly agree	82.0%					
G8	Strongly disagree	3.3%	REVISION REQUIRED	0.0%	REVISION REQUIRED	3.5%	**NOT ADOPTED**
	Disagree	8.2%		2.0%		3.5%	
	Agree	9.8%		22.4%		36.8%	
	Strongly agree	78.7%		75.5%		56.1%	
G9	Strongly disagree	0.0%	**ADOPTED (AS THIS RECOMMENDATION WAS CLOSELY RELATED TO RECOMMENDATION G6, IT WAS MERGED WITH THE LATTER)**				
	Disagree	0.0%					
	Agree	16.4%					
	Strongly agree	83.6%					
G10	Strongly disagree	0.0%	**ADOPTED**				
	Disagree	1.6%					
	Agree	13.1%					
	Strongly agree	85.2%					
G11	Strongly disagree	0.0%	**ADOPTED**				
	Disagree	3.3%					
	Agree	18.0%					
	Strongly agree	81.7%					

GUIDELINES FOR ONLINE PREVENTION OF VIOLENT EXTREMISM							
O1	Strongly disagree	0.0%	REVISION REQUIRED	0.0%	REVISION REQUIRED	5.3%	**NOT ADOPTED**
	Disagree	3.3%		4.3%		5.3%	
	Agree	24.6%		17.0%		26.3%	
	Strongly agree	72.1%		78.7%		63.2%	
O2	Strongly disagree	6.6%	REVISION REQUIRED	0.0%	**ADOPTED**		
	Disagree	11.5%		0.0%			
	Agree	9.8%		2.1%			
	Strongly agree	72.1%		97.9%			
O3	Strongly disagree	1.6%	REVISION REQUIRED	0.0%	REVISION REQUIRED	3.5%	**NOT ADOPTED**
	Disagree	8.2%		0.0%		3.5%	
	Agree	14.8%		23.4%		29.8%	
	Strongly agree	75.4%		76.6%		63.2%	
O4	Strongly disagree	4.9%	**AS THIS RECOMMENDATION WAS CLOSELY RELATED TO RECOMMENDATIONS O1 AND O2, IT WAS MERGED WITH THEM BEFORE THE START OF THE SECOND WAVE**				
	Disagree	1.6%					
	Agree	19.7%					
	Strongly agree	73.8%					
O5	Strongly disagree	4.9%	REVISION REQUIRED	2.1%	**ADOPTED**		
	Disagree	1.6%		2.1%			
	Agree	19.7%		6.4%			
	Strongly agree	73.8%		89.4%			
GUIDELINES FOR PRIMARY AND SECONDARY PREVENTION OF VIOLENT EXTREMISM							
P1	Strongly disagree	3.3%	REVISION REQUIRED	0.0%	**ADOPTED**		
	Disagree	4.9%		0.0%			
	Agree	19.7		17.0%			
	Strongly agree	72.1%		83.0%			

P2	Strongly disagree	0.0%	**ADOPTED**		
	Disagree	3.3%			
	Agree	16.4%			
	Strongly agree	80.3%			
P3	Strongly disagree	1.6%	REVISION REQUIRED	0.0%	**ADOPTED**
	Disagree	16.4%		2.1%	
	Agree	21.3%		8.5%	
	Strongly agree	60.7%		87.0%	
GUIDELINES SUGGESTED BY PARTICIPANTS NOT SPECIFICALLY DERIVED FROM SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS					
NR1	Strongly disagree			0.0%	**ADOPTED**
	Disagree			2.1%	
	Agree			10.6%	
	Strongly agree			87.2%	
NR2	Strongly disagree			4.3%	**ADOPTED**
	Disagree			0.0%	
	Agree			14.9%	
	Strongly agree			80.9%	
NR3	Strongly disagree			4.3%	**ADOPTED**
	Disagree			4.3%	
	Agree			10.6%	
	Strongly agree			80.9%	
NR4	Strongly disagree			0.0%	**ADOPTED**
	Disagree			2.1%	
	Agree			12.8%	
	Strongly agree			85.0%	

NR5	Strongly disagree	0.0%	**ADOPTED**		
	Disagree	4.3%			
	Agree	10.6%			
	Strongly agree	85.1%			
NR6	Strongly disagree	2.1%	**ADOPTED**		
	Disagree	2.1%			
	Agree	8.5%			
	Strongly agree	87.2%			
NR7	Strongly disagree	4.3%	REVISION REQUIRED	1.8%	**NOT ADOPTED**
	Disagree	8.5%		1.8%	
	Agree	31.9%		19.3%	
	Strongly agree	55.3%		77.2%	

Note. The codes preceding the recommendations indicate the type of recommendation. G = general recommendations for preventing violent extremism; O = recommendations for online prevention of violent extremism; P = recommendations for primary and secondary prevention of violent extremism; and NR = recommendations suggested by participants not specifically derived from systematic reviews.

Guidelines for the Prevention of Violent Extremism

General Guidelines for the Prevention of Violent Extremism

G1. Build and maintain a relationship of trust (or a therapeutic alliance) with the individuals you help. Trust remains the key element.

G2. Ensure that meeting conditions maximize the sense of comfort of the individuals you help while taking into account the realities of your work (e.g., institutional vs informal setting) and the safety of both parties.

G3. Recognize that the grievances of the individual and their group may be legitimate, even if their means are not.

- "Recognize" does not mean approve or accept.

G4. Develop the person's sense of agency and problem-solving skills by asking interactive questions and seeking an open dialogue.

G5. Avoid being judgmental and/or letting conflict escalate when discussing the extremist views of the individuals you help. Challenging people on extremist views may result in these views becoming more crystalized. Take a flexible and respectful approach anchored in a relationship of trust.

G6/G9. Seek training and up-to-date information on issues related to violent radicalization. Do not hesitate to ask more experienced colleagues or teams if you feel overwhelmed by a situation (while maintaining confidentiality). Training topics include but are not limited to the following: cultural sensitivity, mental health and psychosocial issues, trauma-informed care, harm reduction, human rights, vulnerability/needs/risk assessment, violent extremist groups and narratives, the role of the Internet/social media, effective prevention approaches, ideology and dogma, and misinformation.

G7. The generalizability of PVE programs appears to be limited. Therefore, practitioners should refrain from transplanting a program "as is" from one context to another. Practitioners must adapt and tailor programs to local contexts.

G10. If funding enables it, evaluation models should be designed at the onset of programs to ensure methodologically robust evaluations. Stronger data concerning PVE programs are urgently needed.

G11. When evaluating prevention programs, conflicts of interest and potential biases should be kept to a minimum or be explicitly disclosed if unavoidable.

Guidelines for Online Prevention of Violent Extremism

O2. If you notice that the individuals you help are actively consuming and/or propagating hateful and violent extremist content online (e.g., they regularly participate in discussion forums of extremist groups or they search and share violent/hateful content on social media), you should take time to discuss how this content connects to offline behaviors and other aspects of their lives.

