

## Supplementary Materials for “Systematic Review on the Outcomes of Primary and Secondary Prevention Programs in the Field of Violent Radicalization”

Sébastien Brouillette-Alarie<sup>a1</sup>, Ghayda Hassan<sup>a</sup>, Wynnpaul Varela<sup>a</sup>, Sarah Ousman<sup>a</sup>, Deniz Kilinc<sup>a</sup>, Éléa Laetitia Savard<sup>a</sup>, Pablo Madriaza<sup>a</sup>, Shandon Harris-Hogan<sup>b</sup>, John McCoy<sup>c</sup>, Cécile Rousseau<sup>d</sup>, Michael King<sup>e</sup>, Vivek Venkatesh<sup>f</sup>, Eugene Borokhovskif<sup>f</sup>, David Pickup<sup>f</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Université du Québec à Montréal, <sup>b</sup>Victoria University, <sup>c</sup>University of Alberta, <sup>d</sup>McGill University, <sup>e</sup>Organization for the Prevention of Violence, <sup>f</sup>Concordia University

### Africa (Positive Outcomes)

**Table S1**

*Summary of Evidence*

Study	Savage et al. (2014)   Secondary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Program and country	Being Kenyan Being Muslim (BKBM), Kenya.
Objectives of the program	<i>Main objective:</i> Counter violent extremism and other forms of intergroup conflict through the promotion of value and integrative complexity. <i>Specific objectives:</i> 1) Increase participants’ integrative complexity and expose them to the multiplicity of values that influential Muslims embody; 2) Structure group activities that allow participants to explore values on issues central to extremist discourse and relevant to events in Kenya, free from criticism or social pressure; 3) Protect from the black-and-white discourse used by radical groups; 4) Train professionals who work in the PVE field. <i>Intervention:</i> Participants took part in a 16-hour course consisting of films and group activities that enabled them to solve problems on topics related to violent extremism, according to their personal values and priorities. The program was adapted to include relevant aspects of Kenyan culture and terrorist events. During the intervention, films representing an array of Muslim viewpoints from the extreme right to the extreme left were presented to the participants.
Sample characteristics	<i>24 participants of Kenyan and Somali ethnicities who met either of the following criteria:</i> 1) have previously been exposed to extremist discourse or 2) were PVE professionals. 22 completed all the pre- and post-test assessments, eight were identified as vulnerable to extremism, and six were former Al-Shabaab members. Mean age = 29.6; 52% men and 48% women; 96% born in Kenya, 4% born in Somalia; 92% had secondary education, 50% had technical college education, 37% had university education, and 50% had Islamic religious education; 75% had work, 29% were unemployed or looking for work; and 61% reported being Muslim, but the sample included a few Christians and individuals identifying to other groups. Participants were invited by the Kenya Transition Initiative (KTI) to BKBM and were selected because of recent activity or alignment with extremist groups or ideology. <i>Four subgroups of participants went through BKBM:</i> Subgroups 1 and 4 comprised individuals who were considered to be vulnerable to extremism. Subgroup 2 included KTI staff, and subgroup 3

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding Author Contact: Sébastien Brouillette-Alarie, Email: [brouillette-alarie.sebastien@uqam.ca](mailto:brouillette-alarie.sebastien@uqam.ca), Department of Psychology, Université du Québec à Montréal, Adrien-Pinard Building (SU), PO Box 8888, Downtown Station, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, H3C 3P8; ORCID: 0000-0002-7620-8786

Study	Savage et al. (2014)   Secondary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Methods: data collection, procedure, and measures	included co-workers, organizations, and individuals who worked in the field and were contracted by KTI. <i>Measures:</i> 1) Paragraph completion tests were coded for integrative complexity using a standardized protocol and an intercoder reliability criteria ( $\kappa = 0.89$ ); 2) During the last session, participants gave a presentation about what they learned and how they would apply integrative complexity to future situations in their lives. Presentations were qualitatively analyzed for the presence/use of differentiation (ability to perceive the validity of two or more viewpoints) and integration (ability to perceive underlying common values). Then, a score of 1 was given for every piece of information that reflected differentiation or integration, and a cumulative total score was calculated. This score was correlated with participants' post-test scores. Presentations were also coded for social intelligence and the confidence to address extremist issues with integrative complexity; 3) Conflict-style questionnaire consisting of two scenarios each for the pre- and post-tests. The questions were followed by five response options capturing Kraybill's five conflict-style constructs; 4) Demographics, social identity, and power measures: five-item demographics questionnaire given at the end of the course in addition to the Social Identity & Power scale.
Positive outcomes	1) The intervention had a significant effect on increasing the complexity with which participants think about social issues and social groups relevant to extremism, as indicated by levels of integrative complexity; 2) 100% of the presentations reflected understanding and applied differentiation, and 50% reflected integration; 3) 77% of the participants experienced an increase in social intelligence; 4) 100% experienced an increase in confidence; 5) Conflict style shifted to direct, which is in line with the confidence and empowerment expressed by participants; 6) The program seemed effective even for former Al-Shabaab members; 7) Integrative complexity seems to highly increase traditional Islamic teachings regarding mercy and benevolence to others.
Negative outcomes	None reported.
Overall outcome of the program	Positive.
Limitations (authors)	1) The intervention should last longer (weeks instead of days) in order to let participants process the material and integrate new ways of thinking; 2) Floor effects exist in measuring integrative complexity, as it is difficult to capture enough argumentation or evaluation in verbal data for integrative complexity to be scorable (especially difficult in the context of written test conditions); 3) Group sizes should be smaller.
Limitations (team)	1) The researchers assessed a program they were involved in, introducing potential conflicts of interest; 2) The protocol of the intervention should be presented more clearly, as many variables were measured. It is sometimes difficult to understand what was done during the pre- and post-tests.
Quality of study (/10)	9

**Table S2**

*Summary of Evidence*

Study	Aldrich (2014)   Primary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Program and country	Trans-Sahara Counter Terrorism Partnership (TSCTP)-based programs, Mali.
Objectives of the program	Counter violent extremism using "soft security" and development programs comprising educational training for groups vulnerable to terrorist recruitment, norm messaging through local radio programming, and job creation in rural communities.
Sample characteristics	<i>200 participants split into two groups:</i> 1) Residents of Timbuktu who were exposed to the TSCTP programs and 2) Residents of Diré who mostly did not benefit from the programs (control). Participants were selected randomly from the broader population by knocking on people's doors and administering the survey to those who agreed to participate. The sample included men and women from early to late adulthood of diverse socioeconomic, political, and cultural backgrounds.
Methods: data	<i>Quasi-experimental design aiming to understand if several years of U.S. government-funded PVE</i>

Study	Aldrich (2014)   Primary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
collection, procedure, and measures	<i>programs have achieved the following:</i> 1) increased the access to peace and tolerance programs on local radio channels; 2) increased civic participation; 3) led more residents to be critical of Al Qaeda's use of violence in the name of Islam; and 4) motivated people to see the United States as combatting terrorism, not Islam. This was done through a 14-question survey with Likert scales. The study controlled for sex, age group, and ethnicity. <i>Data analysis:</i> After ensuring that the Timbuktu and Diré samples were comparable, the authors used bivariate analyses to see if there were any noticeable connections between exposure to the programs and outcomes of interest. Cross-tabulations with chi-squared distributions were performed, as well as regression analyses (ordered probit) to control for factors such as age, sex, demographic, socioeconomic, and cultural characteristics. The authors also reordered the data through propensity-matching techniques to better resemble a twins-study structure and to ensure that the control and treatment groups were comparable.
Positive outcomes	1) Bivariate analyses indicated a strong positive connection between exposure to the programs and listening to radio broadcasts about peace and tolerance; 2) Regressions showed that Timbuktu residents exposed to the sponsored radio programs were 40% more likely than those of Diré to listen to radio broadcasts focused on peace and tolerance, as well as to civically engage.
Negative outcomes	1) No difference in attitudes towards Al Qaeda or the United States between the two samples; 2) The study was unable to prove a causal relationship between programming and behavioral outcomes.
Overall outcome of the program	Positive.
Limitations (authors)	1) Bivariate analyses cannot control for confounding factors; 2) The results were potentially affected by other unmeasured factors, such as historical legacy, self-perception, local leadership, the media, and participants' perceptions of US foreign policies; 3) The sample size is limited and did not intend to be representative of the entire nation; 4) Some participants might have felt uncomfortable discussing their religious views and support for the Sharia law with the interviewers as it is a sensitive subject; 5) No baseline measurements were taken in the control and treatment groups.
Limitations (team)	1) The authors did not sufficiently describe their sample; 2) Insufficient information regarding the questionnaire; 3) The selection of the participants by knocking on doors could be biased and not representative of the city as some neighborhoods could be over-represented.
Quality of study (/10)	8

**Table S3**

*Summary of Evidence*

Study	Bala (2017)   Primary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Program and country	Search for Common Ground: Bottom-Up Approach to Countering Violent Extremism, Tunisia.
Objectives of the program	<i>Main objective:</i> Increase the ability of vulnerable communities to prevent and counter violent extremism in Tunisia. <i>Specific objectives:</i> 1) Increase the engagement of diverse stakeholders (including civil society, youth, women, religious leaders, schools and universities, local governments, and the police and the army) in a community-level dialogue to identify push and pull factors for supporting violent extremism or joining as foreign fighters in Tunisia; 2) Strengthen the capacity of diverse stakeholders to implement initiatives within their communities to counter violent extremism.
Sample characteristics	10 participants (one or two stakeholder representatives in each of the six localities where the program was implemented).
Methods: data collection, procedure, and measures	<i>Interviews and focus groups about the following:</i> 1) motivation to join the program; 2) effectiveness and relevance of the program; 3) aspects of the program which worked best; 4) prior knowledge of PVE issues; 5) experience with community engagement activities; 6) the most significant change through the program; 7) whether the program improved the understanding of driving forces behind violent extremism; and 8) whether the program improved the relationship between institutions and civil society.
Positive outcomes	1) The program contributed to raising communities' awareness of what drives someone to violent

Study	Bala (2017)   Primary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
	<p>extremism; 2) It contributed to promoting a culture of dialogue, particularly within schools, as well as with youth and religious leaders; 3) The program also seemed to have succeeded in creating a stimulating environment for debate and helped ease strained relations between citizens and police forces; 4) The dialogue sessions emphasized the importance for youth to be granted access to cultural and educational activities as a deterrent to violent extremism; 5) Stakeholders declared increased motivation and a stronger involvement in partner NGOs activities; 6) The originality of the program, its positive role in instilling a culture of dialogue, and easing of relationships between stakeholders and NGOs was appreciated; 7) The program contributed to enhance the visibility of partner NGOs within their communities by helping them develop community-led activities and increasing public awareness through workshops, school clubs, mass media, or cultural productions; 8) The program succeeded in showing how school dropouts or other less-suspected factors, such as the absence of alternative narratives, may act as recruitment drivers for violent extremism.</p>
Negative outcomes	None reported.
Overall outcome of the program	Positive.
Limitations (authors)	None mentioned.
Limitations (team)	1) Key concepts and variables should have been more clearly operationalized; 2) Lack of information about the sample (age, nationality, religion, etc.); 3) As only stakeholders were questioned, it is impossible to know if the program had any effect on its targeted population.
Quality of study (/10)	5

