



NEWSLETTER



Summer 2020



MESSAGE FROM THE BOARD

The world has changed in 2020.

The pandemic coronavirus transformed life as we know it.

The way we interact with each other now, is different.

Not only do we have to accept the existing health risks - many countries also deal with severe economic restrictions. Due to limitations of our personal lives and the lockdown situation, we are suffering from the psychological and economic consequences. Covid-19 also brings existential fears and the loss of financial security. We expected an increase in acts of violence within different fields. Comparative figures on domestic violence in The Netherlands are presented in this newsletter.

Under normal circumstances, AETAP's 13th conference would have taken place in Budapest in 2020 but because of the Covid-19 situation we had to postpone the event to 2021. Like in threat management, the situation is dynamic and we need to observe the status related to Covid-19. We will closely monitor the requirements and recommendations for organising events as our priority is to protect the health of our conference participants, speakers and of course AETAP members.

The new date for AETAP's 13th conference is 19th to 22nd April 2021 and we are currently in the preparation phase. The program will largely remain the same, yet the topics will be adjusted to present the current status. We hope to see you all in Hungary in 2021. Needless to say we'll keep you updated on any developments regarding AETAP's 2021 conference.

On behalf of the AETAP board,

Andrea Wechlin

AETAP President

Karoline Roshdi

AETAP Vice President

STATISTICS ON VIOLENT CRIME AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE IN THE NETHERLANDS

Especially now that countries are suffering the consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic, it is worth exploring the effects the drastic virus countermeasures have on violence rates, especially on domestic violence. There is little doubt that stress, disruption of social and protective networks, loss of income and decreased access to services can exacerbate the risk of violence. A substantial increase of family violence would therefore not at all be surprising. The reality is that many people experience personal and emotional difficulty during these dramatic times, and consequently endure more stress. But not everyone. For example those with a permanent job contract, a stable income and pleasant family life might even experience increased quality of life, spending more time at home with their loved ones, while others suffer greatly. But do the real numbers correspond with these expectations? It is obviously too early to draw hard conclusions, but in this newsletter a few first indications and research results will be presented.

Apart from the COVID-19 situation, insight into the occurrence of violence in society is important for threat assessment professionals. These statistics help us focus on the right topics and guide us to fields where our expertise is needed most. Also, important findings such as that most victims do not report the violence committed against them, underlines the importance of the work we do and should motivate threat assessment professionals to continue their fight against violence and crime.

In this contribution the main focus will lie on the situation in The Netherlands, starting with a general overview of crime and victimisation rates and followed by a focus on domestic violence. In the last section the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the occurrence of family violence will be discussed.

Crime in The Netherlands

The Netherlands currently counts 17.408.573 inhabitants, with a population that has increased during the past 25 years by 12%. In 2018 the Netherlands police registered 766.638 crimes which indicates a 6,1% decrease from the previous year. Figures from our Central Bureau of Statistics corroborate this downward trend with reports of a nearly 50% reduction in registered suspects of crime since 2005.

In 2017 approximately 1 in every 7 Dutch citizens (older than 15) report that in that year a criminal act has been committed against them.

Feeling Safe

People in The Netherlands feel relatively safe. Only one in three Dutch citizens (15 years and older) report that they '*sometimes feel unsafe*'. The group experiencing most feelings of insecurity are young females. More than half of the females in the age range 15-24 years report having experienced feelings of insecurity. In contrast, both males and females of 65 years and above clearly feel more safe compared to all other age categories. Since 2005 the proportion of Dutch citizens '*sometimes feeling unsafe*' has decreased by nearly 30%.

Violent Crime

When focussing specifically on violent crime, researchers report that the total amount of Dutch citizens having experienced violence, property crime and vandalism dropped significantly - by more than half in the time period 2005-2017 (Gielen & Akkermans, 2019). This decrease was the highest for vandalism, followed by property crime and violent crime.

For 2017 it is calculated that 2% of the Dutch population fell victim to a violent crime. This percentage is clearly lower when compared to the percentage of citizens who for instance became a victim of one or more property crimes in that same year (10%).

Notifying the Police

Perhaps the most concerning finding, raising questions about human social interaction but even more about the social, legal and political structures we have established in our society, is the fact that the vast majority of crime committed in our society remains hidden and is never reported. Only in a third (34%) of all cases of committed crime, the police are notified.

