

ASSESSING AND MITIGATING RISK



DR. BRIAN VAN BRUNT



LOOKING
GLASS
— CONSULTING —

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Terminology | 3 |
| Affective & Predatory Violence | 7 |
| Hunters & Howlers | 10 |
| Understanding & Mitigating Bias | 11 |
| Assessing Truthfulness | 12 |
| Threat & Violence Risk Assessment Tools | 15 |
| Selected Predatory Violence Cases | 17 |
| Selected Articles & Resources | 22 |
| End Notes | 25 |

Terminology

Risk Factors

Many researchers have discussed the various risk factors related to targeted violence. These have included the Federal Bureau of Investigations¹, National Center for Threat Assessment², The U.S. Post Office³, National Behavioral Intervention Team Association⁴, and the Association of Threat Assessment Professionals⁵. Some of these are listed here below:

| | | | |
|--------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Direct threat | Indirect threat | Lack mental support | End of a relationship |
| Access to weapons | Lack of peer support | Explosive reactions | Inability to date |
| Hardened thoughts | Lack of family support | Intimidates others | Hopelessness |
| Social isolation | Loss of job | Lacks empathy | Last act behavior |
| Victim of bullying | Decline in academics | Polarized thoughts | Legacy token |
| Substance abuse | Acquiring weapons | Glorifies violence | Feeling persecuted |
| Authority conflict | Suicide attempt | Lacking remorse | Leaking attack plan |
| Fixation on target | Focus on target | Action plan for attack | Timeframe for attack |
| Fantasy rehearsal | Rejection | Financial loss | Catalyst event |
| Feeling trapped | Poor anger outlets | Fame seeking | Objectification/ Depersonalization |

A key aspect of understanding risk factors is the importance of seeing these in combination, like puzzle pieces coming together to create a larger meaning. As with a puzzle, one piece alone is not particularly useful. It's when these pieces combine that the factors begin to be more useful in understanding risk.

Protective Factors

When conducting a threat assessment, it is essential to balance risk factors against the protective factors that exist for an individual. These protective factors often “take the temperature down” regarding the concerns⁶. Some of these factors are included below:

| | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Social support | Empathy to others | School engagement | Religious supports |
| Family support | Perspective taking | Work engagement | Non-violent outlets |
| Positive future view | Intimate relationship | Positive self-esteem | Problem solving |
| No weapon access | Sense of identity | Consequence aware | Emotional stability |
| Social/political safety | Housing stability | Resiliency | Lacks reactivity |

Leakage

Leakage is the communication to a third party of intent to do harm⁷. BIT team members have opportunities to detect leakage concerning a potential attack during an initial interview. Team members should be aware that violence is rarely spontaneous. Those who act violently take time to rehearse and fantasize about violent acts. This presents an opportunity for others to overhear or observe potential leakage that could then be used to prevent an attack. The presence of this kind of leakage prior to an attack gives evidence to

support the idea that those who plan this kind of mass casualty violence often plan, fantasize, and talk about the event prior to an attack. This offers an opportunity to discover this leakage and thwart the potential assault.⁸

Silo(ing)

Siloing occurs when departments or individuals hold onto information in isolation, without working collaboratively. These isolated communications occur when each department focuses on their own individual mission, policy, and rules without seeing themselves as part of a larger, more complex system. Communications that focus primarily on a single department to the detriment of seeing threat assessment and behavioral intervention as larger, community-based approaches are said to be operating in a “silo.” Much like the tall grain silos that are spotted throughout the Midwest, they are single structures serving their function, separated from the larger overall system. Researchers further define this danger: “there is always the risk of a ‘silo effect’ — different domains of behavior are never linked together or synthesized to develop a comprehensive picture of the subject of concern, conduct further investigation, identify other warning behaviors, and actively risk-manage the case.”⁹

Catalyst Event

A catalyst event is an event in the subject’s life that involves a sense of stark change. Some examples would include the death of a parent, the loss of a job, chronic illness, losing a position in an academic program, not making the cut for a sports team, suspension or expulsion from school, failing a pledge to a fraternity or sorority, police charges, or loss of an intimate relationship. The danger here is the idea that the catalyst event becomes the match to a pool of gasoline, accelerating the movement towards violence.¹⁰

Legacy Token

Legacy tokens are writings or media content prepared by a perpetrator prior to an attack that are typically designed to be found following the attack as a way to share a message. The legacy token is a manifesto, written text, online blog, video project, piece of art, diary, or journal created prior to an attack and left for someone to find after the attack. It clarifies the motives of the attacker or better defines the attacker’s message of infamy. A legacy token merits study by those involved in violence prevention because it can help them be better prepared to engage others who intend to harm.¹¹

Costuming

Costuming is the process of creating a persona or mask that defines or hides the true identity of those planning violence. There are two explanations for the type of clothing and accessories mass shooters choose. First, this is an individual who is dressing tactically to complete a mission. Few retailers sell tactical vests, knee pads, thigh rigs, and harnesses offer colors in red, pink, or yellow. Choices are more typically black, olive drab, and camouflage. Colors and styles are designed to allow wearers to have easy access to their weapons, as well as to blend into surroundings. Shooters choose these items for similar reasons. The second reason shooters outfit themselves in this style of tactical gear is more psychological in nature. Meloy refers to this as identification warning behavior. “Identification warning behavior is any behavior that indicates a psychological desire to be a ‘pseudo-commando’ have a ‘warrior mentality’¹², closely associate with weapons or other military or law enforcement paraphernalia, identify with previous attackers or assassins, or identify oneself as an agent to advance a particular cause or belief system.”¹³

Zero-Tolerance Policies

These zero-tolerance policies refer to a straightforward separation based on a single incident of weapons possession or violent threat/rhetoric. Simply separating a subject from school or work under the authority of a zero-tolerance policy creates the potential to take an upset, frustrated individual and escalate them into a rage-filled and potentially vengeful attacker. Careful assessment, intervention, and monitoring are the tools that are most effective in mitigating threats of violence in the community. While separating a subject from campus or work may give an illusion of safety, there are numerous examples where angry, disgruntled, and disempowered individuals came back to campus or the workplace to seek their revenge. O'Toole writes, "In a knee-jerk reaction, communities may resort to inflexible, one-size-fits-all policies on preventing or reacting to violence."¹⁴ The FBI writes, "Do not rely on expulsion, except as a last resort and unless absolutely necessary to ensure campus safety; authorities should avoid the temptation to simply expel students of concern to quickly resolve a risk. Isolated from other contingency and safety planning, this strategy sometimes can worsen matters. The final humiliation of expulsion may serve as a precipitating, or triggering, stressor in the subject's life and propel the marginalized and hostile individual toward violence."¹⁵

Hardening the Target

Target hardening is the process of making a target more difficult to attack. This occurs when buildings create a single point of entrance, use closed circuit television cameras (CCTV), build reinforced doors, install automatic locks, create sign in/sign out policies, or have armed School Resources Officers (SROs). Many attackers have shown in their journals that they are specifically considering these factors when carrying out an attack. This was evidenced in James Holmes' journal at the Colorado movie theatre attack and then more recently in the El Paso shooters manifesto, which stated: "Attack low security targets. Even though you might out gun a security guard or police man, they likely beat you in armor, training, and numbers. Do not throw away your life on an unnecessarily dangerous target. If a target seems too hot, live to fight another day."

Objectification and Depersonalization

Distancing oneself from a target is a common technique used to avoid any lasting emotional connection that might distract from completing the mission at hand. Objectification and depersonalization are risk factors, as they allow the aggressor to dehumanize the intended victims. The seeing of another as separate from oneself is one of the building blocks necessary prior to carrying out a rampage shooting or other extreme violent event.

Weapons

The following is a short list of some common weapons. Familiarizing yourself with these would allow you to better understand weapons commonly used in attacks. This is not a definitive list, but rather a starting place for those without firearm experience.¹⁷

- **Glock handgun.** This weapon is commonly seen as a streamlined and modern handgun capable of holding 17 bullets in a standard sized magazine. The gun can have different calibers, such as 9mm, 10mm, .40 caliber, and .45 caliber. Generally speaking, the 9mm caliber is the smallest and cheapest to purchase. This handgun is commonly used at the shooting range and are easy to maintain.