**Table S4**
*Summary of Evidence*

Study	Swedberg & Reisman (2013)   Primary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Program and country	Somalia Youth Livelihoods Program (SYLP), Somalia; Garissa Youth Program (G-Youth), Kenya; and Kenya Transition Initiative Eastleigh Program (KTI-E), Kenya.
Objectives of the program	<p><i>Common objective:</i> Foster and promote a positive identity for youth vulnerable to recruitment by extremist elements in regions with a substantial Al-Shabab presence and a history of Al-Qaeda actions.</p> <p>SYLP emphasizes positive messaging, dialogue, and information-sharing, along with support for job and skill training opportunities. Unique to SYLP was a firm emphasis on placement following the training.</p> <p>G-Youth focuses on enhancing the role of youth in the community, providing messages about positive behavior and personal choice, and livelihood. G-Youth has four primary pillars of intervention: youth action, education, work, and civics.</p> <p>KTI-E emphasizes moderation and peace, as well as the role of youth in the community (primary goal) and youth livelihood (secondary goal). Its objective was to reduce the risk of engagement with extremist groups by providing youth with positive opportunities.</p>
Sample characteristics	<p>1,446 Somali youths in five communities in East Africa (Eastleigh/Nairobi, Garissa, Hargeisa, Bosaso, and Mogadishu). The sample comprised full beneficiaries (individuals who completed the training program), partial beneficiaries (individuals who engaged to a lesser extent or dropped out), and individuals who did not participate in the programs (control group). Equal-shares, choice-based stratified sampling in the communities of interest was used to ensure the collection of high-quality data. 90 to 110 respondents per group, per program, in each location.</p>
Methods: data collection, procedure, and measures	<p><i>Likert-scale questionnaires measuring the following:</i> 1) civic engagement; 2) perception of the effectiveness of civic engagement; 3) support and belief in the power of youth associations; 4) perception of one's employability and optimism in the future; and 5) support for the use of violence in the name of Islam. It was reinforced by focus groups and key-informant interviews (face-to-face, by telephone, or by Skype).</p>
Positive outcomes	Compared to the two other groups, the full beneficiary group had both of the following: 1) much higher levels of civic engagement and 2) higher levels of perception of the effectiveness of civic

Study	Swedberg & Reisman (2013)   Primary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Negative outcomes	engagement, support and belief in the power of youth associations, and perception of their employability and optimism in the future. 1) No substantial decrease in rejection of violence in the name of Islam (the difference was often not statistically significant, except in the aggregate sample); 2) Differences between full and partial beneficiaries were not, for the most part, statistically significant (although full beneficiaries usually scored higher than partial ones); 3) Implementation issues (given the important non-response rate, the entire list of partial beneficiaries had to be used instead of a randomized selection).
Overall outcome of the program	Positive.
Limitations (authors)	1) Potential selection bias (people who signed up were potentially more motivated than those who did not); 2) Translation of tools, questions, and responses from Somali and/or Kiswahili to English and vice-versa might have affected the quality of the gathered information; 3) Difficulties in establishing a baseline: Because programs were already underway, collecting baseline data on participating residents and affected communities was not possible.
Limitations (team)	Not enough information about the sample. Even though demographic information was said to be collected, no data is presented.
Quality of study (/10)	8

### Africa (Mixed Outcomes)

**Table S5**

*Summary of Evidence*

Study	Mercy Corps (2016)   Primary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Program and country	Somali Youth Leaders Initiative (SYLI), Somalia.
Objectives of the program	Foster good governance, economic recovery, and reducing the appeal of extremism through targeted interventions that increase education and civic participation opportunities for Somali youth.
Sample characteristics	<i>802 participants for quantitative analyses:</i> 504 in-school youth (treatment group) and 298 out-of-school youth (control group). <i>25 participants for qualitative analyses:</i> 15 in- and out-of-school youth from the above samples and 10 teachers/Ministry of Education officials/members of community education committees.
Methods: data collection, procedure, and measures	Mixed-method impact evaluation. <i>Quantitative:</i> Quasi-experimental matched design, relying on survey data about attitudes and behaviors towards political violence. <i>Qualitative:</i> Key-informant interviews measuring change in participation and support for political violence and violent extremism.
Positive outcomes	1) Decreased likelihood of youth participating in political violence by 16%; 2) Increased perceptions of government doing a good job in providing services such as water, electricity, and healthcare; 3) Reduced sense of marginalization (youth are 15% less likely to feel isolated and excluded in communities); 4) Civic engagement activities reduced the likelihood of youth participating in political violence (by 14%) and thinking that political violence is “sometimes necessary” (by 20%).
Negative outcomes	1) Increased likelihood of youth supporting the use of violence for a political cause by 11%; 2) Decreases of over 30% in the likelihood of being satisfied with the government’s provision of education; 3) Caused a nearly 16% decrease in likelihood of feeling optimistic about future employment opportunities, and expressing fear and concern when describing the future.
Overall outcome of the program	Mixed.
Limitations (authors)	None mentioned.
Limitations (team)	Possible conflict of interest arising from Mercy Corps evaluating an initiative in which it had a role.
Quality of study (/10)	7



### Asia (Positive Outcomes)

**Table S6**

*Summary of Evidence*

Study	Speckhard et al. (2018)   Primary and secondary prevention   Violent Islamist Radicalization
Program and country	Break the ISIS Brand Counter Narrative Project, Iraq.
Objectives of the program	Raise awareness through a counter-narrative Facebook ad campaign designed to highlight the futility of ISIS’s promises of bringing about the desired utopian caliphate and its failure to deliver any of its promises. The program showcases the realities of belonging to ISIS and offers opportunities for those considering joining to reconsider their decisions. The ultimate goal is to protect and prevent action in the fight against ISIS and violent extremism.
Sample characteristics	1,287,557 online participants residing in 10 Governorates across Iraq: 82% male and 18% female; 18–50 years old (78% between 18 and 34 years old); of Shia and Sunni Muslim religious background.
Methods: data collection, procedure, and measures	<i>Data collection:</i> Using data on a counter-narrative video ad which ran for 24 days on Facebook, the level of reach and video retention, number of impressions, clicks, likes, shares, and comments were collected in order to measure engagement with the video and to identify possible causality between exposure to the video and change in extremist behavior. <i>Data analysis:</i> Descriptive statistics on the variables mentioned above.
Positive outcomes	1) Comments to the video evoked negative impressions and emotions of disdain for ISIS; 2) The comments sometimes led to discussions about why terrorism happens and how to prevent/stop it; 3) The comments expressed solidarity for the Iraqi people in their fight against ISIS; 4) There were multiple positive indicators about the video, such as the number of views, likes, and shares by the audience; 5) 126,400 out of the 1,287,557 individuals in the target audience were likely to remember the ad content within two days of viewing it. This illustrates the strength of the video and its positive impact on viewers.
Negative outcomes	1) There were a few anti-Islamic/Semitic/American/European/Turkish comments; 2) Some viewers who openly support and sympathize with ISIS expressed anger in their comments by calling the researchers unbelievers, government stooges, etc.
Overall outcome of the program	Positive.
Limitations (authors)	1) The videos, which were intentionally given ambiguous titles, could be considered pro-ISIS at the initial exposure; 2) Insufficient resources.
Limitations (team)	1) Methodological limitations (i.e., lack of pre- and post-measurements to evaluate behavioral/cognitive changes following exposure to the counter-narrative video, lack of control group); 2) Lack of pilot project to test certain aspects of the video (e.g., tone of the message, identity of the messenger); 3) Potential conflict of interest as the authors work at the center responsible for the creation of the program.
Quality of study (/10)	6

### Asia (Mixed Outcomes)

**Table S7**

*Summary of Evidence*

Study	Mercy Corps (2015)   Primary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Program and country	Introducing New Vocational Education and Skills Training (INVEST), Afghanistan.
Objectives of the program	The primary goal of INVEST is to increase youth employment in Helmand by offering three- and six-month vocational and technical training sessions in nine centers. These centers link students to various career choices through private sector actors and business leader mentorship. The broader goal is to improve stability in the region by targeting a population that is traditionally sympathetic to the Taliban.

Study	Mercy Corps (2015)   Primary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Sample characteristics	729 students from the INVEST program (between February and April 2014). Propensity score matching was used to create treatment and comparison groups that were similar along observable characteristics. The treatment group consisted of 465 recent graduates from the INVEST program, while the comparison group comprised 264 students who had enrolled in the program but did not start their classes.
Methods: data collection, procedure, and measures	<i>Quasi-experimental, mixed-method impact evaluation design.</i> Its objectives were to examine the mechanisms through which the program was hypothesized to have influenced young Afghans' propensity towards violence and support for the Taliban insurgency. The mechanisms were as follows: 1) direct effects on participants' propensity towards political violence; 2) improvements in employment status and economic conditions; 3) social status and connections; and 4) perceptions of government performance.  <i>Data collection:</i> Data was collected through face-to-face surveys and individual- and group-based interviews of former and future INVEST students. The survey included questions specifically aimed at measuring economic outcomes (employment, economic optimism, and economic conditions), social outcomes (confidence and abilities, social status, and social connections), and political outcomes (confidence in government institutions and perceptions of government effectiveness). Questions capturing propensities and attitudes towards political violence were also collected.
Positive outcomes	1) The greatest impacts of the INVEST program were on economic outcomes: decreased unemployment, increased income, and greater economic optimism among participants. Economic optimism was significantly associated with a decrease in willingness to engage in and support for political violence; 2) Social outcomes: increased social connectedness, increased identification as an Afghan, and decreased perceived discrimination; 3) Political outcomes: significant positive impact on perceptions of local government performance.
Negative outcomes	1) No direct program effects on attitudes towards political violence; 2) Economic outcomes: Results from the survey showed that employment status had no effect on support for political violence; 3) Social outcomes: No effects on participants' personal confidence, locus of control, perceived position in society, or their feelings of being respected in their community were recorded. There was little evidence that social outcomes can decrease propensity towards political violence; 4) Political outcomes: Participation in INVEST did not appear to improve youths' perceptions of the performance of the Afghan government or confidence in institutions; 5) A significant link between violence and the INVEST program was only recorded for three outcomes across the entire analysis: economic optimism, social connections, and identifying as an Afghan.
Overall outcome of the program	Mixed.
Limitations (authors)	1) Response bias: Suspicion and social desirability could have influenced answers; 2) Data for economic factors (income, expenditures, etc.) was unavailable. This demographic information could have influenced the likelihood of program participation, outcome variables, or both; 3) Generalizability: Participants in the INVEST program had to meet certain criteria in order to enter the training. Both the treatment and comparison groups may, therefore, have different characteristics than the general population, such as having more influence in their communities.
Limitations (team)	Potential conflict of interest (Mercy Corps carried out the study and helped to identify eligible participants for the program).
Quality of study (/10)	6

## Australia (Mixed Outcomes)

**Table S8**

*Summary of Evidence*

Study	Johns et al. (2014)   Targeted primary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Program and country	More Than a Game, Australia.
Objectives of the program	<i>Main objective:</i> Engage young Muslim men through a team-based sport (e.g., football) to deliver a range of activities intended to develop personal wellbeing and pro-social skills, and to facilitate a greater sense of social inclusion and community belonging. <i>Specific objectives:</i> 1) Develop young role models and leaders in the community; 2) Enhance greater understanding of the Muslim community by the broader Australian community; 3) Foster greater intercultural contact and understanding between participants and other cultural groups.
Sample characteristics	<i>Three target groups:</i> 1) 21 program participants (young men, aged 15–25, predominantly of Lebanese cultural background, recruited from the Newport Islamic Society of Melbourne); 2) eight program facilitators; and 3) 10 college students who also participated in the Peace Team dialogue and Unity Cup.
Methods: data collection, procedure, and measures	<i>Mixed method, post-evaluation approach:</i> Semi-structured interviews and focus groups were combined with quantitative data collection (exit surveys) as the primary method to explore participants' personal development through the program. Researcher participant-observation was also conducted during the second half of the program. <i>Data analysis:</i> Thematic analysis was used to code qualitative responses and identify patterns in the way participants and stakeholders described their experiences of the program.
Positive outcomes	1) Sport as a level-playing field where people of all cultural backgrounds were bound by the same rules and expectations allowed participants to feel free to engage in forms of knowledge sharing and social and physical interactions with participants from difficult cultures—even with groups with which they shared a historically conflict-ridden relationship; 2) The experiences of playing together with participants from different racial, cultural, and religious groups provided new forms of awareness and knowledge to participants, demonstrating that social functions and roles can, under certain circumstances, become more important than social identities, transcending other kinds of group boundaries and divisions. For example, out of the 21 participants who took part in the evaluation, following participation in the program most indicated a more positive attitude towards a range of cultural groups (particularly towards Jewish youth); 3) Team-based sports that emphasize cooperation, sense of responsibility to others, and trusting teammates can reduce participants' sense of vulnerability or solitude. Participants identified this type of social bonding as providing a safe space where other cultural groups can be safely encountered, stereotypes can be challenged, and friendships formed; 4) Discipline learned through sports encouraged participants to develop self-control in situations where conflict could arise; 5) Using team-based sport countered feelings of alienation and strengthened feelings of belonging to the broader community and society by promoting an understanding that there is a role for everyone in the team.
Negative outcomes	Participants felt strong bonds to their ethnic and religious community, and thus felt torn between a sense of loyalty to their community and openness to the program.
Overall outcome of the program	Positive.
Limitations (authors)	1) No pre- and post-evaluation data was collected; 2) Possible social desirability effect of participants potentially skewing recollections of their experiences; 3) Small sample size leading to limitations for representativity; 4) Methodological problem of trying to establish a link between sport-based mentoring programs and the prevention of violent extremism given the difficulty of measuring the processes that take place while engaging in sports activities.
Limitations (team)	None.
Quality of study (/10)	7



