Communities
and Local Government

Preventing Support for Violent Extremism through Community Interventions: A Review of the Evidence

Rapid Evidence Assessment – Full Final Report

Acknowledgments

Preventing Support for Violent Extremism through Community Interventions: A Review of the Evidence

Rapid Evidence Assessment – Full Final Report

Department for Communities and Local Government
Eland House
Bressenden Place
London
SW1E 5DU
Telephone: 0303 444 0000
Website: www.communities.gov.uk

If you require this publication in an alternative format please email alternativeformats@communities.gsi.gov.uk

Communities and Local Government Publications
Tel: 0300 123 1124
Fax: 0300 123 1125
Email: product@communities.gsi.gov.uk
Online via the Communities and Local Government website: www.communities.gov.uk

75% recycled
This is printed on
75% recycled paper

Aims of the Rapid Evidence Assessment on Preventing Violent Extremism through community level interventions

This research provides a rapid evidence assessment of the evidence base around preventing violent extremism through community interventions. It focuses on the most relevant evidence in order to identify which interventions prevent support for violent extremism; how they may best be implemented, and with which groups they are best developed.

From the outset it is important to note that our remit was to undertake a REA on what worked best in changing communities' attitudes to violent extremism. However, it should be noted that it was **not possible** – in the scope and timescale of the study – to identify examples of change in the **full community**. None of the cases that were identified in the search for evidence focused on community level changes in attitude or support for violent extremism. Indeed, the team recognise that measuring changes in community attitudes is intrinsically difficult and unlikely to be the focus of most activities. Consequently, the study has identified changes in the behaviour and attitudes of individual participants in certain interventions. It is possible that, if such changes subsequently ripple outwards to a wider community, that this community might experience the same change in attitudes. However, this wider change was not evidenced in the interventions identified in the study.

In part, this reflects the practical difficulty of conducting studies on whole communities – studies often focus on a group of participants, and may suggest that trends noted among participants might reflect trends for a wider community. However, it is not possible to conclude this from the studies assessed by our research. Our work has uncovered some important principles in how attitudes to violent extremism can be tackled; but it is not possible to infer from the assessed studies that there is a causal link between such interventions and any change in community attitudes.

The report focuses on the practical implementation of policies for reducing support for violent extremism and provides an analysis of what works best in relation to tackling the issues of extremism, and in particular extremism *in the name of religion*. It also looks at the impact of working with different sections of the population, using different types of intervention, or employing different mechanisms for a reduction in support for violent extremism.

The limitations of the evidence base around community support for violent extremism restrict the potential to develop clear policy guidance from this REA. However, this report analyses the available evidence, by drawing on wider literature together with the existing experience and understanding of the research team to draw out implications for policy makers and practitioners in order to identify what works best in preventing support for violent extremism at a community level.

Contents

Appendices:

Executive summary

Over the last few years there have been a wide range of interventions aimed at reducing support for violent extremism. This report focuses on those interventions which seek to prevent violent extremism, or reduce support for it, at the community level. For the purposes of analysis, 'community level' is used simply to distinguish such interventions from national level interventions or campaigns, or those which are focused on particular individuals – for example, personalised de-radicalisation programmes – are therefore not included in this research. This focus reflects the policy area of Communities and Local Government which commissioned this research.

The report is the product of a rapid evidence assessment (REA). The REA looked at a wide range of databases, both nationally and internationally, to find evidenced, evaluated interventions which had been intended to change attitudes towards violent extremism. Following on from an earlier report which mapped the evidence base on community level interventions aimed at preventing violent extremism, this report analyses specific interventions to identify which were most effective at preventing support for violent extremism *in the name of religion*, in what ways and with which population groups.

The analysis is not limited to literature concerned with preventing violent extremism in the name of Islam within a western context but also covers interventions in relation to sectarian violence in Northern Ireland and religious violence (Christian and Muslim) in Indonesia.

The evidence base

Our stage one report set out an evidence base of 813 references, all with some relevance to preventing support for violent extremism at the community level. Cases were drawn from UK and non-UK contexts.

In the second phase the evidence base has been refined further in terms of quality, scope, and definitional clarity, thereby reducing the evidence base from 813 references to 68. Further detailed reading of these publications led to the identification of 18 sources, which between them offered 70 different interventions. Out of these 70 interventions 55 of those relate to preventing support for violent extremism *in the name of religion* and it is these 55 cases which are the basis of our analysis here (see table 2).

Limitations of the literature

Due to time constraints, the review is only focused on English language sources, although it does cover international examples where they were available in English. Moreover, much of the evidence was case-based and qualitative in nature, and the extent of evaluation was limited in many of them. Using the Boolean technique described below, however, many of these limitations have been controlled for in the analysis. Nevertheless, the limited quality of the evidence base does imply that caution should be adopted in interpreting the findings.

Methodology

To analyse the cases we used the Boolean approach developed by Ragin *et al* which facilitates qualitative comparative analysis (QCA). This approach enabled the research team, in discussion with CLG, to identify a range of factors which might influence the effectiveness of interventions to reduce support for violent extremism, and then code each of the 55 cases to establish the presence or absence of these factors. The factors identified and coded for were:

The target population group:
- Young People
- Women
- Community
- Leaders.

Focus of intervention:
- Capacity building/Empowerment
- Challenging Ideology
- Focus on Theology
- Debate/Discussion Forums
- Education/Training.

Mechanism for delivery:
- Outreach/Peripatetic (i.e. delivered in a community setting by a community-embedded individual or organisation)
- Multi-agency (i.e. the result of partnership or collaboration)
- Community Consultation (i.e. consultation with leaders, or other forms of participation aimed at consulting communities).

Findings and Analysis

In reviewing the 70 interventions from the 18 studies, there are a number of caveats which need to be acknowledged. There is no evidence from the 18 literature sources to suggest which interventions worked best in changing communities' attitudes towards violent extremism. This absence of cases in our analysis does not necessarily say that none exist; or that the evidence does not point the way towards certain interventions, pre-conditions and methods that appear to have a positive impact. The implicit theory within the literature is one of 'trickle down' or 'contagion' effect, whereby changing attitudes in preventing violent extremism in an individual would lead to a change of attitude for the whole of the community. Also, out of these 18 studies none were based on robust quantitative methods, which further limits their quality. Therefore, all the evidence evaluated here must be viewed as being limited – there is insufficient evidence to conclude that any particular intervention can directly cause a change in community attitudes, or infer that a change in attitude from individual participants could be simply replicated at a community level.

1 **The most successful interventions to prevent support for violent extremism in the name of *religion* are:**

In terms of young people:

- Interventions to capacity build/empower delivered via outreach/peripatetic mechanisms and multi-agency working.
- Interventions to challenge ideology that focus on theology and use education/training delivered through outreach peripatetic work.
- Outreach/peripatetic work with young people is particularly necessary in terms of success in relation to any focus.

In terms of women:

- Interventions to challenge ideology that focus on theology and are delivered via outreach/peripatetic means.
- Interventions that focus on theology, using debate and discussion and are delivered via outreach/peripatetic mechanisms.
- Outreach/peripatetic work with women is particularly necessary in terms of success in relation to any focus.

In terms of community:

- Interventions to capacity build/empower delivered via outreach/peripatetic mechanisms.

Work with leaders was not sufficient on its own to produce a successful outcome in relation to preventing violent extremism *in the name of religion*.[1]

---

[1] This is not to suggest that the involvement of leaders in projects is not beneficial, or, in some cases, necessary for success – see page 23 for further information.

Chapter 1
Introduction

Preventing support for violent extremism at a community level is not a new problem. For example, community-level strategies have been employed in an attempt to resolve the 'troubles' of Northern Ireland, whilst some other European countries have been working hard to tackle right-wing extremism in their communities for a number of years now. This work is in addition to the current international focus on preventing support for violent extremism in the name of Islam, at community level.

The literature, although not extensive, provides an important resource for policy-makers when supporting and evaluating policy in this challenging but highly significant area. This research provides a rapid evidence assessment of the evidence base, focusing on the most relevant evidence in order to identify which interventions prevent support for violent extremism; how they may best be implemented, and with which groups they are best developed.

This research, conducted by the Local Governance Research Unit, De Montfort University, provides a rapid evidence assessment (REA) of the evidence base around preventing support for violent extremism in the particular case of religion and preventing support for violent extremism more generally. It does not undertake primary research but, develops a robust and systematic analysis of the existing academic and policy literature on preventing support for violent extremism at a community level.

Initially, the research distinguished between interventions related to preventing violent extremism (PVE) generally and those associated with PVE *in the name of religion*. However due to the small number of interventions related to PVE generally, we decided in discussion with CLG to focus the analysis of this report solely on PVE *in the name of religion*. Our findings on preventing support for violent extremism generally are offered separately in appendix D.

This report builds on the initial stage one mapping exercise which is the subject of a separate report. The mapping stage identified some broad trends but, due to the wide scope of the exercise, was unable to develop a detailed analysis of specific areas of intervention. It is only by focusing on specific areas of intervention that detailed lessons can be drawn from the most relevant literature within the evidence base. The project team produced syntheses on four specific areas of intervention:

- work with young people
- work with women
- work with community[2]
- work with leaders.

---

[2] Building on our Stage One Report definition, 'Community(ies)' here refers to those that are both identified by themselves or by others to be part of a group considered to exist in opposition to another social group.

This report focuses on the practical implementation of policies for reducing support for violent extremism and provides an analysis of what works best in relation to tackling the issues of extremism, and in particular, violent extremism *in the name of religion*. It also looks at the impact of working with different sections of the population, using different types of intervention, or employing different mechanisms for a reduction in support for violent extremism. As mentioned above, evidence on the prevention of violent extremism beyond that associated with religion was also investigated. However, there was only limited evidence available of such interventions (15 cases) so these have been excluded from the analysis, although they have been included as an appendix in the full report.

The report uses UK and international English-language evidence from both academic and wider sources. The research draws on specific methodological techniques for analysis together with the wider knowledge of the research team around preventing violent extremism (PVE). The research also considers the implications of the evidence for policy development and implementation.

At the outset we chose to adopt a methodology (a Boolean methodology known as fuzzy-set qualitative comparative analysis – fsQCA) that allows for a systematic review and causal interpretation of qualitative case based material. This methodology has been successfully tested in a previous systematic review by members of the research team. However, the PVE REA allowed the team to further refine and develop the methodology to better reflect the specifics of the project. In order to interpret the evidence that follows it is important to read and understand the methodology section of this report. Further supporting documents on the detail of the methodology/methods, and the findings generated are available as appendices at the end of the report.

Chapter 2
Methodology

2.1 Selecting the evidence base

This research undertakes a rapid evidence assessment of community level[3] interventions to prevent support for violent extremism. In the first phase of work this entailed a rapid, systematic review to ascertain both the extent and broad relevance of the evidence base. Our search covered the academic and grey literature, English language sources in existence in the UK and beyond, around this policy area (see Stage One Report). Stage two builds on this work to identify, from selected sources out of this evidence base, which interventions prevent support for violent extremism and violent extremism *in the name of religion*, in what ways and with which population groups. The report also provides guidance as to how government can appropriately intervene in order to most effectively prevent support for violent extremism.

A systematic review and assessment of the evidence in this way is an approach often taken in pure science disciplines. Such an approach pulls together evidence from a range of studies to reach overarching conclusions that span the full range of the studies. In relation to preventing support for violent extremism much of the evidence is drawn from qualitative case studies. It is possible to conduct a valid review of qualitative case study material by using the particular meta-analytical technique of the Boolean approach (see appendix A, for more details on this approach and Peters, 1998; Ragin, 2000; Ragin and Davey, 2008). The Boolean approach is a key method in developing systematic findings in comparative case studies.

Our stage one report set out an evidence base of 813 references, all with some relevance to preventing support for violent extremism at the community level. The initial report mapped the relevance of this literature in relation to a number of different aspects (location and time period, proximity to current PREVENT policy interventions, intervention type, delivery mechanisms, and quality of evaluation). We found that about 30 per cent of sources had some level of evaluation attached to them (primary or mainly), and 74 per cent of sources having derived from higher quality sources (these included: academic papers, theses, conference papers, centres of research). This established a baseline of potentially suitable references.

---

[3] Our definition of 'community' as set out in the Stage One Mapping Report (2009: 44) was as follows: 'Community' is a group that recognise that they have something in common with each other, or who are recognised by others as such. Policy was understood as 'applicable to the community level' as defined as relevant to: a group that is not simply focused on isolated individuals, but instead only includes individually focused interventions where they could be/are applied to individuals when comprising a group.

Our search aimed to cover a global range of sites for interventions into preventing attitudes of violent extremism. A wide range of locations produced results in our search, highlighting that there is evidence available beyond the UK on preventing attitudes of violent extremism. However, there is a predominance of English-speaking countries reflected in the results (Great Britain, Northern Ireland, the Irish Republic and the Americas, where North America figured most strongly). This is not surprising as our remit was primarily on English language sources.

Our remit was not simply to cover interventions relevant to preventing Muslim extremism, or even simply religious extremism, but included a consideration of other types of extremism and conflict in our coverage, such as: organised party-based extremism, separatist conflicts (including ethnic conflicts along these lines) and ideological conflict (e.g. communist extremism). The evidence is concentrated around three main areas, preventing violent extremism in the UK, sectarian violence in Northern Ireland and the conflict in Indonesia. These areas have not been selected arbitrarily for this analysis but reflect the areas where the highest quality research has been undertaken into interventions aimed at preventing violent extremism.

Our search was focused on changing community attitudes to violent extremism. Evidence was sifted in terms of its relevance to community level attitudes. This meant that we were primarily interested in local area-based initiatives, rather than national initiatives. However, where we felt that national initiatives could have transferable lessons for local areas, these were also included. Examples include work around gangs, hate crime, and community cohesion.

During stage rqo the evidence base has been further refined to find the most suitable cases for further study. The process of further refining took place in two steps. First we refined this base of 813 references down to 68 by developing (in consultation with CLG) a number of definitions for inclusion/exclusion. Using these definitions, we excluded references with the following characteristics:

- Only related to overall community cohesion, and not specifically at changing attitudes towards extremism (e.g. general community programmes).

- Only related to localised issues of violence and not extremism *per se* (e.g. local disorder or anti-social behaviour such as vandalism, gang activity, etc).

- Where the available information did not allow an assessment of the relevance of the study to our research.