- **Sig Sauer.** A German-made handgun known for its efficient design.
- **Smith & Wesson.** This weapon is most commonly a revolver known for its reliability and American-made status.
- **Colt Python.** A popular revolver in the Resident Evil video game series and the Walking Dead TV series. While it only holds six bullets, it is valued for its accuracy and stopping power.
- **Desert Eagle.** An Israeli-made handgun that is available in a .50-caliber round. This gun was made popular because of the enormous kick it gives when fired. The gun is also popular in the Call of Duty video game series.
- **FN P90.** This is a bull-pup style carbine that fires expensive ammunition. It was made popular in the movie StarGate and the Call of Duty video game series. The rifle is very recognizable due to its compact size and high magazine capacity of 50 rounds laid out across the top of the rifle. The FN pistol uses the same ammunition and was the weapon of choice by Major Hasan, the psychiatrist who killed 13 and injured 29 in the 2009 Fort Hood shooting
- **AR-15.** A rifle made popular following several of the recent large school and movie theatre shootings— at Newtown, Connecticut by Adam Lanza, and James Holmes at the Aurora, Colorado movie theatre. It is often the subject of debate between gun enthusiasts and those looking to reduce access to firearms in the United States.
- **Crossbow.** This weapon has been made more popular following the TV series The Walking Dead by one of the lead characters, Darryl. It is also featured on many of the Call of Duty video games and is seen as a more elegant way to kill opponents with skill rather than the power of traditional weapon.
- **EOtech.** This company manufactures a high-quality set of optics and holographic weapon sites that are used in many popular TV shows, movies, and video games.
- **Hollow-Point Bullets.** These used to be known as “cop-killers” because of their wound pattern and tendency to break up into smaller projectiles upon impact.
- **Airsoft.** Hobbyists who play intricate military games use these toy guns frequently. The guns are popular with teenagers and young adults.

Explosives

The following is a list of common concepts and terminology that are useful for BIT team members to have an awareness of when interviewing a subject. This is not meant to be a comprehensive list and certainly does not reflect any expertise in chemistry or explosives.

- **C4.** This is a military-grade plastic explosive used for its relative stability. Frequent media references to this make it a commonly-known explosive, even though its availability is highly restricted.

- **Radio Controlled “RC” Car.** Related to C4 and made popular in the Call of Duty video game, where radio control cars are strapped with C4 explosive and a video camera. They are available to the player to drive around and “explode” when triggered.
- **The Anarchist Cookbook.** Popular in the 1970s, the cookbook contains information about how to make bombs, illegal drugs, and ways to subvert the phone company. Made available on the Internet, it has been downloaded and studied by several involved in bombing attacks and school assaults.
- **Pressure Cooker Bomb.** This is a method of creating an explosive device using a pressure cooker, shrapnel, and an explosive charge. It’s a low-tech, low-cost method of creating an explosive device, and was made popular by the April 2013 Boston bombing.
- **Dirty Bomb.** This is a bomb made with some kind of radioactive material designed to contaminate a larger area. The concept was made popular by many TV shows, movies, and video games.
- **Pipe Bomb.** This is a small, contained explosive made out of a plumbing or PVC pipe. Similar to a pressure cooker bomb, basic materials may be found at hardware stores and fireworks outlets.
- **Little Cricket.** These bombs were used during the Columbine attack and are made from CO2 cartridges, explosives, and fuses. They may be mentioned by those who study past attacks and seek to copy-cat previous assaults.

Affective & Predatory Violence

There are two different primary types of violence that BIT team members will encounter: affective and predatory violence. Meloy writes, “It is generally agreed that violence is either affective or predatory. Affective violence, sometimes referred to as reactive, impulsive, or emotional violence, is preceded by autonomic arousal, caused by a reaction to a perceived threat, and accompanied by intense feelings of anger and/or fear. It is a defensive violence, and its evolutionary basis is self-protection to live another day... Predatory violence, sometimes referred to as instrumental or premeditated violence, is characterized by the absence of autonomic arousal and emotion, the absence of an imminent threat, and planning and preparation beforehand. It is offensive violence, and its evolutionary basis is hunting for food to live another day.”¹⁸ The difference is described below.

Affective Violence

Affective violence is the result of a progressive, biologically driven path towards physical violence. It is poorly planned and a reaction to environmental stressors. Affective violence is based upon the primal instinct of fight or flight, fueled by adrenaline and characterized by someone losing control and ultimately attacking a victim. Howard describes it this way: “A potential aggressor channels his appraisal into some form of coping. The strength of the reaction is a direct function of the validation of the threat and the

degree of certainty that the threat will thwart an objective or a goal. It is the emotion of being threatened and the inability to cope with that threat that initiates aggression. The common thread throughout this process is the release of adrenaline.”¹⁹

Grossman and Sidle have conducted landmark studies looking into how aggression can induce adrenaline’s (or epinephrine’s) influence on the heart rate, body language, behavior, and communication.²⁰ The adrenaline rushing through a subject’s system has also been well studied by Hart²¹. He illustrates that when an individual cannot cope with their anxiety, their mind perceives this anxiety as a threat. As the individual starts to produce adrenaline, this triggers the affective violence response.²²

Predatory Violence

Predatory violence, in its extreme form, is described as an intent-driven, planned attack. This aggression occurs when a subject becomes isolated, disconnected, lacks trust, and often feels threatened and frustrated by a perceived attack. They plot and plan their revenge and execute their plans with a militaristic, tactical precision.²³ This violence is a result of a planned, intent-driven action that is more commonly exhibited by a subject engaging in mission-oriented, instrumental violence such as a mass shooting.²⁴ Predatory violence involves a more strategic, focused attack and a desire to complete a mission.

The NaBITA Model of Predatory Violence

The NaBITA approach shows this type of aggression moving through four stages: empowering thoughts, escalating behaviors, elaboration of threat, and the emergence of violence.²⁵

1. **Empowering Thoughts:** The individual feels a strong passion about a particular belief, while filtering out information that doesn’t line up with their beliefs. Common examples include religion, politics, academic expectations, social justice, or relationships. There are no threats or specific targeted individuals identified at this phase. These beliefs may be demonstrated by social media posts or wearing inflammatory articles of clothing.
2. **Escalating Behaviors:** The individual at this level begins to argue and confront others around them in harmful debate with an intent to polarize. Here, being right supersedes the facts, and they seek to impose their beliefs on others or encourage common cause. They frequently engage in confrontations with others as a result. The individual finds their previous arguments and discussions unsatisfactory and begins to storm off or become aggressive when challenged. This leads to an increase in non-verbal behaviors, which communicate their frustration and anger. There is a move away from debate and dialogue and a move toward further objectification and depersonalization. This may include the use of signs and posters, social media posts, and passive-aggressive behavior.
3. **Elaboration of Threat:** Here, there is a crystallizing of a target and a fixation and focus on an individual, group, department, or organization. They find others who support their beliefs by joining groups or clubs, organizations, teams, reading books, or accessing online resources. They seek to confirm their ideas and find ways to intimidate and confront others beyond verbal arguments. There is a shaming or embarrassing of the target and a desire to unmask them in the community.

There is further objectifying and depersonalizing of the target's feelings, thoughts, and actions. They may challenge the target with a "do this or else" conditional ultimatum. There may be a threat of punishment if the target does not comply with the threats and demands. Threats are infused with credibility, but there is rarely physical violence at this stage, and only an increase in threatening language or leakage of plan details.

4. **Emergence of Violence:** The early stage of this phase can involve test runs at carrying out the attack plan on the target or a substitute target. These may include destroying the target's possessions, invasive monitoring of their family, friends, or social circle, or gathering information to better harm the target. Intentional leakage is rarer at this stage than in Level 3 (Elaboration of Threat) but may occur inadvertently, as the preparation behavior for the final step on the pathway to violence is observed by others despite efforts to keep it covert. As the planning moves forward, the attacker increasingly uses militaristic and tactical language, developing strategies to carry out their plan. They are often full of hopelessness, desperation, and suicidal thoughts, and have a sense of inevitability related to their attack plan. Detaching from meaningful relationships, giving away prized possessions, extremely flat affect, or warning some people away from the target are abstracted forms of leakage that may characterize this stage. They justify their violence based on their hardened perspective.