31% of victims of property crimes notify the police, but only 19% of victims of violent crime do that. Also, police more often follow up on an official property crime report than they would do when dealing with a violent crime report. One of the factors playing a role could be the availability of forensic evidence.

Newsletter – Summer 2020

24% of victimised Dutch citizens not only notify the police but take it a step further by making an official report. It seems that the number of cases *not* leading to an official report is slowly on the increase. In 2016 exactly a quarter of the total group made an official report, and in 2012, 29% did.

Worth noticing is that in 2018 the Netherlands police reported seeing an increase in the number of registered sexual crimes (7%). An explanation, according to the Dutch police, may lie in the increased attention and openness with regards to sexual violence. It seems that sexual violence has received more attention in society in general but also government and other social organisations addressed this topic by creating more places victims can go to for help nationwide. Those providing care and support to possible victims encourage reporting to the police.

Domestic Violence

Domestic violence is the most extensive form of violence in society and deserves special attention. For the Dutch population (age range 18 - 70 years) approximately 45% report that at some point in their lives they have become a victim of physical, sexual or psychological violence in the domestic arena. Every year around 63.000 cases are reported to our police, but as previously mentioned this covers only a relatively small percentage of the total victim pool.

In her recent online presentation APATAP's president Prof. Lorraine Sheridan showed that 30% of women globally had experienced physical and/or sexual violence perpetrated by an intimate partner at some point during their lifetime (Devries et al., 2013). These researchers also found a considerable variation in rates between different regions of the world, with the highest rates found in Central Sub-Saharan Africa (65,64%) and the lowest in East Asia (16,30%).

5,5% of all adults in The Netherlands report that they have become a victim of domestic violence (including physical and sexual violence) during the past 5 years. Women are victimised more often than men. 5,4% of victimised women claim to have experienced physical violence, and 1,8% report sexual violence. For men these numbers respectively are 4,5% and 0,3%. In contrast to what many people think and expect, most intimate partner violence occurs only once: in 76% of all the cases. However, it should be underlined that these are conviction rates: a conviction for domestic violence can involve a structural pattern of multiple assaults.

Newsletter – Summer 2020

It is estimated that 1,1% of female victims and 0,2% male victims are victimised on a structural basis, meaning at least once a month. 15% of intimate partner violence leads to physical injury.

Every year around 119.000 children in the Netherlands (age group 0-18 years) become a victim of child abuse. Being witness to violence also is considered child abuse. Victims report that in 23,5% of the incidents, children were witness to the violence.

As indicated earlier, crime rates are dropping, both registered crime and self-report. Since 2008 the prevalence of domestic violence is also decreasing, including both structural and incidental violence and covering all age groups. The largest decrease is seen amongst young adults (18-24 year old).

Domestic Murders

The Netherlands Central Bureau of Statistics report that in 2019 114 people had died due to murder or manslaughter. This number includes cases outside of the family circle. In 2018 119 people were murdered: 39 less than in 2017.

The number of male victims of murder and manslaughter decreased from 112 in 2017 to 76 in 2018 and has returned to the levels of 2015 and 2016. In 2018, 43 women were victims of murder or manslaughter, in 2017 there were 46. Of all women who died in 2018 due to murder or manslaughter, at least three quarters were victims of (former) partner violence.

Since the beginning of this century, the number of victims of murder and manslaughter in our country has halved. Of the 119 victims in 2018, 19 were not official residents of the Netherlands. It is worth mentioning that the murder cases in which there were multiple victims had increased: in 2019 fifteen people died during six incidents.

Back to family violence: a research group in The Netherlands, 'Bureau Beke' in 2011 reported that one in every three murders and manslaughters in The Netherlands involve deadly family violence (Van Leiden & Ferwerda, 2011). According to Beke: in 86% of the cases a suspect had been arrested and in some cases the investigation was still ongoing.

Newsletter – Summer 2020

In how many cases was the suspect known to the authorities as a violent domestic offender, prior to committing the murder? Beke found that in one fifth of the cases (21%) the arrested suspect had previously committed domestic violence that was known to the police. 60% of the suspects were reported unknown and for the remaining 19% the police said it was unclear whether or not the suspect was previously involved with domestic violence.