- Where the source of the study was not deemed to be sufficiently robust. We used a six-point scale to assess the source; those sources which fell below level 6 were excluded. The scale is as follows:

Academic peer-reviewed journal publications	(1)
Theses	(2)
Conference papers	(3)
Centres of research	(4)
Government websites	(5)
International organisations	(6)
Think-tanks/NGOs	(7)
Foreign organisations/centres	(8)
Other	(9)

Once we had a list of 68 references, the second step was to obtain the full text of these sources (in either print or electronic format as available); the research team had previously only had access to abstracts or titles. At this stage all sources were read and we checked their usefulness once more. We used a checklist drawn up to reflect the influences considered to be most likely to play a part in the success or otherwise of either preventing violent extremism, or preventing violent extremism *in the name of religion* (see appendix E). This list of influences, and the two outcome factors (preventing violent extremism or preventing violent extremism *in the name of religion*), were adopted as the analytical factors to go into the Boolean software analysis.

Finally, a revised list of references was compiled on the basis of this assessment, and of the spread of papers that existed across the Boolean analytical factors, as had been identified by CLG (see appendix G for bibliography of these sources). In trying to obtain such a spread, and in view of the fact that the amount of relevant literature was quite small, this meant that the quality of literature and level of evaluation was inevitably variable across our final sources. The type of evaluation also varied due to the mix of literature sources we had in our dataset. For example, academic papers tended to have more of a long-term evaluation, often including comparison with other intervention cases; in policy-related literature evaluations these were often very much more specific to one intervention that took place at a particular time.

Through the course of these additional sifting steps the evidence base was reduced from 813 to 18. Within these 18 sources we coded 70 different interventions for analysis. Those related to PVE *in the name of religion* are included in the main body of the report (55 interventions), while those related to PVE generally (15 interventions) are to be found in appendix D.

2.2 Quality of the evidence base

In reviewing the 70 interventions from the 18 studies, there are a number of caveats which need to be acknowledged.

- There is no evidence from the 18 literature sources to suggest which interventions worked *best* in changing communities' attitudes towards violent extremism. The implicit theory within the literature is one of 'trickle down' or 'contagion' effect, whereby changing attitudes in preventing violent extremism in an individual would spill over into a change of attitude for the whole of the community.

- Out of these 18 studies, none were based on robust **quantitative** methods, and so it is not possible to infer from the assessed studies that there is a causal link between such interventions and any change in participants' attitudes.

- Also the 18 case studies were based around qualitative data, which can be difficult to compare directly, and may not always yield clear causal or influential linkages. However, by adopting the fsQCA approach (i.e. the application of Boolean analysis) we have been able to compensate for many of these shortcomings (see below).

As mentioned above, the 18 case studies were qualitative, and not quantitative. Further details of the 18 case studies can be found in the appendices. Quantitative research can help to clarify causal factors, and to put numbers to the strength of research findings. Qualitative research is less effective at producing these particular types of results. The fact that all 18 studies were qualitative studies potentially limited the degree of analysis that could be undertaken; we used a comparative technique called fsQCA to compensate for this, by effectively allowing a quantitative analysis of qualitative data. Full details of how we undertook this technique are available in the appendices. By 'compensate' we mean that case studies are analysed as a group, thereby smoothing out inconsistencies in individual case studies and finding common themes across them. This allows systematic analysis of the whole evidence set.

Put simply; our analysis (known as Boolean analysis) converts the key elements of a case study – the influencing factors, and the potential outcomes – into a framework that can accept quantitative analysis. This is a new and emerging technique, but one which has a body of experience and academic acceptance behind it, and which we have applied to other studies. The key to the technique is to identify influencing factors which can create an outcome; and to identify the potential outcomes themselves. This allows the technique to display 'pathways' that the evidence suggests lead from a set of influencing factors, to a particular outcome.

2.3 Defining success in preventing support for violent extremism

Using fsQCA, we identified two potential outcomes that could be analysed:

- Whether the intervention/treatment resulted in a reduction in participating individuals' support for violent extremism.

- Whether the intervention/treatment resulted in a reduction in participating individuals' support for violent extremism *in the name of religion.*

We also identified a number of influencing factors:

The target population group:

- Young People

- Women

- Community

- Leaders.

Focus of intervention:

- Capacity building/Empowerment

- Challenging Ideology

- Focus on Theology

- Debate/Discussion Forums

- Education/Training.

Mechanism for delivery:

- Outreach/Peripatetic

- Multi-agency

- Community Consultation.

Our definition of 'success' in terms of the outcomes of the case studies was set by the studies themselves. 'Success' was self-defined either by the author of the study, or by the feedback reported from study participants.

Definition:

- *Violent Extremism = taking actions to cause injury or death to people in order to make a political protest.*

Table 1: Coding frame for outcome variables	
PVE – General	PVE *in the Name of Religion*
Interventions positioned within the wider context of preventing violent extremism.	Interventions positioned within the wider context of preventing violent extremism in the name of religion.
Achieves positive outcomes in terms of changing participant's attitudes.	Achieves positive outcomes in terms of changing participant's attitudes.
Coding Frame	Coding Frame
0 – No change in attitudes.	0 – No change in attitudes.
0.33 – Indication of implied changes of attitude as result of intervention albeit slight.	0.33 – Indication of implied changes of attitude as result of intervention albeit slight.
0.67 – A recognised change in attitudes was present towards an identifiable subject as a consequence of the intervention, but this was in conjunction with other foci (for example, community cohesion as well, where the intervention involved several different groups).	0.67 A recognised change in attitudes was present towards an identifiable subject as a consequence of the intervention, but this was in conjunction with other foci (for example, community cohesion as well, where the intervention involved several different groups).
1 – The intervention resulted in a notable change in negative community attitudes towards an identifiable subject.	1 – The intervention resulted in a notable change in negative community attitudes towards an identifiable subject.

NB: There were recorded cases where the intervention had the contradictory outcome of increasing negative attitudes. These can be seen in appendix C. The prevalence of such outcomes and the recorded sense of change were not conducive to further analysis and for that reason the coding criteria have been omitted from the above Table.

In relation to these two output variables there are two aspects to each which need to be considered. As Ross (2000: 1005-7) notes: 'Central to deciding whether a conflict resolution initiative has been successful, is the connection between its specific programmatic goals and changes in the long-term relationships between large groups.' In doing this he argues that it is analytically useful to differentiate between the internal success factors and the external success factors. For Ross (2000:1005-7), 'Internal criteria concern the impact on those participating in an initiative, while external criteria link a project's activities to the conflict as a whole.' Internal factors therefore may refer to changes in attitudes of workshop participants, the gaining of skills and knowledge, the resolution of local disputes and so on. Ross suggests that behavioural changes such as these are a good indicator of the impact of internal success. These changes may be at the level of changes in the patterns of the everyday lives of communities, or at the level of changes in attitudes between political leaders. In this project we are interested in considering projects that address changes like this at the community (rather than national elite) level.

Ross (2000: 1005-7) considers: 'External criteria of success (to) link the specific effects of an intervention to the wider conflict in which it is embedded – what Kelman calls transfer.' He notes that since no programme can categorically argue that it alone has resulted in the resolution of a conflict, or particularly cannot suggest that violence has or has not taken place as the direct causal result of a particular intervention, these criteria are difficult to assess. As a result most intervention programmes make no comment on the factors in their intervention that have an impact on the external conflict. This is the case too in the literature we reviewed in this project, which means that in the interventions we considered this aspect was largely present as an implicit rather than explicit reference.

In spite of these difficulties of assessment though, Ross (2000: 1005-7) does argue that it is useful for a project's initiators to hypothesize what the spill-over effects, multiplier effects or ideas of a particular project may be on the wider conflict. He suggests three ways in which hypotheses can be drawn up on this basis in relation to projects and their success as concerns external criteria. These are:

1   *Face validity* – whether it is plausible or not that a project has contributed to an outcome or non-outcome?

This factor would seem to require a long-term assessment over a period of time.

2   *Consistency with theory* – do the claims made add up in relation to the body of theory?

These two 'tests' are assessed by those outside the intervention, and are primarily likely to occur in academic assessments.

3   *Consensus between the disputing parties* – this refers to gaining the perspectives of the communities involved as to the effects or not of a particular intervention. Ross argues that this is particularly useful where considered alongside one of the other tests and results concur.

Due to the lack of direct causal mechanisms in relation to the external assessment criteria, these have not been coded for or assessed as part of the Boolean methodology. The focus here will be on internal success criteria instead. While some of our papers do suggest underlying hypotheses both for the success or failure of particular interventions in relation to the wider problem of preventing violent extremism, these factors where present, will be discussed in the research syntheses section of the final report.

On the basis of our knowledge of the wider literature and our reading of the 18 sources selected for coding, our final coding frame took account of these definitional issues and inclusion of the possibility of a direct negative impact of a particular intervention (as well as a no change result). We therefore fed these two aspects into the Boolean analysis (see appendix C for details of the coding frame).

2.4 Influencing the success of interventions to prevent violent extremism

Alongside a definition of what is meant by a successful outcome to prevent support for violent extremism, it is also necessary to identify those factors that are likely to drive or inhibit different types of outcomes. Influencing factors fall into three main categories: the population group with whom the intervention is played out, the main content of the intervention, and the mechanism for delivery. Within these categories we distinguished between them as follows:

The target population group:

- Young People
- Women
- Community
- Leaders.

Focus of intervention:

- Capacity building/Empowerment
- Challenging Ideology
- Focus on Theology
- Debate/Discussion Forums
- Education/Training.

Mechanism for delivery:

- Outreach/Peripatetic
- Multi-agency
- Community Consultation.

A full account of the definitions employed in the research in relation to these influencing factors is detailed in the coding frame in appendix C.

Chapter 3
Background to the findings

The majority of our literature and the interventions therein related to preventing violent extremism *in the name of religion* and this forms the focus of this report. Findings related to PVE generally are shown in appendix D. It is important to note that the interventions included in this literature were not exclusively focused on preventing violent extremism in the name of Islam within a Western context. They also covered interventions in relation to sectarian violence in Northern Ireland and religious violence (Christian and Muslim) in Indonesia.

Table 2: Focus of Interventions	
Outcome variables	No. of times intervention was relevant to each outcome
PVE Generally	15
PVE *in the name of religion*	55

In terms of providing a general overview of the literature from the coding, table 4 below summarises the context for our findings in relation to PVE *in the name of religion*:

- Most of the interventions, when entirely focused on one group, were focused on young people or community (as a more general term).

- Work was most often focused on capacity building/empowerment, followed by education.

- A high number of interventions were delivered via outreach/peripatetic mechanisms, although multi-agency working was also a popularly employed mechanism.

- Work with leaders and women were most absent.

- Focuses on theology and debate/discussion were least frequently employed in the interventions.

- Capacity building/empowerment and challenging ideology were regularly evident alongside other focuses or in an implied way in interventions.

- Community consultation as a mechanism for delivery was least frequently employed in interventions.

- Multi-agency working was most often used alongside other mechanisms or was implicit in interventions.

Table 3 below shows the number of time each influencing outcome variable was present in interventions for PVE *in the name of religion*. This does not take account of the interventions that were coded as successful as opposed to those that were found to result in no change or a negative impact to a given outcome. The aim of the discussion at this stage is to give an overview of the literature and interventions in general as a context to the discussion to follow.

Table 3: Distribution of Interventions			
Influencing variables	No. times variable was totally present in the intervention	No. of times some variable was implicitly present or present to an extent in the intervention	No. of times variable was totally absent in the intervention
Young people	21	18	16
Women	8	33	14
Community	21	25	9
Leaders	7	29	19
Capacity building/Empowerment	23	12	20
Challenging Ideology	8	23	24
Focus on Theology	7	30	18
Debate/Discussion	9	24	22
Education/Training	19	20	16
Outreach/Peripatetic	35	5	15
Multi-agency working	24	13	18
Community consultation	4	33	18

3.1 Summary of the main findings

One of the key features of the fsQCA approach is that it emphasises that different paths may lead to the same outcome. Instead of assuming a simple line of causality in relation to particular policy goals, it recognises the complex and often messy world of real policy making. It allows, therefore, for different combinations of influencing factors to be equally important in leading to a particular outcome. This approach, in turn, places an emphasis upon explaining patterns according to an explicit set of theoretical assumptions about how influencing factors might be successfully combined. It is to such an analysis that we now turn.

Evidence in the literature suggested clusters of influencing factors were important in providing positive outcomes. The paths leading to the outcome involved a combination of factors such as the target group, the content of the intervention and the mechanisms

employed. There was some indication that the target group was an important factor on its own, but the evidence was such that it would be difficult to draw any real conclusions from this without further research. What we can conclude, however, is that in identifying successful outcomes complex combinations of factors are unavoidable. The emphasis in our report on one factor or another should not be taken to mean that that factor alone is sufficient in achieving a successful outcome. There was also some indication from the literature of a contradictory outcome (i.e. where intervention has exacerbated a situation rather than ameliorate it). Unfortunately, the occurrence of such outcomes did not generate sufficient data to enable us to include it in a separate analysis.

The most successful interventions to prevent support for violent extremism *in the name of religion* are:

In terms of interventions with young people:

- Interventions to capacity build/empower delivered via outreach/peripatetic mechanisms and multi-agency working.

- Interventions to challenge ideology that focus on theology and use education/training delivered through outreach/peripatetic work.

- Outreach/peripatetic work with young people is particularly necessary in terms of success in relation to any focus.

In terms of interventions with women:

- Interventions to challenge ideology that focus on theology and are delivered via outreach/peripatetic means.

- Interventions that focus on theology, using debate and discussion and are delivered via outreach/peripatetic mechanisms.

- Outreach/peripatetic work with women is particularly necessary in terms of success in relation to any focus

In terms of interventions aimed generally at the community:

- Interventions to capacity build/empower delivered via outreach/peripatetic mechanisms.

Work with leaders was not sufficient on its own to produce a successful outcome in relation to preventing violent extremism *in the name of religion*.[4]

The tables of configurations detailing these results as it appears in the software are to be found in appendix G.

---

[4] This is not to suggest that the involvement of leaders in projects is not beneficial, or, in some cases, necessary for success – see page 23 for further information.

3.2 Limitations to the findings

In addition to the general caveats discussed previously (see section 2.2) there are some specific limitations related to the results of the analysis:

• We had disappointingly low scores in terms of the extent to which each pathway to success explains the outcome. The consequence of these low scores is that in no pathway is there a clear and strong message about what works or does not work. The pathways do offer some direction but need to be treated with some caution.