## Europe (Positive Outcomes)

**Table S9**

*Summary of Evidence*

Study	Liht & Savage (2013)   Secondary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Program and country	Being Muslim Being British (BMBB), UK.
Objectives of the program	Prevent violent extremism in young UK Muslims who have been exposed to extremist discourse with a course designed to allow participants to see the multiplicity of values that influential Muslims embody and to explore all positions on issues central to radical Islamist discourse. The program also aimed to decrease the affinity towards the “us versus them” discourse by increasing the participants’ integrative complexity. A higher integrative complexity favors reflection, conflict resolution, and the ability to perceive multiple points of view. The program was also offered to people who are interested in issues that affect young Muslims.
Sample characteristics	<i>81 youths, mostly Muslims, who have been exposed to extremist discourse or are interested in the issues raised by it.</i> Only 49 out of the 81 participants filled a sociodemographic questionnaire. Mean age = 19.48; 60% men, 40% women; 88% Sunni Muslims, 5% Church of England, 2% Protestant, 5% other; 29% Pakistani, 8% Bangladeshi, 42% Afro-American, 21% Indian. The participants were divided into seven pilot groups: one in a university setting, one in a technical community college, one in a community group for newly arrived Somali immigrants, two in Prevent local initiatives, and two in existing initiatives for young Muslim men and women.
Methods: data collection, procedure, and measures	Participants took a 16-hour, eight-session course consisting of film and group activities that enabled them to solve problems according to a broad array of personal values. Participants could explore all positions on issues central to radical Islamist discourse, free from criticism or social pressure. Activities included group discussions that were coded to assess the evolution of integrative complexity over the course of the program. Pre- and post-test data was gathered. <i>Measures:</i> 1) Recorded group discussions from the first (pre) and last (post) session of the course, scanned for integrative complexity and the presence of values using a standardized coding framework and protocol; 2) Moral dilemmas: Six vignettes with dilemmas relevant to Muslims living in Britain were presented to the participants (three pre- and three post-). Integrative complexity and the presence of Schwartz’s 10 basic values were evaluated with responses to the dilemmas (number of times each value was present in the conversation), as well as Kraybill conflict styles. Inter-rater reliability was assessed between two trained coders blind to the pre/post conditions ( $\kappa = 0.54$ ).
Positive outcomes	1) Improved integrative complexity compared to the pretest levels; 2) Significant increase in the values of universalism (equal worth of human beings), benevolence, and stimulation (valuing new information and being open to new viewpoints); 3) Better conflict resolution strategies in group discussions and in written responses to moral dilemmas relevant to Muslims living in the UK; 4) Participants shifted towards collaboration and compromise and away from the “us vs. them” discourse commonly used by extremist groups; 5) At the beginning, the views of a pilot group were aligned with those of Hizb ut Tahrir (Islamist group), but at the end of the course, all of them had significantly changed their position; 6) Improved resilience against the dichotomous discourse from extremist groups; 7) Participants were better equipped to choose prosocial ways to resolve conflicts.
Negative outcomes	1) Integrative complexity did not improve based on the written moral dilemmas; 2) No significant improvement in value spread when analyzing the pre- and post-written answers to moral dilemmas; 3) Age was moderately and negatively correlated with integrative complexity gains.
Overall outcome of the program	Positive.
Limitations (authors)	1) Integrative complexity scores (pre- and post-intervention) could not be compared as paired-type data because of the anonymity of participants; 2) No control group; 3) The cognitive load of the moral dilemmas was too heavy, making it difficult to elicit written evidence from the participants.
Limitations (team)	1) Potential conflicts of interest as the authors evaluate a program they seem to be involved in; 2) Inter-rater reliability for integrative complexity was low; 3) The sample description is incomplete as only 49 out of the 81 participants filled a sociodemographic questionnaire.
Quality of study (/10)	9

**Table S10**

*Summary of Evidence*

Study	Boyd-MacMillan (2016)   Targeted primary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Program and country	Being Muslim Being Scottish (BMBS), Scotland.
Objectives of the program	Increase integrative complexity and collaboration across communities.
Sample characteristics	21 participants divided into two groups: the Muslim group ( $n = 10$ ; educators, housewives, students, and other professionals) and the practitioner group ( $n = 11$ ; educators, social workers, and Prevent police officers). Mean age = 42.05; most participants ( $n = 19$ ) had university scholarship; 13 men, eight women.
Methods: data collection, procedure, and measures	Mixed methods. <i>Quantitative</i> : Pre- and post-paragraph completion tests, as well as social identity and power questionnaires. <i>Qualitative</i> : Presentations of self-perception and integrative complexity regarding the ingroup/outgroup.
Positive outcomes	1) Increased cognitive capacities in conflict resolution (wider array of responses when facing difference and disagreement); 2) Decreased “othering,” a mindset that can be exploited by violent extremist groups; 3) Increased capacity to respect difference and see validity in other views despite disagreement; 4) Learned about how to communicate between communities, how to support people vulnerable to radicalization, better awareness of risk factors involved in radicalization, and increased confidence to speak about controversial topics.
Negative outcomes	Possibility of participants growing fatigued over the two days of training, which may have curtailed their reflections and discussions.
Overall outcome of the program	Positive.
Limitations (authors)	Lack of formal follow-up measures that evaluate if benefits of the program on integrative complexity last over time.
Limitations (team)	None.
Quality of study (/10)	8

**Table S11**

*Summary of Evidence*

Study	Christiaens et al. (2018)   Secondary prevention   General violent radicalization
Program and country	BOUNCEUp program, Belgium, France, Germany, Netherlands, and Sweden.
Objectives of the program	1) The BOUNCE program aims to strengthen youngsters’ resilience through group-based interventions in order to prevent violent radicalization. Personal resilience is seen here as a factor that can reduce susceptibility to violent extremism; 2) The BOUNCEUp program aims to train future BOUNCE trainers about the three BOUNCE tools (understand these tools, use them, implement them in one’s own domains and cities, and inspire other services and colleagues to use and promote them).
Sample characteristics	<i>Study 1</i> : User satisfaction of trainers who received the BOUNCEUp program (101 participants). <i>Study 2</i> : Short-term outcome evaluation of the BOUNCEUp tool by trainers (50 participants). Gender and age were not provided.
Methods: data collection, procedure, and measures	<i>Data collection</i> : 1) User surveys (reactions during participatory observations, a quantitative questionnaire about participants’ experience, and follow-up interviews with half of the participants to assess their knowledge and application of the BOUNCE program); 2) Trainers’ experience of the program (semi-structured interviews); 3) Program evaluation (focus groups and follow-up interviews with trainers about the project); 4) User satisfaction (observation during training, quantitative surveys, and telephone interviews). <i>Data analysis</i> : Descriptive statistics of user satisfaction and perception of the program (quantitative) and content analysis (qualitative).

Positive outcomes	<p><i>Study 1:</i> 1) Both during the training observations and in the post-training surveys, participants expressed that they were satisfied (average between 7.29 and 8.39/10) with the BOUNCEUp training (clarity of content, satisfaction with content, satisfaction with trainers, and satisfaction with exercises); 2) Participants largely perceived that the training clarified the concepts and methods of BOUNCE, with 53.5% agreeing that trainers used clear explanations; 3) The logical sequence of the ten sessions—each following the same structure (opening circle, energizer, exercises, reflection)—was also appreciated by participants, as well as the holistic approach and combination of BOUNCEYoung and BOUNCEAlong; 4) Participants also agreed that the trainers’ attitude was adequate and enjoyable; 5) The training content was generally well understood and supported by participants.</p> <p><i>Study 2:</i> 1) Participants said that the training taught them new working methods with younger populations; 2) Participants also mentioned that they already knew some of the performed exercises but learned to use them for a “broader cause”; 3) Other participants said that the BOUNCE training experience was an opportunity for self-reflection, while others mentioned that exercises were not innovative (but the structure of the BOUNCE program was); 4) All participants agreed or strongly agreed that the training clarified the conceptualization of resilience; 5) A majority of participants (39/50) were thinking, during the follow-up interviews, of organizing BOUNCE actions in the future. Six weeks after the program, participants were enthusiastic but uncertain about how to implement BOUNCE in their city; 6) At the end of the follow-up, most participants had told colleagues about the program, and half of them mentioned that their colleagues were eager to learn more.</p>
Negative outcomes	<p><i>Study 1:</i> BOUNCE trainers cannot explain, with a logic model, why the program is able to prevent radicalization. The process analysis also showed that several training elements were still unclear for participants, most notably the link between BOUNCE and preventing radicalization.</p> <p><i>Study 2:</i> 1) Few participants mentioned that they gained knowledge on theoretical models, the importance of group dynamics, and resilience training; 2) The theory behind BOUNCE is not immediately understood by everyone; 3) During the follow-up interviews, only 10 out of 50 participants had organized BOUNCE-related activities; 4) Even though many participants reported interest from their colleagues in BOUNCE, only five respondents said that concrete actions for implementation were taken.</p>
Overall outcome of the program	Positive.
Limitations (authors)	1) High dropout rate (1/4 of the sample), size of the groups (should ideally be between eight to 12 while they were from six to 14); 2) Timing of the training: All sessions took place in the spring of 2017, but the last three were near the summer holidays, thus lowering possibilities for immediate action; 3) Not all colleagues understood the added value or logic of the program.
Limitations (team)	The multitude of measures and results concerning different aspects of the program makes this report difficult to follow. The writing also lacked organization.
Quality of study (/10)	8

**Table S12**

*Summary of Evidence*

Study	Feddes et al. (2015)   Targeted primary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Program and country	Diamond, The Netherlands.
Objectives of the program	Strengthen participants’ self-esteem and increase their agency, perspective-taking skills (cognitive ability to anticipate the behavior and reactions of other people), and empathy in order to reduce their relative deprivation and disconnectedness from society, which in turn is expected to result in more resilience against violent radicalization.
Sample characteristics	<p>A total of 46 adolescents and young adults: aged 14 to 23 (<math>M = 16.9</math>, <math>SD = 2.8</math>); 85% Moroccan, 11% Turkish, 1% Surinamese, and 1% Pakistani; all participants indicated they were Muslim.</p> <p>Participants were divided into three groups: Group 1 (<math>n = 12</math>; 67% men, 33% women; 45% first-generation immigrants, 58% second generation) and group 2 (<math>n = 16</math>, 63% men, 37% women; 12% first-generation immigrant, 88% second generation) included youngers who followed the training in a community center, while group 3 (<math>n = 18</math>; all men; 6% first-generation immigrant,</p>

Study	Feddes et al. (2015)   Targeted primary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Methods: data collection, procedure, and measures	<p>94% second generation) included high-school students.</p> <p>Participants were recruited via the municipality (e.g., unemployment office), trainers or peers (groups 1 and 2), or via the school board (group 3).</p> <p><i>Longitudinal research design with five measurements:</i> T1 (pre-measurement), turning point (after the end of the first module), T2 (between-measurements), T3 (post-training), and T4 (follow-up, only with group 1).</p> <p><i>Questionnaire to measure outcomes of interest on scales comprising two to four 5-point Likert variables:</i> 1) individual relative deprivation; 2) collective relative deprivation; 3) social disconnectedness; 4) self-esteem; 5) agency; 6) narcissism; 7) empathy; 8) perspective taking; 9) attitudes toward ideology-based violence by others; and 10) own violent intentions. Internal consistency of scales was overall “good” to “very good.” Where necessary, questions were adapted to the ethnic and religious backgrounds of participants.</p> <p><i>Data analysis:</i> Paired sample t-tests.</p>
Positive outcomes	1) A marginal increase of reported self-esteem, empathy, and perspective-taking when comparing T1 and T3; 2) A significant increase in reported agency was found; 3) Attitudes toward ideology-based violence and reported own violent intentions decreased significantly when comparing T1 and T3.
Negative outcomes	1) Data showed a marginally significant increase of reported narcissism, which was strongly associated with ideology-based violence; 2) Higher reports of perspective-taking were positively associated with attitudes toward ideology-based violence.
Overall outcome of the program	Positive.
Limitations (authors)	1) Participants were not members of extremist groups nor showed signs of violent radicalization. Therefore, it is unknown whether Diamond is effective with actual violent extremists; 2) The study did not include a control group. Potential positive or negative effects may therefore have been undetected; 3) There is a possibility that participants’ characteristics influenced the results of the training as they knew the objectives of the program beforehand, which might have had a confounding impact on their behavior; 4) Small sample size limiting the examination of age or context effects in the study.
Limitations (team)	None.
Quality of study (/10)	9