Recent numbers from the United Kingdom show that there were 1870 domestic murders in England and Wales between the years 2000 and 2018. It is 'refreshing' to see how these numbers compare to other forms of serious crime that often receive much more media coverage and growing interest from behavioural- and social scientists. For instance, there were 126 victims of terrorism-related fatalities in England and Wales between the years 2000 and 2018, 80 of which were killed in 3 incidents alone. This means that domestic violence in Britain had killed 15 times as many as terrorism.

Domestic Violence & the COVID-19 Pandemic

Some countries report that the number of reports of domestic violence have doubled since the lockdown. It remains unclear what these numbers are based upon and how this research was conducted. The impression is also that there has been quite some speculation within the media.

Several European countries report that they are seeing indications that the number of victims of domestic violence are on the rise, that emergency services are extra busy due to the coronavirus, or simply cannot offer help because of the lockdown. The United Nations report that in France reports of domestic violence have increased by 30% since the lockdown on March 17, that in Singapore and Cyprus helplines have registered an increase in calls of 30% and 33% respectively, and that in Argentina the emergency calls for domestic violence have increased by 25% since the lockdown on March 20. In contrast, the Italian police report a significant decrease in the number of reports that are received. What do all these numbers exactly mean? Is there a real increase (or decrease) of domestic violence incidents? Do victims for some reason find it more difficult to go to the police or call an emergency number? Are calls correctly registered? Do victims have less trust that the police will solve their problem? Hopefully all these questions can be answered as researchers will present their findings during the months to come.

Newsletter – Summer 2020

Speaking about these statistics with Behavioural Investigative Adviser at the National Crime Agency in the UK, Pippa Gregory, she provided an interesting comment regarding the interpretation of numbers: there are indications that a lot of domestic violence incidents have been reported by neighbours during lockdown as they have been at home more often, and have been more aware of the signs of abuse which is different to the pre-COVID picture.

Secretary General of the United Nations has already made it quite clear that he is concerned and wants *“the fight against intimate partner abuse to be an important part of the fight against the coronavirus”*.

In The Netherlands researchers at the ‘Verwey-Jonker Instituut’ are currently conducting three studies, focusing on the consequences of the corona crisis for families suffering domestic violence. The research group recently released the news that while several experts in the media have pointed out the suspected increase in domestic violence / child abuse in families where there was already violence, new figures do not support this suspicion.

In the Netherlands the most recent indications are that reports to the police are decreasing and that there also is no increase registered at Safe-houses or Centres for Sexual Violence.

Inquiries with families already known to the police because of domestic violence show that the number of violent incidents before and during the lockdown appear to be almost the same. More than half of the parents feel that the situation at home has become no worse or better since the lockdown. 247 families who were reported last year because of family problems, participated in this study. Problems such as poverty, addiction, partner abuse and divorce had accumulated in these families before the corona crisis began. Half of the families were found to have experienced serious violence during the corona crisis, at least one incident every week. This includes violence against children and intimate partner violence (such as death threats, use of weapons and violence causing physical injury).

Taking into account the (very) limited willingness to report violence to the police in general, the conclusion from these figures at this point cannot be that there is less domestic violence during the Corona lockdown. Again, there can be multiple reasons why victims feel even less motivated or more restricted to seek help or go to the police.

Newsletter – Summer 2020

Our Australian colleague Prof. Lorraine Sheridan during her recent online presentation explained the nine pathways that link pandemics and family violence:

- (1) economic insecurity and poverty related stress,
- (2) quarantines and social isolation,
- (3) disaster and conflict-related unrest and instability,
- (4) exposure to exploitive relationships due to changing demographics,
- (5) reduced health service availability and access to first responders,
- (6) inability to temporarily escape abusive partners,
- (7) virus-specific sources of violence,
- (8) exposure to violence and coercion in response efforts, and
- (9) violence perpetrated against health care workers.

Continuing the discussion

Everyone from our international threat assessment community is invited to join the discussion regarding this matter and send us their thoughts for the next publication in this newsletter (December 2020). Reading views of others about the specific situation and statistics in other countries would be very much appreciated.

Pippa Gregory (Behavioural Investigative Adviser at the National Crime Agency, UK) and her team are currently looking into the impact of COVID-19 on incidents of serious sexual violence, including domestic rape. They collected data from 2 police forces for three periods of time - 1) 5 weeks during lockdown, 2) 5 weeks prior to lockdown, and 3) 5 weeks in 2019 that correspond to lockdown dates.