• Our method is used to working with low numbers of cases. However, when we refer to our spread of cases they were particularly low in some instances (e.g. women, leaders, focus on theology/ideology, community consultation). Therefore we need to consider further whether this may be a factor to explain why these interventions with these groups did not appear to be so successful.

• The computer analysis sometimes threw up pathways to success with almost the same factors present consecutively. The difference between paths was simply the addition of a couple of new variables (conditions) in one as opposed to another. On analysing this data therefore we focused on the extent to which each of the pathways resulted in success (using the raw coverage calculation). Following this analysis, and building upon both our detailed policy knowledge and the relevant literature, we were able to select the most plausible success story. This approach is consistent with the way in which the researcher's detailed knowledge of the policy area is expected to be applied to the interpretations of the findings brought out by the fsQCA analysis.

One of the major advantages to this methodology is its reliance on the use of qualitative analysis combined with quantitative analysis to provide conclusions. This means that we had the chance to consider the initial Boolean method findings in the light of both the relevant literature within our sample and our wider knowledge of the literature. This secondary stage of analysis therefore gives us the opportunity to confirm the likelihood of the results we have presented in this section, as well as providing more detail as to the potential reasoning behind such results, where they do seem plausible.

Chapter 4
Analysis of findings

This section will analyse the key findings, as presented in the fsQCA (section 3) within the context of the literature. We have selected the four major areas of interest provided in the previous results to analyse in more detail in this section. These were:

- work with young people,

- work with community,

- work with women, and

- work with leaders.

The analyses provided here add more detail to the last section, both to verify the validity of our findings and to provide more context to the findings presented. In this section, we discuss only the interventions where there was a positive impact upon attitudes to violent extremism *in the name of religion* (this is in contrast to the Boolean analysis technique we have used, which takes account of **all** references in its calculations). In each of the four major areas of interest, the emergent themes are discussed in relation to the key literature. This section therefore serves to support our final conclusions and suggestions for policymakers (which are in section 5). Only outcomes related to PVE *in the name of religion* are discussed here (the analysis for PVE generally can be found in appendix D).

4.1 Work with young people

A review of the literature confirms the fsQCA analysis results in broad terms. Work with young people is the most important focus in the literature in this area, since it is this group that are felt to be the most susceptible to becoming attracted to extremism, for a number of reasons commonly theorised in terms of radicalisation (Hundeide, 2003; Slootman & Tillie, 2006). However, the link between the choice of this target group in relation to others, and the wider aim of this area of work to prevent support for PVE at the community level, does require further development at a theoretical level in the UK.

Work with young people does seem to require high levels of trust and community-led engagement in order to be successful. In this way it makes sense that outreach/ peripatetic work is particularly useful. Personal development and ongoing supported leadership development were strong elements relating to work to challenge ideology and focus on theology through the use of education and training. Key elements in this form of intervention are personal development and leadership development; they allow the training and education of young people, to enable them to challenge ideology and the focus on theology. This aspect highlighted the need for sustainability in this area of work. It also clearly articulated that although courses could be more formally provided as well as informally administered to still be successful (Pearce and Barnett, 2008; Marcouch,

2008; Lowndes and Thorp, 2008), there was a need for such courses to be developed through community groups.

Our analysis of literature in the area of PVE *in the name of religion* included one key report from a country beyond the UK – The Netherlands.[5] A closer look at this report (Marcouch, 2008) could be useful for new policy development in this area for the UK. The Slotervaart report we obtained in English, was a preliminary evaluation summary of the internal impact factors as to the growing awareness of and resilience to radical ideologies. Slotervaart was chosen to lead work in this area in relation to national policy development. The evaluation was based on independently generated qualitative assessment and in one instance an action learning style of evaluation. Work with young people was the focus of interventions in the borough of Slotervaart, The Netherlands. Although other work with women, leaders and community in general took place, these were conceived as secondary to the work with young people. The rationale behind this decision was that the anti-radicalisation policy was focused on 'thinkers' not 'doers' (defined as those not engaged in illegal acts related to terrorism, but those who have not yet assimilated radical ideas and are therefore susceptible to radicalisation). The theory behind these assumptions rests on the socialisation model of an individual's development, in much the same way as PVE work to counter radicalisation does in the UK. The theory identifies orthodox interpretations of religion, isolation, and the sense that Islam is under political threat as the main 'pull' factors that feed into a lack of resilience built up through socialisation processes to produce radicalisation. This explanation then clearly ties work to intervene with radicalised individuals to that of 'building resilience with the wider community' to create a clearer theoretical base. Work in the Netherlands was therefore conducted with various agencies and public bodies (youth service, social workers, schools etc) alongside local mosques, Islamic research/ training centres to provide support to parents, school teachers, youth workers, social workers, religious leaders, and self-appointed community leaders in providing broad-based resilience to young people in terms of their socialisation.

Our fsQCA analysis showed interventions with young people were generally delivered through a mix of multi-agency working and/or outreach/peripatetic working. The importance of developing strong relations of trust with local partners and community was highlighted as a key success factor. Part of this certainly related to the mechanism employed, since it was noted that in the case of one project where a local research organisation had tried to engage the community in a project this had had serious engagement issues at first, until multi-agency approaches were employed across the Slotervaart borough. Similarly work with local schools had stalled until outreach work had been able to develop greater trust in the rationale behind the borough's action plan (Marcouch, 2008).

---

[5] The Change Institute report (2008) was also included in this synthesis, but since it was less specifically focused on work with young people (it covered a number of interventions in different countries with a variety of groups), we have preferred to primarily focus on the Netherlands as a good comparative example here.

The focus on outreach/peripatetic work in order to develop and maintain trusting relations between community hubs and local partners, was mirrored in terms of success in the PVE Pathfinder UK interventions. Similarly community-led interventions were identified as vital to their success (See Case 9 – Diversionary activities).

In Slotervaart, outreach engagement was highly successful where it was based on a respectful, listening mode of interaction; it was focused on what might be termed as key community hubs. This is to say that the groups/agencies/public bodies which the intervention focused on were those clearly identified as relevant to the theoretical base within the action plan, and who were either able to develop – or were at the time of engagement crucial to longer-term governance within this policy area. At the same time, however, the importance of actual and perceived autonomy of such groups was considered to be central to them producing effective activity (Change Institute, 2008). Creating long term sustainability and engagement with this agenda seemed to be an important factor in building resilience. The issue of sustainability was also one that was regularly repeated in the PVE Pathfinder UK reports in terms of ensuring ongoing success in this area. In the UK work, however, there was sometimes a mixture of governance modes between a set-up that saw the community as representatives or as experienced members of a particular group. In the UK work, we saw a mixture of governance modes. In some cases, those involved were treated as representatives of the community at large. In other cases, they were treated as those individuals directly relevant to the experience at hand, rather than representing others. Where this governance mixture applied, there was sometimes argument about resources, and how they were used – this threatened to undermine the work being conducted. In some cases this may have exacerbated community tensions over resources (Lowndes and Thorp, 2008). Another sustainability issue was the need for groups to gain wide support, beyond their target group in the community for initiatives, as well as exhibiting flexibility and adaptation in response to local needs (Change Institute, 2008).

Education and training delivered to challenge ideology and theology was successful when it was non-prescriptive, but instead focused on allowing individuals to develop independent thinking or research and leadership skills in order to question and challenge themselves and others about knowledge they received from sources such as the internet and radical groups (Marcouch, 2008; Change Institute, 2008). Once more a focus on the development of community-led responses to the PVE agenda was emphasised as important in the UK PVE Pathfinder reports included in our review. However, in many cases the framework within which groups were asked to engage seemed less broad than Slotevaart, where there were a number of initiatives for young people to participate in a less formal way. There was for instance a much more prescriptive, citizenship model of education focused on thinking about identity in relation to 'Britishness' and shared values rather than simply encouraging through experiential learning, independent thinking and a questioning of the sources of knowledge (OPM, 2008; Slough, 2008).

Example: Work with young people

Case 9 Diversionary activities

OPM (unpublished) 'Preventing Violent Extremism Pathfinder Evaluation – Draft Final Report for West London Alliance. April 2008. PVE *Pathfinder Evaluation 2007-8* (received via CLG).

Research by Office for Public Management (OPM), evaluates the impact and effectiveness of the West London Alliance (WLA) PVE Pathfinder Programme.

The case is an example of a number of projects aimed at involving young people in a variety of diversionary activities and support networks ranging from sporting activities such as football sessions to group discussions and a social support network. For example, the ASDC Somali youth project in Ealing involves Muslim youths to take part in a number of activities within the security of the youth club such as cooking, football matches etc.

The research found the potential barriers to this kind of project included engaging those 'most at risk' in diversionary activities due to the sensitivity of the subject. However, those who took part in these activities supported the view that diversionary activities had the potential to redirect individuals away from extremist ideologies.

Bibliography of most relevant cases to work with young people:

Change Institute (2008) *Study on Best Practices in Cooperation between authorities and civil society with a view to the prevention and response to violent radicalisation:* A study commissioned by DG JLS of the European Commission.

Hughes, J. (2007) Peace Reconcilation and a Shared Future: a policy shift or slightly more of the same? *Community Development Journal*, Vol. 44, No. 1, pp. 22-37.

Khuri, L. M. (2004) Facilitating Arab-Jewish Intergroup Dialogue in the College Setting. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, Vol. 7: 3, pp. 229-50.

Lowndes and Thorp (unpublished) East Midlands *PVE Pathfinder Evaluation 2007-8*.

Marcouch, Ahmed (2008). *Slotervaart Action Plan – Countering Radicalisation* Council of Amsterdam Borough of Slotervaart.

McEvoy, McEvoy and McConnaichie (2006) Reconciliation as a dirty word: Conflict, community relations and education in Northern Ireland. *Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 60: 1, pp. 81-108.

OPM (unpublished) 'Preventing Violent Extremism Pathfinder Evaluation – Draft Final Report for West London Alliance'. April 2008. *PVE Pathfinder Evaluation 2007-8* (received via CLG).

Renaisi – Pearce and Barnett (2008) Evaluation: Young Muslim Leaders London Borough of Waltham Forest. *PVE Pathfinder Evaluation 2007-8* (received via CLG).

Rieker, P. Glaser, M. and Schuster, S. (Eds) (2006) *Prevention of Right-wing Extremism, Xenophobia and Racism in European Perspective*. Deutsches Jugendinstitut, Aussenstelle Halle.

Slough Local Authority (Unpublished) Slough against Violent Extremism – Final Report – Draft Only *2007-8 PVE Pathfinder* (received via CLG).

Waterhouse Consultancy Group, (2008) PVE – An independent evaluation of the Birmingham Pathfinder. For Birmingham City Council *PVE Pathfinder Evaluation 2007-8* (received via CLG).

4.2 Work with women

Much of the work with women to date within the PREVENT UK strategy has been focused around empowerment/capacity building. However, an important part of such empowerment has been supporting women to debate theological issues around their role in Muslim society. Theological debate within a Western context has also helped women to support their children's understanding and negotiation of identity. In addition to this, many women have taken the initiative to challenge Islamophobic ideas and divisive ideologies of which they often feel they are a direct target.

Due to their traditional role in Muslim society women have not previously been engaged in public institutions on a large scale. A number of reports note (e.g. Faith Associates, 2008) that some Muslim women lack good English language and confidence to engage in wider society (including further education) as well as facing cultural barriers to access public services. These factors, alongside more widespread findings in feminist literature, imply that the most successful way to deliver work to women is through outreach/ peripatetic routes. In some case studies the use of drama and role play (see Case 51 – Drama Workshop) was seen as an effective way to break down barriers to communication and build trust between women (OPM, 2008).

Being given the chance to have a space for discussion on theological issues was important to women in terms of success (Waterhouse Consultancy Group, 2008). In Slotervaart, the Netherlands, women approached the local mosque with this kind of request at first from where they were put in touch with the youth imam and given a space for debate (Marcouch, 2008). As they gained confidence and interest, their involvement was integrated more into the main youth forum already in existence and additional leadership training work. Many of the women went on to become more integrated into the decision-making processes around the agenda over time, although at first the provision of a segregated, 'safe' space was critical to their initial engagement.

Example: Work with women

Case 51 Drama workshop

Faith Associates (unpublished) 'The Muslimah make a difference' High Wycombe *2007-8 PVE pathfinder evaluation* (received via CLG).

Research from Faith Associates evaluates the Muslimah Project, which originated from the funding received from the Wycombe District Council as part of the PVE. The project was aimed at engaging Muslim women to take an active part in their communities.

The drama workshop formed a part of the Muslimah Project and was delivered to small groups of girls in local high schools and to women. The main aim of the workshop was for participants to explore what could be regarded as extremist behaviour through drama. By taking part in the workshop participants were given the opportunity to discuss their role in society and in preventing violent extremism.

The research found that participants felt there were few opportunities to have the discussions in the way the workshop allowed, due to the fear of being labelled an 'extremist'.

Bibliography of most relevant cases to work with women:

Change Institute (2008) *Study on Best Practices in Cooperation between authorities and civil society with a view to the prevention and response to violent radicalisation:* A study commissioned by DG JLS of the European Commission.

Faith Associates (unpublished) 'The Muslimah make a difference' High Wycombe *2007-8 PVE pathfinder evaluation* (received via CLG).

Lowndes and Thorp (unpublished) East Midlands *PVE Pathfinder Evaluation 2007-8*.

OPM (unpublished) 'Preventing Violent Extremism Pathfinder Evaluation – Draft Final Report for West London Alliance. April 2008. *PVE Pathfinder Evaluation 2007-8* (received via CLG).

Slough Local Authority (Unpublished) Slough against Violent Extremism – Final Report – Draft Only *2007-8 PVE Pathfinder* (received via CLG).

Waterhouse Consultancy Group, (2008) PVE – An independent evaluation of the Birmingham Pathfinder. For Birmingham City Council *PVE Pathfinder Evaluation 2007-8* (received via CLG).

4.3 Work with leaders

The fsQCA analysis did not produce pathways to success in this area. This could be due to two reasons.

Firstly, the literature on interventions with leaders and the level of evaluation within it was not sufficiently detailed for the coding to support such analysis. A second, and related reason, was that work with leaders was underdeveloped at the community level.

Although the analysis did not lead to any successful pathways, it is possible to discern from the literature that work with leaders in relation to the UK PREVENT agenda has been primarily focused on developing the role of religious leaders. The focus for this work has been on supporting better training for religious leaders. Such leaders are operating within a Western context, often without the background or skills to do so effectively. In addition to this, a particular focus has been on improving the ability of Imams to relate to young people and to support those most susceptible to radicalisation. In light of immigration entry restrictions being proposed in relation to Imams and government being active in promoting support for a moderate Islam, there has been a great deal of tension between the internal aims and national security focus in relation to this area (Haddad and Balz, 2008). All of the reports we have on this work speak of a slow but necessary process of trust-building with local Imams.

