



The author(s) shown below used Federal funding provided by the U.S. Department of Justice to prepare the following resource:

Document Title: Using Gatekeeper Training as a CVE Tool: Replication and Evaluation of a Gatekeeper Program in Prince George's County

Author(s): Analytic Services Inc. (ANSER)

Document Number: 256022

Date Received: January 2021

Award Number: 2016-ZA-BX-K003

This resource has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. This resource is being made publically available through the Office of Justice Programs' National Criminal Justice Reference Service.

Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

DRAFT SUMMARY OVERVIEW REPORT

Introduction (See *Appendix 1: Study Abstract*)

Background. ANSER received an NIJ grant to evaluate the Global Citizen’s Forum (GCF, See *Appendix 2: The GCF Program*). The World Organization for Resource Development and Education (WORDE) developed GCF in response to an NIJ-funded research (Williams, Horgan & Evans 2016) that indicated a peer gatekeeping program would be a promising tool to address violent extremism (VE) among youth (See *Appendix 3: Glossary of Key Terms*). During its independent analysis, ANSER worked with WORDE as well as the Take Charge Program (See *Appendix 4: The Study Team*).

Study Purpose. This study addressed two research questions: (1) Does GCF offer an effective youth gatekeeper training to address VE? (2) Can others replicate the GCF program in their communities? The evaluation considered short-term effects on participants’ knowledge, attitudes and gatekeeper efficacy in a VE context. The study team also conducted a cost analysis and examined all components of GCF implementation to develop a replication framework. The framework documents implementation steps and lessons-learned, and includes all supporting materials needed for replication.

Evaluation Design & Implementation

Design Overview. The GCF study relied on quasi-experimental design with pre/post testing of treatment and control groups, focus group discussions, analysis of implementation observations, and a financial cost analysis. An external IRB approved the study design, materials and procedures.

Measures. The survey instrument followed established elements of a gatekeeper training evaluation and drew largely upon instruments used by others to evaluate gatekeeper training programs in other areas (Organizational Research Services 2002; Wyman et al. 2008; Tompkins and Witt 2009).

Accordingly, the survey sought to assess VE-related changes in knowledge, attitudes and self-appraisal of gatekeeper efficacy (See *Appendix 5: Survey Questions and Variable Definitions*). The study did not

assess long-term GCF effects; therefore, the survey did not include questions on behaviors. Individuals were surveyed both before (“baseline”) and after (“endline”) the GCF; the endline survey included questions on training satisfaction and experiences, as applicable.

Sample. At the outset, we determined that a sample size of 100 participants would, even with some allowance for attrition, provide a good statistical measure of how well the data reject the null hypothesis (i.e., the hypothesis that the GCF program has no effect on assessment areas). The recruitment efforts targeted high school students aged 14 to 17 year old and proficient in English, with no restrictions on gender, ethnicity, race or other demographic attributes. Participants voluntarily joined the study and executed consent forms. Although the study team collected a total of 72 such forms, there were significant attrition problems both before and during the program implementation due to unforeseen developments in one of the participating schools (see the section on *Implementation Challenges*). Only 45 of the 72 students were available at the start of the GCF program. Of these, just 40 completed the baseline survey with 29 in the treatment (GCF) group and 11 in the control group. Attrition during the program reduced the total number of participants by another 9; additionally, 16 surveys were discarded based on a quality screening. The final sample included 15 participants, with 12 in the GCF group and 3 in the control group (See *Appendix 6: Breakdown of Study Sample.*)

Procedure. The GCF program was implemented in two private high schools in Prince George’s County, Maryland from February to May 2019. To coordinate with schools’ academic and sports schedules, the curriculum was compressed from 10 modules to 8 modules and implemented through 90-minute weekly sessions. The GCF group attended the training, completing the baseline/endline surveys within one week of program start/end dates. The control group did not participate in the GCF training, but completed the same surveys following the same timeline.

Implementation Challenges. The implementation of the GCF program encountered a number of challenges. Program implementation efforts shifted from public to private schools mid-academic year

in 2018 as a result of the complications in working with the public school system. Existing student commitments to other activities made it difficult to achieve and maintain the desired sample size. There were also other, completely unexpected developments. For example, many students who initially joined the GCF study were forced to withdraw when their school was split into two schools and they were transferred to the “other” (non-participating) institution. These challenges forced the study team to make changes in the research design (e.g., nonrandom control group and unequal distribution between groups) in an effort to maintain the sample size. Despite the team’s best efforts, however, the final sample was too small. In particular, the negligible control group participation allowed only for exploratory research.