Other topics of interest during these times that the pandemic is amongst us: COVID-19 and workplace violence, specific threats during COVID-19 (for example threats against virologists and other specialists appearing in the media), social isolation and suicide rates.

Bram Van der Meer

AETAP member of the board

MEDIA

Responsible media reporting on mass casualty attacks

In the direct aftermath of the terrible rampage in Nova Scotia last April, prime minister Trudeau asked the media to “avoid” both mentioning the name of the primary suspect and “showing” his picture. Trudeau isn’t the first world leader to make this kind of request to prevent reinforcement of the suspect by “a gift of infamy”. After a gunman killed 51 people and injured dozens of others at two mosques in Christchurch, New Zealand in March 2019, the country’s prime minister, Jacinda Ardern, said she wouldn’t speak the perpetrator’s name and urged people to “deny” him the spotlight he sought. While some politicians and law enforcement agencies employed this practice, it is not commonplace yet.

Thanks to ATAP-president, Dr. Russell Palarea we can recommend this webinar on covering mass shootings. It is for free at this moment! This webinar reviews the research that informs our understanding of the copycat phenomenon, and suggests coverage techniques. <https://www.poynter.org/shop/webinar/covering-mass-shootings/>

RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

Update from the GRIEVANCE Project

GRIEVANCE is a five-year project (2018-2022) funded by the European Research Council, conducted at University College London’s Department of Security and Crime Science, and led by Professor Paul Gill.

GRIEVANCE seeks to make significant advances in increasing our understanding, and thereby reducing the risk, of various forms of targeted violence. Various strands of research are relevant to AETAP members.

Nadine Salman’s research focuses on the application, reliability and validity of tools used for the individual assessment of terrorism risk. Nadine conducted a survey with 41 professional threat assessors, asking about their experiences and perceptions of different terrorism risk assessment tools.



Newsletter – Summer 2020

The findings highlight that the training and experience required differs greatly across different disciplines involved, and the importance of considering the context in which threat and risk assessments take place. These findings also highlight cognitive abilities and personality characteristics (such as analytical skills, objectivity, and conscientiousness) that may be desirable for risk assessors in this context. These findings provide avenues for further research to examine the role of these factors in risk assessment. This research is due to be published in the Journal for Threat Assessment and Management later this year.

Last year, Caitlin Clemmow undertook the first survey of over 100 correlates of violent extremism in a general population; the Base Rate Study. Following on from the initial release of our results, we have since undertaken some exploratory analyses to investigate possible predictors of self-initiated exposure to violent extremism. We found that thrill-seeking, mental illness/psychological distress, and experiencing prejudice or being disrespected predicted self-motivated exposure to materials, settings, or people supporting terrorism. We also found that having children and being married were protective factors for seeking out exposure to violent extremism. This year we looked to refine the estimates gathered in the Base Rate Study by deploying the survey to a representative UK sample. We collected a wide range of self-reports of risk and protective factors for grievance-fuelled violence alongside measures of a range of violent and criminal behaviours, including domestic violence, hacking, counterproductive workplace behaviour, and extremism.

Work is currently ongoing to explore correlates of these behaviours concerning, as well as correlates *among* some of these violent/criminal behaviours. Drawing from an approach popular in psychopathological research, we applied a network framework to explore the interactions between risk factors, in order to visualise risk as emerging from a complex, dynamic system. Future work aims to compare our general population sample with a range of offending samples who present differently along a spectrum of risk, in order to begin to establish the relevance of some of these factors, particularly to informing clinical/practitioner judgements of relative risk.

Zoe Marchment's research focuses upon the spatial aspects of extremist violence. Guided by previous research and recent empirical analyses, her latest paper gives insight into elements that characterize the spatial decision making of terrorist target selection. Five key factors explain why targets are chosen by terrorists.



Newsletter – Summer 2020

The authors propose that, generally, targets will be selected when they are *Tolerable, Relevant, Accessible, Close and/or Known*. This is followed by a discussion of attacks witnessed between January 2013 and December 2018 in the United Kingdom, and implications.