In some instances, where the language competences are good and local trust can be developed, Imams have proved a vital resource in improving inter-generational relations, diffusing local tensions (myth-busting), offering theological support to other initiatives around, for example, citizenship (Marcouch, 2008). For Imams, as long as it is felt that training courses are not imposed, or do not interfere in religious issues, capacity building in areas such as statutory requirements or teaching skills have proved useful (see Case 20 – Capacity Building Training). These can facilitate better links and networks with schools and other statutory agencies to sustain such work in an ongoing manner and build better community cohesion (Ali, 2008; Change Institute, 2008).

It is also important to note that while work with leaders did not come out as successful on its own, the involvement of leaders in projects directed at youth, women or the community in general may be highly beneficial – in some cases even necessary – for some programmes. Hence their involvement may contribute to success. However, the analysis was neither able, nor designed, to test the role of leaders in this context.

Example: Work with leaders

Case 20 Capacity building training

Ali, Aisha (2008) Capacity building of staff in Madressahs (Islamic Schools) *PVE Pathfinder Evaluation 2007-8*. For Kirklees Council (received via CLG).

Research evaluates a training programme developed to assist mosques and madressahs to improve their organisational infrastructures and their teaching and learning environment in Kirklees.

Mosque leaders and community representatives were consulted to identify specific training needs that their institutions required in order for it to run effectively and sufficiently.

The aim of this intervention was to encourage the personal development of staff and volunteers who work in mosques and madressahs so that they can improve their teaching skills as well as increase their confidence as positive role models for the children and young people who regularly use such organisations.

Bibliography of most relevant cases to work with leaders:

Ali, Aisha (2008) Capacity building of staff in Madressahs (Islamic Schools) *PVE Pathfinder Evaluation 2007-8*. For Kirklees Council (received via CLG).

Change Institute (2008) *Study on Best Practices in Cooperation between authorities and civil society with a view to the prevention and response to violent radicalisation:* A study commissioned by DG JLS of the European Commission.

Haddad and Balz (2008) Taming the Imams: European Governments and Islamic Preachers Since 9/11. *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations*, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 215-235.

Lowry, C. and Littlejohn, S. (2006) Dialogue and the discourse of peacebuilding in Malaku, Indonesia. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, Vol. 23: 4, pp. 409-426.

Marcouch, Ahmed (2008). *Slotervaart Action Plan – Countering Radicalisation* Council of Amsterdam Borough of Slotervaart.

OPM (unpublished) 'Preventing Violent Extremism Pathfinder Evaluation – Draft Final Report for West London Alliance'. April 2008. *PVE Pathfinder Evaluation 2007-8* (received via CLG).

4.4 Work with community

The concept of 'community' is a notoriously complex one in social science. This complexity is related to the many different uses of the term in practice. In broad terms, our analysis considered 'community' as a generalised, residual category to the other categories introduced so far. Our analysis was only able to highlight one successful pathway in relation to PVE *in the name of religion*. However, unlike in some of the results with other groups, the coverage figures in these instances were reasonable in terms of the extent to which success was related to work with the community. It is therefore likely that part of the reason for the poor result in this instance is the different uses of the term 'community' itself. Because the concept of 'community' is a flexible and elastic term in social science, it can be difficult to attribute results for programmes based around 'community', because this term can mean different things in different studies. The studies showed qualitative evidence that working with the community was related to overall success; and that success was difficult to achieve without community involvement. However, the quantitative analysis yielded poor overall results, because the analysis required tighter definitions for the methodology to work. Therefore, the link between community work and success would appear to exist, but cannot be demonstrated conclusively by the fsQCA analysis. The article by Ross (2000) makes it clear that in theoretical terms different conflicts are approached differently in terms of interventions, but that these could all be considered to be applied to a 'community'. The use of the term 'community' also appears to be more common in PVE work where two divided communities (in a broad sense of the term) are in conflict with one another. This makes the analysis of these results difficult in terms of providing any clear relationships between conditions.

However, one commonality across all the results referred to the importance of community interventions to capacity building. In PVE *in the name of religion* community capacity building was highlighted as effective when delivered via outreach/peripatetic work. This result makes sense when we consider that the rationale for capacity building work is one of reconciling social divisions that are often exacerbated by differences in skills based resources (see Case 68 – Community Volunteering). In work related to PVE *in the name of religion* for instance, a media workshop (see Case 59 – Media Workshop) allowed participants to gain skills in communication as well as understand how to access a means of communication that they thought was closed to them as a community (Waterhouse Consultancy Group, 2008). This is the time that in both PVE and PVE *in the name of religion*, it would appear that 'community' implicitly refers to an intervention enacted with one 'community' in relation to another 'community'. In all of the other cases of PREVENT UK work other population groups are subsets of 'a community', although they are also the main way in which the focus of the intervention is referred.

Example: Work with community

Case 59 Media Workshop

Waterhouse Consultancy Group, (2008) PVE – An independent evaluation of the Birmingham Pathfinder. For Birmingham City Council *PVE Pathfinder Evaluation 2007-8* (received via CLG).

The research by Waterhouse Consultancy Group evaluates the potential benefits of media workshops in providing Muslim communities with valuable media skills.

The purpose of the media workshop was to assist individuals within the Muslim community to increase their communication skills as well as broadening their understanding of the media and specifically the regional media. This was managed by the Birmingham City Council's Equalities divisions and supported by the Communications directorate.

The research found the media workshop had the potential to help break down the suspicion and misunderstanding that can result from ignorance.

Example: Work with community

Case 68 Community volunteering

OPM (unpublished) 'Preventing Violent Extremism Pathfinder Evaluation – Draft Final Report for West London Alliance'. April 2008. *PVE Pathfinder Evaluation 2007-8* (received via CLG).

This case is an example of different sections of the community working together for a common goal.

The case provides an example of how PVE projects can involve Muslims and non-Muslims to promote positive community relations. The Ealing Faith Volunteering Project gave Muslims a range of opportunities to volunteer alongside non-Muslims. These included community challenges (cleaning up of mosques, churches and football matches), communications and media projects and opportunities with local public services. The aim was to help increase inter-faith knowledge and dialogue through this type of volunteering.

The potential barrier to this type of project was engaging those deemed 'most at risk'. The participant's who took part in the volunteering projects were self-selecting.

Bibliography of most relevant cases to work with community:

Change Institute (2008) *Study on Best Practices in Cooperation between authorities and civil society with a view to the prevention and response to violent radicalisation:* A study commissioned by DG JLS of the European Commission.

Hughes, J. (1998) Community Relations from Northern Ireland: Lessons from Drumcree. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol. 24: 3, pp. 433-450.

Knox and Hughes (1996) Crossing the Divide: Community Relations in Northern Ireland. *Journal of Peace Research.* Vol. 33, No. 1, pp. 83-98.

Lowndes and Thorp (unpublished) East Midlands *PVE Pathfinder Evaluation 2007-8*.

Marcouch, Ahmed (2008). *Slotervaart Action Plan – Countering Radicalisation* Council of Amsterdam Borough of Slotervaart.

OPM (unpublished) 'Preventing Violent Extremism Pathfinder Evaluation – Draft Final Report for West London Alliance'. April 2008. *PVE Pathfinder Evaluation 2007-8* (received via CLG).

Ross, M. H. (2000) Creating the conditions for peacemaking: theories of practice in ethnic conflict resolution. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 23, No. 6, pp. 1002-1034.

Waterhouse Consultancy Group, (2008) PVE – An independent evaluation of the Birmingham Pathfinder. For Birmingham City Council *PVE Pathfinder Evaluation 2007-8* (received via CLG).

Chapter 5
Conclusions

In this report we have analysed existing studies and evaluations of attempts to prevent violent extremism. We first approached this research with two types of successful outcomes: whether the intervention/treatment resulted in a reduction in community support for violent extremism; and whether the intervention/treatment resulted in a reduction in community support for violent extremism *in the name of religion*. However, as noted above there is no evidence from the 18 literature sources to suggest which interventions worked best in changing communities' attitudes towards violent *extremism*, The implicit theory within the literature is one of 'trickle down' or 'contagion' effect, whereby changing attitudes in preventing violent extremism in an individual would lead to a change of attitude for the whole of the community. Therefore, our findings relate to interventions which worked best in reducing participants' support for violent extremism. Also due to the limited number of interventions related to PVE generally the report focuses on PVE *in the name of religion* (as noted previously this does not imply extremism in the name of Islam but also includes sectarian conflict in Northern Ireland and religious conflict in Indonesia).

In this concluding section we shall discuss both PVE generally and PVE *in the name of religion* together, as much of what we say here relates to both outcomes.

Much of the evidence from the 18 studies was case based and qualitative in nature, and the extent of evaluation was limited in many of them. By adopting the fsQCA approach we have compensated for any shortcomings that may have arisen (see section 2.2).

Using the fsQCA approach we have been able to move beyond the simple explanation of one type of intervention being more useful than another, to be able to point to the way in which particular combinations of factors might combine in particular contexts to have sustained success. In this concluding section we highlight some of the broader lessons that can be drawn from the analysis. Three factors form the basis of these conclusions.

Target group

The importance of a clearly defined target group in relation to a detailed overarching theory of preventing support for violent extremism is highlighted in the literature and is a key feature of success. The conclusion is not simply that particular groups should be targeted (e.g. young people, women etc) but that in doing so there needs to be a clear theory that explains why such focus might lead to success. Having such a theory not only provides a justification for the intervention but also offers a clear set of criteria against which to evaluate it.

The starting point for such an approach would be through a literature review of the theoretical approaches that underpin current initiatives in PVE and PVE *in the name of religion*. These could be usefully assessed using Ross' (2000: 1005-7) three tests (see outline on p. 13-14), although other conceptual frameworks might also exist.

Such an approach would not only be helpful strategically, but it would also help support clearer read-over from practical examples of policy and allow better policy implementation and delivery.

This review has focused more on real life examples of PVE and PVE *in the name of religion*, and so has not analysed or developed the theoretical models in detail. However, several conclusions nevertheless stand out.

- Work with any of the four main groups – women, leaders, young people, and the community – needs to be firmly linked to a theoretically informed strategy (see above). It is also important to understand links between these four groups. It is not sufficient to simply assume that work with one group will automatically trickle down or across to other groups within the community. In order to both explain and evaluate such interventions it is necessary to have an explicit theory for why the interventions are taking place and how they link between or across groups, which takes into account both the internal and external factors.

- Work with leaders at the community level needs to consider their involvement as community participants rather than just as representatives.

- Work with young people seems to be the most important area on which policy-makers should focus their attention. This message is one which is sustained across the literature and which appears to offer the greatest likelihood of success.

- Inter-generational work is an important aspect to promoting community resilience that needs development and one where learning could be drawn from other work around PVE.

Type of intervention

Focusing on target groups within a community will only be successful if the correct type of intervention is adopted. It is evident that different groups will respond better to some types of intervention than others. Moreover, the context in which the intervention is adopted, and the way it is combined with others, will matter. Our analysis suggests that the following issues are most important in relation to the type of intervention:

- Successful types of intervention were those which focus on challenging ideology, often combined with a focus on theology. Discussion and debate was often a sub-type of this kind of approach but were not necessarily sufficient on their own.

- Challenging ideology and extremist interpretations of theology are best when community-led debates occur, encouraged through sessions to gain skills on independent thinking and a questioning of information.

- Providing long-term, sustainable support for spaces, resources and training in offering such community-led support is important.

- There is some evidence (see Marcouch 2008) to suggest that when identity issues and ideology issues are addressed this needs to be a two stage process. Firstly, initiated as a process where community debate on Islam and Muslim politics can take place in safe, accessible spaces. Secondly, moving to a process where there is wider debate,

including discussion forums to involve a two-way dialogue with other faith groups and those of no faith. This would correspond with government's community cohesion policy.

- A successful type of intervention was that which focuses on capacity building/ empowerment. Informal education and training was often a sub-type of this approach.

- Capacity building/empowerment was successful particularly when it gained sustainability either through a peer-led continuation of mentoring type schemes, or when linked to a recognised leadership qualification.

- Multi-agency involvement in capacity building/engagement was crucial in terms of providing ongoing signposting to support continued individual development.

Mechanism

Alongside the type of intervention, the mechanism through which it is delivered has also been identified as being crucial to success. The importance of outreach/peripatetic work was strongly confirmed in our study, particularly the following factors:

- Interventions need to go where the specific communities or sub-communities are, rather than working through more formal channels. In relation to young people in particular, outreach work in more informal settings seems to be much more successful than working through schools or other more formal organisations.

- Within the area of outreach/peripatetic work, the way in which this was adopted seems to be important in terms of successful engagement taking place. The following seemed to be important:

  – Adopting a 'listening mode' of engagement.

  – Relating to all target group members, as people with experience of their community, rather than representatives. This relies on integrating such members into governance structures appropriately in order to support such a role.

  – Building good relations of trust with existing community hubs, allowing them to support new community engagement and leadership development.

Not surprisingly, our analysis concludes by recognising the ongoing difficulties which policy makers face in identifying and implementing appropriate interventions to reduce support for violent extremism within specific communities, and especially support for violent extremism *in the name of religion*. However, in bringing together the existing literature and policy evaluations on this topic and subjecting them to a systematic analysis, we have gone some way to identifying those types of interventions which might be most successful. A rapid evidence assessment of this type cannot give definitive direction to future policy, not least because, as we have discussed earlier, the evidence base on which it is premised remains limited. Nevertheless, the report has highlighted some areas and combinations which hold greater promise of success. In this respect, this rapid evidence assessment should provide a valuable resource for all those concerned with reducing support for violent extremism.