The Meloy Model of Predatory Violence

Meloy defines these stages through these approach behaviors. These are: pathway, fixation, identification, novel aggression, energy burst, leakage, last resort, and directly communicated threat.²⁶

1. **Pathway warning behavior** – any behavior that is part of research, planning, preparation, or implementation of an attack.
2. **Fixation Warning Behavior** – any behavior that indicates an increasingly pathological preoccupation with a person or a cause. It is measured by:
 - increasing perseveration on the person or cause;
 - increasingly strident opinion;
 - increasingly negative characterization of the object of fixation;
 - impact on the family or other associates of the object of fixation, if present and aware; and/or
 - angry emotional undertone.

It is typically accompanied by social or occupational deterioration.

3. **Identification Warning Behavior** – any behavior that indicates a psychological desire to be a "pseudo-commando," have a "warrior mentality," closely associate with weapons or other military or law enforcement paraphernalia, identify with previous attackers or assassins, or identify oneself as an agent to advance a particular cause or belief system.
4. **Novel Aggression Warning Behavior** – an act of violence that appears unrelated to any targeted violence pathway warning behavior committed for the first time. Such behaviors may be used to test the ability of the subject to actually do a violent act, and may be a measure of response tendency, the motivation to act on the environment, or a behavioral tryout.

5. **Energy Burst Warning Behavior** – an increase in the frequency or variety of any noted activities related to the target, even if the activities themselves are relatively innocuous, usually in the days or weeks before the attack.
6. **Leakage Warning Behavior** – the communication to a third party of an intent to do harm to a target through an attack.
7. **Last Resort Warning Behavior** – evidence of a violent “action imperative,” increasing desperation or distress through declaration in word or deed, forcing the individual into a position of last resort. There is no alternative other than violence, and the consequences are justified.
8. **Directly Communicated Threat Warning Behavior** – the communication of a direct threat to the target or law enforcement beforehand. A threat is a written or oral communication that implicitly or explicitly states a wish or intent to damage, injure, or kill the target, or individuals symbolically or actually associated with the target.

Structured Professional Judgment

Hart, a proponent of using structured professional judgment and co-author of the HCR-20, a violence risk assessment tool, offers an outline to understand the process of threat assessment focused on the needs of the individual, case management, and a detailed discussion of clinical formulation.²⁷ Hart’s work moves away from prediction models and instead illustrates the potential exacerbating factors that could cause violence, as well as those inhibiting factors that reduce violence risk. The structured professional judgment process can be outlined in seven steps: gather information, determine the presence of risk factors, determine the relevance of risk factors, develop a good formulation of violence risk, develop scenarios of violence, develop a case management plan based on those scenarios, and develop conclusory opinions about violence risk. For a more detailed look at SPJ, chapter three in *Harm to Others* walks readers through the process.²⁸

Hunters and Howlers

Calhoun and Weston (2009) wrote a seminal book on threat assessment called *Threat Assessment and Management Strategies: Identifying the Howlers and Hunters*.²⁹ Their central premise is that those who plan to attack don’t always communicate this in advance. They write: “Threat management involves managing two very different types of individuals. One group consists of hunters. They truly intend to use lethal violence to aggrieve some perceived injustice. Hunters develop a reason for committing violence, come up with the idea to do so, research and plan their attack, prepare for it, then breach their target’s security and actually attack. Whatever their reason, those who intend to act violently go through the process of intended violence.”

Most direct communicated threats do not lead to violence. Calhoun and Weston make this point: “Writing letters is easy; shooting someone or setting him on fire presents a considerably more

difficult challenge.” While this is accurate, it remains important to explore the contextual risk factors related to the specific case at hand. The challenge is to determine whether a violent or threatening behavior is simply a bad decision on the part of the subject, or if the threat of violence is the proverbial “tip of the iceberg,” exposing deeper plans that may lead to a more dangerous event occurring in the future.

Although direct threats often do not lead to violence, there must be a diligence in the assessment process. The FBI explains it this way: “Unlike disruptive and other forms of aggressive behavior, violent or directly communicated threat always requires immediate investigation and evaluation... While most communicated direct threats do not end in violence, this can only be determined after directly questioning and assessing the student in question.”³⁰

Understanding & Mitigating Bias

Bias is our tendency to see the world from our particular lens of experience. It can lead us to ignore the evidence or make assumptions not based on evidence. It can impact what we remember and what witnesses remember. It can create blinders for BIT team members and impact their ability to build rapport, connect, and create safe/neutral spaces. While we can never remove bias, we can train to make us more aware of how bias can affect decision making.

What is Bias?

- A preference or tendency to like or dislike; a cognitive process
- A habit learned over time through repeated personal experience
- Implicit or expressed
- Can be intentional, but generally unintentional
- Formed from stereotypes, societal norms, cultural experiences, and expectations of the people around you

Type of Bias

- **Confirmation Bias:** Form an early hypothesis and tend to seek or overvalue evidence that fits it or confirms it. Are you interviewing or validating?
- **Experience Bias:** The tendency to see the world from your own experience.
- **Responsibility Bias:** The tendency to assume people should be responsible for themselves.
- **In Group/Out Group:** The tendency to be favorable toward the group that is similar to you.
- **Blind Spot:** Ability to spot systematic errors in others’ decisions.
- **Availability Bias:** Reliance upon readily available (most recent) information.

Where does bias come from?

- Gender, gender identity experiences, and sexual orientation

- Race/ethnicity, world view, and generational expectations
- Mental illness or physical disabilities
- Different cultures or geographic areas
- Veteran history; and religious or political experiences
- Economic differences; and friend or peer groups

Assessing Truthfulness

It is often difficult to know if a subject is being truthful. “Deception, a deliberate attempt to convince someone of something the liar believes is untrue, is a fact of everyday life. Depaulo and her colleagues (1996) asked participants to keep a diary for a week of all their social interactions lasting more than 10 minutes and to note how often they lied during these interactions. Almost all participants admitted that they had lied during the week they kept the diary. They lied in one out of every four social interactions and to more that 30 percent of all the people they interacted with.”³¹ Lot of things don’t work:

- In ancient China, suspects would be made to chew dry rice while being questioned. When the suspects spat out the rice, they were assumed to be guilty if the grains remained stuck to their tongue. The reasoning was that the stress created by lying would slow saliva flow and cause a dry mouth. It was believed that an innocent person would have no reason to stress under such conditions.
- Trials by ordeal were a common means of detecting guilt from innocence, although they’re widely considered now to be barbaric and violent tests revealing nothing of truth or lies. These were ancient judicial practices in which the accused was subjected to dangerous perils. Death would indicate guilt, and survival suggested innocence.
- The Bocca della Verità (the Mouth of Truth) is a heavy marble disc carved into the shape of a head and face. It is said to originally represent the Titan god Oceanus, of the great earth-encircling river that feeds all the world’s rivers, wells, and springs. Beginning in the middle ages, the disc was supposed to tell truth from lies.

Terminology

- **Credibility Assessment:** A credibility assessment determines how believable an individual’s prior statements and testimony are. Credibility assessments are used more in legal settings to determine quality of a witness in a proceeding.
- **Deception Detection:** Deception detection makes use of questioning and observation techniques, along with technology that records physiological functions, to assess the likelihood of truth and falsehood in a subject’s story. “In the end, detecting deception is all about honesty.” Ekman concludes, “It’s much harder to find the truth than to find a lie. A good

lie-catcher is good at identifying truthfulness.”³²

- **Impression Management:** “In sociology and social psychology, impression management is a goal-directed conscious or unconscious process in which people attempt to influence the perceptions of others about a person, object, or event. Impression management is performed by controlling or shaping information in social interactions.”³³
- **Faking Good:** Faking good is when a subject attempts to distort their true motives by convincing the evaluator that they are better, or respond to questions in a more socially desirable manner. They may do this to convince the evaluator that they are healthy, well adjusted, and have few problems. They may attempt to hide mental health problems, anti-social beliefs, or problems they have with authority or following the rules.
- **Faking Bad:** Faking bad refers to when a subject attempts to make the evaluator think that the problems they are having are worse than they really are. They may do this in order to receive some kind of accommodation, such as increased time on an exam they are taking, or they may want to convince the evaluator that the reason they made a threat or hurt another person was due to a serious mental disorder, rather than simple anger or recklessness.
- **Halo Effect:** The halo effect is a bias in which our overall impression of a person (a figurative halo) colors our judgment of that person’s character. The research into the halo effect shows that a person’s positive qualities, physical appearance, and general attractiveness affects how we judge their character — the better they look and behave, the better a person we judge them to be. Thorndike (1920) conducted an experiment in which soldiers were rated by their commanding officers in terms of their physical qualities (e.g., neatness, energy, and physique) and their mental, emotional, and social qualities (e.g., intellect, leadership, and responsibility). Thorndike found that if one of the soldier’s qualities was rated highly, the other qualities tended to also be rated highly, and vice versa. Example: Concluding that a politician who is warm, friendly, and has a great smile would make good decisions.³⁴
- **Cognitive Overload:** Cognitive load refers to the total amount of mental effort being used in the working memory. In the late 1980s, Sweller developed this concept in reference to learning environments. Studies confirm that being deceptive is more cognitively demanding than being truthful.³⁵ As a result, there is a cognitive overload.
- **Microexpressions:** Microexpressions are very brief facial expressions, lasting only a fraction of a second. They occur when a person either deliberately or unconsciously conceals a feeling. Ekman’s research has revealed that seven emotions have universal signals: anger, fear, sadness, disgust, contempt, surprise, and happiness.³⁶