O5. If useful or needed, contribute to the digital literacy and critical thinking of the individuals you help. This will help them authenticate valid information online, which may, in turn, help them recognize and deconstruct violent extremist messages.

Guidelines for Primary and Secondary Prevention of Violent Extremism

P1. Programs should not be expected to prevent an attack from occurring but rather to reduce the risk—in the mid- to long-run—that an individual may engage on a path toward violent radicalization. Well-designed primary and secondary PVE programs that target relevant risk and protective factors have generally been found to be effective and should be encouraged.

P2. Primary and secondary prevention programs should not arbitrarily target any specific gender, cultural, religious, or ethnic group. This does not mean that programs should not be tailored for a specific audience. Rather, programs should avoid stigmatizing groups by assuming that membership of any of the above groups constitutes a risk factor for involvement in violent extremism. Programs must, however, be age-appropriate.

P3. Trust relationships with individuals and collaborations with communities are likely to be harmed if programs designed for primary or secondary prevention conflate surveillance/ information gathering with psychosocial/mental health support. If your program contains components that may be used for surveillance/information gathering, be transparent with individuals and clearly explain the limits of your confidentiality commitments, as dictated by your professional code of conduct.

Guidelines Suggested by Participants Not Specifically Derived from Systematic Reviews

NR1. Conduct a comprehensive mental health and psychosocial evaluation to address mental health issues such as trauma and their relation to practical needs or stressors. If this is not possible in your context, make sure you have access to specialized support in this area.

NR2. Pay attention to the larger social ecology of individuals who are involved in violent extremism. Consider families, friends, and institutions to identify potential risk and protective factors and, if possible, involve them in the intervention.

NR3. Pay attention to the cultural environment of individuals involved in violent extremism, especially the roles of racism and systemic discrimination as catalysts toward anger and feelings of exclusion.

NR4. As far as possible, work with a multidisciplinary team within your organization.

NR5. Include a gender-based approach in your evaluation and intervention plans to respond to the different gendered drivers involved in violent extremism.

NR6. Before meeting with individuals involved in violent extremism, make sure your institution has a safety plan and guidelines regarding escalation to law enforcement.

Nonconsensual Guidelines

G8. Given the limited data on prevention programs addressing far-left, far-right, and single-issue (e.g., misogyny) violent extremism, practitioners, researchers, and policymakers should encourage the implementation and evaluation of programs that specifically address these types of violent radicalization and/or combine different forms of extremism.

O1. Be open to discussing the online habits of the people you help. Make sure you have permission if they are minors. Remember to respect their privacy and avoid being intrusive, as this could threaten the bond of trust that you need to establish and maintain. Be aware that online behaviors may not have the same impact on different people. Therefore, the central concern should be whether relationships developed through the internet and social media (real or imagined), as well as other online behaviors, negatively influence real-life relationships and/or contribute to the radicalization of the individual.

O3. Be particularly careful if you notice that the person you are helping is expressing violent intentions or making threats online or offline. Before taking any serious action (e.g., reporting them to law enforcement agencies), assess the level of risk/threat and consult the appropriate resources.

- Remember to always work within the legal framework of your country/profession and honor your professional code of ethics.
- Remember that misreporting a person may jeopardize your trust relationship and increase the individual's sense of injustice and ostracization.

NR7. Try to understand, assess, and help the persons find answers to their needs (e.g., reducing marginalization, accessing employment, etc.) so that they do not seek those answers from violent extremist narratives/groups.

Conclusion

It is hoped that the present work will contribute to the prevention of violent radicalization and extremism, particularly in light of the recent increase in conspiracy theories linked to the distress and inequities generated by the COVID-19 pandemic, as well as the global rise in hatred and violence toward minority groups targeted by "othering" processes.

The field is new, complex, and in need of nuanced practice. Hard data are scarce, and the effectiveness of most prevention efforts is yet to be documented. Because of the lack of strong empirical evidence, the conditions required for the emergence of evidence-only practice guidelines are currently absent. Despite this, communities of practice are making clear demands for guidelines that would help to avoid implementing problematic/stigmatizing practices and prioritize practices that are consensually described as effective.

In response to these issues, we have taken a proactive stance by developing practice guidelines that are grounded in both field expertise and empirical literature (despite its limitations). By linking expert opinion with available empirical data, we have managed to bridge the gap between practice and research and produced guidelines based on the consensus of international experts in the field.

These guidelines must now be adapted to and put into practice in the specific contexts in which practitioners work and, most importantly, evaluated for their relevance. As such, the Delphi process is iterative, whereby the guidelines are reviewed and adjusted as new evidence regarding the outcomes of prevention programs emerges, as well as on the basis of studies that have directly evaluated the effectiveness of the guidelines.

In conclusion, the imbalance in scientific publications from North American and European countries compared with those from Asia, Oceania, South America, and Africa, as well as the preponderance of experts from Europe and North America in the Delphi process, will likely limit the generalizability or even applicability of these guidelines in other settings. This suggests that research and communities of practice in the prevention of violent extremism are not sufficiently globalized and inclusive of experiences from various regions of the world. It also reflects the disparity in the size and resources available for research centers in North America and Europe compared to those in other regions. The results of this guideline development process call for an integrated and ongoing international effort to develop best practice guidelines for the prevention of violent radicalization and extremism.

References

Bourrée, F., Michel, P., & Salmi, L. R. (2008). Méthodes de consensus : revue des méthodes originales et de leurs grandes variantes utilisées en santé publique [Consensus methods: Review of original methods and their main alternatives used in public health]. *Revue d'Épidémiologie et de Santé Publique, 56*(6), 415–423. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respe.2008.09.006

Brouillette-Alarie, S., Hassan, G., Varela, W., Ousman, S., Kilinc, D., Savard, É. L., Madriaza, P., Harris-Hogan, S., McCoy, J., Rousseau, C., King, M., Venkatesh, V., Borokhovski, E., & Pickup, D. (2022). Systematic review on the outcomes of primary and secondary prevention programs in the field of violent radicalization. *Journal for Deradicalization, 30*, 117–168. https://journals.sfu.ca/jd/index.php/jd/article/view/577

Feddes, A. R., & Gallucci, M. (2015). A literature review on methodology used in evaluating effects of preventive and de-radicalisation interventions. *Journal for Deradicalization, 5*, 1–27. https://journals.sfu.ca/jd/index.php/jd/article/view/33/31

Fink, A., Kosecoff, J., Chassin, M., & Brook, R. H. (1984). Consensus methods: Characteristics and guidelines for use. *American Journal of Public Health, 74*(9), 979–983. https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.74.9.979

Horgan, J., & Braddock, K. (2010). Rehabilitating the terrorists?: Challenges in assessing the effectiveness of de-radicalization programs. *Terrorism and Political Violence, 22*(2), 267–291. https://doi.org/10.1080/09546551003594748