Appendix A
The Fuzzy Logic Methodology

Fuzzy-Set Social Science

Ragin[6] describes a method for working with small-N sets of data, which he calls Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA). He posits the method as an alternative to the dichotomous quantitative/qualitative debate dominant within social science. The method was premised on the presence or absence of a quality. Ragin[7] argues that QCA utilises Boolean algebra to allow case comparison *…by scholars engaged in the qualitative study of macro social phenomena*. The main claim in support of QCA is that it… *makes it possible to bring the logic and empirical intensity of qualitative approaches to studies that embrace more than a handful of cases*. The process generates a truth table which represents the combinations of variables leading to a given outcome. This is based on a minimisation process whereby… *The goal of the logical minimisation is to represent – in a shorthand manner – the information in the truth table regarding the different combinations of conditions that produce a specific outcome.*

QCA works with crisp sets, something is either present (1) or absent (0)[8] which is not always possible to discern in social science research. Ragin[9] developed the method to incorporate the subtle distinction between presence and absence with a new tool, fsQCA, which incorporates the idea of fuzzy-sets. Fuzzy-sets are simply the name given for the extension of QCA crisp sets into the gradation possible with fsQCA.

This project will use a four value fuzzy-set (0, .33, .67, 1) to code attributes as completely absent (0), more absent than present (.33), more present than absent (.67) and completely present (1). This allows researchers the ability to grade the absence or presence of a phenomenon to reflect the nuances evident within the original research.

Data Sets

Data sets generated from the literature review can be entered directly into fsQCA or a range of other statistical software compatible with fsQCA.[10] This research uses SPSS to complement the outputs generated by fsQCA and allow further statistical analysis if required.

---

[6] Ragin, C. (1987), *The Comparative Method*, Berkeley: The University of California.

[7] http://www.u.arizona.edu/~cragin/fsQCA/

[8] Present/Absent is used to represent True/False, In/Out; Membership/Non-Membership, Inclusion/Exclusion and other possible combinations.

[9] Ragin, C. (2000) *Fuzzy-Set Social Science,* Chicago/ London: The University of Chicago Press,

[10] Ragin C and Davey, S. (2008), *User's Guide to Fuzzy-set/Qualitative Comparative Analysis*, Arizona: University of Arizona.

Boolean Algebra

Within fsQCA the use of Boolean algebra differs from the use in QCA. With crisp sets the logical operators and/or are used differently to fuzzy-sets. In fsQCA and/or are used as follows:

Logical AND. With fuzzy-sets, logical AND is accomplished by taking the minimum membership score of each case in the sets that are intersected.

Logical OR. Two or more sets also can be joined through logical OR – the union of sets.

In addition, Ragin argues that when looking at the truth table (in fsQCA referred to as 'table of configurations' rather than 'truth table') *the researcher must begin by developing a rule for classifying some configurations (vector spaces corners) as relevant and others as irrelevant based on the number of cases residing in each sector of the vector space defined by the causal conditions.*[11]

In short, the choice is based on a decision made by the researcher where a cut point is made – cases above the point will be used in analysis, below the point removed from analysis. The software recommends a cut-off point not below 0.8 which was the logical point to adopt in relation to our analysis.

The truth table works as described above for crisp sets, but the output identifies the factors that need to be present/absent to explain the 'dependent variable'.

Before reading our findings it is important to reiterate the point made earlier that the paths leading to the outcome display 'equifinality': that is, all paths are as important as each other in leading to the outcome. Also the higher the solution coverage and the solution consistency (see tables in appendix H) the more trust we can have in the outcome. There should be a threshold set for both and as we move away from 1 the less we can trust the findings. It is suggested that the threshold should not fall below 0.8 but that in itself is an arbitrary indicator and a higher threshold (i.e. closer to 1) is recommended.

---

[11] Ragin C and Davey, S. (2008), *User's Guide to Fuzzy-set/Qualitative Comparative Analysis*, Arizona: University of Arizona, pp77-78.

Appendix B
Stage Two Literature Sifting Process

1   We cut down the references in our database from 813 to 68. In this process of elimination we excluded references: only relating to community cohesion, classified localised issues of violence (e.g. gang crime), relevance of the research classified as 'other', level of evaluation unknown/none and primary evaluation, below level 6 (e.g. below international organisations) in terms of source (see mapping report stage one for details of this hierarchy).

The table below provides a breakdown as to the numbers of references that have been eliminated during this process:

References removed	No. excluded from academic database	No. excluded from grey lit. database
1 Relevance of the literature (exclusion of references relating to community cohesion, localised issues of violence, or 'other' issues)	234	177
2 Level of evaluation (exclusion of unknown, none and primary evaluation)	314	254
3 Quality of research (exclusion of sources derived from think tanks/NGOs, foreign organisations/centres, or classified as 'other'	9	41
Total of remaining references	35	33
Overall total remaining	N/A	68

NB: The codes excluded here are not in many cases applicable in one instance. In other words, references may have fallen under two or three of these coding categories whilst clearly only having been removed once in effect.

2   The 68 items were then obtained in either electronic or paper format (as possible) and reviewed by the research team to check their relevance to the variables identified for the stage two analyses (see checklist for details). Final sources were also selected in relation to gaining a spread of sources across the variables, as far as possible. This process narrowed the literature for the coding stage of analysis down to 18 references.

Appendix C
Coding Frame Applied

Boolean analysis coding frame

In general terms, this project will use a four value fuzzy-set (0, .33, .67, 1) to code attributes as completely absent (0), more absent than present (.33), more present than absent (.67) and completely present (1). This allows researchers the ability to grade the absence or presence of a phenomenon to reflect the nuances evident within the original research.

The aim of this coding frame is two-fold: firstly it is to set out the parameters for the inclusion of a particular variable within a paper as present or absent by giving a clear definition of the variable. Secondly, it is to give a sense as to the nuances that may arise between the categories 0, .33, .67 and 1 in defining the level of inclusion of the variable. This second aim is necessarily subjective and what is provided here is intended to be a guide as to potential possibilities via the use of examples. It should be noted therefore that there are inevitably other examples that could be equally valid alongside those given here.

In addition to this the output variables will be coded in terms of the success of a particular intervention, in addition to the existence of adverse effects so as to lead to a more than unsuccessful result. This refers to something that is not simply the existence of an unsuccessful result in terms of the intervention aims, but means that we can distinguish between this scenario and that of something that was not only unsuccessful in terms of aims, but also entailed negative effects.

The Boolean approach converts case study evidence into a form suitable for the analysis and comparison of key factors. It does this through providing tables of configurations, which represent the combinations of influencing factors leading to a given outcome, with the use of a specialised computer software package. Through our coding of the interventions in the literature, we have provided an analysis as to the extent to which something needs to be present or absent in any given intervention in order for an influencing factor to have a successful outcome. By using the 'fuzzy logic' element of QCA analysis we have been able to incorporate any nuances present in the literature we have assessed (see appendix A, for details). Any negative outcomes from an intervention have also been included in our assessment, in addition to an assessment of what simply did not produce the intended outcome.

The research draws on expertise within the research team in an emerging research methodology called Configurational Comparative Methods (CCM). CCM builds on techniques from quantitative comparative analysis (QCA). One aspect of CCM, fuzzy-set qualitative comparative analysis (fsQCA), enables the use of a method that is, it is argued, simultaneously qualitative and quantitative (Ragin 2009:89).

QCA adopts a multiple case analysis in attempting to address the research question. In this research cases were identified as individual pieces of literature relating to interventions in PVE.

In adopting fsQCA the research team had to identify conditions of interest. One way to understand conditions is to see the term as synonymous with variables. The conditions are expressed as sets i.e. membership or non-membership of a set such as young people, women and so on. Fuzzy-sets are expressed in terms of their membership or non-membership with two fixed points: complete membership (1) or complete non-membership (0). In between the fixed points the level of inclusion in the set is finer grained. For this research there were four states: complete absence = 0; more out than in = .33; more in than out = .67; complete presence = 1. This allowed the research team to make a judgement about the conditions under investigation within the context of the coding frame. Sources were then checked for inter-coder reliability through the use of double-coding.

Research analysis

The research undertook two types of analysis. Once the data had been coded it was entered into the fsQCA software for quantitative statistical analysis. This process identified the clusters of influencing factors that are most likely to lead to a successful outcome in relation to each of our outcome factors. Our findings and the tables of configurations produced in this analysis can be found in the findings section of the report and appendix G.

For ease of reference, initially the coding process was recorded on an Excel spreadsheet before transferring to SPSS and then into the software package fsQCA for analysis. Within fsQCA an outcome is specified alongside a number of conditions which are, theoretically, thought to explain, to some extent, the outcome. The initial part of the analysis generates a 'table of configurations' for which it was necessary to set a cut-off point for determining which causal combinations pass fuzzy-set theoretic consistency[12] and which do not (Ragin 2009:109). The software offers a default setting which it is recommended to accept as the lowest acceptable threshold, this was therefore the cut-off point we adopted. Conditions below the threshold are removed from further analysis and the table of configurations is ordered by conditions leading to a positive outcome ranked by their strength of consistency.

The final stage of the operation generates the outcome specified. The output section is then analysed for the combinations of conditions which could help in explaining the causal outcome suggested by fsQCA. Following this process of analysis we undertook a qualitative analysis of the sources to further consider these findings. This is contained in the research syntheses section of the report.

---

[12] 'Consistency' measures the degree to which membership in each solution term is a subset of the outcome. Consistency is computed by first computing the consistency of each case. For any solution term a case is consistent if membership in the solution term is less than or equal to membership in the outcome. If a case's membership in the solution term is greater than its membership in the outcome (i.e. it is inconsistent) then the case is given a score that equals its membership in the outcome. These scores are then summed and divided by the sum of memberships in the solution term.

Output variables:

1   Whether the intervention/treatment resulted in a reduction in participants' support for violent extremism.

2   Whether the intervention/treatment resulted in a reduction in participants' support for violent extremism *in the name of religion*.

1   Definition

Violent Extremism = taking actions to cause injury or death to people in order to make a political protest.

In relation to these two output variables there are two aspects to each to be considered. As Ross (2000:1005-7) notes: 'Central to deciding whether a conflict resolution initiative has been successful, is the connection between its specific programmatic goals and changes in the long-term relationships between large groups.' In doing this he argues that it is analytically useful to differentiate between the internal success factors and the external success factors. For Ross (2000:1005-7), 'Internal criteria concern the impact on those participating in an initiative, while external criteria link a project's activities to the conflict as a whole.' Internal factors therefore may refer to changes in attitudes of workshop participants, the gaining of skills and knowledge, the resolution of local disputes etc. Ross suggests that behavioural changes such as these are a good indicator of the impact of internal success. These changes may be at the level of changes in the patterns of everyday lives of communities that are seen to directly impact on negative attitudes, or at the level of changes in attitudes between leaders, for instance. In this project we are interested in considering projects that address changes at the community (rather than national elite) level.

Ross (2000:1005-7) considers: 'External criteria of success (to) link the specific effects of an intervention to the wider conflict in which it is embedded – what Kelman calls transfer.' He notes that since no programme can categorically argue that it alone has resulted in the resolution of a conflict, or particularly cannot suggest that violence has or has not taken place as the direct causal result of a particular intervention, these criteria are difficult to assess. As a result most intervention programmes make no comment on the factors in their intervention that have an impact on the external criteria Conflict?.

Due to the lack of direct causal mechanisms however in relation to the external assessment criteria, these will not be coded for or assessed as part of the Boolean methodology. The focus here will be on internal success criteria instead. Some of our papers do, however, suggest underlying hypotheses both for the success or failure of particular interventions in relation to the wider problem of preventing violent extremism.

The coding frame for outcome variables is therefore as follows:

PVE – General	PVE – General (Negative Outcome)	PVE in the Name of Religion	PVE in the Name of Religion (Negative outcome)
Interventions positioned within the wider context of preventing violent extremism.		Interventions positioned within the wider context of preventing violent extremism in the name of religion.	
Achieves positive outcomes in terms of changing attitudes	Leads to negative outcomes in terms of changing attitudes	Achieves positive outcomes in terms of changing attitudes	Leads to negative outcomes in terms of changing attitudes
Coding Frame			
0 – No change in attitudes	0 – No change in attitudes	0 – No change in attitudes	0 – No change in attitudes
0.33 – Indication of implied changes of attitude as result of intervention albeit slight.	0.33 – The intervention appears to strengthen negative community (either in scale or extent of negativity).	0.33 – Indication of implied changes of attitude as result of intervention albeit slight.	0.33 – The intervention appears to strengthen negative community (either in scale or extent of negativity).
0.67 – A recognised change in attitudes was present towards an identifiable subject as a consequence of the intervention, but this was in conjunction with other foci (for example, community cohesion as well, where the intervention involved several different groups).	0.67 – The intervention resulted in both the extent and level of negativity increasing.	0.67 A recognised change in attitudes was present towards an identifiable subject as a consequence of the intervention, but this was in conjunction with other foci (for example, community cohesion as well, where the intervention involved several different groups).	0.67 – The intervention resulted in both the extent and level of negativity increasing.
1 – The intervention resulted in a notable change in negative community attitudes towards an identifiable subject.	1 – The intervention resulted in both the extent and level of negativity becoming totally galvanised in opposition towards an identifiable subject.	1 – The intervention resulted in a notable change in negative community attitudes towards an identifiable subject.	1 – The intervention resulted in both the extent and level of negativity becoming totally galvanised in opposition towards an identifiable subject.

Influencing variables

Target group:

1 Targeted at young people.

2 Targeted at women.

3 Targeted at leaders.

0 – The intervention is focused on another population group entirely.

.33 – The intervention discussed may focus on the target community in general, but implicitly refer to young people/women/leaders (maybe in the case study for instance).

.67 – Elements of the intervention focus on young people/women/leaders, while other aspects focus on another target group.

1 – The intervention is entirely focused on young people/women/leaders.

Note: Most government departments refer to young people as being those below the age of 25. Leaders may be political, religious, or community for instance depending on the nature of the conflict and the groups involved.

4 **Focused on a target community/ies (target of the attitudinal change for the output).**

0 – The intervention is not specifically targeted on any closely defined group.

.33 – The intervention discussed may focus on broader communities more widely perhaps, but within this category the target community/ies is implicitly recognised, or alternatively it could be focused on an ethnic community that are likely to be Muslim (i.e. Pakistani – if this is the target community in the case).

.67 – Elements of the intervention focus on the target community/ies, while the intervention is focused on other defined communities or maybe specific groups like young people at the same time.

1 – The intervention is exclusively focused on the target community/ies.

Target community(ies) here, refers to those that are both identified by themselves or by others to be part of a group considered to exist in opposition to another social group.

Content/process

5   Includes capacity building/empowerment.

0 – The intervention is not about either of these aspects of work (may be about promoting discussion instead for example).

.33 – The intervention could be focused on something like a general programme of education, but implicit to this is some capacity building/empowerment of community.

.67 – The intervention is about skills development and encouraging discussion on issues of concern which covers aspects of capacity building and empowerment without necessarily supporting a platform for these to be effectively actualised.