Why do we lie? To protect:

- **Ourselves.** Lying often is a way for people to avoid suffering painful consequences, shame, embarrassment, or conflict.
- **Our interests.** We lie so that we may get material goods (e.g., money) and non-material goods (e.g. attention from the telling of tall tales).

- **Our image.** We all want others to think well of us, yet we all do things that we ourselves consider less than respectable at times.
- **Our resources.** We often lie to avoid expending energy or time doing something we really don't want to do.
- **Others.** Telling people what they want to hear is a way to protect their feelings.³⁷

Friendship = Proximity + Frequency + Duration + Intensity

- **Proximity** is the distance between you and the another individual and your exposure to the individual over time (think non-threatening environment).
- **Frequency** is the number of contacts you have with another individual over time.
- **Duration** is the length of time you spend with another individual over time.
- **Intensity** is how strongly you are able to satisfy another person's psychological and/or physical needs through the use of verbal and nonverbal behaviors (think curiosity).³⁸

Friend Signals

- **Eyebrow flash** is a quick up-and-down movement of the eyebrows that lasts about one-sixth of a second (brief and not staring).
- **Head tilt** to the left or the right is a nonthreatening gesture. This is a strong friend signal.
- **The smile** should be genuine with upturned corners of the mouth and upward movement of the cheeks accompanied by a wrinkling around the eyes. Insincere smiles tend to be lopsided.
- **Head nodding** communicates to those speaking that they should keep talking.
- **Isopraxism** is mirroring a person's body language.
- **Inward lean** is when people lean toward those they like and away from those they don't.
- **Verbal nudges** reinforce head nodding and encourages the speaker to continue talking (e.g., "I see," "go on...," "tell me more," etc.).
- **Focused listening** requires those conducting interviews to not let distractions interrupt their attentive listening.

Foe Signals

- **Elongated stare** or eye contact that lasts more than a second can be read as aggressive.
- **Body scan/elevator eyes** is a head-to-toe gaze and is often seen as intrusive because the person doing the looking hasn't earned the right to invade the other's personal space.
- **Eye roll** sends the message that you think the individual is stupid and not worth listening to.
- **Eye squinting, furrowed eyebrows, and facial tension** are associated with disapproval, uncertainty, and anger.
- **Conversational bridge back** is used to build rapport and convey a sense that you are attending to the person being interviewed. There is a reference to a prior knowledge set or conversation that establishes past connections and moves the rapport forward.
- **Asking a favor** is used to build rapport and builds on the concept that doing favors for others builds trust and helps the individuals feel good about themselves. (Watch drink example.)

Threat & Violence Risk Assessment Tools

NaBITA: Risk Rubric

The NaBITA Risk Rubric is designed to be the initial assessment applied to every case a threat or BIT/CARE team comes across. Following this triage assessment, teams should deploy additional assessments and gather additional data to most effectively assess risk. The NaBITA Risk Rubric gives teams a framework for understanding the risk present in a case and offers possible interventions to reduce the risk. The Risk Rubric is made up of two scales:

- 1. The D-Scale:** This scale assesses issues of life stress and emotional health through a series of four progressive levels: 1) Developing, 2) Declining, 3) Deteriorating, and 4) Decompensating. As the levels increase, there are more concerning and serious emotional and behavioral health-related risks, including the potential for affective violence and aggression. The trajectory of this scale is more likely to result in self-harm than in harm to others.
- 2. The E-Scale:** This scale assesses issues of hostility and violence to others through a series of four progressive levels: 1) Empowering Thoughts, 2) Escalating Behaviors, 3) Elaboration of Threat, and 4) Emergence of Violence. The levels increase to address more concerning risk factors for targeted/instrumental violence, hostility, and threats to others. The trajectory of this scale is more likely to result in harm to others than in harm to self, though both risks are present.

Once the overall risk rating of Mild, Moderate, Elevated or Critical is made, the BIT/CARE or threat team moves to develop interventions. The NaBITA Risk Rubric offers a range of risk-based actions that the team should consider. These interventions are based on the level of risk determined in the Overall Summary (Mild, Moderate, Elevated, and Critical), and they are supported by a decade of successful interventions by teams that have followed their roadmap. For an online version of the Risk Rubric, or to access supporting articles, training opportunities and a colorful tri-fold version of the tool, visit www.nabita.org/tools.

NaBITA: Violence Risk Assessment of the Written Word (VRAW²)

The VRAW² was created in 2015 following increasing numbers of cases in which subjects shared concerning written communication through social media, creative writing classes, and over email. The VRAW² offers five factors (Fixation and Focus, Hierarchical Thematic Content, Action and Time Imperative, Pre-Attack Planning, and Injustice Collecting) that are then scored to provide a Mild, Moderate, Elevated, or Critical Level of risk, in line with NaBITA Risk Rubric. The VRAW² has aided teams in focusing more objectively on the literature related to threat assessment when assessing threatening or concerning writing. The VRAW² provides teams with better footing when making decisions about intervention related to written concerns. For an online version of the Risk Rubric, or to access supporting articles and training opportunities, visit www.nabita.org/tools.

NaBITA: Structured Interview of Violence Risk Assessment (SIVRA-35)

The SIVRA-35 was created in 2012 as an expert system. It is a structured set of items to use with individuals who may pose a threat to the community. The SIVRA-35 is a guided structured interview

useful for classifying risk into Low, Moderate, and High categories based on concepts from existing threat and violence risk assessment literature. The SVIRA-35 was designed to address targeted and strategic violence on college campuses, such as the Virginia Tech massacre and the shootings at Northern Illinois University, Umpqua College, and Santa Monica College, and by enrolled or recently enrolled college students at non-campus locations, such as James Holmes and Jared Loughner. For a foundational online version of the SIVRA-35, or to access supporting articles and training opportunities, visit www.nabita.org/tools.

NaBITA: Extremist Risk Intervention Scale (ERIS)

BIT/CARE and Threat Assessment Teams have, with good reason, become increasingly concerned with how to identify the potential for radicalization of students, faculty, and staff. Radicalism and extremism should be viewed on a continuum, from critical or counter-culture thinking to seeing violence as a reasonable pathway to bring about a desired change. The Radicalization Risk Rubric seeks to provide teams with an understanding of what to look for to identify and intervene with at-risk individuals who have radical thoughts and behaviors that are escalating to extremist violence and terrorism. For an online version of the ERIS, or to access supporting articles and training opportunities, visit www.nabita.org/tools.

Historical Clinical Risk Management-20 (HCR-20)

The HCR-20, which is in its third version, is a structured professional judgment instrument used to assess risk and develop mitigation plans. The measure is well researched and evidence-based. The authors of the measure explain that risk and threat are always incompletely understood due to the uncertainty inherent in individuals' choices. The HCR-20 is commonly used in psychiatric settings to determine release criteria, admission screenings, and inpatient psychiatric management, as well as to monitor risk in probation and parole settings. The HCR-20 is a process rather than a singular tool producing a quantitative score or measure. The seven-stage process includes: 1) gathering information, 2) identifying the presence of risk factors, 3) determining the relevance of the risk factors, 4) formulation of the motivators for violence, 5) the development of risk scenarios, 6) management, and 7) final opinions. For more information about the HCR-20, visit <http://hcr-20.com>.