Study Findings

Limitations. The above implementation challenges and the resulting design problems (i.e., small study sample; small and nonrandom control group) decreased the statistical power of this study. First, this assessment must be considered a “low-power study” – defined as a study in which the standard error of the parameter estimate exceeds the size of the true, underlying effect. Such studies suffer from greater likelihood of Type II error and cannot reliably distinguish between a real effect and a random variation, or a variation induced by confounding variables- even when results are statistically significant. Also, problems with control group design and size decrease our ability to attribute any difference in outcomes between two groups to the intervention under study. Therefore, low statistical power (including a non-diverse sample) hinders our ability to extrapolate results to the overall population. In other words, the comparisons (within and between groups) reported in this study cannot establish reliable conclusions about the GCF program’s effects. Second, given the aforementioned limitations, the use of advanced multivariate tests was not appropriate; we only conducted some simple statistical tests to gain a preliminary sense of the data collected. In sum, the results documented below should not be considered reliable or conclusive; instead, they should be interpreted as preliminary

findings that require further testing and validation by a larger study. We present these findings to document the analysis results, generate hypotheses and spark interest for a future iteration of this research with a more robust design.

Preliminary Analysis. Initial analysis assessed potential differences between various sample groupings. Independent sample t-tests and chi-square tests showed that there were no major preexisting differences in demographic and background characteristics between the GCF and control groups other than the grade level (See *Appendix 7: Sample Characteristics of GCF and Control Group Participants*). In addition, no differences were found between the GCF and control group participants who completed only the baseline survey and those who completed both surveys.

Impact Analysis. The study team conducted independent sample t-tests to gain an initial understanding of the GCF group’s performance relative to that of the control group. The results indicated that there were no statistically significant improvements in the GCF group’s scores in any of the areas assessed (See *Appendix 8: Participants’ Average Change in Scores*). However, given the extremely low number of control group participants (n=3), a comparison of the baseline/endline scores within the GCF group is a more meaningful assessment. The results of the paired sample t-tests (**Table 1**) show that GCF group participants experienced small but statistically significant improvements in *perceived* and *overall knowledge*, and *attitudes*. These results are in agreement with focus group discussions and

Variable	Baseline Scores		Endline Scores		Δ	t	p
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Factual Knowledge	0.76	0.07	0.80	0.13	0.03	-1.40	n.s.
Perceived Knowledge	0.38	0.23	0.67	0.15	0.29	-4.84	0.001
Applied Knowledge	0.67	0.14	0.66	0.13	0	0.14	n.s.
Knowledge	0.60	0.09	0.71	0.07	0.10	-3.68	0.004
Attitudes	0.65	0.18	0.73	0.14	0.08	-2.46	0.031
Efficacy	0.64	0.19	0.65	0.08	0.01	-0.16	n.s.
Global Citizenship	0.84	0.16	0.89	0.16	0.04	-0.80	n.s.

observations of the evaluation team. The lack of significant gains in *applied knowledge* (which measures gatekeeper skills) and *efficacy* is important to note and may be a result of the observed issues with the curriculum or low implementation fidelity, particularly regarding the experiential learning components of the curriculum (See the section on *Qualitative Analysis and Observations*).

We also conducted a number of paired sample t-tests to see whether attendance in VE-related sessions (GCF training modules 3 and 4) or the overall number of sessions attended had a relationship to the average change in scores within the GCF group. These tests indicated that attendance in the session covering Module 3 of the GCF curriculum had a statistically significant relationship to the average change in factual knowledge score. This is not surprising given that one of the learning objectives of Module 3 is to convey VE-related definitions and facts. There was no difference, however, in average change in GCF group scores between participants who attended four or fewer sessions and those who attended five or more sessions. This may be due to the limiting effects of a small sample or the mutually reinforcing design of the GCF modules or the specific modules attended.