Jones, J., & Hunter, D. (1995). Consensus methods for medical and health services research. *BMJ, 311*(7001), 376–380. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.311.7001.376

Jorm, A. F. (2015). Using the Delphi expert consensus method in mental health research. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry, 49*(10), 887–897. https://doi.org/10.1177/0004867415600891

Madriaza, P., Ponsot, A.-S., Marion, D., Monnier, C., Ghanem, A., Zaim, B., Nait-Kac, W., Hassani, N., & Autixier, C. (2017). *The prevention of radicalization leading to violence: An international study of front-line workers and intervention issues*. International Centre for the Prevention of Crime. http://www.crime-prevention-intl.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Publications/2017/EN_Rapport_Radicalisation_Final_Aout2017.pdf

Marques, J. B. V., & de Freitas, D. (2018). The DELPHI method: Characterization and potentialities for educational research. *Pro-Posições, 29*(2), 389–415. https://doi.org/10.1590/1980-6248-2015-0140

Rayens, M. K., & Hahn, E. J. (2000). Building consensus using the policy Delphi method. *Policy, Politics, & Nursing Practice, 1*(4), 308–315. https://doi.org/10.1177/152715440000100409

START. (2019). *Global terrorism database*. University of Maryland. https://www.start.umd.edu/gtd/

Waggoner, J., Carline, J. D., & Durning, S. J. (2016). Is there a consensus on consensus methodology? Descriptions and recommendations for future consensus research. *Academic Medicine, 91*(5), 663–668. https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000001092

Appendix A: Experts and Practitioners Who Took Part in the Delphi Process

The CPN-PREV wishes to express its deepest thanks to the experts and practitioners who took part in the Delphi process and thus helped move the field towards better evidence- and consensus-based practices. This report would not have been possible without their valuable contribution.

Experts and Practitioners Who Took Part in the Delphi Process

Name	Organization
Adrian Cherney	University of Queensland
Afrodita Musliu	NEXUS Civil Concept from the Republic of North Macedonia
Ahmed Buckley	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Anna Antonakis	Freie Universität Berlin
Anna Ekström	Institute for Future Studies
Ardian Shajkovci	American Counterterrorism Targeting and Resilience Institute (ACTRI)
Ashley Carver	Saint Mary's University
Barbara Perry	Centre on Hate, Bias and Extremism – Ontario Tech
Bart Schuurman	Leiden University
Benjamin Van Cutsem	CREA (Centre de ressources et d'appui) du Réseau de prise en charge des extrémismes et radicalismes violents de la Fédération Wallonie-Bruxelles (FWB)
Brian Smith	Toronto Police Service
Cécile Rousseau	McGill University
Bibi Claude Eitel	Ministère des Relations Extérieures de la République du Cameroun
Dan Laitsch	Simon Fraser University
Divina Frau-Meigs	Université Sorbonne Nouvelle
Eelco Kessels	Global Center on Cooperative Security
Elisabeth Maïba	CNEPCI, REAC-PREV
Fatima Akilu	Neem Foundation
Felix Munger	Canadian Municipal Network on Crime Prevention
Garth Davies	Simon Fraser University
B. Heidi Ellis	Boston Children's Hospital
Humera Khan	Muflehun
Joel Busher	Coventry University
John McCoy	Organization for the Prevention of Violence
Justine Coulidiati-Kielem	Groupe d'Action pour la Promotion, l'Éducation et la Formation de la femme et de la jeune fille (GAFEP)
J. Kevin Cameron	North American Center for Threat Assessment and Trauma Response
Maimou Wali	Cercle.Dev
Martine Zeuthen Hansen	RUSI
Michael King	Organization for the Prevention of Violence

Mustapha El Alami El Fellousse	Ministère des Affaires Etrangères, de la Coopération Africaine et des Marocains Résidant à l'Etranger
Myrna Lashley	McGill University
Navaid Aziz	Organization for the Prevention of Violence
Paul Gill	University College London
Rasha Nagem	Université Toulouse Jean Jaurès
Rebecca Emerson-Keeler	Insaan Consulting
Sabine Choquet	ITERP
Sabra Ben Ali	Laboratoire LIRCES – Université de Nice
Sara Savage	IC Educational (Cambridge) Ltd
Shandon Harris-Hogan	Center for Research on Extremism (C-REX) – University of Oslo
Tami Amanda Jacoby	University of Manitoba
Temitope Oriola	University of Alberta
Toria Ficette	Safe.brussels

and 19 other experts and practitioners.

Appendix B: Guidelines Suggested by Participants Not Specifically Derived from Systematic Reviews

#	Participants' suggestions	Formulation of new guideline or grounds for exclusion
	INCORPORATED SUGGESTIONS	
NR1	Three people recommended conducting a comprehensive mental health and psychosocial evaluation to address mental health issues such as trauma and their relation to practical needs or stressors.	Conduct a comprehensive mental health and psychosocial evaluation to address mental health issues such as trauma and their relation to practical needs or stressors. If this is not possible in your context, make sure you have access to specialized support in this area.
NR2	• Pay attention to family situations and the larger social ecology of individuals who are involved with VE. Consider families, friendships, and institutional linkages as important contributors to generating both risk and protective factors. • Start by analyzing the environment in which potentially radicalized people operate, using a PESTEL analysis (political, economic, sociological, technological, ecological and legal), in order to better understand the factors of radicalization in a specific environment. • Two experts stressed the importance of involving the clients' entourage in the search for solutions/responses, if the framework allows it. • One participant clarified by adding that this is the Palo Alto systemic approach. • Importance of having an implicit "refutation plan" involving all the actors surrounding the client (professionals, relatives) was also emphasized. Having such a plan would allow relevant individuals to prepare themselves so as not to be surprised when an incident of radicalization occurs and make refutations to the individual in the process of becoming radicalized.	Pay attention to the larger social ecology of individuals who are involved in violent extremism. Consider families, friends, and institutions to identify potential risk and protective factors and, if possible, involve them in the intervention.
NR3	• Demonstrate cultural humility and pay attention to the roles of racism and systemic discrimination as catalysts toward anger and feelings of exclusion. • Try to understand the cultural context in which your client lives so that you can understand the influence this may have on their responses, both in real life and on social networks.	Pay attention to the cultural environment of individuals involved in violent extremism, especially the role of racism and systemic discrimination as catalysts toward anger and feelings of exclusion.