Workplace Assessment of Violence Risk-21 (WAVR-21)

The WAVR-21 is a workplace violence risk assessment designed to assist human resource and threat assessment professionals to work through a structured set of dynamic and static risk factors to better estimate the likelihood of violence by an employee. Though designed with a workplace setting in mind, the WAVR-21 offers some guidance to those working in a higher education environment when it comes to identifying potential risks with students, faculty, and staff. For more information about the WAVR-21 visit www.wavr21.com.

Selected Predatory Violence Cases

El Paso Shooting. On August 3, 2019, 21-year-old Patrick Crusius shot and killed 22 people at an El Paso Walmart. He published a white nationalist, anti-immigration manifesto on an internet site (8chan) 27 minutes before the attack. He cited the Christchurch attacker as inspiration. His main worry was around a Hispanic invasion, military imperialism, automation, large corporations, and environmental degradation.

Christchurch Mosque Shootings. On March 15, 2019, Brenton Tarrant, a 28-year-old Australian man, carried out two attacks, killing 51 people and injuring 49. The attacker had a history of white supremacy and alt-right leanings. The attack demonstrated detailed planning, and the proficient use of multiple firearms and tactical gear. The attacker livestreamed the attack to Facebook with a go-pro camera. He was captured by police at gunpoint on his way to a third location. Tarrant is allegedly the author of a 74-page manifesto titled “The Great Replacement.”³⁹

Bartow Attack Shooting. On October 24, 2018, two middle school girls (ages 11 and 12) brought several knives and weapons to school with a detailed plan to kill up to 15 younger classmates in the bathroom. They were apprehended when the school automated attendance system called their parents to report they were not in school. The parents called the school with concerns and the school was placed in lockdown. The girls were found in the bathroom with detailed plans to kill other students, drink their blood, and carve satanic symbols into their flesh. On search of the girls’ cell phones, there was evidence of messages stating plans “to leave body parts at the entrance and then we will kill ourselves.” They conducted internet searches to learn what wounds would cause people to bleed out the fastest. They said they came up with the plan over the weekend after watching horror movies.

Pipe Bomb Mail Attack. In late October 2018, Cesar Altieri Sayoc mailed 16 packages containing pipe bombs to critics of Donald Trump. These included Barack Obama, Joe Biden, Hillary Clinton, CNN, and Robert De Niro. While all bombs that were sent were improvised explosive devices, none of them had a trigger mechanism. Sayoc was convicted on 65 felony counts and sent to prison for 20 years on August 5, 2019.⁴⁰

Santa Fe Shooting. On May 18, 2018, Dimitrios Pagourtzis shot and killed eight students and two teachers and wounded 13 others before being taken into custody by police. He began shooting at 7:40 a.m. in an art class, saying, “I am going to kill you” and “Surprise!” He told police he wanted to kill the students he targeted and spare those he liked so he could “have his story told.” He used a shotgun and .38 revolver in the attack, along with explosive devices and Molotov cocktails. There were reports the shooter was a victim of frequent bullying by students and coaches. He was on the honor roll and played football. Students reported that he was at the water park the day before and “seemed friendly and funny.” He was described as quiet, and some felt he was a “loner” and “never seemed quite right.” He had posted some concerning content on his Facebook page on April 30, prior to the attack.

Parkland Shooting. On the afternoon of February 14, 2018, a former student, Nikolas Cruz, walked into a building at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida. He situated and armed himself with an AR-15 rifle, pulled the fire alarm, and began shooting at students and teachers exiting classrooms. Approximately six minutes later, after navigating three floors of classrooms while killing 17 people and

wounding 17 more, he put his weapon down and exited the building among the chaos he had started. There were numerous opportunities to detect the escalation to the attack. On February 5, 2016, a neighbor's son told the sheriff's office that Cruz, pictured with guns on Instagram, "planned to shoot up the school." A deputy responded, discovered that Cruz owned knives and a BB gun, and informed the high school's resource officer, Scot Peterson. On September 28, another student informed Peterson that Cruz may have ingested gasoline a week earlier and was cutting himself. In September 2017, A blogger in Mississippi warned the FBI that someone named "Nikolas Cruz" wrote on his YouTube page: "I'm going to be a professional school shooter." On November 1, 2017, Katherine Blaine told the sheriff's department that her cousin, Nikolas' mother, recently died. She said Cruz had rifles and requested that the agency recover them. A close family friend agreed to take possession of the weapons. On November 30, 2017, a caller told the sheriff's department that Cruz was collecting guns and knives and "could be a school shooter in the making." On January 5, 2018, a person close to Cruz contacted the FBI's tipline to report concerns about him, including his possession of guns.⁴¹

Sutherland Springs Church Shooting. On November 5, 2017, Devin Patrick Kelley killed 26 people and wounded 20 others at the First Baptist Church. Kelley was not allowed to purchase a firearm due to a domestic violence conviction and court martial from the Air Force. He died from a self-inflicted gunshot wound.

Las Vegas Concert Shooting. On October 1, 2017, 64-year-old Stephen Paddock opened fire on a crowd attending the Route 91 Harvest Music Festival, killing 58 people and wounding 422. He fired more than 1,100 rounds of ammunition from his suite at the Mandalay Bay Hotel on the Las Vegas Strip. He died from a self-inflicted gunshot wound. An FBI report found inconclusive motives for the attack, yet suggested that, "as he grew older, Paddock became increasingly distressed and intolerant of stimuli while simultaneously failing to navigate common life stressors affiliated with aging." And, "once Paddock decided to attack, he characteristically devoted time, attention, and energy to the shooting. Paddock engaged in detailed preparations for the attack, including a year-long burst of firearms and ammunition acquisition."⁴²

Freeman High Shooting. On September 13, 2017, Caleb Sharpe flipped a coin that came up heads and he entered his school with an AR-15 and a handgun in a duffel-bag. The AR-15 jammed, and he used the handgun to shoot a fellow student, who was trying to stop the shooting. Caleb continued to shoot down the hall and then surrendered to a custodian. He told detectives that he wanted to "teach everyone a lesson about what happens when you bully others." Around the time classes started at the high school, Caleb gave notes to several friends indicating plans to do "something stupid" that might leave him dead or in jail. One of those notes was reportedly passed on to a school counselor. He also bragged to several friends when he figured out the combination to his father's gun safe, and again when he learned to make bombs out of household materials. He acted out violent scenarios on his YouTube channel and spoke openly about his fascination with school shootings and notorious killers like Ted Bundy. He messaged a friend over Facebook, asking if the friend could get him gasoline, tinfoil, and fuses. The friend reported "I said, 'No,' and asked him why. He said, 'For a science experiment.' I said, 'Why are you doing a science experiment?' and he said, 'Nevermind.'"

Portland Light Rail Attack. On May 26, 2017, Jeremy Joseph Christian allegedly started yell-

ing what “would best be characterized as hate speech toward a variety of ethnicities and religions” toward two women in a Metropolitan Area Express (MAX) light-rail train, according to police. Several passengers tried to intervene, and he fatally stabbed two people and injured a third. A self-described white nationalist, Christian left behind many social media posts and clues to his reactive attacks towards Muslims. There is video of him at protests being rejected by alt-right groups and carrying a baseball bat.

Charleston Church Shooting. In June 2015, gunman Dylann Roof shot and killed nine people at a church service at the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina.⁴³ Roof became radicalized in his beliefs concerning white supremacy after the Trayvon Martin shooting in Florida in 2012. Roof had two prior arrests and convictions on felony drug counts that should have prevented him from purchasing the firearm used in the attack.⁴⁴ The FBI reports that Roof was self-radicalized in his beliefs and was not connected to a larger terrorist group. Prosecutors in the case argued that Roof believed, “that violent action is necessary to fight for white people and achieve white supremacy and that the choice of targets and execution of violent action should be conducted in a manner that promotes these objectives, to include publicizing the reasons for those actions to inspire others to engage in violent action to further white supremacy.”⁴⁵ Roof studied black-on-white crime and created a website and manifesto discussing white supremacy. He viewed this attack as a trigger for a future race war. Roof, a ninth-grade dropout, wrote, “I have no choice.” He stated as part of the final section, titled “An Explanation,” “I am not in the position to, alone, go into the ghetto and fight. I chose Charleston because it is [the] most historic city in my state, and at one time had the highest ratio of blacks to Whites in the country.”⁴⁶

San Bernardino Shooting. In December of 2015, Syed Rizwan Farook and Tashfeen Malik, a married couple from California, attacked an 80-person Christmas party at the San Bernardino County Department of Public Health. Syed was an American-born citizen of Pakistani decent, and Tashfeen was a Pakistani-born legal U.S. resident. The couple fled after the shooting and were killed by police. Per the FBI, the couple had been stockpiling weapons, ammunition, and bomb-making material; had visited many websites related to jihadism and martyrdom; and had traveled to Saudi Arabia before the attack. They had been planning an attack as early as 2011, and it is believed the mandatory attendance at the company Christmas party was a catalyst for the event.⁴⁷ In the weeks before the attack, they acquired a \$28,000 loan believed to help fund the attack.