Youth Perception of VE and VE Gatekeeping. At endline, 50% of the GCF participants disagreed or strongly disagreed that VE was a problem in their community. Most GCF participants rated their engagement in VE gatekeeping activities as likely or very likely, indicating they would: go with peers to get help (83%), talk to a trusted adult (75%), get more information on peers' intentions and plans (75%), talk to peers about their desire (58%), call a crisis hotline (58%), and encourage peers to get help (50%). To a question about whether anything would prevent them from engaging in gatekeeping practices, 17% of the participants responded affirmatively citing potential risk to self and laziness. In response to a question on gatekeeping reluctance, 25% agreed or strongly agreed that seeking help for a friend will make things worse while 17% agreed or strongly agreed that it will put them at risk.

Program Satisfaction. Training participants rated the GCF program highly. 83% of the participants agreed or strongly agreed that the training was interesting and informative. An overwhelming majority

of the participants (91%) agreed or strongly agreed that the training met their expectations and that they would recommend the training to a friend. In implementing a training program like GCF, one concern may be exposing youth to uncomfortable topics. According to the survey responses, 58% of the GCF participants disagreed that the training subjects made them feel uncomfortable, with 33% not taking a particular position. All participants (100%) indicated that they felt comfortable articulating their opinions/experiences in the group setting. Finally, 83% of the participants reported feeling more confident in their ability to deal with their peers' problems.

Focus Group Results. Focus group discussions, with a subsample of the GCF group, indicated that participation in GCF was driven mainly by references by key adults (e.g., parents and counselors), the appeal of rewards (i.e., snacks and gift cards), desire to strengthen college applications, and personal interest in curriculum topics. Broader positive implications of GCF, as perceived by the focus group participants, included improvement in public speaking and social interaction skills, as well as closer ties with peers. Missing other afterschool activities was the only negative consequence reported. When participants reflected on the VE portion of the GCF training, they discussed perceived improvements in understanding of the motivations behind VE incidents, risk awareness, desire to be an upstander, and identification of trusted adults in various risk scenarios. Some GCF participants reported that they had already applied or were planning to apply gatekeeper and advocacy skills in non-VE contexts. Some reasons cited for potential gatekeeping reluctance included the fear of making things worse, losing peer trust, and the potential for emotional or physical harm. While participants were able to discuss differences between extremist thought and action, some conceptual confusion persisted in the differentiation between VE and other forms of violence.

Cost Analysis. Although the original research design included GCF program's cost-effectiveness analysis, such advanced cost assessment is not appropriate at this time given this study's inability to establish the effectiveness of the GCF program. As an alternative, Table 2 presents the financial cost

analysis of the GCF program pertaining to the current and potential future implementations. The latter portion of the cost analysis is likely more informative to future implementations as it both reflects the significant cost reduction expected due to the improvements in program design and execution and applies national averages in personnel salary rates.

Table2: Cost Analysis of the GCF Program

Categories	Cost Type	Current Implementation			Future Implementation		
		Unit Cost (\$)	Quantity	Total Cost (\$)	Unit Cost (\$)	Quantity	Total Cost (\$)
Personnel	Implementation Coordinators	71.35/hour	1731.5	123542.53	NA	0	0
	Program Consultant	31.43/hour	1596	71456.11	TBD	100	TBD
	Supervision & Finance	100.00/hour	852.5	85250.00	TBD	50	TBD
	GCF Program Coordinator	125.00/hour	382.5	47812.50	TBD	120	TBD
	Facilitator/Instructor	78.13/hour	166.5	13009.00	TBD	85	TBD
Recruitment	Recruitment Event Snacks			150.00	TBD	TBD	TBD
	Recruitment Materials & Printing (posters, fliers)			500.00	TBD	TBD	TBD
	Room and Maintenance			0.00	NA	0	0
Training	Equipment (computer, projector, cables etc.)			0.00	NA	0	0
	GCF Session Snacks	4.00/person/session	29 person/8 session	928.00	4.00/person/session	15 person/8 session	TBD
	Incentive Payments to Participants	5.00/person/session	29 person/8 session	1160.00	5.00/person/session	15 person/8 session	TBD
	GCF Materials (pen, paper, certificates)	5.00/person	29 person /1 training	145.00	5.00/person	15 person/1 training	TBD
Transportation	Busses			0.00	NA	0	0
				343953.14			TBD

Notes: (1) To calculate each cost, multiply unit cost by quantity. (2) The use of available classroom, equipment and transportation means required no additional cost. (3) Current implementation cost covers activities in two schools; future implementation assumes training in one school. (4) Personnel unit cost excludes indirect costs (i.e., fringe and overhead). (5) Costs reported exclude evaluation-related expenses (e.g., data analysis, grant management, and IRB approval).