NR4	Diversify staff.	As far as possible, work with a multidisciplinary team within your organization.
NR5	Women and men have different drivers to radicalization. Address them accordingly.	Include a gender-based approach in your evaluation and intervention plans to respond to the different gendered drivers involved in violent extremism.
NR6	Add a recommendation about having a safety plan and process for escalation to be given to law enforcement prior to seeing a client.	Before meeting with individuals involved in violent extremism, make sure your institution has a safety plan and guidelines regarding escalation to law enforcement.
NR7	Two people stressed the importance of providing for the underlying needs and desires of clients that may be currently in contact with hateful groups and ideologies.	Understand, evaluate, and respond to the needs of the individuals you help (e.g., being marginalized, not having a job, etc.) that are given voice through violent extremist narratives/groups.

REJECTED SUGGESTIONS

• Incorporate focus group testing by exposing the general population and those expressing interest/sympathy for violent extremist content to alternative narratives and counter-narratives. Refer to: Speckhard, Shajkovci, Ahmed, and Izadi's (2018) publication on targeting the Somali-American community with counter-narratives published in the Journal of Strategic Security (JSS). • Longitudinal evidence of online exposure linked to offline behavior is widely needed. Measure cognitive flexibility, metacognition, resilience, and integrative complexity as these measures are relevant to reducing the implicit bias and intergroup hostilities that can feed violent extremism and have positive educational outcomes. Schools may be more willing to gather longitudinal data using these measures. • Evaluation should focus on capturing variation amongst clients by looking at aggregate and individual outcomes.	** These recommendations were left out of the Delphi process because of their purely methodological nature. We consider these recommendations relevant for research but not for practitioners. **
• Recommend something on the importance of the sustainability of programs. • Avoid 3 to 5-year projects because they can do more harm than good in some cases.	** Because these suggestions were contradictory, they were left out of the Delphi process. **

SUGGESTIONS THAT WERE INCORPORATED AND/OR ALREADY COVERED BY THE CURRENT GUIDELINES	
Discomfort with the use of the term "client" was noted on several occasions, and suggestions to replace it, including "user," "member of the public," and "seeker or recipient of assistance," were made.	** Done. **
Two people commented about feelings of hurt and grievances. They recommended identifying and addressing emotionally painful issues before customizing a program for a client.	** Included in recommendation G3. **
One expert stressed the importance of listening to the clients and asking them questions with empathy (non-violent communication).	** Included in recommendation G5. **
Recognize that training and experience with trauma-informed care, harm reduction, and access to mental health support are essential to the success of prevention and intervention programs.	** Included in recommendation G6/G9. **
Develop familiarity with ideology and dogma associated with VE and various extremist movements.	** Included in recommendation G6/G9. **
One person stated that regional and local variations in risk and protective factors and their variation over time suggest that, whenever possible, prevention programs should be based on knowledge and monitoring of local determinants of violent radicalization.	** Included in recommendation G7. **
It was mentioned that the difficulty in evaluating programs is most often a question of the relationship between the resources allocated to a project and the means necessary to evaluate it.	** Included in recommendation G10. **
• Examine and build upon existing research-based programs designed to strengthen those protective factors to ensure such programming is in place in high-need communities. • Use measures with a track record for predictive validity such as cognitive flexibility, metacognition, and integrative complexity (pre/post instruments). Refer to: Savage, S., Ward, A., Tutton, L., & Oliver, E. (forthcoming, 2020). Developing critical thinking through cognitive and value complexity: An empirical assessment of the “Living well with difference” course in secondary schools in England. European Journal of Social Science Education.	** Included in recommendation P1. **

Appendix C: Detailed Results of the Delphi Process

	Wave 1				Wave 2			Wave 3	
Code	Original guideline	Categories of agreement	Agree-ment %	Comments	Revised guideline	Agree-ment %	Comments	Revised guideline	Agree-ment %
GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR THE PREVENTION OF VIOLENT EXTREMISM									
G1	Build and maintain a relationship of trust (or a therapeutic alliance) with the individuals you help. Trust remains the key element.	Strongly disagree	0.0%	**ADOPTED**					
		Disagree	0.0%						
		Agree	6.6%						
		Strongly agree	93.4%						

G2	Consider using non-formal settings to reduce wariness.	Strongly disagree	3.3%	• Three people thought this recommendation was unclear. What is a non-formal setting and wariness?
				• This does not apply to counselling visits.
				• Need to see evidence in support of this statement before feeling comfortable endorsing it.
				• Two people noted that this recommendation did not apply to all settings. One suggested adding "If the setting allows, think about..." at the beginning of the sentence, and another suggested rephrasing it as follows: "If you are working in an institutional setting, think about XYZ to maximize your clients' comfort and minimize...."
				• Three people pointed out the need for safety in non-formal settings: The non-formal setting should be safe for both the practitioner and the client.
				• Two people suggested to contextualize the recommendation by adding:
				  ○ This may depend on the POC, as some individuals may be highly educated and more comfortable in a professional setting, while others may be overwhelmed if it feels too professional.
				  ○ Consider feasibility from a budgetary/safety perspective. Non-formal settings may be too all-encompassing and should be
					Ensure that meeting conditions maximize the sense of comfort of the individuals you help while taking into account the realities of your work (e.g., institutional vs informal setting) and the safety of both parties.	0.0%	**ADOPTED**		

		Disagree	3.3%			0.0%			
		Agree	26.2%			10.2%			
		Strongly agree	67.2%			89.9%			

				considered on a case-by-case basis, with perhaps a preference for non-formal settings if a set of conditions are met. • Two people recommended clients' active involvement in deciding the setting. • One participant suggested mentioning that while less formal, these environments need a clear ethical framework. • Two individuals added the notion of having to adapt when choosing intervention sites. One did so by specifying that it is necessary to adapt to the context while the other mentioned the need to adapt to the youth (some find a formal setting rewarding and appreciate it). • Finally, one participant suggested replacing the term "clients" with "individuals."			
G3	Acknowledge that the grievances of your clients and their group may be legitimate, even if their means are not.	Strongly disagree	1.6%	• Two participants commented that the concept of "means" needed to be better developed. • Almost all participants had concerns about the legitimacy of clients' grievances: o A healthy degree of skepticism is necessary to identify whether clients have learned to present their motives for involvement through grievances that reproduce their extremist narrative. o Maintain trust. If you believe the grievances of your client are legitimate, let them know that you believe them. If you do not find them legitimate, try to relate to the client's personal pain (such as being marginalized, having no employment, aversive life events in childhood, etc.) that is being voiced through extremist ideology. Try to acknowledge the pain the client has experienced without legitimating the ideology. o "Understand" rather than "acknowledge" that grievances	Recognize* that the grievances of the individual and their group may be legitimate, even if their means are not. * "Recognize" does not mean approve or accept.	0.0%	**ADOPTED**
		Disagree	8.2%			6.1%	
		Agree	16.4%			6.1%	
		Strongly agree	73.8%			87.8%	

				may be legitimate. If the helper "acknowledges" rather than "understands," the POC may say to themselves, "See, I am right? Even they agree." Also, they could see the helper as not having the guts to fight them. • Three participants pointed out that the client's claims could be problematic or even unacceptable. • Taking a contextual approach was also suggested. "May" could be key here, but it depends on the case. Add a preface to the recommendation, "where and when appropriate."			
G4	Develop the person's sense of agency and problem-solving skills by asking interactive questions and seeking an open dialogue.	Strongly disagree	1.6%	**ADOPTED**			
		Disagree	0.0%				
		Agree	9.8%				
		Strongly agree	88.5%				
G5	Avoid being judgmental and/or letting conflict escalate when discussing the extremist views of the individuals you help. Challenging people on extremist views may result in these views becoming more crystalized. Take a flexible and respectful approach anchored in a relationship of trust.	Strongly disagree	0.0%	**ADOPTED**			
		Disagree	1.6%				
		Agree	9.8%				
		Strongly agree	88.5%				