Las Vegas Police Shootings. On June 8, 2014, in northeastern Las Vegas, Nevada, Jerad and Amanda Miller killed three people in an anti-government attack.⁴⁹ The couple killed two police officers at a restaurant and fled to a nearby Walmart, where they shot and killed a civilian. Jerad was shot by the police and Amanda committed suicide. Jerad had previous arrests for drug charges. On the day of the attack, Jerad had multiple posts on social media about distrusting police officers and law enforcement. He posted on Facebook the day of the attack, “The dawn of a new day. May all of our coming sacrifices be worth it.”⁵⁰ On June 2, he posted on Facebook, “We can hope for peace. We must, however, prepare for war. We face an enemy that is not only well funded, but who believe they fight for freedom and justice. Those of us who know the truth and dare speak it, know that the enemy we face are indeed our brothers. To stop this oppression, I fear, can only be accomplished with bloodshed.”

Downtown Austin Shootings. At 2:00 a.m. on November 28, 2014, Larry Steve McQuilliams started firing

shots at a Mexican consulate, a federal courthouse, and a bank in Austin, Texas.⁵¹ He was trying to set fire to the consulate when he was shot dead by the police. McQuilliams had “let me die” written in marker across his chest. There were no other fatalities. Police searched his rental van and found homemade bombs made from propane cans, a map containing 34 targets, and a white supremacist book called “Vigilantes of Christendom.” There was no clear motive or manifesto left, but McQuilliams moved to shoot up the Mexican Consulate shortly after President Obama issued his executive order regarding immigration, so this order was believed to be the motive for the shootings. He had a history of aggravated robbery arrests in the past.

Orlando “Pulse” Shooting. In June of 2013, Omar Mateen killed 49 people and wounded 53 in a gay nightclub in Orlando. Mateen claimed the attack for Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), and claimed it was revenge for the killing of ISIL militant Abu Waheeb the previous month. He purchased two firearms legally in the weeks before the attack. During the attack, he posted on Facebook, “I pledge my alliance to (ISIS leader) Abu Bakr al Baghdadi. May Allah accept me,” “You kill innocent women and children by doing us airstrikes. Now taste the Islamic state vengeance,” and “In the next few days you will see attacks from the Islamic state in the USA.”⁵² Mateen was previously a prison guard who was terminated for joking about bringing a gun to work. He unsuccessfully tried to become a state trooper in 2011 and failed to gain admission into the police academy in 2015. He was a security guard before the attack. There are reports that he had a history of being mentally unstable, physically abusive, and was a long-time steroid user. He often used slurs, and those who worked with him as security guards shared that he had a lot of hatred for people — black people, women, Jews, Hispanics, and gay or lesbian people.⁵³

Freedom High Attack (Averted). On August 18, 2011, Jared Cano was arrested for planning an attack at his high school. Cano was expelled from Freedom High School in 2009, and planned an attack that was stopped after an anonymous tipster notified the police. He had a history of drug charges and burglary. Police found fuel, shrapnel, plastic tubing, timing and fusing devices for making pipe bombs, along with marijuana and marijuana cultivation equipment. They also found a detailed journal with statements about killing specific administrators and students who may be in the vicinity of his attack, as well as detailed schematics of rooms in Freedom High School. There are reports of him being bullied at school. He created a manifesto video about the attack (see page 35.)⁵⁴

Norway Shooting. On July 22, 2011, after nine years of meticulous planning, Anders Behring Breivik set off a bomb at a government building in Oslo, Norway, killing eight. He then posed as a police officer and killed 69 youths on Utoya Island, a Labor Party youth camp. He surrendered when armed police confronted him. He claims to have taken these actions to prevent a Muslim takeover of Europe. He outlined his thoughts and instructions for others to follow in his footsteps in his 1,500-page manifesto. He wrote: “I am required to build a capital base in order to fund the creation of the compendium. I don’t know if I will ever proceed with a martyrdom operation at this point as it simply seems too radical” (Englund 2011). He sold many of his belongings to develop funds; buried armor, weapons, and ammunition underground in an airtight case; obtained explosives; reviewed public security reports released by the Norwegian government; and developed intricate cover stories for his friends and family. His planning was methodical, well documented, and focused on accomplishing his mission.⁵⁵

Tucson Shooting. On January 8, 2011, Jared Lee Loughner killed six people and injured 14 others with a Glock 9mm pistol. He was required by Pima College to complete a mental health evaluation after concerns around his disruptive behavior in the classroom and posting of YouTube video clips. He did not

complete the evaluation request and instead withdrew from school. There is some speculation that Loughner's past drug use or schizophrenia may have also contributed to his behavior.⁵⁶

Florida School Board Shooting. On December 15, 2010, 56-year-old Clay Duke held a school board hostage after spray painting a large "V" on the wall. He talked about revenge after his wife was fired. After firing two shots at a member of the school board, he shot himself as the SWAT team moved in. The entire shooting was caught on tape. He created a Facebook page stating: "Some people (the government sponsored media) will say I was evil, a monster (V), no, I was just born poor in a country where the Wealthy manipulate, use, abuse, and economically enslave 95% of the population. Rich Republicans, Rich Democrats, same-same, rich, they take turns fleecing us, our few dollars, pyramiding the wealth for themselves. The 95%, the us, in US of A, are the neo slaves of the Global South. Our Masters, the Wealthy, do, as they like to us..."

UT Austin Library Shooting. On October 28, 2010, Colton Tooley came armed with an AK-47 and opened fire on the University of Texas, Austin campus. He took his own life shortly after running into the school's library. There was not much known about Colton prior to the attack, other than he was a 19-year-old math major, a good student, and seemed to keep to himself.⁵⁷

Austin Suicide Attack. On February 18th, 2010, Andrew Joseph Stack III flew his single engine aircraft into an IRS building, killing 1 and injuring 13 others. In 1994, he failed to file a state tax return and declared bankruptcy on his company. He again had his corporation suspended in 2004 for failure to pay taxes. At the time of the incident, he was being audited by the IRS. His suicide note detailed his dislike for the government. He wrote, "I can only hope that the numbers quickly get too big to be white washed and ignored that the American zombies wake up and revolt; it will take nothing less. I would only hope that by striking a nerve that stimulates the inevitable double standard, knee-jerk government reaction that results in more stupid draconian restrictions people wake up and begin to see the pompous political thugs and their mindless minions for what they are. Sadly, though I spent my entire life trying to believe it wasn't so, but violence not only is the answer, it is the only answer. The cruel joke is that the really big chunks of shit at the top have known this all along and have been laughing, at and using this awareness against, fools like me all along."^{58,59}

Fort Hood Mass Shooting. On November 5, 2009, Nidal Malik Hasan shot and killed 13 people and injured more than 30 others in the Fort Hood mass shooting. Hasan was a United States Army Medical Corps psychiatrist and described by his colleagues as "anti-American." Six months before the attack, he posted online about suicide bombings and other threats. In August 2013, he was convicted of 13 counts of premeditated murder and 32 counts of attempted murder. He is awaiting execution.⁶⁰

Northern Illinois University Shooting. On February, 14, 2008, Steven Kazmierczak came into Cole hall and killed five students and injured more 21 others before committing suicide. He carried his weapons concealed in a guitar case. He struggled with mental illness, suicide attempts, and being bullied in high school.⁶¹

Columbine Shooting. On April 20, 1999, Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold shot and killed 12 students and a teacher, and injured 21 other students and a teacher at Columbine High School. Both had several pipe bombs, napalm, knives, and other homemade explosives. Two bombs were set in the school cafeteria. They recorded hours of video, calling others to follow in their footsteps. The

video begins with a reference to another shooting: “Do not think we’re trying to copy anyone,” it tells some future, unseen audience. “We had the idea before the first one ever happened. Our plan is better, not like those fucks in Kentucky with camouflage and .22s. Those kids were only trying to be accepted by others.” There was a shooting, the Johnson and Golden shooting in Arkansas in 1988, that seems to match the description, or perhaps the Michael Carneal shooting in Kentucky, which involved a .22.