**Table S13**
*Summary of Evidence*

Study	SAFIRE (2013)   Targeted primary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Program and country	Diamond, The Netherlands.
Objectives of the program	Increase resilience against radicalization among vulnerable youth and reduce susceptibility to violent extremism of non-radical Muslim adolescents. The Diamond program is based on two kinds of interventions: the system and the resilience approaches. The program involves parents, schools, and municipal organizations such as welfare agencies and frontline workers. It aims, among other things, to increase the participants’ self-esteem and sense of agency, as well as decrease social isolation.
Sample characteristics	<p><i>46 non-radicalized Muslim teenagers:</i> between 14 and 24 years old (<math>M = 16.93</math>), mostly with bicultural identities. Most participants were referred by government agencies such as organizations for the unemployed, social workers, or secondary schools. 85% were of Moroccan background, 11% of Turkish background, 2% of Surinam background, and 2% of Pakistani background. 78% were males and 22% females. 83% were born in the Netherlands (i.e., second-generation immigrants).</p> <p><i>Participants were divided into three groups:</i> Groups 1 (<math>n = 12</math>) and 2 (<math>n = 16</math>) included participants who were referred to the Diamond training via social workers and municipal organizations. Group 3 (<math>n = 18</math>) consisted of pupils at a secondary school. Participants of groups 2 and 3 participated voluntarily in the program; however, most of the group 1 participants did not</p>

Study	SAFIRE (2013)   Targeted primary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Methods: data collection, procedure, and measures	<p>participate voluntarily. Moreover, only group 1 had completed the four follow-up measurements at the publication of the report. Group 2 had completed three follow-ups and group 3, only two.</p> <p>This research aimed to investigate the long-term effectiveness of resilience training in preventing radicalization among vulnerable youth. It is a longitudinal study using a mixed-method design. Both qualitative and quantitative measures were taken at four different times: before the training, in the middle of the training, after the training, and three months after the training. The study consisted of interviews and surveys.</p> <p><i>Quantitative measures:</i> Participants filled a Likert-type questionnaire measuring the following factors: 1) identification with Islam; 2) identification with Dutch society; 3) identification with one's ethnic background; 4) perceived distance to non-Muslims; 5) perceived superiority of the Muslim ingroup; 6) disconnectedness from Dutch society; 7) agency; 8) uncertainty; 9) self-esteem; 10) symbolic threats to the Muslim ingroup; 11) realistic threats to the Muslim ingroup; 12) illegitimacy of authorities; 13) collective relative deprivation (feeling of receiving less than one deserves) of the ethnic ingroup; 14) perceived humiliation of the ethnic ingroup; 15) perspective-taking skills with regard to non-Muslims; 16) empathy towards non-Muslims; 17) attitudes towards ideology-based violence; and 18) own violent intentions.</p> <p><i>Qualitative measures:</i> semi-structured interviews examining the variables of interest. They were then coded independently by two researchers using a coding scheme and analyzed.</p>
Positive outcomes	<p><i>Quantitative:</i> 1) Reduced sense of social marginalization and isolation (social disconnectedness) as more participants were enrolled in school, had an internship, or worked; 2) Better perspective-taking abilities; 3) Steady increase in empathy over time.</p> <p><i>Qualitative:</i> 1) Increase in self-esteem, perspective-taking, and empathy after the training; 2) Participants had more insight about their personal abilities and showed personal responsibility; 3) Participants learned to set concrete goals and deal with conflicts and negative feelings; 4) Decrease in social disconnectedness and feelings of relative deprivation; 5) The fact that the training was given in groups had a positive effect on participants; 6) Participants made friends during the training; 7) Participants made a positive evaluation of the training.</p>
Negative outcomes	<p><i>Quantitative:</i> 1) The decrease over time in attitudes toward ideology-based violence was non-significant, as was the increase in agency; 2) No significant results were found regarding the participants' own violent intentions; 3) No significant increases in agency and self-esteem.</p> <p><i>Qualitative:</i> None reported.</p>
Overall outcome of the program	Positive.
Limitations (authors)	1) It was not possible to find a comparable control group that did not follow the Diamond training; 2) Each experimental group suffered drop-out of participants; 3) Measures could not be taken at the four different time points for most groups.
Limitations (team)	1) The program defined "vulnerability to violent extremism" as being Muslim and having multiple cultural identities; 2) We do not know if the program was effective with radicalized youth.
Quality of study (/10)	9

## Tables S14 and S15

### Summary of Evidence

Study	Manby (2010a)   Secondary prevention   General violent radicalization	Manby (2010b)   Secondary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Program and country	Prevent (Citizenship Programme), UK.	Prevent (Pathways into Adulthood), UK.
Objectives of the program	1) Provide young people with a broad grounding in citizenship, principles of democracy, terrorism, and dictatorship; 2) Undertake library assignments exploring these issues.	1) Provide an opportunity to focus on issues of identity experienced by young people in the British communities (including issues related to radicalization); 2) Create a film on the theme of identity.
Sample characteristics	<i>Nine young men:</i> age = 14–18; ethnicity = two British Pakistani, seven White British.	<i>Five young men:</i> age = 17–18; ethnicity = British South Asian; religion = Islam.



Study	Manby (2010a)   Secondary prevention   General violent radicalization	Manby (2010b)   Secondary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Methods: data collection, procedure, and measures	1) Observation of one session; 2) Live and telephone interviews with participants; 3) Telephone interviews with parents of the participants; 4) Questionnaires and interviews for the staff.	1) Observation of two group sessions; 2) Semi-structured interviews with participants; 3) Telephone interviews with parents of the participants; 4) Questionnaires for the staff; 5) Interviews with program managers.
Positive outcomes	1) Acquisition of knowledge on citizenship and cultural diversity; 2) Better self-confidence; 3) Parents and staff members confirmed the clear positive impact of the program.	1) Exploring identity issues related to ethnocultural belonging; 2) Maturation and better self-confidence; 3) Staff had a very positive view of the program's execution and benefits.
Negative outcomes	Some participants were too young to fully understand the notions presented.	None reported.
Overall outcome of the program	Positive.	Positive.
Limitations (authors)	Participants were not at risk of radicalization (and should have been since it is a condition of this Prevent program).	The program was only accessible to young Asian people; it should be made available to a wider demographic.
Limitations (team)	1) Low number of participants; 2) Weak methodology.	1) Low number of participants; 2) Weak methodology.
Quality of study (/10)	5	4

## Tables S16 and S17

### Summary of Evidence

Study	Manby (2009a)   Primary prevention   General violent radicalization	Manby (2009b)   Secondary prevention   General violent radicalization
Program and country	Prevent (Pilot Parenting Project), UK.	Prevent (Theatre Project), UK.
Objectives of the program	<i>Main objective:</i> Increase the knowledge, skills, and confidence of local parents so that they are better able to support their children/young people, should they be targeted or recruited by extremist groups. <i>Specific objectives:</i> 1) Improve general parenting skills; 2) Build more resilient communities.	Create a short drama production on the theme of preventing violent extremism.
Sample characteristics	Seven mothers of mixed ethnicity (British, South Asian).	<i>Six young people:</i> age = 13–17; gender = four men and two women; ethnicity = three British Asian, two White British, one of dual heritage. All had experienced racism before, either as victims or perpetrators.
Methods: data collection, procedure, and measures	1) Parents' views of problem behaviors in their children (Eyberg Child Behaviour Inventory); 2) Interview of participants about the impact of the program; 3) Questionnaire about the experiences of participants in the program; 4) Questionnaire for the staff about the easiness of implementation and progress achieved by participants.	1) Observation of a training session and a video of the theatrical production; 2) Interviews with participants about their experience in the project, understanding of violent extremism, and self-esteem improvements during the project; 3) Questionnaires and interviews for the staff.
Positive outcomes	1) Feeling of having developed better parenting skills (knowledge about child protection/safeguarding and against the potential for recruitment via radical websites); 2) Decrease in problem behaviors as observed by	1) Knowledge acquisition and skill development related to theatrical productions, teamwork, and conflict management; 2) Better self-confidence; 3) Cost-effective; 4) Staff commended the commitment and progress of

Study	Manby (2009a)   Primary prevention   General violent radicalization	Manby (2009b)   Secondary prevention   General violent radicalization
Negative outcomes	mothers; 3) Very good overall feedback by participants. Three parents dropped out because of communication problems (language barrier).	participants. The stressful context for participants (tight schedule, performance anxiety) sometimes led to conflicts.
Overall outcome of the program	Positive.	Positive.
Limitations (authors)	1) Interpreters for non-native English speakers could have prevented dropouts; 2) The program should have covered a wider range of interests and concerns.	Unclear how well the aims and potential benefits of the Prevent project were understood by the Theatre Project program staff.
Limitations (team)	1) Low number of participants; 2) Weak methodology.	1) Low number of participants; 2) Weak methodology.
Quality of study (/10)	6	4

## Europe (Mixed Outcomes)

**Table S18**

### *Summary of Evidence*

Study	Sheikh et al. (2012)   Targeted primary and secondary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Program and country	Advisory Directorate for Youth, Women and Imams' Active Development (ADFYWIAD), UK.
Objectives of the program	<i>Main objective:</i> Increase community resilience to violent extremism. <i>Specific objectives of ADFYWIAD projects:</i> 1) iLead program (13–16 years and 16+ years): Build the confidence and skills of Muslim youth so that they are able to act as leaders in the community; 2) “Keep fit”: Involve young Muslim women in various activities that can make them less vulnerable to extremist messages; 3) Radical Middle Way training sessions: Educate Muslim leaders and community representatives about identifying and deconstructing extremist messages, so that they can cascade messages to the grassroots communities they work in; 4) Governance and child protection training for mosques, madrassahs and Muslim organizations: build the resilience of mosques, Madrassahs, and Muslim organizations across Wales; 5) Meetings between police officers and Imams: partnership work between Imams and the police.
Sample characteristics	<i>A total of 82 individuals participated in this evaluation:</i> 1) Program participants: Of the 48 individuals in this category, the majority had participated in the iLead youth leadership program ( $n = 15$ in the 13–16 years old group; $n = 9$ in the 16+ group). 10 persons were participants of the Radical Middle Way project, 10 of the “Keep fit” project, and the four left participated in the governance and child protection training for mosques, madrassahs, and Muslim organizations; 2) Institutions: A link to an online survey was emailed to 64 institutions across Wales, whose contact details were identified through the Welsh government’s own networks. 29 respondents from Welsh Muslim institutions answered (response rate of 45.3%). Most of them were females ( $n = 16$ ), and the majority were from Cardiff ( $n = 17$ ) or Newport ( $n = 6$ ). Roughly half worked with a Muslim voluntary group ( $n = 14$ ), and one third worked in a mosque ( $n = 9$ ); 3) Police officers: Two police officers that attended meetings with Imams were interviewed; and 4) Project coordinators: Three project coordinators were from the Muslim Council of Wales.
Methods: data collection, procedure, and measures	<i>Data collection:</i> Measures focused on the awareness of ADFYWIAD programs and participants’ perceived impacts. These were assessed using the following: 1) an online questionnaire designed by the Office for Public Management; this tool aimed to assess the awareness of Muslim institutions on four key elements of the program—governance training, child protection training, iLead youth leadership projects, and “Keep Fit” monthly social activities; 2) interviews: 14 structured interviews were administered to two police officers, nine program participants, and three project coordinators about their understanding of the program, its perceived strengths and weaknesses, and its potential impacts; and 3) focus groups: a total of five focus groups (from seven to 15 participants each) were conducted by Office for Public Management facilitators, who