G6	Seek training and up-to-date information on issues related to violent radicalization. Do not hesitate to ask more experienced colleagues or teams if you feel overwhelmed by a situation (while maintaining confidentiality). Training topics include but are not limited to the following: cultural sensitivity, mental health and psychosocial issues, trauma-informed care, harm reduction, human rights, vulnerability/needs/ risk assessment, violent extremist groups and narratives, the role of the Internet/social media, effective prevention approaches, ideology and dogma, and misinformation.	Strongly disagree	0.0%	**ADOPTED**
		Disagree	1.6%	
		Agree	13.1%	
		Strongly agree	85.2%	
G7	The generalizability of PVE programs appears to be limited. Therefore, practitioners should refrain from transplanting a program "as is" from one context to another. Practitioners must adapt and tailor programs to local contexts.	Strongly disagree	1.6%	**ADOPTED**
		Disagree	3.3%	
		Agree	13.1%	
		Strongly agree	82.0%	

G8	The lack of prevention programs targeting far-left, far-right, anti-government, and/or single-issue violent radicalization and extremism stands in stark contrast with the prevalence of these phenomena in many regions around the globe. Such programs should be designed, implemented, and evaluated in areas where these forms of violent extremism exist.	Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree	3.3% 8.2% 9.8% 78.7%	• The lack of clarity in this statement was raised by participants, especially with respect to the "and/or single issue" part: ○ Cautious about recommending a major rollout and scaling up for primary and secondary programs because evidence concerning their success is currently scant. ○ Very clear definitions of what comprises problematic forms of "far left," "far right," and so on ought to be developed before recommending a whole suite of new programs. ○ This is a general statement inviting many different responses depending on the context/country. Change the first sentence to "prevention programs more often tend to target forms of extremism that are perceived as a problem by majorities and neglect other forms of extremism that may nonetheless be very prevalent." ○ Change the first sentence to "stands in stark contrast to the prevalence of such forms of violent radicalization (sic), which appear in regions of the world considered less affected by violent radicalization with ideological or religious reference, but just as disturbing." • I'm not sure that specific programs should be designed to tackle only one type of ideology. • It may be that there is a lack of programs specifically designed for PVE, but that does not mean that programs designed to strengthen protective factors do not exist. • Change "from the far left" to "for the far left." • One person suggested completing the second sentence with "and in regions not familiar with these forms." • Another suggested ending the recommendation with "and taking into account the specificities of each region."	There is a need for PVE programs addressing far-left, far-right, and single-issue (e.g., misogyny) violent radicalization. Practitioners, researchers, and policymakers should encourage the implementation and evaluation of such programs, especially in regions where these forms of extremism are prevalent.	0.0% 2.0% 22.4% 75.5%	• Several people mentioned that the different forms of radicalization should be approached in a more global and transversal way: ○ There is a need to develop prevention programs that address violent radicalization in a cross-cutting manner allowing for all forms of violent extremism to be tackled. ○ More comprehensive programs can help prevent and assess several types of radicalization and help avoid the damaging effects of programs focused on only one type of radicalization. ○ For example, "There is a need for PVE programs addressing far-left, far-right, and/or single-issue (e.g., misogyny) violent radicalization." Combine rather than separate different types of radicalization because a person can be misogynistic and far-right, for example. ○ While we may not need programs addressing every issue, we should be able to work with all individuals,	Given the limited data on prevention programs addressing far-left, far-right, and single-issue (e.g., misogyny) violent extremism, practitioners, researchers, and policymakers should encourage the implementation and evaluation of programs that specifically target these types of violent radicalization and/or combine different forms of extremism. **NOT ADOPTED**	3.5% 3.5% 36.8% 56.1%

							regardless of the source of their radicalization. ○ The recommendation could target "specific and combined forms of violent radicalization." Naming just a few types may reveal a bias, so such wording should be avoided. • Link to human rights (e.g., anti-discrimination, anti-hate speech, freedom of expression, etc)? • Encourage, research root causes, and implement and evaluate these programs. • Two people suggested changing/removing the section, "especially in regions where these forms of extremism are prevalent:" ○ "Present" might be a better word than "prevalent" as it suggests a more intensive problem. ○ The absence or presence of a prevention program is not related to the prevalence of radicalization in a particular region. • One person mentioned that PVE programs were not always useful and that the evidence of their effectiveness was not compelling. It would		

							be better to say that such programs were only one response to radicalization.		
G9	A successful program may become harmful if handled without due sensitivity. Practitioners should therefore be adequately trained to deal with the complex issues that this type of work involves, including risk assessment, case management and follow-up, cultural sensitivity, and the supervision of group dynamics in group-based programs.	Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree	0.0% 0.0% 16.4% 83.6%	**ADOPTED (AS THIS RECOMMENDATION WAS CLOSELY RELATED TO RECOMMENDATION G6, IT WAS MERGED WITH THE LATTER)**					
G10	If funding enables it, evaluation models should be designed at the onset of programs to ensure methodologically robust evaluations. Stronger data concerning PVE programs are urgently needed.	Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree	0.0% 1.6% 13.1% 85.2%	**ADOPTED**					
G11	When evaluating prevention programs, conflicts of interest and potential biases should be kept to a minimum or be explicitly disclosed if unavoidable.	Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree	0.0% 3.3% 18.0% 81.7%	**ADOPTED**					