Selected Articles & Resources

Government Articles

DOJ/FBI. (2017). Making Prevention a Reality: Identifying, Assessing, and Managing the Threat of Targeted Attacks. Behavioral Analysis Unit: National Center for the Analysis of Violent Crime.

www.fbi.gov/file-repository/making-prevention-a-reality.pdf

Jarvis, John & Scherer, J. Amber. (2015) Mass Victimization: Promising Avenues for Prevention. Washington D.C: Federal Bureau of Investigation.

www.fbi.gov/file-repository/stats-services-publications-mass-victimization-promising-avenues-for-prevention/view

National Threat Assessment Center. (2019). United States Secret Services: Mass Attacks in Public Spaces. U.S. Secret Service, Department of Homeland Security.

www.secretservice.gov/data/press/reports/USSS_FY2019_MAPS.pdf

National Council Medical Directors Institute. (2019). Mass Violence in America: Causes, Impacts and Solutions.

www.thenationalcouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/Mass-Violence-in-America_8-6-19.pdf

National Threat Assessment Center. (2018). Enhancing school safety using a threat assessment model: An operational guide for preventing targeted school violence. U.S. Secret Service, Department of Homeland Security.

www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/18_0711_USSS_NTAC-Enhancing-School-Safety-Guide.pdf

Silver, J., Simons, A., & Craun, S. (2018). A Study of the Pre-Attack Behaviors of Active Shooters in the United States Between 2000–2013. Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20535.

www.fbi.gov/file-repository/pre-attack-behaviors-of-active-shooters-in-us-2000-2013.pdf

U.S. Department of Education (2019). Indicators of School Crime and Safety.

<https://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/>

Research Articles

Meloy & O’Toole. (2011). The Concept of Leakage.

http://forensiseuropa.files.wordpress.com/2011/11/2011_theconceptofleakage.pdf

Meloy et. al. (2011). The Role of Warning Behaviors.

http://forensiseuropa.files.wordpress.com/2011/11/2011_theroleofwarningbehaviorsinthreat.pdf

Pescara-Kovach & Raleigh. (2017). The Contagion Effect as it Relates to Public Mass Shootings and Suicides

https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/b64c59_ff3081963db049ab81cf8e5034f1374b.pdf

Vossekuil et. Al. (2004). The Safe School Initiative.

www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/safety/preventingattacksreport.pdf

Van Brunt & Murphy. (2017). An Exploration of the Risk, Protective, and Mobilization Factors Related to Violent Extremism in College Populations.

https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/b64c59_0295c7722d614ce09730415e7f638213.pdf

Van Brunt & Lewis. (2015). Assessing Threat in Written Communications, Social Media, and Creative Writing.

https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/b64c59_dda112c3e35d4ca0aee9c66e425cb100.pdf

Van Brunt & Pescara-Kovach. (2018). Debunking the Myths: Mental Illness and Mass Shootings.

https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/b64c59_77f17edf6f3744f4ae82c7033891ce1f.pdf

Threat Assessment Books

Deisinger et. Al. (2008). Campus Threat Assessment.

<http://www.amazon.com/Handbook-Campus-Threat-Assessment-Management/dp/0615234933/>

Jed Foundations. (2012). A Guide for Campus Teams.

www.jedfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/campus-teams-balancing-safety-support-campus-jed-guide.pdf

Langman. (2010). Why Kids Kill.

www.amazon.com/Why-Kids-Kill-Inside-Shooters/dp/0230101488/

Langman. (2009). Rampage School Shooters: A Typology.

<https://schoolshooters.info/rampage-school-shooters-typology>

O'Toole et. al. (2012). Dangerous Instincts: Use an FBI Profiler's Tactics to Avoid Unsafe Situations.

<http://www.amazon.com/Dangerous-Instincts-Profilers-Tactics-Situations/dp/0452298520/>

Schafer. (2015). The Like Switch: An Ex-FBI Agent's Guide to Influencing, Attracting, and Winning People Over

www.amazon.com/Like-Switch-Influencing-Attracting-Winning/dp/1476754489

Turner & Gelles. (2003). Threat Assessment.

www.amazon.com/Threat-Assessment-Risk-Management-Approach/dp/0789016273/

Van Brunt. (2012). Ending Campus Violence.

www.amazon.com/Ending-Campus-Violence-Approaches-Prevention/dp/0415807441

Van Brunt. (2015). Harm to Others: The Assessment and Treatment of Dangerousness.

www.amazon.com/Harm-Others-Assessment-Treatment-Dangerousness/dp/155620342X

Threat and Violence Risk Assessment Measures

RAGE-V (ATAP): <http://atapworldwide.org/associations/8976/files/documents/RAGE-V.pdf>

MOSAIC (Gavin de Becker): <https://www.mosaicmethod.com>

WAVR-21 (White & Meloy): <http://wavr21.com>

HCR-20 (Hart): http://proactive-resolutions.com/old-site/bookletsmanuals/hcr-20-ver2_eu.html

FAVT (Firestone): www4.parinc.com/Products/Product.aspx?ProductID=FAVT

SIVRA-35 (Van Brunt): www.nabita.org/resources/assessment-tools/sivra-35/

HARE Psychopathy Checklist (Hare): www.hare.org/scales/pclr.html

End Notes

1. www.fbi.gov/file-repository/stats-services-publications-school-shooter-school-shooter/view
2. www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/18_0711_USSS_NTAC-Enhancing-School-Safety-Guide.pdf
3. www.nalc.org/workplace-issues/resources/manuals/pub108.pdf
4. www.nabita.org
5. www.atapworldwide.org
6. Van Brunt, B., Murphy, A. and Zedginidze, A. (2017). An Exploration of the Risk, Protective, and Mobilization Factors Related to Violent Extremism in College Populations. *Journal of Violence and Gender*, 4(3), p. 81-101.
7. Meloy, J., & O'Toole, M. (2011). The concept of leakage in threat assessment. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*. Advance online publication.
8. Van Brunt B. (2015). *Harm to Others: The Assessment and Treatment of Dangerousness*. (American Counseling Association, Alexandria, VA).
9. Meloy, J., Hoffmann, J., Guldemann, A. & James, D. (2011). The Role of Warning Behaviors in Threat Assessment: An Exploration and Suggested Typology. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, doi: 10.1002/bsl.999, p 19.
10. Van Brunt, B., Murphy, A. and Zedginidze, A. (2017). An Exploration of the Risk, Protective, and Mobilization Factors Related to Violent Extremism in College Populations. *Journal of Violence and Gender*, 4(3), p. 81-101.
11. Van Brunt B. (2016). Assessing threat in written communications, social media, and creative writing. *J Gender Violence*. 3, 78–88.
12. Hempel, A., Meloy, J. R., & Richards, T. (1999). Offender and offense characteristics of a nonrandom sample of mass murderers. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 27, 213–225.
13. Meloy, J., Hoffmann, J., Guldemann, A., & James, D. (2011). The role of warning behaviors in threat assessment: An exploration and suggested typology. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 30, 265.
14. O'Toole, M. (2000). *The school shooter: A threat assessment perspective*. Quantico, VA: National Center for the Analysis of Violent Crime, Federal Bureau of Investigation. p. 2
15. Scalora, M., Simons, A. & Vansly, S. (February, 2010). *Campus Safety: Assessing and Managing Threat*. DC: FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin. p. 7.
16. Grossman, D. (1996). *On killing: The psychological cost of learning to kill in war and society*. Lebanon, IN: Little, Brown, and Company Back Bay Books.
17. Van Brunt B. (2015). *Harm to Others: The Assessment and Treatment of Dangerousness*. (American Counseling Association, Alexandria, VA).
18. Meloy, J. R., Hart, S., & Hoffmann, J. (2014). Threat assessment and management. In J. R. Meloy & J. Hoffmann (Eds.), *The international handbook of threat assessment* (p. 5). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
19. Howard, P. (1999). *The Owner's Manual for the Brain: Everyday applications from Mind-Brain Research* (2nd Ed.). Austin, TX: Bard Press.