1 – The intervention is totally focused on capacity building/empowerment. This is defined as:

'Capacity is the right organisation, systems, partnerships, people and processes to deliver against a particular agenda or plan.' (ODPM, 2006).

'Empowerment (is) an increased sense of being able to influence local decision-making.' (CLG definition as referred to in DMU/Southampton, 2008: 33).

6   Includes challenging ideology.

0 – The intervention is not about challenging ideology.

.33 – The intervention, for instance, could be focused on discussion/debate forums but implicit to these could be an underlying aim to challenge ideology through debate.

.67 – The intervention is overtly about challenging ideology, alongside another aim like theological education for instance.

1 – The intervention is totally focused on challenging ideology. This is defined as:

Ideology as: 'the body of doctrine, myth, symbol, etc., with reference to some political or cultural plan, as that of communism, along with the procedures for putting it into operation.' (www.thefreedictionary.com).

In our work the idea of challenging an ideology may not only be in terms of internal ideological questions raised, but simply to be to challenge the belief that we are currently living in an age of two competing ideologies (Islamism and Western liberalism).

7   Includes focus on theology.

0 – The intervention is not about theology in any way.

.33 – The intervention could be focused on developing the English language skills of Imams for instance. This has an implicit aim of developing this within the context of theology.

.67 – The intervention is about encouraging theological debate on a number of issues and therefore is relevant to this intervention theme as well as discussion/debate forums for example.

1 – The intervention is totally focused on theology. This is defined as:

'Theology is the study of the existence or attributes of a God or gods, and of how that god or those gods relate to the world and especially to human existence; more generally, it is the study of religious faith, practice, and experience, or of spirituality. It is sometimes contrasted with religious studies: theology is understood as the study of religion from an internal perspective (e.g., a perspective of commitment to that religion), and religious studies as the study of religion from an external (e.g., a secular) perspective'. (www.wikipedia.org)

Within the context of interventions this means working with religious leaders and/or text to make public theological interpretation, debates and related practices to a particular religion/faith.

8   Includes debate/discussion forums

0 – The intervention is not about discussion/debate forums.

.33 – The intervention could be part of an education programme, but imply a focus on discussion and debate forums as a part of a discovery learning approach within the programme, for example.

.67 – The intervention includes an element of discussion/debate forums alongside other content. This may be around empowerment or challenging ideology for instance.

1 – The intervention is focused exclusively on the use of debate/discussion forums.

Such forums can be defined as: Formal or informally convened groups brought together for the purpose of debate or discussion on a range of issues considered to be of concern to the group members. The aim of such forums may be about achieving consensus among the group, or simply engaging people in debate to broaden their knowledge on, or openness towards an issue.

9   Includes education/training

0 – The intervention is not about education/training.

.33 – The intervention implies an element of education/training, without being explicitly about this. For instance, a focus on capacity building may indirectly refer to some training of individuals as part of a wider project.

.67 – The intervention includes an element of education/training that is co-ordinated alongside another aspect of work, such as theological debate.

1 – The intervention is solely focused on education/training.

The nature of this education/training may be informal or formal and encourage self-learning, peer-learning or more top-down methods of pedagogy.

Mechanism

(All refer to interventions at the community level – see stage one).

10 Delivered by outreach/peripatetic work

0 – The intervention is not delivered via outreach/peripatetic work.

.33 – The intervention implies an element of this approach to delivery, perhaps involving religious leaders speaking to their believers in a community about an issue both formally in a religious ceremony and informally through community events.

.67 – The intervention includes an element of this delivery mechanism, for instance at a particular time in its development, alongside other delivery mechanisms like multi-agency working.

1 – The intervention is solely focused on delivery via outreach/peripatetic work.

Outreach work is delivered via a community embedded individual or organisation, while peripatetic work refers to a local liaison moving around between groups in order to deliver an intervention, but who is also embedded at the grassroots level. This definition includes what might be termed elsewhere as community development work.

11 Involves multi-agency working

0 – The intervention is delivered exclusively by a single agency without reference to other organisations.

.33 – The intervention implies an element of this approach to delivery, perhaps focusing on aims that would need a multi-agency approach in order to be delivered within the particular context, such as working to engage gangs of young people in an education programme.

.67 – The intervention includes an element of this delivery mechanism for instance at a particular level of its organisation. But other elements of delivery are taking place alongside this at the same or other times, such as outreach work.

1 – The intervention is explicitly delivered through a collaboration of two or more agencies.

Multi-agency working may be conducted formally via partnerships or informally through collaboration or co-operation. Agencies may be used to refer to statutory agencies, or quangos.

12 Includes community consultation

0 – The intervention does not include any mechanism for community consultation.

.33 – The intervention implies some level of community involvement in its development, but this remains informally defined. This may take place for instance, as likely to be a part of outreach/peripatetic work without being explicitly defined as such.

.67 – The intervention includes community consultation as one aspect in its development, but this is alongside others such as multi-agency working.

1 – Community consultation is fundamental to the intervention.

Community consultation in this instance can refer to both consultation with leaders or more broad mechanisms of participation for the purposes of consultation. This may be formally administered in terms of consultation on a set document or set of questions or more informal in terms of a discussion on a range of ideas or suggestions.

Overall findings

Table 2 represents our 'truth table' with each of the 70 interventions coded for. Each factor is coded as 0 (factor is completely absent), 0.33 (factor is more absent than present), 0.67 (factor is more present than absent) or 1 (factor is completely present). For further detail on the coding frame see appendix C.

Table 2: 'Truth Table' of all cases coded against all factors

No Type of intervention	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	N1	P1	N2	P2
1 Community Relations Policy	0.33	0.33	1	0.67	0.67	1	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.33	1	0.67	0.33	0.67	0.33	0.67
2 Community Relations Legislation	0.67	0.33	1	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.67	0	0.67	0	0.33	0.33		0.67		0.67
3 Community Relations Infrastructure	0.33	0.33	0.67	0.33	1	0.33	0.33	0.67	0.67	0.67	1	0.33	0.33	0.67	0.33	0.67
4 Improving Community Relation	0	0	1	0	0.67	0.33	0	1	0.33	0.67	0.67	0.33		0.67		
5 Principled Negotiation	0	0	1	0	0.33	0.67	0	0	0	0.33	0.33	0		0		
6 Human Needs Theory	0	0	1	0	0	0.67	0	0.67	0	0.67	0	0		0.33		
7 Intercultural Miscommunication	0	0	1	0.33	0.67	0.33	0	1	0	0	0.67	0		0.67		
8 Implementing Conflict Transformation	0	0	1	1	1	0.33	0	0.33	0.67	0.33	0.67	0		0.33		
9 Diversionary Activity	1	0	0	0	1	0.33	0.33	0	1	1	1	0				1
10 Development Of Capacity	1	0	0.33	0	1	0.33	0.67	0.67	1	1	1	0				
11 Muslim Youth Awards	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0.33			0.67
12 Comic Publication	1	0	0	0	0.33	0.67	0	0	0.33	1	1	0		0.67		
13 Muslim Girls' Inclusion	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0.67	1	1	0				0.67
14 Mapping Communities	0	0	1	0.67	0	0	0	0	0	0.67	1	1				0
15 Women's' Inclusion	0.33	1	0	0	0.67	0	0.33	0	0.33	1	1	0				0.33
16 Young People's Inclusion	1	0.33	0	0	1	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.67	1	1	0				0.67
17 Integration Of Education	1	0	0	0	1	0.33	0.33	0	1	0	0.33	0	0.33			
18 Imam Training Programme	0	0	0	1	0	0.67	0	0	1	0	1	0				0

Table 2: 'Truth Table' of all cases coded against all factors (continued)

No Type of intervention	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	N1	P1	N2	P2
19 Intergroup Dialogue	1	0	0	0	0.67	0.33	0	1	0.67	0	0	0		0.67		
20 Capacity Building Training	0	0.67	0	1	1	0	0	0.33	1	1	0	0.67				0
21 Interfaith Dialogue	0	0	0.33	1	0.33	0.67	0	1	0	0	1	0				1
22 Socratic Discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	0.67	0.67	0	1	0	0				0
23 Supporting Imams And Mosques	0	0	0	1	0	0.67	0.33	0	1	0	1	0				1
24 Interfaith Dialogue	0	0	1	0	0	0.33	0	1	0	0	1	0				1
25 Youth Participation Project	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0				0
26 Increasing Resilience	0	1	0	0	0	0.33	1	1	0.33	1	0	0				1
27 Parenting Support	0	0	0.67	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0				0
28 Police Intervention	1	0	0	0	1	0.33	0	0	0	1	0	0		0.67		
29 Inclusion Strategy	1	0	0	0	1	0.67	0	0	0	1	0.67	0		0.67		
30 Parent Walker	1	0	0	0	0.33	0	0	0	0	1	0	0		1		
31 Knowledge Transfer	1	0	0	0	0.33	0.33	0	0	1	1	0.67	0		0		
32 Cross Community Contact Initiative The District Council Community	1	0	0	0	1	0.33	0	0	1	1	0.33	0	0.33			
33 Relations Programme, NI	0.33	0.33	1	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.67				0.67
34 Belgium The Catholic University	0.33	0.33	1	0.67	0.67	0.67	0	0.67	1	0.33	0.67	0.67				0.67
35 Denmark DSIS	0.33	0	1	0.67	0	0.33	0.33	1	0.33	0.67	0.67	1				0
36 Denmark The Team	1	0	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.33	0	0.67	1	1	1	0.33				0.33
37 France Muslim Scouts	1	0.33	1	0.33	0.33	0.33	0	1	1	1	0.33	0.33				0.33

Table 2: 'Truth Table' of all cases coded against all factors *(continued)*

No Type of intervention	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	N1	P1	N2	P2
38 France The Brotherhood	0.67	0.33	0.33	0.67	0.33	1	1	0.67	1	0.33	1	0.33				0.33
39 France Isc Paris	0.33	0	0.67	0.67	1	0.67	0.67	0.67	1	0.33	0.67	0.67				0
40 Germany Islam Forum	0	0	1	0.67	0.33	0.67	0.33	0.67	0.67	0.67	1	0.67				0
41 Hungary Budapest	0	1	1	0.33	1	0	0	0.67	1	0.67	0	0.67		0.33		
42 Netherlands Actieplan	1	0	1	0.67	1	1	0.67	1	1	1	1	0.67				0.33
43 Netherlands Wijzer	0.67	0.33	1	0.67	0.33	1	0.67	1	0.33	0.67	0.67	0.67				0
44 Spain SIC	0	0	0.67	0	0.33	0	0	0.33	1	0	0.67	0.33				0
45 Spain ASMIN	0.33	0.33	1	0.67	0.33	0.33	0	0.67	0.67	0.33	0.33	1				0
46 Sweden Valsta	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.67	0	0	0.33	1	0.67	0.33	0.67				0
47 Uk Prevent	0.67	0.33	1	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.67	1	0.67				0
48 Uk Mcu	0.33	0.33	1	1	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.67	1				0.33
49 Uk Khayaal	0.67	0.33	1	0	0.33	0.67	0.67	1	1	1	0.67	0.67				0
50 Natural Born Leaders Workshop	0.67	1	0	0	1	0	0	0.67	0	1	0	0				0.33
51 Drama Workshop	0.33	1	0	0	0.33	1	1	0.33	0	1	0	0				1
52 Aik Saath	1	0	0	0	0.33	0	0	0	1	1	0	0				0.33
53 West Wing Arts Centre	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0				0
54 Heroes Leadership Programme	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0.33	0	1	0	0				0
55 Slough Community School	1	0	0	0	0.33	0	0	0	0	1	0.33	0				0
56 Madaaris Initiative	1	0	0.67	1	1	0	0	0	0.67	1	0.67	0				0.33
57 Mosque Governance	0	0	1	0.33	1	0	0	0	0	1	0.67	0.33				0.67

Table 2: 'Truth Table' of all cases coded against all factors (continued)

No Type of intervention	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	N1	P1	N2	P2
58 Young Muslim Leadership	1	0	0	0	1	0.33	0.33	0	0	1	1	0				1
59 Media Workshop	0.33	0	1	0.33	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0				1
60 Muslimah In Action	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0				0
61 Study Circle	1	0	0	0	0	0.67	1	0	0.67	1	1	0				1
62 Success Clubs	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0.67	1	0	0				1
63 Know Your Clients	0	0	1	0.33	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0				1
64 Divisionary Activities	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0.33	0				0.67
65 Exploration Of Faith And Citizenship	1	0	0	0	0.67	1	1	0.67	0	1	1	0				0.67
66 Peer Ambassadors	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0.67	0				1
67 Capacity Building With Muslim women	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0				0.67
68 Community Volunteering	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0				1
69 Community Networks And Leaders	0	0	0	1	0	0.67	1	0	0	1	0	0				0.33
70 Interaction With Public Services	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0				0.67

Code: Influencing factors

- A = Young People
- B = Women
- C = Community
- D = Leaders

- E = Capacity Building/Empowerment
- F = Challenging Ideology
- G = Focus on Theology
- H = Debate/Discussion

- I = Education/Training

- J = Outreach/Peripatetic
- K = Multi-Agency
- L = Community Consultation

Code: Outcome factors

- N1 = General PVE outcome – negative
- P1 = General PVE outcome – positive
- N2 = PVE in name of religion – negative
- N3 = PVE in name of religion – positive

Appendix D
Findings for PVE generally

This section details the findings to have come out of the fsQCA Boolean computer assisted analysis conducted on the 70 interventions contained in our sample of 18 literature sources. As we have separated the report along the line of PVE generally and PVE *in the name of religion* (to be found in main report), this part of the report relates to our findings for PVE generally.

The most successful interventions to prevent support for violent extremism generally are:

In terms of interventions with young people:

- Interventions with young people to challenge ideology, when delivered using outreach/peripatetic mechanisms and multi-agency approaches.

- Interventions with young people to capacity build or empower through debate and discussion and education and training.

- Interventions that are delivered through outreach/peripatetic work.

In terms of interventions aimed generally at the 'community':

- Interventions to build capacity/empower through debate and discussion delivered through multi-agency working.

- Interventions to build capacity/empower through debate and discussion delivered through outreach/peripatetic and multi-agency working.

- Interventions to build capacity/empower that challenge ideology, focus on theology, include debate and discussion and education and training, delivered through multi-agency and community consultation approaches.

In terms of interventions with leaders:

- Interventions to capacity build/empower that challenge ideology, focus on theology, include debate and discussion and education and training, delivered through multi-agency and community consultation approaches.