GUIDELINES FOR ONLINE PREVENTION OF VIOLENT EXTREMISM									
O1	Be interested in the online habits of your clients. Find out how, when, and for how long they use the Internet/social media. You could ask: a) which sites and forums they visit; b) how they react and respond to the content they consume; c) what content they share and how widely; and d) what needs are being fulfilled by Internet/social media.	Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree	0.0% 3.3% 24.6% 72.1%	• Five people commented on the issue of trust, advising that practitioners be aware of the risk of losing trust when their inquiry becomes too intrusive. People's privacy and personal integrity should always be respected. • Two people commented on the practical and legal challenges surrounding surveillance of online behavior, suggesting that exploring online/offline habits may amount to surveillance, which could threaten trust. Should such work not be (largely) left to intelligence agencies? • Three people commented on engaging with online material, saying that practitioners should differentiate and identify active and passive seekers of online content. Emphasis should be put on why a client uses a form of social media rather than on how or when they do. Similar online behaviors may not always mean the same thing. Duration of Internet use may be irrelevant; the main concern should be whether social media relations (real or imagined) are replacing real-life relations. • Two participants mentioned that the focus should not be on online habits. One suggested that it would be better to add "if discussions about social media use arise, are you interested in…" at the beginning of the sentence. • One person said that he/she was not sure that how, when, and for how long a person was online reflected the way social media is used. • One person wondered who were the leaders/peers of online influencers. • One person recommended removing question "d," as it could interfere with the therapeutic relationship and require the ability to step back and reflect on one's behavior. • One person suggested that the term "client" should not be used.	Be open to exploring the online habits of individuals you help while respecting privacy and avoiding being intrusive, as this may threaten trust. Similar online behaviors may not mean the same to different individuals. Therefore, the main concern should be whether social media relations (real or imagined) and other online behaviors are replacing real-life relations and negatively impacting the person.	0.0% 4.3% 17.0% 78.7%	• Clarify the term "explore" to avoid confusion about its scope (it does not mean the same thing to everyone). • It can be done in an adult context, but what about children, for whom parents already (often) control access to the Internet? • One person suggested replacing "have a negative impact on the individual" with "contributing to the individual's radicalization to violence." • It's not always necessary to check if virtual contacts replace real contacts, but rather if these virtual contacts and their behaviors are reproduced in reality and/or if they influence the individual.	Be open to discussing the online habits of the people you help. Make sure you have permission if they are minors. Remember to respect their privacy and avoid being intrusive, as this could threaten the bond of trust that you need to establish and maintain. Be aware that online behaviors may not have the same impact on different people. Therefore, the central concern should be whether relationships developed through the internet and social media (real or imagined), as well as other online behaviors, negatively influence real-life relationships and/or contribute to the radicalization of the individual. **NOT ADOPTED**	5.3% 5.3% 26.3% 63.2%

O2	Avoid asking your clients only about their consumption of violent/hateful material, as doing so may give them the impression of being investigated. Ask questions about offline and non-radicalized aspects of their lives as well.	Strongly disagree	6.6%	• Three people recommended using a contextual approach—depending on your role as a practitioner (e.g., if you are associated with the police, the people you help might have a reason to suspect you). Also, whether or not to use this approach depends on the client: If violent/hateful materials are of significant interest to them and play an important role in building their worldviews, you should discuss them. In the case of a lawyer-client relationship, constructive dialogue about the relevance of such consumption would be important.
				• Two people recommended a temporal sequence to asking questions, i.e., asking about the client's life and identity before discussing ideology. It is important to ask about all aspects of their lives, including online and offline interests, at the appropriate time. It is all about when and how you ask questions.
				• Three people compared this recommendation with recommendations O1 and G5:
				  ○ One person stated that questions about consumption of violent/ hateful material should be asked with recommendations O1 and G5 in mind, i.e., developing an interest in the overall online habits of the client and doing so respectfully while refraining from making value judgments.
				  ○ One person asserted that this recommendation contradicted recommendation O1.
				  ○ One person suggested attaching this recommendation to O1.
				• One person argued that clients were intelligent enough to know when they are in these processes and that they would pick up on this. It is therefore essential to build trust first.
				• One participant suggested that it should be "hateful, violent or extremist material online."
					If you notice that the individuals you help are actively consuming and/or propagating hateful and violent extremist content online (e.g., they regularly participate in discussion forums of extremist groups or they search and share violent/hateful content on social media), you should take time to discuss how this content connects to offline behaviors and other aspects of their lives.
					
					** Intrusiveness concerns (i.e., feelings of being investigated) of O2 were moved to O1 to avoid redundancy (concomitantly, experts asked us to integrate nuances about privacy into O1). We thus modified O2 to reflect the step between O1 and O3. **
						0.0%	**ADOPTED**

		Disagree	11.5%			0.0%	
		Agree	9.8%			2.1%	
		Strongly agree	72.1%			97.9%	

				• One participant suggested that what is considered hateful or violent material should be clarified (and suggested that it could be something like “complete forms of propaganda that incite hatred or violence”). The same person also suggested rewording the recommendation proposal as it implies that the client is being duped, and this could affect the trust relationship. • One participant advised the wording "don't explore consumption first..." at the beginning of the sentence to stress that the online experience is not the only sphere of interest.					

03	Pay particular attention if you notice that your clients are actively consuming and/or propagating violent extremist content online (e.g., regularly participate in radical forums, search and share violent or hateful content on social media, express violent intentions or threats). If they do, before taking immediate action, consult a local multidisciplinary team specialized in violent radicalization and risk assessment of violent behavior (https://cpnprev.ca/themap/).	Strongly disagree	1.6%	• Two people pointed out that a local multidisciplinary team specialized in violent radicalization and risk assessment of violent behavior may not be available, especially in smaller settings.
				• Two people found this recommendation too long and convoluted:
				  ○ The first person said this recommendation was two recommendations in one and that he/she agreed with the first part but not the second.
				  ○ The second person identified this recommendation as a “fruit salad” (too much is thrown into it and should be split up because of differences in behavior). He/she recommended separating participation in forums/consuming violent multimedia from making threats/expressing violent intent.
				• Three people expressed the need for clarification:
				  ○ What does “immediate action” mean?
				  ○ Clarify that radical forums are not illegal but inciting violence or sharing content that incites violence is.
				  ○ Add “threat assessment” to the wording, as “risk assessment” may be insufficient.
					Pay particular attention if you notice that individuals you help express violent intentions or threats online (or offline). Before taking any immediate drastic measure (e.g., reporting them to law enforcement agencies), assess the level of risk/threat and consult the appropriate resources if you are not equipped to do so.
					
					1) Remember to always work within the legal framework of your country/ profession and honor your professional code of ethics.
						0.0%	• One participant mentioned that the additions following the recommendation were redundant and could create a reluctance to report problematic behavior.
							• Several suggested removing or changing "to law enforcement" to "third party actors" to include all possible stakeholders that could be alerted, as any reporting may lead to loss of trust.
							• The wording "strong actions" could be replaced with "decisive actions," "high consequence actions," or "aimed at activating a control." One person mentioned that "drastic/energetic" was not appropriate, as a referral is not necessarily drastic or harmful and clinicians can collaborate/coexist with security in
								Be particularly careful if you notice that the person you are helping is expressing violent intentions or making threats online or offline. Before taking any serious action (e.g., reporting them to law enforcement agencies), assess the level of risk/threat and consult the appropriate resources.
								