20. Grossman, D. (1996). *On Killing, the Psychological Cost of Learning to Kill in War and Society*. New York: Back Bay Books.
21. Grossman, D. & Siddle, B. (2000). Psychological effects of combat, in *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace and Conflict*. UK: Academic Press.
22. Hart, A. (1995). *Adrenaline and Stress, the Exciting New Breakthrough that Helps You Overcome Stress Damage*. Nashville, TN: Nelson Press.
23. McEllistrem, J. (2004). Affective and predatory violence: A bimodal classification systems of human aggression and violence. *Journal of Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 10, 1–30.
24. Van Brunt, B. (2012). *Ending campus violence: New approaches to prevention*. New York, NY: Routledge.
25. National Threat Assessment Center. (2018). *Enhancing school safety using a threat assessment model: An operational guide for preventing targeted school violence*. U.S. Secret Service, Department of Homeland Security.
26. Sokolow, B, Van Brunt, B., Lewis, W., Schiemann, M., Murphy, A. and Molnar, J. (2019). *The NaBITA Risk Rubric*. Published by NaBITA.
27. Meloy, J., Hoffmann, J., Guldemann, A. and James, D. (2011). The Role of Warning Behaviors in Threat Assessment: An Exploration and Suggested Typology. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 30(3), 256–279. doi: 10.1002/bsl.999
28. Douglas, K. S., Hart, S. D., Webster, C. D., & Belfrage, H. (2013). *Assessing Risk for Violence User Guide*. Burnaby, Canada: Mental Health, Law, and Policy Institute, Simon Fraser University.
29. Van Brunt B. (2015). *Harm to Others: The Assessment and Treatment of Dangerousness*. (American Counseling Association, Alexandria, VA).
30. Calhoun, F., & Weston, S. (2009). *Threat assessment and management strategies: Identifying the howlers and hunters*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press. p. 7, p. 29
31. Scalora, M., Simons, A., & Vansly, S. (2010, February). *Campus safety: Assessing and managing threats* (FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin). Washington, DC: Federal Bureau of Investigation.
32. Granhag, P. Vrij, A. & Verschuere, B. (2015). *Detecting Deception: Current Challenges and Cognitive Approaches*. Wiley Press, Malden, MA.
33. www.amazon.com/Telling-Lies-Marketplace-Politics-Marriage/dp/0393337456
34. www.boundless.com/management/textbooks/boundless-management-textbook/organizational-behavior-5/individual-perceptions-and-behavior-41/impression-management-219-6809/
35. Nisbett, R. E., & Wilson, T. D. (1977b). The Halo Effect. Evidence for Unconscious Alteration of Judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 250–256. www.beinghuman.org/article/halo-effect
36. Patterson, T. (2009). *The Effect of Cognitive Load on Deception*. FIU Electronic Theses and Dissertations. Paper 121. <http://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1174&context=etd>
37. Ekman, P. (1985). *Telling lies*. New York : W. W. Norton. www.paulekman.com/micro-expressions/
38. www.psychologytoday.com/blog/happiness-in-world/201003/why-we-lie
39. Schafer, J. (2015). *The Like Switch*. Simon and Schuster, NY, NY.
40. <https://crimeresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/The-Great-Replacement-New-Zealand-Shooter.pdf>

41. www.fbi.gov/news/pressrel/press-releases/statement-on-the-fbis-investigation-of-suspicious-packages
42. www.fbi.gov/news/testimony/summary-and-timeline-related-to-parkland-shooting-investigation
43. <https://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=820782>
44. Reuters Staff (2015). Charleston church shooter planned terrorist to attack college. Reuters.
45. Sanchez R, Payne E. (2016, December 16). Charleston church shooting: Who is Dylann Roof? CNN
46. Berman M. (2016, August 22). Prosecutors say Dylann Roof 'self-radicalized' online, wrote another manifesto in jail. Washington Post.
47. Bernstein L, Horwitz S, Holley P. (2015, June 20). Dylann Roof's racist manifesto: 'I have no choice' Washington post.
48. Christie M, Schwartz R, Margolin J, Ross B. (2016). Christmas party may have triggered San Bernardino terror attack: Police. ABC news.
49. Williams P, Abdullah H. (2015, December 9). FBI: San Bernardino Shooters radicalized before they met. NBC News.
50. Lovett I. (2014, June 9). Antigovernment obsession preceded Las Vegas shootings. New York Times.
51. Las Vegas Sun. (2014, June 9). A look inside the lives of shooters Jerad Miller, Amanda Miller. Las Vegas Sun.
52. Ohlheiser A, Izadi E. (2014, December 1). Police: Austin shooter was a 'homegrown American extremist'. Washington Post.
53. Zimmerman M. (2016, June 15). Orlando terrorist's chilling Facebook posts from inside club revealed. Fox News.
54. Times of Israel Staff. (2016). Ex-coworker: Orlando shooter an 'unhinged racist misogynist' Retrieved from www.timesofisrael.com/ex-coworker-orlando-shooter-an-unhinged-racist-misogynist (accessed January 31, 2017).
55. Salient-News (2011 August 18). Tampa Teen Arrested for Bomb Plot. Salient-News.
56. Englund, W. (2011, August 9). In diary, Norwegian 'crusader' details months of preparation for attacks. The Washington Post.
57. Roy, L. (2011). After Tucson. Chronicle of Higher Education, 57 (24): B10.
58. www.timesocket.com/crime/colton-tooley-university-of-texas-shooting/
59. Brick M. (2010, February 18). Man crashes plane into Texas I.R.S. office. Retrieved from www.nytimes.com/2010/02/19/us/19crash.html
60. Stack A. (2010). Suicide note. Retrieved from <http://graphics8.nytimes.com/packages/pdf/us/20100218-stack-suicide-letter.pdf>
61. Owens R. (2009). Attack on Fort Hood. Nightline (ABC). 1. Retrieved from https://archive.org/details/WJLA_20091106_043500_Nightline
62. Vann, D. (2008). Portrait of the School Shooter as a Young Man. Esquire, 150 (2): 114.



InterACTT is a collaborative group of like-minded professionals working to make your everyday work easier and more efficient. Our goal is to support your day-to-day work in counseling, disability services, student conduct, law enforcement, CARE and threat teams, and diversity, equity and inclusion.

www.InterACTT.org

Listserv

InterACTT maintains an active listserv to discuss issues related to counseling, disability services, student conduct, law enforcement, CARE and threat teams, and diversity/equity and inclusion in K-12/secondary schools, colleges/universities and workplaces.

Navigator

This expert system provides assessments and intervention recommendations for cases faced by counselors, HR and CARE and threat teams.

InterACTTives

These interactive case studies use audio/visual and video components to build a case for you to score on the Navigator.

Race

A peer-reviewed journal focused on issues of racial equality and the systematic and personal racism experienced by people of color. Edited by Dr. Tammy Hodo.

Intersections

A peer-reviewed journal focused on issues related to targeted violence, mental health, BIT/CARE operations, and threat assessment. Edited by Dr. Amy Murphy.

InterACTTions

Executive director Dr. Chris Taylor and his guests discuss important topics in the field.

Resources

A collection of documents and training resources, each includes the source document, a summary sheet and slides you can use in your trainings.

TODDs

Thematic One-sheet Document & Directions (TODDs) are short training videos with accompanying materials, perfect when you have limited training time for your team.

SitRep

Dr. Brian Van Brunt will provide reports and information on current cases through a video blog, information sheets and source documents.

Carolyn's Corner

Advisory team member Carolyn Reinach Wolf, Esq. answers legal questions related to CARE and threat team work.

Counseling Across the Pond

David Denino (US) and Dave Wilson (UK) discuss counseling issues faced by teams on both sides of the Atlantic.

Actually Autistic Educator

AAE is a podcast hosted by advisory team member Jeanne Clifton on topics related to accessibility access and issues affecting the autistic, ASD and Asperger's community.

Tea with Tammy

Dr. Tammy Hodo, advisory team member and founder of All Things Diverse, shares her thoughts on race, diversity, equity and inclusion.