Bettina Rottweiler is currently working towards establishing an empirical evidence base for risk and protective factors of radicalisation and violent extremism. Data comes from two nationally representative population surveys conducted in the UK and Germany. The focus is placed upon identifying underlying psychological and cognitive mechanisms related to the development of extremist attitudes and intentions. Her analyses examine the interactional nature of risk and protective factors in order to understand the complex relationships underlying these processes. Recent results for example confirm that a stronger conspiracy mentality leads to increased violent extremist intentions. However, this relationship is contingent on several individual differences. The effects are much stronger for individuals exhibiting lower self-control, holding weaker law-relevant morality, and scoring higher in self-efficacy. Conversely, when stronger conspiracy beliefs are held in combination with high self-control and a strong law-relevant morality, violent extremist intentions are lower. Such individual features thus constitute interactive protective factors for violent extremism. Hence, it is often in adverse circumstances (e.g. the experience of risk factors) where the true value of protective factors becomes apparent and this has a multitude of insights for how we should design interventions focused on countering violent extremism. These results may inform and advance the development of more evidence-based risk assessment tools by providing empirical evidence.

For more, please visit the project website at <https://www.grievance-erc.com> , follow them on Twitter at @grievance_erc , or contact Paul.Gill@ucl.ac.uk for any questions.

Paul Gill

University College London

Violence at home during COVID-19 pandemic: A reflection from child-to-parent violence risk project

Domestic violence during the COVID-19 pandemic has raised great concern among academics and frontline workers. Family violence has greatly increased during quarantine, due to more stress at home, increased contact between victims and offenders, and less access to informal sources of detection such as family members outside the home, friends, or neighbourhood groceries, shops and markets. Child-to-parent violence (CPV) is a type of domestic violence consisting in repeated behaviours of physical, psychological or financial abuse, directed toward parents or caregivers. A current challenge in the management of CPV is violence risk or threat assessment. It seems that CPV is sometimes regarded in the same manner as intimate partner violence was several decades ago. CPV is still often thought of as a family issue to be resolved "*behind closed doors*" (as was titled the seminal 1981 work of Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz). The issue is often seen as something that will stop naturally, and therefore it is better that parents and caregivers not report the aggressor or be involved in any judicial or correctional processes.

Better knowledge about CPV, the raise of cases during recent years, as well as increased concern from clinicians in Spain made it possible to design a project to create a CPV risk assessment tool in 2013. After feedback from professionals, and pilot applications, a draft version of the *Child to Parent Violence Risk Assessment Tool* has been used since 2014 in several therapeutic and forensic settings in Spain. A recently published paper (Loinaz & Ma de Sousa, 2020), examined what pushes some parents to choose to have their children treated in a private clinical context, while others instead report this violence to the justice system. An aspect found repeatedly in previous research is risk related to family factors. As expected, judicial cases had significantly higher prevalence in all risk factors related to family problems (i.e., problematic education style, conflicts and violence among parents, and parent-to-child violence). Offenders that were part of the judicial sample were five times more likely to have been victims themselves at home, and 50% of the full sample (including those in clinical contexts) had been a victim or witness of violence (violence between parents was 11 times more probable among judicial cases).

There was a higher prevalence of personal issues of parents for judicial CPV offenders. Half of the judicial sample's fathers had criminal records, while only 2% of fathers in clinical cases had a criminal record.

We must not forget that boys and girls share many characteristics in this type of violence (in contrast to other female criminality).

Newsletter – Summer 2020

In addition, girls also commit physical assaults, though the victim is typically exclusively the mother.

In a recent paper from our research line (Loinaz, Barboni & Ma de Sousa, in press) both sexes showed similar prevalence rates for most risk factors. Boys and girls committed a comparable type of violence (although injuries toward fathers were only perpetrated by boys), and female perpetrators had more problematic families than their male counterparts. Regarding risk assessment, CPVR scores significantly predicted injuries toward the mother for male offenders (AUC = .842), but not for female offenders (AUC = .660), which is something that still should be analysed to improve threat assessment and management by front line clinicians or security forces that attend related complaints.

A common finding in this line of research is the cycle of violence within a family. Therefore, prevention policies as well as detection and prediction procedures should be adopted to stop violence persistence and its transmission. How do we manage this risk at home? First, we need training and good threat assessment protocols. Once we have these, we can use routine procedures to take risk factors into account on a case-by-case basis to decide if they pose a threat to the family's safety (a possibility of leading to injury) or whether these are early-stage incidents that simply require a family intervention.