By contrast, work with women was not sufficient on its own to produce a successful outcome in relation to preventing violent extremism.

Overall, therefore, in terms of the key differences and similarities between work to prevent violent extremism *in the name of religion* and work simply to prevent violent extremism the following are particularly noticeable:

- Work with young people to challenge ideology in relation to PVE *in the name of religion*, seems to require an educational/training input in order to be successful as compared to PVE.

- Work with young people in relation to PVE to capacity build/empower requires debate and discussion and education and training, in order to be successful as compared to PVE *in the name of religion*.

- Work with young people in general is most successful when delivered through outreach – peripatetic work.

- Work with community seems to be generally successful in relation to capacity building/empowerment when delivered through outreach/peripatetic mechanisms.

- Debate and discussion and multi-agency approaches seem to have been more important when approaching PVE in terms of success.

- Work with women may be more important in relation to the success of PVE *in the name of religion*.

- Work with leaders may be more important in relation to the success of PVE.

Table 3: Distribution of Interventions for PVE generally			
Influencing variables	No. times variable was totally present in the intervention	No. of times some variable was implicitly present or present to an extent in the intervention	No. of times variable was totally absent in the intervention
Young people	7	3	5
Women	1	3	11
Community	7	1	7
Leaders	1	5	9
Capacity building/Empowerment	8	7	0
Challenging Ideology	1	12	2
Focus on Theology	0	4	11
Debate/Discussion	3	5	7
Education/Training	3	7	5
Outreach/Peripatetic	6	6	3
Multi-agency working	3	7	5
Community consultation	0	5	10

Discussion of findings

As the majority of the 70 interventions analysed in this report related to PVE *in the name of religion*, the discussion of PVE generally is limited and is included here only to provide a general overview of our findings.

Young people

Again it would seem that work with young people is the most important focus in the literature when it comes to PVE generally. It is this group which is deemed to be the most susceptible to becoming attracted to extremism, for a number of reasons commonly theorised in terms of radicalisation (Hundeide, 2003, Slootman & Tillie, 2006). Therefore it would make sense to primarily focus interventions to target this specific group. However, research by OPM (2008) found that project deliverers encountered difficulties in engaging those young people who were deemed 'most at risk' to violent extremism. This, according to them, was due to the sensitivity of the subject matter and also the difficulties of defining and identifying those 'most at risk'; therefore, those who did participate in the projects were self-selecting (OPM 2008).

Our analysis found that work with young people was successful when it was delivered through a mix of multi-agency working and/or outreach/peripatetic working rather than formal institutions such as schools. A review of the literature confirms this finding; a number of interventions made use of youth clubs and local community centres as these places provided a safe place for young people to actively participate in group activities. They also provided an outlet for young people to debate/discuss issues which affected them without the worry of being labelled an 'extremist' (Faith Associates 2007-8). A report by Marcouch (2008) stresses the importance of allowing young people the space to develop independent thinking when it comes to challenging ideologies; again this is best delivered via outreach/peripatetic methods rather than formal institutions.

Research by McEvoy *et al* (2006) comments on community level initiatives to PVE in Ireland, which focus more on building community relations through enhanced conflict resolution than on capacity building/empowerment through debate and discussion or education. However, McEvoy *et al* (2006) are critical of the community relations 'contact-based' approach that has been adopted and which they argue has been undermining to reconciliation. According to these authors, programmes have been designed in this way in place of any real attempt to address divisive labels, focus on the political nature of the Northern Ireland conflict or promote citizenship.

Although differing in terms of general perspective, Hughes (2007) similarly suggests that work with young people to challenge ideology needs to be conducted within the context of wider debates and relations. She suggests that in the Northern Ireland context of a history of long-term institutional division, the role of joined-up multi-agency work is really important. How much this success factor is transferable to other contexts is unclear.

Educational initiatives in a US school and Irish integration schools were also the focus of PVE work that aimed to capacity build/empower through promoting dialogue and discussion/meaningful contact Khuri (2004); Hughes (2007). In both these examples the gradual creation of a 'safe environment' was seen to be a key success factor.

Women

Our analysis did not find any pathways to success in relation to women, although this could be due to the interventions not identifying women as a specific target group. Within the literature we noted women were implicit in some interventions but more often they were included as a subset of the broader 'community'.

Leaders

The analysis for leaders revealed that almost all the conditions for success were appropriate (only outreach/peripatetic was not considered to be so). This is in some ways not a surprising result, since in many of these cases leaders were likely to be in obvious and accessible institutionalised positions and therefore did not require outreach/ peripatetic work to be engaged. However, the result beyond this factor is not so clearly explained. There are once again two likely reasons for this. The first reason has to do with the diversity of conflicts and types of leaders involved with any process to prevent violent extremism. This makes a number of different pathways to success plausible across a range of different scenarios. The other reason may be the peripheral role that leaders have perhaps played in PVE at the community level.

Community

The fsQCA analysis highlighted several pathways to success that included almost all conditions in some cases. Capacity building, as a type of intervention, was a necessary factor for successful work with the community (as opposed to being simply a sufficient factor). This result makes sense when we consider that the rationale for capacity building work is one of reconciling social divisions that are often exacerbated by the difference in the skills based resources.

Appendix E
List of Intervention

Case No.	Intervention	Evaluation
1	**Community Relations Policy** Prejudice reduction in Northern Ireland via cross community scheme which would establish and develop contact between schools, youth and community groups.	Author's assessment
2	**Community Relations Legislation** Condition laid down for organisations to participate in the community relations programme was focused on a cross party basis.	Author's assessment
3	**Community Relations Infrastructure** Looks to address the underlying structures which enhance divisiveness between two communities.	Author's assessment
4	**Improving Community Relations** Aims to help improve communications and understanding between communities, promoting a tolerant acceptance of the existence of a diversity of traditions and cultures, and encouraging structures which safeguard the rights of all members of society.	Author's assessment
5	**Principled Negotiation** Aim to help develop an understanding of how to resolve conflicts.	Author's assessment
6	**Human Needs Theory** Conflict resolution strategy which focuses on getting communities to recognise their common needs.	Author's assessment
7	**Intercultural Miscommunication** Focuses on understanding different cultures and emphasises on group harmony.	Author's assessment
8	**Implementing Conflict Transformation** Focuses on altering relationships among groups in society through engagement of, and reconciliation of, middle-range and grass-roots leaders and groups of citizens.	Author's assessment
9	**Diversionary Activity** A number of projects aimed at involving young people in a variety of activities and support network ranging from sporting activities such as football sessions or cricket clubs to group discussions and social networks.	Based on participants' interview
10	**Development of capacity** This project sought to develop 'soft skills' such as presentation and communication skills.	Based on participants' interview
11	**Muslim Youth Awards** To celebrate the achievements of young Muslims to make them feel good about themselves, to provide positive role models to peers as well as letting the wider society know of the many positives associated with young Muslims.	Based on authors' assessment

Case No.	Intervention	Evaluation
12	**Comic publication** To produce comic publication for wider dissemination, through a series of workshops engaging young people in the issues around preventing violent extremism.	Based on authors' assessment
13	**Muslim Girls' inclusion** To engage Muslim girls and young women who were not previously engaged by mainstream youth services. 1. To support leadership, decision-making, personal and social skills. 2. To provide a safe, inclusive environment for Muslim girls to explore issues around identity and belonging. 3. To allow Nottingham City Council to gain an understanding of the key issues surrounding access to services for young people.	Based on authors' assessment
14	**Mapping Communities** To tackle problems of exclusion and improve community engagement, in the context of developing a Muslim Forum in the city of Nottingham.	Based on authors' assessment
15	**Women's inclusion** 1. The inclusion of women, young people and diverse Muslim communities. 2. To encourage the active participation of Muslim communities and develop a sense of citizenship and belonging in Derby. 3. To portray Islam and Muslim people in a positive way and remove negative stereotypes.	Based on authors' assessment
16	**Young people's inclusion** Empower young people to feel a sense of belonging in mainstream society as part of a young people's inclusion project.	Based on authors' assessment
17	**Integration of Education** Cross-community contact scheme which offered financial support to planned integrated school that would educate children from Protestant and Catholic communities.	Author's assessment
18	**Imam Training Programme** Course offered by European governments to teach Imams culture, language and tradition of host country.	Authors' assessment
19	**Intergroup Dialogue** Course ran to facilitate dialogue between Jewish and Arab Americans.	Based on participants' feedback

Case No.	Intervention	Evaluation
20	**Capacity Building Training** The project aims were to develop and implement a training programme that may assist mosques and madressahs to improve their organisational infrastructure and their teaching and learning environment.	Feedback from participants via interviews.
21	**Interfaith Dialogue** To increase the knowledge religious and non-religious groups have about each other to foster understanding and increase tolerance.	Author's assessment
22	**Socratic Discussions** To help young people find their place in society and increase their understanding of the processes and dangers of radicalisation.	Author's assessment
23	**Supporting Imams and Mosques** To support the roles of Imams so that they are better equipped to deal with their role in society.	Author's assessment
24	**Interfaith Dialogue** Five day dialogue which attempted to reconcile tension amongst Christians and Muslims. By exploring differences and common ground.	Author's assessment
25	**Youth Participation Project** Young Muslims work together to develop and manage a project, which will help them develop leadership and management skills.	Author's assessment
26	**Increasing Resilience** Women group discussion forum which links with the youth Imam programme to counter radicalisation.	Author's assessment
27	**Parenting Support** Parent support course which addresses parenting issues related to culture and religion.	Author's assessment
28	**Police Intervention** Focus is on preventing right-wing extremism through empowerment conversation. This conversation is with the youth and their parents in an attempt to motivate towards positive change.	Author's assessment
29	**Inclusion Strategy** Building of personal ties to right wing extremist youths. By listening to these youths it is expected a relationship of trust can be built with wider society in countering these extremist views.	Author's assessment

Case No.	Intervention	Evaluation
30	**Parent Walker** Aim to have parents visible around city centre at night, in order to disperse youths with minimum confrontation.	Author's assessment
31	**Knowledge Transfer** Educational material about racism and discrimination used in school to highlight the importance of tolerance.	Author's assessment
32	**Cross Community Contact initiative** Educational response to the Northern Ireland conflict, in the shape of integrated school.	Author's assessment
33	**The District Council Community Relations Programme NI:** Building resilience via cross community scheme.	Author's assessment
34	**Belgium The Catholic University** The aim of the course is to provide a rounded understanding of Islam, through the promotion of a cultural, historical, scientific approach.	Author's assessment
35	**Denmark DSIS** To create dialogue between the Danish Security and Intelligence Service and Imams.	Based on Authors' assessment
36	**Denmark The Team** Aim to have a place where young people could come together informally, have someone to talk to and also be together with peers.	Author's assessment
37	**France Muslim Scouts** Offers modern religious youth education through a Muslim organisation. It is intended to provide more complete teachings of religions while offering education and guidance on whole range of areas.	Author's assessment
38	**France The Brotherhood** Focuses on inter-faith dialogue.	Author's assessment
39	**France Isc Paris** Aims to promote a better recognition of Islam and the building of social cohesion.	Author's assessment
40	**Germany Islam Forum** Developing guidance on partnership working between Muslim civil society and authorities.	Author's assessment
41	**Hungary Budapest** Project focuses on helping the integration of Muslim women, strengthening their self image.	Author's assessment

Case No.	Intervention	Evaluation
42	**Netherland Action plan** Aim to develop a preventative response to radicalisation through, stimulating improved awareness of issues surrounding radicalisation, strengthening the resilience of local youth against all religious forms of radicalisation.	Author's assessment
43	**Netherland Wijzer** IslamWijzer is an internet initiative set up to provide a more neutral representation of Islam on the internet.	Author's assessment
44	**Spain SIC** To promote understanding of citizenship and the rights that come with it, and improve integration.	Author's assessment
45	**SPAIN ASMIN** Focuses on the challenge of migraton, harnessing and developing new methods of intercultural intervention between the receiving society and the incorporation of immigrant people.	Author's assessment
46	**Sweden Valsta** Project set up to counter a number of social problems which could lead to radicalisation.	Author's assessment
47	**UK Prevent** Aim is for government to engage with the Muslim communities to prevent violent extremism together.	Author's assessment
48	**UK mcu** Muslim Contact Unit was established by the Metropolitan Police Special Branch, with the aim of establishing partnership with the Muslim community leaders.	Author's assessment
49	**UK Khayaal** Objectives are to develop and present educational performing arts that explore Muslim world literature, heritage, culture and arts.	Author's assessment
50	**Natural Born Leaders Workshop** Raising awareness of the need for Muslim women and girls to understand the meaning of 'leadership' within the family context, within the community context and within the wider society.	Based on participants' interview
51	**Drama Workshop** The workshop was to serve as an educational tool through the use of drama. The workshop addressed pertinent theological and ideological issues.	Feedback from participants

Case No.	Intervention	Evaluation
52	**Aik Saath** Project focuses on giving young people conflict resolution and anti-racism skills to prevent violence and promote harmony. This is done by various methods such as peer training in which peer training team pass on their skills to other young people. Addressing conflict with an Islamic approach.	Based on Participants' interview
53	**West Wing Arts Centre** 1. To develop a piece of theatre which is reflective of Muslim women. 2. To create a pilot outreach project which will use the Forum as a way of examining and tackling problems existing amongst Muslim women. 3. Focus on empowering women, by engaging them in new opportunities and skills development.	Feedback from participants via interview
54	**Heroes Leadership Programme** Project bought young people together, to discuss issues that are important to them, while learning from speakers and each other through a variety of indoor and outdoor activities, workshop and lectures.	Feedback from participants via interviews
55	**Slough Community School** Aims of the project was to tackle educational underachievement and increase self esteem and develop proactive and engaged young people amongst Slough's Muslim community.	Based on Author's assessment
56	**Madaaris Initiative** To help develop the capacity of mosques in Slough, to widen their roles to engage with civil society, promote community cohesion and provide community development activities.	Based on feedback from the management committee of Slough Islamic Trust.
57	**Mosque Governance** The main aim of this project was to work closely with ten key Islamic institutions to: 1. Effectively engage and help build their capacities and professionalism. 2. Help improve their governance and management system. 3. Develop robust toolkit that has the potential to be used by all faith-based institutions across the city.	Based on self reporting by participants in the form of interviews