Study	Sheikh et al. (2012)   Targeted primary and secondary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
	followed preestablished guides created by the authors. <i>Data analysis:</i> Data collected over the course of the evaluation was subjected to thematic analysis to assess both extent and type of impact. The theory of change model was used as a broad framework for analysis. Having data from different points in the evaluation allowed triangulation of the data to produce more robust findings.
Positive outcomes	<i>Awareness of Muslim institutions in the iLead and child protection projects:</i> More than half the respondents had heard of them. <i>Perceived impacts:</i> 1) Improvement of practices within Muslim institutions (better organizational structure, knowledge, and skills needed to better support the Muslim communities they serve); 2) Progress in the partnership between Muslim institutions and statutory agencies such as the police; and 3) Development of leadership skills among Muslim youth participants such as confidence, public speaking, conflict management, etc.
Negative outcomes	1) Awareness of the Muslim institutions of the governance training and “Keep Fit”: Slightly less than a third of respondents had heard of them; 2) Difficulties reaching the targeted audiences: Recruiting mosque committee members and Imams to participate in the training sessions was challenging and time-consuming as they tended to be apprehensive in the beginning; 3) Implementation issues included poor management and coordination, and two elements of the original program for Imams were not delivered due to a lack of interest; 4) No reported impacts of the “Keep Fit” project (no decreased vulnerability to recruitment by extremist groups); 5) Inadequate training sessions mostly comprised lectures with little room for practical exercises.
Overall outcome of the program	Mixed.
Limitations (authors)	1) Limited generalizability of findings (due to the small number of participants interviewed or taking part in focus groups); 2) Problematic sampling methods: involvement of Welsh government and the Muslim Council of Wales in the choice of participants; 3) Two other projects under ADFYWIAD could not be implemented.
Limitations (team)	1) Not enough information on participants, including the total sample size; 2) Insufficient methodological details; 3) No detailed descriptions of the projects’ content; 4) Relevant findings are based on subjective perceptions from participants; 5) Limited insight on real-life prevention of radicalization.
Quality of study (/10)	4

**Table S19**

*Summary of Evidence*

Study	Hirschfield et al. (2012)   Targeted primary and secondary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Program and country	48 programs under Prevent, UK.
Objectives of the program	50 locations in the UK were identified as being at higher risk of violent extremism. The Youth Offending Teams (YOTs) of these regions were then encouraged to apply for PVE funding. 48 of these 50 locations had developed programs under the Prevent strategy at the time the evaluation took place. <i>The main objectives of these programs were the following:</i> 1) preventing violent extremism among young people (eight to 18 years old) by delivering programs across YOTs; 2) reaching out to children and young people who are most at risk of becoming involved in violent extremism; 3) expanding existing programs for vulnerable young people in communities where extreme views are prevalent; and 4) providing training and support for selected youth justice staff to counter violent extremism.
Sample characteristics	In order to frame a national picture of the PVE programs under Prevent, practitioners and stakeholders across 48 locations were interviewed ( <i>n</i> = not provided). Practitioners were defined as those who were directly involved in the design and/or delivery of the project. Stakeholders were those who were not directly involved but who had a direct interest in the project or were otherwise aligned to it (e.g., police officers, community engagement officers, leaders from

Study	Hirschfield et al. (2012)   Targeted primary and secondary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Methods: data collection, procedure, and measures	<p>community organizations). No further data on their profession, sex, mean age, or sociodemographic information was provided. 71 stakeholders and practitioners from 12 locations were interviewed, as well as 33 young people who participated in nine out of the 12 programs. Among the 33 young participants, 21 were men, and 12 were women. Their age ranged between 14 and 21 years old, and all but three were Muslim. In all, 18 were Asian, six Somali, five Caucasian, one Moroccan, one Algerian, one Afghan, and one was Albanian.</p> <p>The evaluation of the programs had three stages.</p> <p><i>Stage 1:</i> Systematic review on PVE in order to scope the evidence.</p> <p><i>Stage 2:</i> Framing a national picture of the PVE programs. This stage consisted in the identification and assessment of existing PVE programs. During this stage, the research team visited 48 sites and conducted in-depth interviews with project staff and representatives from each of the YOTs carrying PVE programs, and analyzed project documentation and data provided by the Youth Justice Board (YJB).</p> <p><i>Stage 3:</i> Case studies of 12 project sites were selected on the basis of geographical spread and the delivery of different sets of interventions. Semi-structured interviews with practitioners and stakeholders were conducted (<math>n = 71</math>). The interviews aimed to learn more about their perceptions and experiences of the program, as well as about the interventions being delivered. They also aimed to examine the benefits and challenges of delivering the programs. The research team also conducted interviews with young people who were enrolled in the programs (<math>n = 33</math>) in order to understand their views, attitudes, and beliefs, and to elicit their perceptions of the interventions' effectiveness.</p> <p><i>Project diary sheets:</i> The authors additionally made non-participant observations of project interventions (<math>n = 36</math>) and proceeded to further documentary analysis, such as of the original project bids, evaluation reports, curricula outlines, and recording sheets. This provided information about the characteristics of young people participating in the project, the range of interventions delivered (objectives, methods of delivery, nature of targeting), and an indication of project activity and change over time. Project diary sheets were filled during stages 1, 2, and 3 of the evaluation processes.</p>
Positive outcomes	<p><i>Interviews with staff members and practitioners and program documentation analysis:</i> 1) Some practitioners welcomed the investment of Prevent for communities, which were often deprived and overlooked; 2) Most interviewees considered they had received enough funding to carry their program; 3) Overall, responses to the training were positive among the staff; 4) Most respondents thought their program had positive effects on tackling the causes of violent extremism; 5) Respondents felt that young people had become increasingly involved in group sessions, had received a lot of support and information, and made progress. They also reported that youth had positive reactions towards the interventions and noticed positive attitude changes towards the government and the police; 6) There was increased awareness and understanding of prejudices experienced by the participants; 7) Practitioners believed they had provided young people with the necessary skills to enable them to communicate, debate, reach their own decisions, and resist extremist views; 8) Projects involving peer mentors and youth leaders were considered to be successful and have greater longevity; 9) Some practitioners believed that their work with families led to greater resilience within the wider community; 10) Partnerships with other organizations led to better awareness of PVE among partner agencies and increased the chances of identifying youth at risk of violent radicalization.</p> <p><i>Interviews with participants:</i> 1) Participants enjoyed the programs and activities, especially sport, leisure, and outward-bound activities; 2) Some participants said they developed new skills, such as music production; 3) There was an increase in self-esteem, empathy, and open-mindedness; 4) Some reported an increased awareness of similarities with those who were previously perceived to be different; 5) Some enjoyed meeting participants who shared the same religion or ethnic background as them as it was an opportunity to discuss and learn; 6) A few participants enjoyed discussing conflicts between their faith and Western values and reported feeling more comfortable with themselves afterwards; 7) The staff was described as respectful, non-judgmental, and empathetic; 8) Some reported they were less likely to offend or re-offend because of improved critical thinking and greater awareness of alternatives to offending; 9) The young people felt they understand Islam better and were more equipped to rebut advances from radical groups; 10) Most young people were confident they would be able to put what they had learned into practice.</p>

Study	Hirschfield et al. (2012)   Targeted primary and secondary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Negative outcomes	<p><i>Interviews with staff members and practitioners and program documentation analysis:</i> 1) The title of the initiative (Preventing Violent Extremism) was seen as unhelpful and stigmatizing by some practitioners. Many felt uncomfortable with this label; 2) Most projects targeted young Muslim men and only focused on Islamist terrorism, which could be perceived as stigmatizing and discriminating, as well as potentially counter-productive; 3) There seems to be a lack of communication between the government and Prevent programs regarding the national agenda and perception of PVE, which was initially focusing on Islamist extremism but then shifted to include more types of extremism without informing the projects. Consequently, many programs could not adjust; 4) There was a lack of clarity and understanding of the term “violent extremism” among practitioners, which led to several projects implementing activities with minimal PVE content; 5) Over half of the practitioners stated they had insufficient time to develop and implement their program. They also stated the timetable was unrealistic, with most projects being at least five months behind schedule; 6) It was difficult to recruit and retain staff because of the short length of the contracts and the negative views towards Prevent; 7) It was sometimes difficult to establish partnerships as some organizations, such as local mosques and schools, viewed Prevent as discriminatory. Some mosques started their own programs to keep young people away from Prevent; 8) Some Imams feared deportation; 9) Most of the practitioners did not think their intervention was effective in reaching those most at risk of becoming involved with violent extremism (they only had access to low-risk individuals, the higher-risk ones being more secretive, harder to reach, or untrusting of Prevent); 10) Only three out of the 12 case study programs had external evaluations and only two used pre- and post-intervention measures; 11) Three participants displayed lower prosocial attitudes at the end of the program than at the beginning; 12) Eleven out of 12 projects struggled to assess outcomes in a robust fashion; 13) There seems to be a need for a wider and more holistic approach to counter the risk of violent extremism, involving other agencies and the wider community; 14) In a few situations, the staff seemed to lack the skills required to ensure input and discussion from participants; 15) A program had a high turnover of participants due to their legal status and the logistics involved in moving inmates; 16) Fewer than 30% of the participants were involved over two or three seasons and just over 3% for more than three seasons; 17) Practitioners expressed concerns about confidentiality and about what would happen to the data collected during their project (namely, if it could be used against the participants).</p> <p><i>Interviews with participants:</i> 1) Branding a project as PVE scared some people/families (double agenda of surveillance and intervention); 2) Trust issues between the community and Prevent programs; 3) Some participants felt coerced into activities.</p>
Overall outcome of the program	Mixed.
Limitations (authors)	1) It was not possible to determine the number of young people involved in interventions; 2) Interviews with young participants were not always conducted in ideal situations (e.g., private spaces); 3) No baseline data to measure progress and the impacts of PVE programs; 4) Substantial missing data; 5) The views presented do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the majority of the staff and participants of Prevent initiatives; 6) Very few negative comments were made among the participants, especially for those who were attending the program under conditions.
Limitations (team)	1) Little to no information about methods, qualitative data, statistics, and the robustness of results; 2) The evaluation was mostly based on user satisfaction; 3) The practitioner and stakeholder samples are poorly described, and the sample size is not provided; 4) The report should have been divided into two or three reports to make it easier to follow; 5) Practitioners and stakeholders may be biased as they want the program they are involved in to succeed.
Quality of study (/10)	8



**Table S20**

*Summary of Evidence*

Study	Manby (2009c)   Secondary prevention   General violent radicalization
Program and country	Prevent (Film Project), UK.
Objectives of the program	<i>Main objective:</i> Produce a film focused on supporting and challenging young people’s views. <i>Specific objectives:</i> 1) Support vulnerable individuals who could be recruited in extremist groups; 2) Challenge violent/extremist ideologies and support mainstream views; 3) Open up dialogue with young people.
Sample characteristics	<i>Inclusion criteria:</i> Young people that had been victims of extremism or were disengaged from mainstream activities or were living in polarized communities. <i>Nine participants:</i> Six boys, three girls; age = 14–17; they all had experienced violence in their lives; four had committed offenses.
Methods: data collection, procedure, and measures	<i>Questionnaires and interviews on the following:</i> 1) self-esteem (Rosenberg Self-Esteem scale); 2) skills learned during the project (including awareness about violent extremism); and 3) general performance. <i>Data analysis:</i> Pre- and post- measures were taken and parents were asked to fill questionnaires.
Positive outcomes	1) Acquisition of knowledge on violent extremism, film production, and teamwork; 2) Greater self-esteem.
Negative outcomes	1) Establishing a link between violence and extremism was cognitively hard for participants; 2) Unsure if the program will have an effect on future concrete behaviors; 3) One participant committed an offense during the program; 4) Some were suspected of using drugs; 5) The project was time-consuming and expensive.
Overall outcome of the program	Mixed.
Limitations (authors)	None mentioned.
Limitations (team)	1) Low number of participants; 2) Weak methodology.
Quality of study (/10)	7