								1) Remember to always work within the legal framework of your country/ profession and honor your professional code of ethics.
									3.5%

		Disagree	8.2%			0.0%			3.5%
		Agree	14.8%			23.4%			29.8%
		Strongly agree	75.4%			76.6%			63.2%

				• Two people pointed out the need to include offline behaviors as well. • One participant suggested that the terms "conspiratorial" and "extremist" be preferred to "hateful" and "violent" because they are less limiting and more representative of the content consumed online by most radicalized individuals. • This recommendation a) should be related to laws of professional confidentiality (in many countries, that type of action would be illegal) and b) relies on the local team's knowledge and capacity. How can we be certain that a team has better tools than a professional to handle the issue? • Wider drivers to radicalization should be considered, especially as information is now often shared on encrypted platforms. • The wording "forums spreading violent extremist rhetoric" was suggested instead of "radical forums" by one individual, who also suggested replacing "draconian actions" with "calling for enforcement (reporting, security measures, etc.)." • Finally, one individual stated that he did not understand the purpose of the hyperlink.	2) Remember that misreporting a person to law enforcement may jeopardize your trust relationship and increase the individual's sense of grievance, injustice, and ostracization.		advancing violence prevention. • One person preferred to use "do, unless" to "do not, unless" to advocate reporting violent/threatening behavior, etc., to authorities. Instead of mentioning not alerting authorities too quickly, the person suggested reporting the behavior unless there was a good reason not to. • Expand "shows violent intent or makes threats" and add "to self or others."	2) Remember that misreporting a person may jeopardize your trust relationship and increase the individual's sense of injustice and ostracization. **NOT ADOPTED**	
O4	Pay attention to the overlap between online and offline behaviors, as they are intrinsically linked in our modern world.	Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree	4.9% 1.6% 19.7% 73.8%	• Two people voiced their concerns about the wording of the recommendation: ○ Unsure about the word "intrinsically." ○ What does "paying attention" mean? • Three people explained that while the recommendation was valuable, it was important to recognize that online and offline behaviors may not always be intrinsically linked. • One person suggested changing the first sentence to "pay attention to how your client's online and offline lives interplay, especially if the person is experiencing distress or conflict."	**AS THIS RECOMMENDATION WAS CLOSELY RELATED TO RECOMMENDATIONS O1 AND O2 (SEE ABOVE), IT WAS MERGED WITH THEM BEFORE THE START OF THE SECOND WAVE**				

				• Two participants warned that some people use the Internet as a platform to express a different personality (e.g., avatars) that is not and/or will never be them. Very often, individuals have two personas and focusing on the links between them can lead one down a dark alley. In order to account for the possibility of a divide and the construction of two online/offline identities, one participant suggested replacing this first sentence with "try to understand the interactions between online and offline life." • One person stated that the rise in autism spectrum as a vulnerability factor needed to be considered. Online sites provide an emotionally simple forum for affected individuals to interact with others. • One person considered the recommendation to be true if the online behavior was nonviolent. • One person felt this recommendation was too general.			
O5	Help develop the critical thinking and digital literacy of your clients by referring them to resources such as: a) SERENE-RISK (https://www.serene-risc.ca/en/); b) Microsoft Digital Literacy course (https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/digitalliteracy/home).	Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree	4.9% 1.6% 19.7% 73.8%	• Two people feared this recommendation would come across as condescending. • Three people said they could not comment on this recommendation without learning more about the recommended resources. • One person explained they agreed in principle but needed to know more. • One person said they were indifferent about the “digital literacy” part of the recommendation. • Three people advised that before referring clients to resources, practitioners should make sure clients were able to understand the content of these resources. • One person suggested adding more moderated sites and references, and another suggested that less technical resources be used as well (i.e., common sense and values such as respect, DH, etc.).	If useful or needed, contribute to the digital literacy and critical thinking of the individuals you help. This will help them authenticate valid information online, which may, in turn, help them recognize and deconstruct violent extremist messages.	2.1% 2.1% 6.4% 89.4%	**ADOPTED**

				• One participant questioned giving examples of resources (especially the Microsoft course so as not to advertise them), as the resources should be produced in the person's cultural context and with stakeholders they trust. • Two people argued that the recommended resources were not appropriate for developing critical thinking, authenticating online information, or recognizing and deconstructing online hate. • Conversely, two participants suggested other relevant resources: MediaSmart (http://mediasmarts.ca), ABC Life Literacy (https://abclifeliteracy.ca), and Safe on Web (https://safeonweb.be). • One person outright called this recommendation “stupid” and doubted clients would take this course. • One person recommended translating the resources. Recommended resources are only available in English and, therefore, not accessible to people who do not speak it. • Three people agreed that there was a need to develop critical thinking. One person specifically highlighted the need for young people to be able to decode extremist messaging when it is wrapped in humor (e.g., memes) or everyday-like situations (e.g., YouTube videos). • Another person mentioned that dialogue and trust must be established before developing critical thinking skills and that this must be in response to a person's questioning for it to work. • One person believed clients had already developed critical thinking and digital literacy and that the problem was more about social, political, and economic injustices. • One person suggested replacing the beginning of the sentence with "help your clients develop their digital literacy by exercising critical thinking			

				skills regarding the content they access." • One person considered the recommendation to be helpful for tertiary prevention programs. • It was also suggested by one person that this recommendation should be separated into two, as the development of critical thinking skills (cognitive reflexivity) and digital literacy were different kinds of vulnerability factors.			
GUIDELINES FOR PRIMARY AND SECONDARY PREVENTION OF VIOLENT EXTREMISM							
P1	Researchers and practitioners may benefit from reframing primary and secondary prevention programs from a public health perspective. Clearly, such programs are not designed to prevent an attack from occurring but rather to reduce the risk—in the mid- to long-run—that an individual may engage on a path towards violent radicalization.	Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree	3.3% 4.9% 19.7% 72.1%	• Three people found the recommendation unclear: o The recommendation has two separate ideas, and this does not make sense. o What is the original frame that is incorrect? And what is the better frame? Are you saying that primary and secondary PVE programs are framed as being designed to prevent attacks? o The language of the recommendation is confusing. Using a PH perspective may be better than what? "Clearly" should not be in a recommendation. "Such programs": what programs? "In the mid- to long-run" is unclear. • The parallel with public health was criticized by three people: o One participant suggested deleting the first sentence, as he did not believe there was necessarily a link to public health. o One participant said that, although the parallel was exciting, the epidemiological model did not apply effectively to radicalization. o The third one disagreed with the suggestion to apply a public health perspective, for political reasons. This expert also suggested replacing "benefit for…" with "gain for…." • Two people recommended adopting a larger focus at the group and societal level.	Programs should not be expected to prevent an attack from occurring but rather to reduce the risk—in the mid- to long-run—that an individual may engage on a path toward violent radicalization. Well-designed primary and secondary PVE programs that target relevant risk and protective factors have generally been found to be effective and should be encouraged.	0.0% 0.0% 17.0% 83.0%	**ADOPTED**