Qualitative Analysis and Observations

Using several qualitative sources, the study team formulated a number of insights to guide future implementation of the GCF program or its derivatives.¹

(1) *Teaching GCF as part of an evaluation created school participation and implementation challenges.* Initial implementation in a public school system was disrupted due to approval requirements by the Department of Testing, Research & Evaluation. All schools (both public and private) were hesitant about committing to certain aspects of the evaluation such as the target sample size of 100 participants and an in-depth consent form.

¹ The study team collected qualitative information throughout the conduct of the study, including real time observations captured by the entire team (WORDE, TCP and ANSER) in the form of activity evaluation forms, observations collected on GCF session by the evaluation team, insights gleaned from the weekly review sessions between WORDE and TCP during the implementation, and information collected from the post-implementation hot wash with all team members.

(2) *School administrators did not see the need for VE instruction.* While schools could see the benefits of a positive youth development program, they did not feel their community had an issue with VE. It was also apparent in all discussions with school and county personnel that VE is a sensitive topic, which made the proposal to implement a program like GCF all the more difficult.

(3) *VE is a difficult concept to understand and teach for individuals without an academic or professional experience in VE or a related field.* During the train-the-trainer session, it became evident that the GCF facilitators failed to fully understand certain nuanced VE concepts. Even after additional sessions and some remedial measures, the evaluation team observed problems in teaching related elements of the VE modules. This suggests the difficulty of training GCF facilitators and thus indicates that community service providers may struggle replicating the GCF program.

(4) *The instructor's strong facilitation skills enabled an open and safe environment for discussion and participation.* Participants were able to freely share their opinions and personal stories during sessions, which resulted in active participation and group cohesion. The facilitator was especially adept at handling discussions regarding sexual predation, abortion, suicide, depression and race in a factual and sensitive manner.

(5) *The full curriculum was not taught as intended resulting in reduced implementation fidelity.* In any given module, not all information was presented and not all activities were completed as outlined in the lesson plan. This was due, in part, to a reduced session time (i.e., student late arrivals), as well as the facilitator's lack of preparation and inability to prioritize content. Instruction often focused too heavily on definitions at the expense of the facilitated, experiential learning outlined in the curriculum.

(6) *Participants appeared to have improved their awareness of VE and the characteristics of an upstander, but did not acquire the intended level of VE-specific knowledge or skills.* Students were able to consistently define words such as culture, ideology, upstander, bystander, grooming, and bullying. Participants also demonstrated increased understanding of why individuals might be vulnerable to

risky behaviors, and they were able to confidently identify trusted adults. Conversely, when presented with the VE definition and other related terms (e.g., radicalization, mobilization) students understood the concepts, but were unable to consistently define them independently in subsequent lessons.

Participants could provide examples of both extremist groups and VE incidents. They were unable, however, to correctly substantiate why or why not an incident was considered VE. Students often confused VE with other forms of interpersonal violence or simplified VE to violence by one group (racial or religious) against another. Furthermore, while students developed the general attitudes and skills of an upstander when addressing peers facing crisis (i.e., bullying or depression), they did not discuss or practice these skills in a specific VE context.

(7) *As a VE peer-gatekeeping program, GCF has an ambitious curriculum.* Most gatekeeper programs are designed for adults and provide participants with clear warning signs and specific actions to take (Brunette, Ramchand and Ayer 2015, Indelicato, Mirsu-Paun and Griffin 2011, Stuart, Waalen and Haelstromm 2003, Tompkins, Witt and Abraibesh 2010, Wyman et al 2010). VE, however, is a complex topic and lacks a standard set of clear indicators for radicalization established by evidence-based research. As seen in the GCF train-the-trainer sessions, understanding VE can be challenging for adults, let alone high school students who may struggle with VE concepts and recognizing when and how to intervene with peers. GCF also covers a range of topics that may be indirectly related to VE. However, lumping VE with other forms of risky behavior in the context of a gatekeeper training may be problematic as this assumes VE is sufficiently similar in warning signs and reporting situations.