**Table S21**

*Summary of Evidence*

Study	Madriaza et al. (2018)   Secondary prevention   General violent radicalization
Program and country	Vivre-Ensemble, France.
Objectives of the program	<i>Main objective:</i> Prevent the risk of violent radicalization by promoting cultural and religious pluralism. <i>Intermediate objectives:</i> 1) Develop participants’ critical thinking about dogmatic thoughts; 2) Develop autonomy in regard to external influences; 3) Develop the recognition of multiple identities.
Sample characteristics	The Vivre-Ensemble intervention was implemented on two cohorts from the Isère reinsertion and probation penitentiary services ( <i>services pénitentiaires d’insertion et de probation; SPIP</i> ); <i>n</i> = 10 (five per cohort). All participants were identified by the internal multidisciplinary commission of the establishment as being receptive to violent radicalization. Due to inconsistencies in the answers to demographic questions, all data collected from the first cycle had to be rejected. The second cohort comprised four men and one woman (mean age = 20.4 years old). All participants had French citizenship, but one was born in Algeria. Two individuals were employed, three were unemployed; one was in a relationship, the others were single; one had not finished college, two had graduated, one had not finished high school, and one had.
Methods: data collection, procedure, and measures	<i>A pre- and post-test design was used to evaluate the outcomes of the program.</i> The same online questionnaire was administered before and after the intervention, with items measuring seven domains of interest: 1) sympathy towards radicalization (SyfoR); 2) integrative complexity (Moral Dilemmas Test); 3) self-uncertainty (Scale of Self-Uncertainty); 4) self-esteem (Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale); 5) empathy (Basic Empathy Scale); 6) social isolation (Social

Study	Madriaza et al. (2018)   Secondary prevention   General violent radicalization
Positive outcomes	and Emotional Loneliness Scale for Adults); and 7) anxiety and depression (Symptom Scale Hopkins-25). The post-test questionnaire added 10 items to measure user satisfaction. 1) A statistically significant decrease in self-instability was observed; 2) All participants were very satisfied with the activities included in the program; 3) All users agreed that they would recommend participating in Vivre-Ensemble.
Negative outcomes	1) Some participants distrusted correctional services and therefore gave fake answers; 2) Many results were not statistically significant (no change in mental health and sympathy towards radicalization and a slight decrease in self-esteem, empathy, and social isolation) or could not be evaluated (integrative complexity) because of the poor quality of answers written by participants; 3) The majority of participants did not consider that Vivre-Ensemble’s activities met their goals or helped them with the issues that led them to incarceration.
Overall outcome of the program	Mixed.
Limitations (authors)	1) Small sample size: 10 individuals participated in the programs, and of these, only the data of five could be analyzed. Indeed, because the real purpose of the intervention was not disclosed the first time Vivre-Ensemble was implemented, some participants changed their answers to certain factual questions (e.g., age) in the post-test, invalidating their data; 2) Participants were selected according to very strict criteria, which limits generalizability; 3) Many of the assessed indicators require considerable time to change, but the follow-up was limited.
Limitations (team)	1) Textual inconsistencies: change in the number of participants from one page to another; 2) Psychometric instruments were translated by the researchers, which limits content validity (though translations were reviewed by stakeholders); 3) Potential bias: The authors were responsible for the implementation and evaluation of the program.
Quality of study (/10)	7

## Europe (Negative Outcomes)

**Table S22**

### Summary of Evidence

Study	Bowie & Revell (2018)   Targeted primary and secondary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Program and country	Prevent (in universities), UK.
Objectives of the program	Detect and report extremist behavior among students and colleagues in UK universities to counter radicalization on campuses.
Sample characteristics	<i>Eight participants from two English universities with Anglican foundations:</i> These included two students with senior experience in student union work (both in their 20s) and six staff members who held multiple roles in universities (all in their 40s and 50s). These roles comprised operating Prevent, operating the chaplaincy, and being responsible for diversity and equality in universities. The sample included Christians, Muslims, and those of no expressed faith or belief, all from a range of genders and sexual orientations.
Methods: data collection, procedure, and measures	<i>Semi-structured, in-depth interviews:</i> Conducted in private, these lasted one to 1.5 hours. They explored how academics, students, and professional officers that are engaged in the implementation of Prevent in Anglican universities understood, interpreted, and applied its controversial policies. <i>Data analysis:</i> Interviews were recorded, transcribed, and analyzed qualitatively to draw out thematic patterns.
Positive outcomes	None reported.
Negative outcomes	1) Risk of controversy and poor implementation of the Prevent policy (concerns that staff responsible for Prevent, mostly teachers, might misinterpret religiosity for radicalization); 2) Students experienced fear and self-censorship due to concern that their teachers are spying on them; 3) General concern about the focus on Muslim populations and lack thereof on far-right extremist groups (highlighting the idea that Prevent is mainly an Islamophobic and racist policy—the inclusion of far-right groups in Prevent documentation being tokenistic); 4) Staff

Study	Bowie & Revell (2018)   Targeted primary and secondary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Overall outcome of the program	members feeling a tension between their duty as university staff and the obligations of Prevent. Negative.
Limitations (authors)	Small sample size.
Limitations (team)	1) Potential conflict of interest in the choice of participants, specifically those from student unions, who were known to hold existing opposition to Prevent strategy; 2) Lack of information on methodology and data analysis.
Quality of study (/10)	5

**Table S23**

*Summary of Evidence*

Study	HM Government (2011a–d)   Targeted primary and secondary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Program and country	Prevent, UK.
Objectives of the program	<i>Main objective:</i> Stop people becoming terrorists or supporting terrorism in the UK and overseas. <i>Five specific objectives:</i> 1) Challenge and rebut terrorist ideology; 2) Disrupt the activities of propagandists for terrorism; 3) Support those vulnerable to their messages; 4) Increase community resilience towards violent extremism; 5) Address grievances exploited by ideologues.
Sample characteristics	<i>Besides an unknown number of MPs and councilors, a total of 1,158 individuals or organizations participated in the consultation process:</i> 1) 325 individuals answered the online consultation questionnaire. The majority of respondents identified themselves as from police and local authorities. The others worked in specific sectors of Prevent or were members of the public interested in Prevent. In addition, 78 respondents (individuals or organizations) sent their answers via email and post. Most of them were from local authorities; 2) 586 delegates attended the consultation events. Among these, participants were from local authorities (38%), police (22%), community organizations and faith groups (11%), the National Offender Management Service and Probation (4%), and “other” (19%). Two additional consultation events were held: one for MPs and Peers in the House of Commons, and one for local councilors at the Local Government House in London under the auspices of the Improvement and Development Agency. No information was provided on the number of participants; 3) 124 individuals (37 Muslims, 87 non-Muslims) never involved with Prevent were selected to participate in several focus groups. Respondents were selected using a mix of on-street and snowballing techniques designed to capture a wide range of backgrounds (e.g., working status, socioeconomic group, age, gender). For the Muslim subsample, most individuals were from Pakistan, Somalia, Yemen, Bangladesh, and North Africa, and were between the ages of 18 and 44.
Methods: data collection, procedure, and measures	<i>Online questionnaire:</i> respondents were invited to answer 13 questions, with Question 14 providing respondents with an opportunity to make general comments. Questions covered key aspects of the previous Prevent strategy (CONTEST) and sought the views of respondents concerning a proposed new Prevent strategy. In addition, specific equality impact assessment questions were included to ensure that the project did not discriminate against any of the following characteristics: race, religion or belief, disability, gender, gender reassignment, sexual orientation, age, pregnancy and maternity, and marriage and civil partnership. <i>Consultation events:</i> 11 regional consultation events were held in which participants were divided into subgroups of five to 10 persons. As they answered the five questions, one individual per subgroup noted their answers, and these discussion records formed the content for analysis. <i>Focus groups:</i> A total of 24 in-depth focus groups were organized. Of these, 11 focused on the views of the general public in a variety of regional settings. 13 smaller sessions sought the views of Muslim members specifically. Participants had eight themes/questions to answer and discuss: 1) aims and objectives of the Prevent strategy; 2) broadening of Prevent to include other threats; 3) resilience and resilient community; 4) funding for Prevent-related interventions; 5) important institutions for the Prevent strategy; 6) collaboration of central and local governments along with community organizations to challenge terrorist propaganda; 7) risk-based approach; and 8) resisting apologists for violence.

Study	HM Government (2011a–d)   Targeted primary and secondary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Positive outcomes	1) Channel, one of Prevent’s key components, was seen quite positively; 2) Broad support of the aims and objectives of Prevent; 3) Some respondents felt that Prevent had had a positive impact on women and young people; 4) It was perceived that the new strategy could help to mitigate the negative impact of CONTEST on religion/race by expanding the scope of violent radicalizations targeted by the program; 5) The proposed strategy could promote active engagement and raise awareness of risks.
Negative outcomes	<i>Implementation issues:</i> 1) Absence of clear guidelines; 2) Poor use/management of funding; 3) Lack of transparency; 4) Lack of consideration of local contexts; 5) Need for more accountability for professionals; 6) Need for more balance between central and local governments; 7) Difficult to evaluate the Prevent activity. <i>Atrogenic effects:</i> Climate of distrust between program providers and the community. <i>Negative impacts:</i> Prevent was perceived to have a disproportionate focus on specific religions, beliefs, and races. Men and young people were particularly likely to be negatively impacted.
Overall outcome of the program	Negative.
Limitations (authors)	None mentioned.
Limitations (team)	1) Evaluation based on the perceptions of participants who did not go through the program; 2) Absence of limitations and discussion sections; 3) Lack of demographic information on the sample; 4) Vague terms (e.g., “many”) in the descriptive statistics.
Quality of study (/10)	5

**Table S24**

*Summary of Evidence*

Study	Joyce (2018)   Targeted primary and secondary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Program and country	Prevent (in schools), UK.
Objectives of the program	1) Identify children who may be vulnerable to radicalization; 2) Know what to do when they are identified; 3) Build resilience to radicalization through promoting British values and enable them to challenge extremist views; 4) Manage concerns via setting-based safeguarding policies.
Sample characteristics	The author identified 38 teachers through termly planning meetings and by talking to them individually. The sample consisted of 27 female and 11 male teachers working in two high schools and 10 elementary schools. Seven held undergraduate degrees, 21 had postgraduate certificates, and 10 had master’s degrees. 33 participants were White British, two were British Asian, and three were Black British. The level of experience that teachers had in implementing Prevent in schools varied greatly: 15.8% had no experience, 31.6% had less than one year of experience, 50% had between two to five years of experience, and 2.6% had more than five years of experience.
Methods: data collection, procedure, and measures	Pragmatic, sequential, mixed-method design. <i>Quantitative:</i> Cross-sectional data collected via paper-based surveys. <i>Qualitative:</i> Semi-structured interviews with open-ended questions to expand on quantitative results. The 38 surveys included information on teachers’ sociodemographic and professional characteristics, as well as their attitudes towards the implementation of Prevent. 10 teachers were then interviewed on their general awareness of radicalization and extremism, the fidelity of Prevent, their attitudes towards Prevent, dosage and adaptations made to the program, the quality of the training received, how their pupils reacted to discussions around Prevent, and any other factors that might have affected the implementation of Prevent in schools. Thematic analysis using NVivo12 was applied to analyze the interviews.
Positive outcomes	Most teachers identified anti-radicalization training as highly important.
Negative outcomes	1) A large proportion of the teachers expressed that Prevent had not been easy to deliver in their schools, that they had not received enough training, and that they did not feel particularly comfortable putting it into practice; 2) Teachers defined and understood radicalization and extremism in different ways, affecting their perception of what their duty under Prevent

Study	Joyce (2018)   Targeted primary and secondary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
	legislation should be; 3) Most teachers felt that they were not given enough time to deliver the content, with few opportunities to generalize the training; 4) Teachers' general perception of Prevent is that it has a greater emphasis on policing, as opposed to educating, leading to uncomfortable tensions for some participants; 5) There was a widespread view that there were not enough resources to deliver the program effectively, with teachers having to make up many of their own PowerPoints, documents, and other resources; 6) Almost all teachers had to make adaptations to the program for it to be fit for purpose; 7) The training of the program was deemed inconsistent, with some receiving the training online only.
Overall outcome of the program	Negative.
Limitations (authors)	1) Small sample size; 2) The data collection took place in schools where the author worked as a trainee educational psychologist, and as such, it is possible that teachers may have been more likely to get involved in the project, having had contact with the author in the past; 3) It is also possible that teachers who were willing to talk about radicalization and extremism already had strong views about the topic; 4) Limitations inherent to cross-sectional research (e.g., giving only a snapshot) and semi-structured interviews (e.g., possible lack of objectivity).
Limitations (team)	None.
Quality of study (/10)	9