Family or domestic violence, of whatever kind, should be a priority from the point of view of risk assessment and management. After this pandemic some lessons should be learned from the threat assessment perspective. First, family environment is almost the most dangerous environment. Detection of violence by people outside the family is essential. Second, young people are especially in danger (child physical and sexual abuse, killing in an intimate partner violence context, being a witness of violence, different types of online harassment), but sometimes young people are also a source of threat, as is the case in CPV. Last, we need to be able to develop fast detection and threat assessment to stop violence, protect the victims, and remove the offender from the home if necessary. These procedures are well established in cases of intimate partner violence, but such procedures for CPV and child abuse cases remain challenging. The project here explained aims to improve detection and intervention in the specific context of CPV.



Newsletter – Summer 2020

We hope that it can be of use for professionals of different services and even different countries. We are open to collaboration with any interested AETAP members.

Most recently published reference:

Loinaz, I. & Ma de Sousa, A. (2020). Assessing risk and protective factors in clinical and judicial child-to-parent violence cases. *The European Journal of Psychology Applied to Legal Context*, 12, 43-51. <https://doi.org/10.5093/ejpalc2020a5>

Ismael Loinaz

University of Barcelona

Calls for special issue papers Violence and Gender

The peer-reviewed journal *Violence and Gender* calls for papers on the special issue of **Intimate Partner Violence During National Emergencies**. Deadline for manuscript submission is already August 15, 2020. <https://home.liebertpub.com/cfp/intimate-partner-violence-during-national-emergencies/257/>

Violence and Gender invites manuscript submissions related to the full spectrum of outcomes following direct or indirect **exposure to violence during early childhood**. Experiencing or observing violence as a child has an enduring impact that results in an increased risk of a wide range of psychological and somatic disorders, including aggressive and violent behavior by former victims. Understanding the long-term consequences of exposure to violence in childhood is therefore critical not only to the assessment of and response to violent offenders but also to the development of scientifically informed treatment and prevention strategies. Deadline for submissions is October 15th.: https://www.liebertpub.com/doi/full/10.1089/vio.2020.29027.cfp#utm_source=FastTrack&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=vio

PUBLISHED RESEARCH

Technology, cyberstalking and domestic homicide: informing prevention and response strategies (2020)

An emerging concern in relation to the importance of technology and social media in everyday life relates to their ability to facilitate online and offline stalking, domestic violence and escalation to homicide. However, there has been little empirical research or policing and policy attention to this domain.

Newsletter – Summer 2020

This study examined the extent to which there was evidence of the role of technology and cyberstalking in domestic homicide cases based on the analysis of 41 Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) documents, made available by the Home Office (UK). Three interviews were also conducted with victims or family members of domestic homicide in the UK. It aimed to develop a deeper understanding of the role of technology in facilitating these forms of victimisation to inform further development of investigative practice, risk assessment and safeguarding procedures. Key themes identified by the thematic analysis undertaken related to behavioural and psychological indicators of cyberstalking, evidence of the role of technology in escalation to homicide and the digital capabilities of law enforcement. Overall, the results indicated that: (1) there was evidence of technology and social media playing a facilitating role in these behaviours, (2) the digital footprints of victims and perpetrators were often overlooked in police investigations and the DHR process and (3) determining the involvement of technology in such cases is important for risk assessment and earlier intervention to prevent escalation of behaviour to domestic homicide. It also indicates the importance of further developing evidence-based approaches to preventing and responding for victims, the police and other practitioners.

Cited from: **Todd et al.** In: Policing and Society: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10439463.2020.1758698>

Disaggregating Lone-actor Grievance-fuelled Violence: Comparing Lone-actor Terrorists and Mass Murderers (2020)

Research suggests that lone-actor terrorists and mass murderers may be better conceptualized as lone-actor grievance-fueled violence (LAGFV) offenders, rather than as distinct types. The present study sought to examine the extent to which these offenders could (or could not) be disaggregated along dimensions relevant to the threat assessment of both. Drawing on a Risk Analysis Framework (RAF), the offending process was theorized as interactions among propensity, situation, preparatory, leakage and network indicators. We analyzed a dataset of 183 U.S. offenders, including sixty-eight lone-actor terrorists and 115 solo mass murderers. Cluster analysis identified profiles within each of the components: propensity (stable, criminal, unstable), situation (low stress, high stress (social), high stress (interpersonal), preparatory (fixated, novel aggression, equipped, clandestine, predatory, preparatory), leakage (high leakage, low leakage), and network (lone, associated, connected). Bi-variate analysis examined the extent to which the profiles classified offenders previously labeled as lone-actor terrorists or mass murderers.