Discussion

Implications for Criminal Justice Policy and Practice in the United States. The study team believes the GCF program may have been easier to implement had it not been part of an evaluation study addressing the sensitive topic of the VE, which resulted in additional scrutiny and approval requirements. This conclusion is relevant to the criminal justice system because any training that

addresses VE might be viewed by school communities with hesitation. For example, a common reaction from school personnel was a belief that they did not have a VE problem in their schools and the broader community and, therefore, did not need VE training. One implication may be that addressing extremism-related violence may be easier if it is part of a broader program that focuses on violence prevention in general rather than presenting VE as a potential risk to youth as the latter might require the implementer to justify the risk.

Future Directions. This study's small sample size and lack of implementation fidelity compromise definitive judgements on GCF's ability to serve as a viable youth VE peer gatekeeping program. However, portions of the GCF curriculum may serve as educational tools for awareness of VE and other risks and development of leadership and advocacy skills. Future implementation and evaluation efforts should consider the following suggestions:

- (1) The effectiveness of the GCF program should be assessed by future evaluation efforts to reach conclusive results. Future research can inquire particularly about the GCF program's effects on VE-related knowledge and attitudes as our preliminary results suggest a potential gain in those areas. Additionally, future evaluations may benefit from including an assessment of GCF's long term effects (i.e., retention of knowledge and behavioral changes). Researchers should consider the challenges we faced when designing their studies (e.g., school participation and student recruitment).
- (2) Derivatives of the GCF program may consider streamlining the curriculum to sharpen its focus and aligning vicarious help-seeking portions with the current state of the VE knowledge.
- (3) Future efforts should also consider including an instructor/teacher familiar with VE rather than one who only has the requisite facilitator skills.

Finally, another interesting possibility would be a comparative evaluation of parallel GCF programs: one targeting youth; the other, adults.

Appendix 1: Study Abstract

This study evaluated Global Citizen’s Forum (GCF), an afterschool youth program designed as a peer gatekeeping program in the area of violent extremism. GCF was implemented in two private high schools in Maryland during spring of 2019. Although the study was designed as a quasi-experimental research with pre/post testing of treatment and control groups, implementation challenges resulted in design problems and a small sample, allowing only for exploratory study. The preliminary results suggest that GCF is associated with some statistically significant gains in participants’ knowledge and attitude. The study also presents team’s qualitative findings as well as GCF replication framework and financial cost analysis. An assessment of the GCF implementation experience and related observations indicates that GCF may be difficult to replicate due to community sensitivities about accepting the violent extremism threat and the ability of service providers to teach the GCF curriculum. For conclusive and reliable results, this study needs to be replicated with participation of a larger sample.

Appendix 2: The Global Citizen’s Forum (GCF) Program

GCF is an afterschool program designed for youth at the high school level, ages 14-17. The GCF curriculum’s core focus is on preventing destructive and violent behaviors. GCF draws from good practices in the positive youth development field to provide young people with knowledge and skills to address a range of challenges (e.g., cyber threats, suicidal ideation, bullying, teen dating violence, gun violence, and VE). While various topics are addressed within the program, GCF was created particularly in response to a perceived need for a youth peer gatekeeper program focusing on VE. Therefore, two modules solely focus on VE, with related terms and issues spread throughout the curriculum. The other subjects covered in GCF act as both building blocks to support participant understanding of extremism and gateway topics to help participants develop the requisite coping and help-seeking skills. GCF teaches students to cultivate empathy, manage stress, improve cross-cultural communication, mitigate and resolve conflict, advocate for positive change and recognize and act when a peer is in crisis. A central message in GCF is encouraging the participants to become *upstanders* rather than *bystanders*.

Appendix 3: Glossary of Key Terms

Bystander: An individual who is hesitant to take action to prevent a negative or destructive act or seek others' assistance.

Gatekeeper: An individual who is trained to identify persons who are at risk of a particular destructive behavior and refer them to supportive resources for help.

Global Citizen: Someone who understands interconnectedness, respects and values diversity, has the ability to challenge injustice, and takes action in personally meaningful ways (U.S. Fund for UNICEF, 2011).

Grooming: Deliberate tactics and strategies used by an individual to identify, prepare, and influence another person towards engaging in abusive relationships and / or destructive behaviors (i.e., joining a gang, joining a violent extremist organization, engaging in illicit sexual activity, etc.).

Mobilization: The process by which radicalized individuals take action to prepare for, participate in or support violent causes.