**Table S25**
*Summary of Evidence*

Study	Kundnani (2009)   Targeted primary and secondary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Program and country	Prevent, UK.
Objectives of the program	1) Challenge violent extremist ideology and disrupt its promoters; 2) Support institutions in activity fields related to prevention; 3) Support individuals who are being targeted and potentially recruited in violent extremist causes and support mainstream voices; 4) Increase resilience of communities and address grievances.
Sample characteristics	<i>32 participants:</i> Six Prevent program workers and managers in local authorities, 10 members of local Prevent boards, 10 voluntary sector workers engaged in Prevent, and 6 community workers familiar with local Prevent work. All but 5 participants were Muslim and half were women. Interviewees were selected based upon their experience and knowledge of Prevent projects, rather than being established community leaders; they had a range of prior perspectives on Prevent, ranging from refusing to work on Prevent, to neutral ones, to viewing it positively. Participants were located across England.
Methods: data collection, procedure, and measures	32 interviews (half face-to-face, half by telephone) followed by a roundtable event with 24 participants to explore in more detail the issues that were raised in the interviews. <i>Questions in the interviews and roundtable were about the following:</i> 1) the general impact of Prevent funding at the community level; 2) the definition of extremism in Prevent-funded projects; 3) whether Prevent efforts foster social cohesion or exacerbate inter-communal conflicts and divisions; 4) how Prevent programs interact with the local democracy; 5) how Prevent programs depict Muslim communities; and 6) whether Prevent programs involve non-police agencies in intelligence gathering.
Positive outcomes	None reported.
Negative outcomes	1) Prevent programs construct the Muslim population as a "suspect community"; 2) Fosters social divisions among Muslims themselves and between Muslims and others; 3) Encourages tokenism; 4) Facilitates violations of privacy and professional norms of confidentiality; 5) Is counter-productive in reducing the risk of political violence; 6) Has been used to establish one of the most elaborate systems of surveillance ever seen in Britain.
Overall outcome of the program	Negative.
Limitations (authors)	None mentioned.
Limitations (team)	1) Evaluation based on participants who did not go through the program; 2) Potentially biased



---

Study	Kundnani (2009)   Targeted primary and secondary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization sample as to their prior opinions of Prevent.
Quality of study (/10)	7

---

## Table S26

### Summary of Evidence

---

Study	Kyriacou et al. (2017)   Targeted primary and secondary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Program and country	Prevent (in universities), UK.
Objectives of the program	<i>Main objective:</i> Obstruct university students' exposure to radical and extremist narratives and thereby derail the path to violent extremism. <i>Specific objectives:</i> 1) Stop campus speakers from inciting terrorism; 2) Block access to websites inciting terrorism on campus computers; 3) Offer pastoral support to radicalized individuals or those becoming radicalized (students and staff members).
Sample characteristics	<i>Nine British Muslim undergraduate students.</i> Invitations to participants were sent to contacts at several universities in the UK, who were asked to forward the invitations to members of the Islamic Society in their respective institutions.
Methods: data collection, procedure, and measures	The aim of the study was to explore participants' perceptions concerning Prevent and its impact on their sense of personal and national identity. Data was collected over an eight-week period via an online questionnaire. The questionnaire comprised five-point Likert scale questions to measure agreement with a number of statements and 12 open-ended questions which required the students to report their views on the following: 1) To what extent are the students aware of the government's Prevent strategy?; 2) How do the students think the Prevent strategy will impact their experience of higher education?; 3) What do these students think about the Prevent strategy and its effectiveness in combating terrorism?; and 4) Has the Prevent strategy had any influence on their sense of personal and national identity?
Positive outcomes	1) Participants had a general understanding of Prevent; 2) One student felt Prevent enhanced his/her identity as a British Muslim.
Negative outcomes	1) None of the participants believed Prevent was effective or would ensure that students are not radicalized; 2) The majority of participants believed that Prevent failed to understand the root causes of terrorism and could use more effective strategies; 3) Most felt that Prevent encourages Islamophobia and suspicion of young Muslims, that it is clearly focused on Muslims, and not—as stated by the government—on a broad range of groups that might be involved in terrorism; 4) Several were worried about possible negative repercussions on Muslim students' university experience (such as feeling isolated, becoming extra vigilant about what they say, and discourage them from going to university); 5) Three participants said that Prevent made them feel like they did not belong in Britain and made Muslims feel that they are an isolated and monitored group; 6) One participant described Prevent as institutionally racist.
Overall outcome of the program	Negative.
Limitations (authors)	1) Low response rate; 2) Small, unrepresentative sample; 3) Researchers had no way of knowing which universities the participants attended.
Limitations (team)	Lack of details about the sample.
Quality of study (/10)	5

---

**Table S27**

*Summary of Evidence*

Study	Lakhani (2012)   Targeted primary and secondary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Program and country	Prevent, UK.
Objectives of the program	<i>Five main objectives:</i> 1) Challenge the ideology behind violent extremism and support mainstream voices; 2) Disrupt those who promote violent extremism and support the places where they operate; 3) Support individuals who are vulnerable to recruitment or have already been recruited by violent extremists; 4) Increase the resilience of communities to violent extremism; 5) Address the grievances which ideologues are exploiting. <i>Two specific objectives:</i> 1) Develop supporting intelligence, analysis, and information; 2) Improve strategic communication.
Sample characteristics	<i>56 male participants recruited through snowball sampling:</i> 12 members of the Muslim community; 31 individuals involved with this community (e.g., imams, representatives); one minister; two high-level public servants; three government employees; one police officer; two university teachers; and four researchers. <i>Respondents were categorized into two groups:</i> 1) informed informants (individuals conducting deradicalization and counter-radicalization work at the grassroots level within particular local Muslim communities) and 2) community members (members within four distinct local Muslim communities who were not, to the author’s knowledge, directly exposed to those with extremist beliefs).
Methods: data collection, procedure, and measures	<i>Data collection:</i> Data was gathered over a nine-month period through in-depth, semi-structured interviews across England. Several respondents were interviewed multiple times. <i>Data analysis:</i> Transcriptions of the interviews (produced by the author using Express Scribe) were analyzed using a combination of both thematic and comparative analyses. NVivo 8 was used for qualitative analysis.
Positive outcomes	A very small minority of grassroots groups believed many elements of the Prevent strategy were crucial to their work to provide a stronger support structure for at-risk individuals.
Negative outcomes	1) <i>Funding issues:</i> Money invested through the Prevent Strategy was being wasted because many of the funded projects were far removed from the overarching aims of Prevent. Local authorities lacked knowledge and confidence on how to allocate funding for projects run by non-state actors. Local authorities were accused of funding groups with whom they already had established networks, regardless of whether these organizations had the capacity, knowledge, or experience to achieve the aims of Prevent. Local authorities were opting to fund projects which seemed to be the safest, easiest, and most risk-averse. There was a disconnect between local and central governments with a lack of specified guidance from central to local. Finally, participants felt that the government was “throwing money at the issue” in order to be seen as actively attempting to reduce the threat. 2) <i>Community confusion:</i> Participants found it difficult to see any obvious correlations between the commissioned projects they knew and the end goal of Prevent, due to blurred lines between community cohesion projects and counter-terrorism work. Terms such as “terrorism,” “radicalization,” and “violent extremism” were being used under the Prevent banner when in reality, many projects had very little, if any, meaningful connections with these issues. 3) <i>Intelligence gathering/spying:</i> Prevent was perceived as being used as an intelligence-gathering or spying tool for the State. Many feared that these methods, when coupled with other counter-terrorism legislations (e.g., detention without charge), could potentially disrupt the lives of individuals who were later released without charge. Muslim communities were looking at one another with suspicion, causing an element of distrust and apprehension. Half of the grassroots respondents admitted they either regretted receiving Prevent funding, subsequently refused it, or attempted to conceal it from their communities.
Overall outcome of the program	Negative.
Limitations (authors)	1) Lack of trust towards the researcher; 2) Unwillingness to discuss sensitive issues around the topic of terrorism.
Limitations (team)	1) Poor reporting of sample characteristics and research methodology; 2) Evaluation based on participants who did not go through the program; 3) Potential conflict of interest in the choice of participants (e.g., ministers and government employees); 4) Lack of female participants.

Study	Lakhani (2012)   Targeted primary and secondary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Quality of study (/10)	6

**Table S28**

*Summary of Evidence*

Study	Younis & Jadhav (2019)   Targeted primary and secondary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Program and country	Prevent (in health care), UK.
Objectives of the program	Identify and report patients who show signs of vulnerability towards radicalization.
Sample characteristics	<i>16 National Health Service staff:</i> 10 psychiatrists, three psychologists, two general practitioners, and one manager; nine men and seven women; nine Muslim and seven non-Muslim; 10 ethnic minority and six White British.
Methods: data collection, procedure, and measures	<i>Data collection:</i> All participants were recruited via snowballing. Semi-structured, open-ended interviews were carried out in person, as well as over the phone, and lasted between 30 minutes to two hours. A two-way dialogue was used to unpack participants' experiences of Prevent training and its translation into practice. <i>Data analysis:</i> A thematic content analysis was used to measure the narratives, where a mind map was constructed to connect themes to particular social contexts.
Positive outcomes	None reported.
Negative outcomes	1) Fear and moralizing discourse intrinsic to Prevent training; 2) Self-censorship among health care staff, more prominently for Muslim participants, who experienced anxiety and fear about speaking out during training; 4) Perception of Prevent as a racist policy which first and foremost targets Muslim populations; 5) Moral distress, anger, and lack of trust arising from structural issues within the National Health Services, which were amplified by integrating Prevent training.
Overall outcome of the program	Negative.
Limitations (authors)	1) Most participants already held critical positions towards Prevent; 2) Small number of participants; 3) Lack of delineating between various health professionals participating in the study; 4) Prevent training sessions may have differed significantly during the ethnographic fieldwork.
Limitations (team)	None.
Quality of study (/10)	5

**Table S29**

*Summary of Evidence*

Study	McDonald & Mir (2011)   Targeted primary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Program and country	Prevent (Pathfinder), UK.
Objectives of the program	Improve mutual understanding on issues of policing, crime, and community safety between police, stakeholders, and select individuals from Black and minority ethnic communities residing in London. Improve policy development and service delivery for communities in the future.
Sample characteristics	<i>1<sup>st</sup> phase:</i> 1,149 community residents from five boroughs: Newham (Tamil Sri Lankan), Tower Hamlets (Bangladeshi), Redbridge (Pakistani), Haringey (Turkish/Kurdish and Turkish/Cypriot), and Ealing (Somali). 54% men, 46% women; average age < 30 years old. <i>2<sup>nd</sup> phase:</i> 48 Muslim community members of 10 different ethnicities among participants that were recruited in the first phase.
Methods: data collection, procedure, and measures	<i>Qualitative data collection:</i> Semi-structured questionnaires, one-on-one interviews, and expert briefings. <i>1<sup>st</sup> phase:</i> Local consultations in all five boroughs using semi-structured questionnaires to gather

Study	McDonald & Mir (2011)   Targeted primary prevention   Violent Islamist radicalization
Positive outcomes	<p>feedback from residents on a range of concerns about local crime, community safety, and local policing.</p> <p><i>2<sup>nd</sup> phase:</i> More in-depth research (one-on-one interviews) on issues that emerged in the first phase.</p> <p>1) Decreased sense of suspicion and anxiety because of inter-group contact; 2) Better relations between Muslims (and other communities) and the police where mutual understanding and engagement had previously been low.</p>
Negative outcomes	<p><i>1<sup>st</sup> phase:</i> Participants expressed a number of issues afflicting their communities, which included: 1) a lack of trust and confidence in policing; 2) hate crimes and Islamophobia; 3) hidden crimes (such as domestic violence, forced marriage, and drug use); 4) youth crimes and gangs, and 5) vulnerability of young people to gang recruitment.</p> <p><i>2<sup>nd</sup> phase:</i> Focused more precisely on the issue of Al-Qaeda-influenced terrorism, participants felt the Prevent program: 1) was excessively focused on their community; 2) led to a strong sense of discrimination; 3) decreased community trust and confidence in the police leading to under-reports to the police; 4) described the Muslim community as a single-faith group which tended to alienate this community; and 5) was discriminatory and institutionally racist. Finally, 6) police intervention was not seen as a helpful tool for prevention with discontent expressed by Muslim respondents on account of unfair and discriminatory “stop and search” incidents experienced in their communities.</p>
Overall outcome of the program	Negative.
Limitations (authors)	<i>Pre-held attitudes of participants:</i> 1) Lack of community trust in the police; 2) The subject of Prevent was itself already contentious, especially within Muslim communities.
Limitations (team)	The interviews in the second phase, led by volunteers from the same communities as the participants, may have led to biases and created obstacles to the participants’ ability to freely express their opinions.
Quality of study (/10)	6