Newsletter – Summer 2020

The results suggest that while significant differences may exist at the periphery of these dimensions, offenders previously classified as lone-actor terrorists or mass murderers occupy a noteworthy shared space. Moreover, no profile classifies a single “type” of offender exclusively. Lastly, we propose a dynamic, interactional model of LAGFV and discuss the implications of these findings for the threat assessment and management of LAGFV offenders.

Cited from: **Clemmow et al.** In: Terrorism and Political Violence.

[file:///H:/Mijn%20Documenten/Downloads/Clemmowetal_2020DisaggregatingLoneactorGrievancefuelledViolenceComparingLoneactorTerroristsandMassMurderers%20\(2\).pdf](file:///H:/Mijn%20Documenten/Downloads/Clemmowetal_2020DisaggregatingLoneactorGrievancefuelledViolenceComparingLoneactorTerroristsandMassMurderers%20(2).pdf)

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS, PROFESSIONAL NETWORKS & EDUCATION

APATAP & CATAP webinars

Obviously all our sister organisations have to postpone their conferences and meetings. Some associations took the great initiative to organize webinar series on various relevant topics.

CATAP organised a webinar in May about “the role of perceived personal control in assessing risk”. For interesting upcoming events: <https://catap.ca/Violence-Prevention/Events>

APATAP gave already two very informative sessions about “conspiracy theories” and “domestic violence during COVID-19”. The APATAP webinar calendar looks very promising and if you are interested, registration is possible via this link: <https://apatap.wildapricot.org/events>

July 2020

Consulting in Threat Assessment: Navigating Client, Role and Service

David Whittingham, Director of Evexia and Decipher Zone

August 2020

Careers in threat assessment

Leeran Gold, Google, and Dr Melisa Wood, VFTAC



September 2020

Introduction to structured professional judgment (SPJ) tools

Dr Michael Davis

October 2020

Public figure threat assessment

Felicity Riddle, AFP, and Dr Justin-Barry Walsh, NZ FTAC

November 2020

Behavioural threat assessment in tertiary education

Michelle Lewis, Deakin University and Ryan Hsu, La Trobe University

United States Secret Service National Threat Assessment Center (NTAC)

Thursday, August 6, 2020

7:00 PM – 10:00 PM CEST

NTAC will present the findings from the latest study on targeted violence titled Mass Attacks in Public Spaces - 2019 (MAPS-2019). The presentation will address the report's implications for the prevention of targeted violence as part of NTAC's continuous efforts to ensure the informed development of prevention strategy through research. The study examines 34 targeted attacks that occurred in public or semi-public spaces (e.g., schools, places of business, houses of worship, open spaces) from January through December 2019, during which three or more persons were harmed, not including the attacker. This free virtual seminar is open to law enforcement, mental health professionals, workplace managers, school personnel, campus security, house of worship leadership, government officials, and others with a role in public safety across the United States.

For registration: <https://www.eventbrite.com/e/us-secret-service-ussm-mass-attacks-in-public-spaces-2019-registration-111998996012>.

Registrants will be sent a link to a Microsoft Teams Live Event.



Newsletter – Summer 2020

AETAP'S Next Newsletter

In December of this year you will receive the winter edition of our newsletter.

Forensic psychiatrist and ATAP member, dr. Philip Saragoza will write about the Incel movement which is causing growing concern. Violent incidents in the United States and in Canada already took place, but now we see the first cases on European soil.

If she can get approval from the police forces, Behavioural Investigative Adviser Pippa Gregory will also publish her research results. As described in this newsletter she and her team are currently looking into the impact of COVID-19 on incidents of serious sexual violence, including domestic rape.

Additional contributions on various topics are very welcome so please contact us if you are interested in sending us your research or practical day to day threat assessment / management experiences.