Radicalization: The process by which individuals come to believe that violence is necessary to achieve social and political change.

Upstander: An individual willing to take a stand for positive change, including helping their peers receive help from a trusted adult.

Violent Extremism: Use of ideologically motivated violence to further political, social, or religious goals.

Violent Extremist: Individuals who enable or commit ideologically motivated violence to further political, social, or religious goals. A range of actors/groups fall under the violent extremism rubric including sovereign citizens, white nationalists/supremacist movements, issue-based extremists (e.g., eco-terrorists), ideologically linked gangs/organized criminal networks, and Islamist extremists (e.g., ISIL- Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, al-Qaeda, and Al-Shabab).

Appendix 4: Study Team

The GCF study team included three organizations who each filled distinct roles:

- *Evaluation and Program Management:* ANSER is a Virginia-based, not-for-profit studies and analyses organization with a mission of public service in the domains of national security, homeland security and public safety.
- *Curriculum Development and Training:* WORDE is a Maryland-based, non-profit, educational organization working to enhance communication and understanding between communities to mitigate social and political conflict.
- *GCF Implementation:* TCP is a Maryland-based, non-profit, community-based organization that works with at-risk youth and their families by providing a wide range of behavior modification, mental health/ education and outreach services.

While ANSER acted as overall project lead for the grant, once classroom instruction actually began, ANSER staff focused solely on evaluation activities in order to maintain analytic integrity and objectivity. WORDE, the GCF developer, did not participate in or influence the independent assessment of the GCF program. WORDE staff updated and compressed the GCF curriculum, conducted the train-the-trainer sessions and provided TCP with support as needed during the GCF program. TCP was responsible for coordinating with the participating schools, recruiting students and securing consent, and implementing the GCF program.

Appendix 5: Survey Questions and Variable Definitions

Variable	Sample item (number of items)	Scale	α
Factual Knowledge	Which of the following are examples of violent extremism? (28 items)	Y/N, T/F	
Perceived Knowledge	Rate your knowledge about: Behaviors associated with radicalization to violence (7 items) ¹	1= <i>Very Low</i> to 5= <i>Very High</i>	0.82
Applied Knowledge	How likely you are to seek help if someone: Verbally supports the actions of a terrorist group. (16 items) ²	1= <i>Very Unlikely</i> to 5= <i>Very Likely</i>	0.69
Knowledge	Arithmetic mean of Factual Knowledge, Perceived Knowledge, and Applied Knowledge variables		
Attitudes	I can contribute to preventing violent extremism. (7 items)	1= <i>Strongly Disagree</i> to 5= <i>Strongly Agree</i>	0.65
Efficacy	I feel comfortable discussing extremism with my friends. (6 items)	1= <i>Strongly Disagree</i> to 5= <i>Strongly Agree</i>	0.65
Global Citizenship	Even though people may be different from one another, they can still be a part of the same community. (2 items)	1= <i>Strongly Disagree</i> to 5= <i>Strongly Agree</i>	0.47

Note. ¹ Five of the seven items were measured on the above five-point scale; two items were rated on the scale 1=*Strongly Disagree* to 5=*Strongly Agree*. ² Eleven of the sixteen items were measured on the above five-point scale; five items were rated on the scale 1=*Very Low* to 5=*Very High*.

Appendix 6: Breakdown of Study Sample by Group and Survey Response

	Sample Completed Baseline Survey	Sample Completed Both Surveys	Sample with Acceptable Surveys*
GCF Group	29	23	12
Control Group	11	8	3
Full Sample	40	31	15

*The survey instrument included trap questions designed to filter participants who did not read the survey thoroughly.