### North America (Positive Outcomes)

**Table S30**

*Summary of Evidence*

Study	Castillo (2015)   Primary prevention   General violent radicalization
Program and country	Los Angeles Police Department’s (LAPD) iWatch Anti-Terrorism Program, USA.
Objectives of the program	Use community-oriented policing programs to foster positive relationships among community members and law enforcement as a means of creating partnerships to gather information about suspicious terrorist behavior.
Sample characteristics	10 LAPD officers (eight men, two women; between 30 and 51 years old; seven patrol-level officers and 3 full-time supervisors) and eight community members (four men, four women; between 30 and 67 years old; education ranging from high school to graduate). All participants were purposefully recruited based on their familiarity with the iWatch program.
Methods: data collection, procedure, and measures	<p><i>Qualitative explanatory single-case study:</i> 18 one-on-one semi-structured interviews comprising 31 open-ended questions, administered face-to-face or over the telephone across a period of eight weeks. Interview questions were field-tested by two anti-terrorism professionals with experience in the field of law enforcement and research.</p> <p><i>Data analysis:</i> Transcriptions of the interviews were analyzed through a constant comparative method to identify emerging codes, which were then sorted into themes concerning participants’ perceptions of the iWatch program.</p>
Positive outcomes	1) iWatch was seen as a valuable program for anti-terrorism purposes; 2) Community policing was seen as an effective tool against terrorism; 3) Law enforcement education was perceived positively; 4) iWatch was thought to create effective guardians within the community who would be able to work with law enforcement professionals to report suspicious terrorist activities; 5)

Study	Castillo (2015)   Primary prevention   General violent radicalization
Negative outcomes	Feelings of empowerment, acknowledgement, and mutual trust were associated with iWatch. 1) Federal government failed to provide specific guidelines for anti-terrorism in the US; 2) Lack of communication regarding anti-terror guidelines/programs between the federal government, law enforcement, and community.
Overall outcome of the program	Positive.
Limitations (authors)	1) Selection of a very specific population and site; 2) Findings limited in scope/participants/geographic region, therefore, not applicable to other contexts; 3) Methodology did not account for existing views and biases of participants and researchers.
Limitations (team)	Potential conflict of interest in the choice of participants (e.g., police officers).
Quality of study (/10)	9

**Table S31**

*Summary of Evidence*

Study	Helmus & Klein (2019)   Secondary prevention   Islamist and far-right radicalization
Program and country	Redirect Method, USA.
Objectives of the program	<i>Main objective:</i> Prevent unobstructed access to extremist content. <i>Specific objective:</i> Expose individuals searching for violent extremist content on Google to an ad that redirects them to counternarrative videos.
Sample characteristics	Google AdWord technology was used to identify Google searches in the US for violent radical content. Those who did the searches were subsequently exposed to counternarrative videos in the search results. 216,221 searches were identified during the duration of the program.
Methods: data collection, procedure, and measures	Descriptive statistics about the number of searches for violent radical content and the number of clicks on counternarrative videos.
Positive outcomes	The campaign effectively exposed individuals searching for violent jihadist or far-right content to videos offering alternative narratives. Among those exposed, 2.39% clicked on a link leading to a counternarrative video. This result is on par with industry standards in web advertising. The campaign was more successful in placing Google ads and CVE videos in front of users who searched for violent jihadist content than in front of individuals who searched for far-right extremist content. In addition, more users looking for violent jihadist content (3.19%) clicked on counternarrative links than those looking for far-right content (2.22%).
Negative outcomes	None reported.
Overall outcome of the program	Positive.
Limitations (authors)	Partial evaluation that did not assess the impact of the counternarrative videos on users' attitudes and behaviors.
Limitations (team)	1) Not enough information about the methods, namely the content of counternarrative videos, and by whom they were produced; 2) No information about the keywords that were used to trigger the Redirect method.
Quality of study (/10)	7



**Table S32**

*Summary of Evidence*

Study	Williams et al. (2016)   Primary prevention   General violent radicalization
Program and country	World Organization for Resource Development (WORDE), USA.
Objectives of the program	<i>Main objective:</i> Create and maintain networks of civically engaged individuals who are sensitized to violent extremism and who have proactive, cooperative relationships with local social services and law enforcement agencies. <i>Specific objectives:</i> Promote volunteerism, youth civic engagement, cross-race/cross-religion social integration, and family relationship building.
Sample characteristics	<i>179 youth and adults in Montgomery County, Maryland.</i> These individuals fell in one of two categories. The first was comprised of those who had participated in any of WORDE’s programs ( $n = 133$ ). To ensure data was collected across demographic categories, a stratified random sample was selected from the list of interested participants. The second category was comprised of 46 individuals who reported participation in volunteerism or multicultural events, but never with WORDE. These participants were recruited by interfaith and public-school partners in Montgomery County, as well as in electronic bulletin boards (Facebook, Craigslist, Google groups). <i>Both groups were statistically matched with respect to nine factors:</i> 1) religiosity; 2) religious dogmatism; 3) political extremism; 4) amped political extremism; 5) emotional stability; 6) historical loss; 7) modern racism; 8) resiliency and coping; and 9) trust in police. No additional demographic information was provided on the participants.
Methods: data collection, procedure, and measures	<i>Data collection:</i> Focus groups were held with individuals who participated in WORDE volunteer-service or multicultural programs, where the researchers asked about motivations to participate and perceived benefits. The various answers were distilled into categories that the research team considered PVE-relevant: 1) feeling welcomed; 2) feeling part of something bigger than oneself; 3) feeling a sense of teamwork; 4) making friendships beyond the project; 5) making friends with people from other races; 6) feeling useful; 7) having responsibilities; 8) having leadership responsibilities; 9) feeling a sense of purpose; 10) feeling free of peer pressure; 11) feeling accepted; 12) not feeling lonely; 13) not feeling afraid to talk to others; and 14) learning about other cultures. <i>Data analysis:</i> Employing time-series analyses, change in attendance to PVE program events was also tested. Combined to factor analyses, this allowed the authors to predict individuals’ future participation in activities and programs. Additionally, to compare those who had participated in WORDE with those who volunteered in other programs or multicultural events, propensity-score matched analyses were employed.
Positive outcomes	1) Participants felt the project had its intended effects on 12 of the 14 outcomes believed to be relevant to PVE; 2) No discernable iatrogenic effects.
Negative outcomes	1) Two outcomes scored below the midpoint (making friends with people from other races and having leadership responsibilities); 2) None of the outcomes were significantly better in comparison to the subsample of participants who volunteered or participated in multicultural events other than WORDE.
Overall outcome of the program	Positive.
Limitations (authors)	1) Some secondary PVE projects under WORDE could not be implemented during data collection and thus were not included in this evaluation; 2) Social desirability bias may have affected responses and was not controlled for; 3) Findings may not be generalizable; 4) Findings rely on inferential statistics; 5) Insufficient data (i.e., events/time points) to yield any discernable patterns or trends over time regarding the size of attendance at WORDE’s various programs.
Limitations (team)	1) Lack of demographic information; 2) Compares WORDE participants’ responses to those of individuals who have taken part in similar projects rather than a fully-fledged control group.
Quality of study (/10)	7

## North America (Mixed Outcomes)

**Table S33**

*Summary of Evidence*

Study	Campbell III (2011)   Primary prevention   General violent radicalization
Program and country	See Something, Say Something, USA.
Objectives of the program	1) Make the public more aware of tactics used by terrorists; 2) Keep the public more informed of threats; 3) Empower the public to report suspicious activities to the proper authorities; 4) Work closely with state and local authorities, as well as community groups, to fight crime and terrorism.
Sample characteristics	A total of 25 individuals participated in this study, separated into two groups. <i>Government subsample (n = 10)</i> : Department of Defense employees were recruited using both a purposive and snowball sampling technique. Half of these participants were females, and the mean age was 48.8 years old, with participants ranging from 41 to 61 years old. All participants but one were Caucasian. <i>College students subsample (n = 15)</i> : Students were recruited through convenience sampling in communication department classes at a Mid-Atlantic university. 12 participants were women, and three were men. The mean age of this subsample was 22.4 years old, with individuals ranging between 18 and 33 years old. Five students were Caucasian, four were Afro-American, three were Asian, one was East-Indian, one was Persian, and one was Middle Eastern.
Methods: data collection, procedure, and measures	<i>Data collection</i> : The author conducted 25 in-depth semi-structured interviews, using a protocol pre-tested with two graduate students in communication. The interviews asked basic demographic questions and how the participant made meaning of terrorism, counter-terrorism, and campaign messages. Detailed transcriptions of the recordings were made. <i>Data analysis</i> : Using a grounded theory approach, the author looked for patterns, concepts, themes, and ideas that emerged from the data.
Positive outcomes	1) A sense of empowerment due to giving citizens the ability to do something; 2) Raising awareness and increasing vigilance; 3) Informing the public to recognize domestic terrorism as a threat and challenging preconceived associations of terrorism with Middle Easterners (or Islam); 4) The campaign messages had a somewhat greater impact on young adults.
Negative outcomes	1) Participants felt that the Department of Homeland Security should do more to publicize the campaign. All were receptive to the messages, but few had ever heard of it; 2) Although they felt they should be involved in the campaign, the messages had a smaller impact on government employees.
Overall outcome of the program	Mixed.
Limitations (authors)	1) The author conducting the interviews can lead to biases in the data; 2) Because the government subsample was mostly unaware of the campaign, it could not be considered as the “internal public” subsample, which the author would have wanted. Therefore, the study became a comparison of two external publics: the government and young adults.
Limitations (team)	1) Small sample size limits generalizability; 2) No detailed qualitative results were reported—only positive and convenient quotes selected by the author; 3) Lack of precision in the result section: subjective terms (e.g., “most,” “a majority,” “many”) were used instead of clear numbers and statistics; 4) No description of the content of the campaign videos and press releases, which could have helped to understand why the campaign was unknown to most participants.
Quality of study (/10)	6

### About the JD Journal for Deradicalization

The JD Journal for Deradicalization is the world's only peer reviewed periodical for the theory and practice of deradicalization with a wide international audience. Named an [“essential journal of our times”](#) (Cheryl LaGuardia, Harvard University) the JD's editorial board of expert advisors includes some of the most renowned scholars in the field of deradicalization studies, such as Prof. Dr. John G. Horgan (Georgia State University); Prof. Dr. Tore Bjørgo (Norwegian Police University College); Prof. Dr. Mark Dechesne (Leiden University); Prof. Dr. Cynthia Miller-Idriss (American University Washington D.C.); Prof. Dr. Julie Chernov Hwang (Goucher College); Prof. Dr. Marco Lombardi, (Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore Milano); Dr. Paul Jackson (University of Northampton); Professor Michael Freeden, (University of Nottingham); Professor Hamed El-Sa'id (Manchester Metropolitan University); Prof. Sadeq Rahimi (University of Saskatchewan, Harvard Medical School), Dr. Omar Ashour (University of Exeter), Prof. Neil Ferguson (Liverpool Hope University), Prof. Sarah Marsden (Lancaster University), Prof. Maura Conway (Dublin City University), Dr. Kurt Braddock (American University Washington D.C.), Dr. Michael J. Williams (The Science of P/CVE), Dr. Mary Beth Altier (New York University) and Dr. Aaron Y. Zelin (Washington Institute for Near East Policy), Prof. Dr. Adrian Cherney (University of Queensland).

For more information please see: [www.journal-derad.com](http://www.journal-derad.com)

Twitter: @JD\_JournalDerad

Facebook: [www.facebook.com/deradicalisation](https://www.facebook.com/deradicalisation)

The JD Journal for Deradicalization is a proud member of the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ).

ISSN: 2363-9849

Editor in Chief: Daniel Koehler