				• The key focus should be on a general perspective of “care” and “safeguarding” rather than “security.” • Consider an alternative phrasing that does not assume a certain linear direction, such as “that an individual could be at risk of engaging with….” • Programs delivered in prisons or deradicalization detention centers should be the exceptions as it is impossible to avoid the need for a security “lens” in these cases. • Another participant suggested adding "and social cohesion" after “public health.” • One participant suggested replacing the second sentence with "in fact, these programs are not designed to prevent an attack from occurring but to increase/consolidate collective resilience factors and decrease vulnerability factors that are associated with attitudes that legitimize violence."			
P2	Primary and secondary prevention programs should not arbitrarily target any specific gender, cultural, religious, or ethnic group. This does not mean that programs should not be tailored for a specific audience. Rather, programs should avoid stigmatizing groups by assuming that membership of any of the above groups constitutes a risk factor for involvement in violent extremism. Programs must, however, be age-appropriate.	Strongly disagree	0.0%	**ADOPTED**			
		Disagree	3.3%				
		Agree	16.4%				
		Strongly agree	80.3%				

P3	Prevention programs based on surveillance or intelligence gathering (e.g., censorship programs in universities or hotlines to report "suspicious activity") should be avoided, as they appear counterproductive (i.e., they cause more harm than benefits).	Strongly disagree	1.6%	• Most of the people agreed with the recommendation but continued to argue in favor of surveillance or intelligence gathering in certain contexts and for different purposes: o While surveillance and hotlines should not be the main prevention effort, police benefit from them in countering crimes. o General-population involvement in the early detection of potential extremists is important if prevention programs stay short of panopticon-style surveillance. o Surveillance and intel gathering are important for disruption, but there should be a balance between surveillance/intel gathering and community engagement. o Some intelligence gathering could avoid potential or imminent threats posed by violent extremists. o What information is gathered and to whom it gets directed depends on the program's design. o This recommendation is unclear. There is a big difference between encouraging reporting of suspicious activity in the public domain among strangers and encouraging such behavior among intimates (e.g., Grossman and Thomas). Among intimates, there seem to be ways of reporting concerns of violent radicalization to authorities that are not necessarily counterproductive. o Surveillance and hotlines themselves are not counterproductive. It is the way a program is communicated to the public (i.e., the awareness campaign) that is often problematic. Frequently, it fails to address emergent stigmas that cause such programs to be counterproductive. • Four participants disagreed with the statement: o One said that it was difficult to be specific about the topic.	Trust relationships with individuals and collaborations with communities are likely to be harmed if programs designed for primary or secondary prevention conflate surveillance/ information gathering with psychosocial/ mental health support. If your program contains components that may be used for surveillance/ information gathering, be transparent with individuals and clearly explain the limits of your confidentiality commitments, as dictated by your professional code of conduct.	0.0%	**ADOPTED**
		Disagree	16.4%			2.1%	
		Agree	21.3%			8.5%	
		Strongly agree	60.7%			87.0%	

				○ Another said that it may have been too radical and instead specified that these programs should never be used alone. ○ The hotline example was problematic and should be removed. ○ The caution against using PVE programs for surveillance and intelligence gathering should be stronger. • Two people mentioned that there needed to be more clarity in the objectives/target audiences: ○ One said that there should be more transparency about who was using these tools and a better distinction between the responsibilities of those who were asked to use such tools (they should not at the same time be asked to act in other ways). ○ The other added the clarification that programs should declare whether they were a listening or an alerting service. • Support online reporting tools that are focused on "social responsibility" for keeping us all safe. This means it is not a "report a poacher" initiative but a general safety tip for all forms of violence or concerning behavior. Refer to PSST World and the BC Government ERASE Initiative: news.gov.bc.ca "Student Safety Increased Through School-Police Partnership" November 21, 2019. • Finally, one expert suggested replacing the end of the sentence with "should be reviewed and reinforced with follow-up awareness to better understand and support them if needed."			

GUIDELINES SUGGESTED BY PARTICIPANTS NOT SPECIFICALLY DERIVED FROM SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS					
NR1		Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree	Conduct a comprehensive mental health and psychosocial evaluation in order to address mental health issues such as trauma and their relation to practical needs or stressors. If this is not possible in your context, make sure that you have access to specialized support in this area.	0.0% 2.1% 10.6% 87.2%	**ADOPTED**
NR2		Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree	Pay attention to the larger social ecology of individuals who are involved in violent extremism. Consider families, friends, and institutions in order to identify potential risk and protective factors and, if possible, involve them in the intervention.	4.3% 0.0% 14.9% 80.9%	**ADOPTED**
NR3		Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree	Pay attention to the cultural environ-ment of individuals involved in violent extremism, especially the roles of racism and systemic discrimination as catalysts toward anger and feelings of exclusion.	4.3% 4.3% 10.6% 80.9%	**ADOPTED**

NR4		Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree	As far as possible, work with a multidisciplinary team within your organization.	0.0% 2.1% 12.8% 85.0%	**ADOPTED**		
NR5		Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree	Include a gender-based approach in your evaluation and intervention plans to respond to the different gendered drivers involved in violent extremism.	0.0% 4.3% 10.6% 85.1%	**ADOPTED**		
NR6		Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree	Before meeting with individuals involved in violent extremism, make sure your institution has a safety plan and guidelines regarding escalation to law enforcement.	2.1% 2.1% 8.5% 87.2%	**ADOPTED**		
NR7		Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree	Understand, evaluate, and respond to the needs of the individuals you help (e.g., being marginalized, not having a job, etc.) that are given voice through violent extremist narratives/ groups.	4.3% 8.5% 31.9% 55.3%	• Several people disagreed with the wording "respond to the needs of the individuals you help." They advocated for "support the needs" instead. • Replace with "support these people to solve their needs/problems." • It is impossible to solve the socio-economic problems of all individuals. • Avoid making unrealistic commitments. If you do so, the responsibility becomes too great for the provider. "Have clear communication with	Try to understand, assess, and help the persons find answers to their needs (e.g., reducing marginaliza-tion, accessing employment, etc.) so that they do not seek those answers from violent extremist narratives/ groups. **NOT ADOPTED**	1.8% 1.8% 19.3% 77.2%

					your counterpart about what can and cannot be expected." • Some needs cannot be solved by intervention alone (e.g., marginalization) but rather by a combination of factors and societal and cultural changes. • "Understand, evaluate, and contribute to solving the needs of the individuals you help." • "Solve" is too engaging and fraught with responsibility. • It is not the responsibility of the violent extremism prevention practitioner to solve the needs of individuals unless it is explicitly part of the prevention program. • "Encouraging them to seek to solve." • The wording "assisting in solving the problem" is a suggestion from several experts. • According to one expert, it is more effective to assist the individual in solving their problem independently than to solve it "for" them.		