Appendix 7: Sample Characteristics of GCF and Control Group Participants

Sample Characteristics of Treatment and Control Participants

Characteristics	<i>M</i>		<i>t</i>	<i>%</i>		χ^2
	Treatment	Control		Treatment	Control	
Age (in years)	16.73	15.89	n.s.			
Gender						n.s.
Male				25%	0%	
Female				75%	100%	
Ethnicity						n.s.
Black or AA				75%	66%	
Asian or PI				8%	0%	
Hispanic or Latino				0%	0%	
White				0%	0%	
Other Race				16%	0%	
Multiracial				0%	33%	
School						n.s.
School A				50%	100%	
School B				50%	0%	
Grade						15.00**
9 th				50%	0%	
10 th				0%	100%	
11 th				17%	0%	
12 th				33%	0%	
Organized Activities						n.s.
Participate				83%	100%	
Do not participate				17%	0%	
Currently Employed						n.s.
Yes				8%	0%	
No				92%	100%	
Had Peer Mentor Training						n.s.
Yes				7%	8%	
No				80%	75%	
Not Sure				13%	17%	
Participated in VE Training						n.s.
Yes				0%	0%	
No				100%	67%	
Not Sure				0%	33%	
Talked to or sought help for a friend who may be radicalizing or involved with violent extremism						n.s.
Yes, once				25%	0%	
Yes, multiple times				0%	33%	
No, I had such a friend but did not get involved				8%	0%	
No, I never had such a friend				67%	67%	
Gatekeeper Tendencies						
People talk to me about their thoughts and feelings	0.79	0.91	n.s.			
People come to me for advice	0.65	0.92	n.s.			
I enjoy helping when people come to me with personal problems	0.73	0.75	n.s.			
Gatekeeper composite	0.72	0.86	n.s.			

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$

Appendix 8: Treatment and Control Group Participants' Average Change in Scores from Baseline to Endline Surveys

Variable	Treatment Group (<i>n</i> = 12)		Control Group (<i>n</i> = 3)		<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Factual Knowledge	0.033	0.081	-0.048	0.144	1.333	n.s.
Perceived Knowledge	0.287	0.206	0.250	0.412	0.232	n.s.
Applied Knowledge	-0.005	0.123	0.047	0.072	-0.689	n.s.
Knowledge	0.105	0.099	0.083	0.107	0.339	n.s.
Attitudes	0.081	0.114	0.087	0.149	-0.081	n.s.
Efficacy	0.009	0.183	0.139	0.158	-1.124	n.s.
Global Citizenship	0.042	0.179	-0.083	0.072	1.156	n.s.

Appendix 9: References

- Burnette, C., R. Ramchand, and L. Ayer. 2015. *Gatekeeper Training for Suicide Prevention: A Theoretical Model and Review of the Empirical Literature*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR1002.html.
- Indelicato, N. A., A. Mirsu-Paun, and W. D. Griffin. 2011. "Outcomes of a Suicide Prevention Gatekeeper Training on a University Campus," *Journal of College Student Development*, Vol. 52, No. 3, pp. 350–361.
- Organizational Research Services (ORS). 2002. Youth Suicide Prevention Program: Annual Evaluation Report 2001-2002. *Evaluation of Program Training Workshops*. http://yspp.org/downloads/about_yspp/2001-2002Report.pdf. Accessed, July 25, 2017.
- Stuart, C., J. K. Waalen, and E. Haelstromm. 2003. "Many Helping Hearts: An Evaluation of Peer Gatekeeper Training in Suicide Risk Assessment," *Death Studies*, Vol. 27, No. 4, May, pp. 321–333.
- Tompkins, T. L., and J. Witt. 2009. "The Short-Term Effectiveness of a Suicide Prevention Gatekeeper Training Program in a College Setting with Residence Life Advisers," *Journal of Primary Prevention*, Vol. 30, No. 2, March, pp. 131–149.
- Tompkins, T. L., J. Witt, and N. Abraibesh. 2010. "Does a Gatekeeper Suicide Prevention Program Work in a School Setting? Evaluating Training Outcome and Moderators of Effectiveness," *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*, Vol. 40, No. 5, pp. 506–515.
- Williams, Horgan and Evans. 2016. *Evaluation of a Multi-Faceted, U.S. Community-Based, Muslim-Led CVE Program*. <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/249936.pdf>. Accessed September 21, 2019.
- Wyman, P.A., J. Inman, J. Guo, C. H. Brown, W. Cross, K. Schmeelk-Cone and J. B. Pena. 2008. "Randomized Trial of a Gatekeeper program for Suicide Prevention: 1-Year Impact on Secondary School Staff. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 76(1): 104-115.
- Wyman, P. A., C. H. Brown, M. LoMurray, K. Schmeelk-Cone, M. Petrova, Q. Yu, E. Walsh, X. Tu, and W. Wang. 2010. "An Outcome Evaluation of the Sources of Strength Suicide Prevention Program Delivered by Adolescent Peer Leaders in High Schools," *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 100, No. 9, September 2010, pp. 1653–1661.