Case No.	Intervention	Evaluation
58	**Young Muslim Leadership** 1. Encourage young Muslims in Birmingham to engage with a set of 'citizenship workshops' that highlight the importance of detecting and tackling the signals of violent extremism. 2. Develop the next generation of Muslim leaders who are able and confident enough to challenge and tackle violent extremism. 3. Learn lessons and disseminate good practice across the city. The project worked to build understanding and equip young people with the theological arguments to counter extremist ideologies, dispel misapprehensions and to develop their role as citizens, leaders and positive role models so that they can become 'leaders' for mainstream Islam and assert their British identity.	Based on self reporting by the participants, however the report does not link this evaluation back to the overall aim of the project
59	**Media Workshop** The purpose of the workshop was to assist individuals amongst the Muslim community to increase their communication skills as well as broadening their understanding of the media specifically the regional media.	Based on self reporting by participants via interviews.
60	**Muslimah in Action** A Steering Group was formed with a range of Muslim women who were keen to be involved in tackling extremism in their communities. The aims of the Steering Committee were to: 1. Identify and determine the variety of issues impacting on Muslim across the city. 2. Develop an action plan to tackle the issues. 3. Explore the most effective ways that women could play their part in local priorities and decision making processes.	Based on the findings from the report
61	**Study Circles** This seeks to create 'safe space' for young people to develop a better understanding of Islam.	Based on self reporting by participants via interviews.
62	**Success Clubs** Building resilience through a focus on understanding a Muslim's responsibility to their wider community. It engages and encourages young Muslims to ask searching questions about identity, politics, citizenship and theology.	Limited evaluation, based on the findings of the report

Case No.	Intervention	Evaluation
63	**Know Your Client** Designed to facilitate and harness a series of constructive discussions between policy makers and grass roots organisations to examine the needs of the Muslim communities and identify a range of short to long-term solutions that build cohesion and inclusion across five core themes: *Education and Skills; Employment and Regeneration: Health: Crime and Safety; Art and Culture.* As the only 'cross cutting' project, it was chosen for its central aim to build resilience through the strengthening of links between mainstream society (its institutions and its leaders) and the Muslim Community.	Based on the findings from the report
64	**Diversionary Activities** The project was designed to train a cohort of young Muslim leaders, through a variety of activities ranging from teaching seminars, workshops, away-days etc. The aim of this project was to provide a new focus, something proactive to occupy a portion of young people's time.	Based on self reporting by participants through interviews and focus groups
65	**Exploration of Faith and Citizenship** Provide young Muslims with the space to discuss and explore to develop positive Muslim identities.	Based on interviews from participants
66	**Peer Ambassadors'** Project aims to develop the competences of participants to tackle community tensions and challenge extremist views. Also to promote positive intra-community relations.	Participants' interview
67	**Capacity Building with Muslim Women** To enable women to act as leaders and role models in the community, through a variety of capacity building initiatives.	Participants' interview
68	**Community Volunteering** Inter-faith volunteering between Muslims and non-Muslims. To promote positive community relations.	Participant's feedback via interviews
69	**Community Networks and Leaders** To establish strong links between PVE projects and Imams/Mosque leaders and project deliverers.	Based on authors assessment
70	**Interaction with public Services** Aim of project to engage Muslim community and develop positive experiences of interacting with local service providers and decision makers.	Participant's feedback via interviews

Appendix F
fsQCA Data Analysis

Tables of configurations for preventing violent extremism successful outcomes

PATHWAYS TO SUCCESS – Influencing factors: Raw coverage*

1. YOUNG PEOPLE *challengingideo*focusontheology*debatediscussio
   *educationtraini*OUTREACHPERIPAT*multiagency*communityconsul+   0.249391

2. youngpeople*CAPACITYBUILDIN*challengingideo*focusontheology
   *DEBATEDISCUSSIO*educationtraini*MULTIAGENCY*communityconsul+   0.250638

3. YOUNGPEOPLE*CHALLENGINGIDEO*focusontheology*debatediscussio
   *educationtraini*OUTREACHPERIPAT*MULTIAGENCY*communityconsul+   0.248144

4. youngpeople*CAPACITYBUILDIN*challengingideo*focusontheology
   *DEBATEDISCUSSIO*OUTREACHPERIPAT*MULTIAGENCY
   *communityconsul+   0.208242

5. YOUNGPEOPLE*CAPACITYBUILDIN*challengingideo*focusontheology
   *DEBATEDISCUSSIO*EDUCATIONTRAINI*outreachperipat*multiagency
   *communityconsul+   0.083546

6. YOUNGPEOPLE*CAPACITYBUILDIN*CHALLENGINGIDEO*FOCUSONTHEOLOGY*
   debatediscussio*EDUCATIONTRAINI*outreachperipat*multiagency
   *communityconsul+   0.082299

7. youngpeople*CAPACITYBUILDING*CHALLENGINGIDEO*FOCUSONTHOLOGY
   *DEBATEDISCUSSIO*EDUCATIONTRAINI*outreachperipat*,MULTIAGENCY
   *COMMUNITYCONSUL+   0.123449

   solution coverage**:   0.914019

   solution consistency***:   1.000000

Outcome Model: PVE = f(WOMAN, CAPACITYBUILDIN, CHALLENGINGIDEO, FOCUSONTHEOLOGY, DEBATEDISCUSSIO, EDUCATIONTRAINI, OUTREACHPERIPAT, MULTIAGENCY, COMMUNITYCONSUL)

PATHWAYS TO SUCCESS – Influencing factors: Raw coverage*

1. woman*CAPACITYBUILDIN*challengingideo*focusontheology
   *DEBATEDISCUSSIO*educationtraini*MULTIAGENCY*communityconsul+   0.250638

2. woman*CAPACITYBUILDIN*challengingideo*focusontheology
   *DEBATEDISCUSSIO*OUTREACHPERIPAT*MULTIAGENCY
   *communityconsul+   0.208242

3. woman*CAPACITYBUILDIN*challengingideo*focusontheology*debatediscussio
   *educationtraini*OUTREACHPERIPAT*multiagency*communityconsul+   0.206995

4. woman*CAPACITYBUILDIN*challengingideo*focusontheology
   *DEBATEDISCUSSIO*EDUCATIONTRAINI*outreachperipat*multiagency
   *communityconsul+   0.165845

5. woman*CAPACITYBUILDIN*CHALLENGINGIDEO*FOCUSONTHETHEOLOGY
   *debatediscussio*EDUCATIONTRAINI*outreachperipat*multiagency
   *communityconsul+   0.082299

6. woman*CAPACITYBUILDIN*CHALLENGINGIDEO*focusontheology
   *debatediscussio*educationtraini*OUTREACHPERIPAT*MULTIAGENCY
   *communityconsul+   0.246897

7. woman*CAPACITYBUILDIN*CHALLENGINGIDEO*FOCUSONTHEOLOGY
   *DEBATEDISCUSSIO*EDUCATIONTRAINI*outreachperipat*MULTIAGENCY
   *COMMUNITYCONSUL   0.123449

   solution coverage**:   0.788076

   solution consistency***:   0.950376

Outcome Model: PVE = f(COMMUNITY, CAPACITYBUILDIN, CHALLENGINGIDEO, FOCUSONTHEOLOGY, DEBATEDISCUSSIO, EDUCATIONTRAINI, OUTREACHPERIPAT, MULTIAGENCY, COMMUNITYCONSUL)

PATHWAYS TO SUCCESS – Influencing factors: Raw coverage*

1. community*challengingideo*focusontheology*debatediscussio
   *educationtraini*OUTREACHPERIPAT*multiagency*communityconsul+   0.249391

2. community*CHALLENGINGIDEO*focusontheology*debatediscussio
   *educationtraini*OUTREACHPERIPAT*MULTIAGENCY*communityconsul+   0.206995

3. COMMUNITY*CAPACITYBUILDIN*challengingideo*focusontheology
   *DEBATEDISCUSSIO*educationtraini*MULTIAGENCY*communityconsul+   0.250638

4. COMMUNITY*CAPACITYBUILDIN*challengingideo*focusontheology
   *DEBATEDISCUSSIO*OUTREACHPERIPAT*MULTIAGENCY
   *communityconsul+   0.208242

5. community*CAPACITYBUILDIN*challengingideo*focusontheology
   *DEBATEDISCUSSIO*EDUCATIONTRAINI*outreachperipat*multiagency
   *communityconsul+   0.083546

6. COMMUNITY*CAPACITYBUILDIN*CHALLENGINGIDEO*FOCUSONTHEOLOGY
   *debatediscussio*EDUCATIONTRAINI*outreachperipat*multiagency
   *communityconsul+   0.082299

7. COMMUNITY*CAPACITYBUILDIN*CHALLENGINGIDEO*FOCUSONTHEOLOGY
   *DEBATEDISCUSSIO*EDUCATIONTRAINI*outreachperipat*MULTIAGENCY
   *COMMUNITYCONSUL   0.123499

   solution coverage**:   0.914019

   solution consistency***:   1.000000

Outcome Model: PVE = f(LEADERS, CAPACITYBUILDIN, CHALLENGINGIDEO, FOCUSONTHEOLOGY, DEBATEDISCUSSIO, EDUCATIONTRAINI, OUTREACHPERIPAT, MULTIAGENCY, COMMUNITYCONSUL)

PATHWAYS TO SUCCESS – Influencing factors: Raw coverage*

1. leaders*CAPACITYBUILDIN*challengingideo*focusontheology
    *DEBATEDICUSSIO*educationtraini*MULTIAGENCY*communitysonsul+   **0.209489**

2. leaders*CAPACITYBUILDIN*challengingideo*focusontheology
    *DEBATEDISCUSSIO*OUTREACHPERIPAT*MULTIAGENCY
    *communityconsul+   **0.167092**

3. leaders*CAPACITYBUILDIN*challengingideo*focusontheology
    *debatediscussio*educationtraini*OUTREACHPERIPAT*multiagency
    *communityconsul+   **0.165845**

4. leaders*CAPACITYBUILDIN*challengingideo*focusontheology
    *DEBATEDISCUSSIO*EDUCATIONTRAINI*outreachperipat*multiagency
    *communityconsul+   **0.165845**

5. leaders*CAPACITYBUILDIN*CHALLENGINGIDEO*focusontheology
    *debatediscussio*educationtraini*OUTREACHPERIPAT*MULTIAGENCY
    *communityconsul+   **0.205748**

6. LEADERS*CAPACITYBUILDIN*CHALLENGINGIDEO*FOCUSONTHEOLOGY*
    debatediscussio*EDUCATIONTRAINI*outreachperipat*multiagency
    *communityconsul+   **0.082299**

7. LEADERS*CAPACITYBUILDIN*CHALLENGINGIDEO*FOCUSONTHEOLOGY
    *DEBATEDISCUSSIO*EDUCATIONTRAINI*outreachperipat
    *MULTIAGENCY*COMMUNITYCONSUL   **0.123449**

    solution coverage**:   **0.788076**

    solution consistency***:   **0.950376**

NOTE: In Boolean analysis the upper case labelling refers to those factors that are present for the successful outcome to occur, while those in lower case refers to those that are absent for the successful outcome to occur

Key:

*Raw coverage measures the proportion of success explained by each term in the solution.

**Solution coverage measures the proportion of memberships in the outcome that is explained by the complete solution.

***Solution consistency measures the degree to which membership in the solution (the set of solution terms) is a subset of membership in the outcome.

Tables of configurations for preventing violent extremism in the name of religion successful outcomes

Outcome Model: PVE in the name of religion = f(YOUNGPEOPLE, CAPACITYBUILDIN, CHALLENGINGIDEO, FOCUSONTHEOLOGY, DEBATEDISCUSSIO, EDUCATIONTRAINI, OUTREACHPERIPAT, MULTIAGENCY, COMMUNITYCONSUL)

PATHWAYS TO SUCCESS – Influencing factors: Raw coverage*

1. YOUNGPEOPLE*capacitybuildin*CHALLENGINGIDEO*FOCUSONTHEOLOGY
    *debatediscussio*EDUCATIONTRAINI*OUTREACHPERIPAT
    *communityconsul+   0.093163

2. youngpeople*capacitybuildin*challengingideo*FOCUSONTHEOLOGY
    *DEBATEDISCUSSIO*educationtraini*OUTREACHPERIPAT*multiagency
    *communityconsul+   0.039984

3. YOUNGPEOPLE*CAPACITYBUILDIN*challengingideo*focusontheology
    *debatediscussio*educationtrainI*OUTREACHPERIPAT*MULTIAGENCY
    *communityconsul+   0.0159936

    solution coverage**:   0.266693

    solution consistency***:   0.909959

Outcome Model: PVE in the name of religion = f(WOMAN, CAPACITYBUILDIN, CHALLENGINGIDEO, FOCUSONTHEOLOGY, DEBATEDISCUSSIO, EDUCATIONTRAINI, OUTREACHPERIPAT, MULTIAGENCY, COMMUNITYCONSUL)

PATHWAYS TO SUCCESS – Influencing factors: Raw coverage*

1. woman*CAPACITYBUILDIN*challengingideo*focusontheology*debatediscussio
   *educationtraini*OUTREACHPERIPAT*MULTIAGENCY*communityconsul+   **0.226709**

2. WOMAN*capacitybuildin*CHALLENGINGIDEO*FOCUSONTHEOLOGY
   *debatediscussio*educationtraini*OUTREACHPERIPAT*multiagency
   *communityconsul+   **0.039984**

3. WOMAN*capacitybuildin*challengingideo*FOCUSONTHEOLOGY*DEBATEDISCUSSIO
   *educationtraini*OUTREACHPERIPAT*multiagency*communityconsul+   **0.039984**

4 woman*capacitybuildin*CHALLENGINGIDEO*FOCUSONTHEOLOGY*debatediscussio
   *EDUCATIONTRAINI*OUTREACHPERIPAT*multiagency*communityconsul+   **0.39984**

   solution coverage**:   0.0307077

   solution consistency***:   0.885813

Outcome Model: PVE in the name of religion = f(COMMUNITY, CAPACITYBUILDIN, CHALLENGINGIDEO, FOCUSONTHEOLOGY, DEBATEDISCUSSIO, EDUCATIONTRAINI, OUTREACHPERIPAT, MULTIAGENCY, COMMUNITYCONSUL)

PATHWAYS TO SUCCESS – Influencing factors:	Raw coverage*
1. COMMUNITY*CAPACITYBUILDIN*challengingideo*focusontheology *debatediscussio *educationtraini*OUTREACHPERIPAT *communityconsul+	0.173131
2. community*CAPACITYBUILDIN*challengingideo*focusontheology *debatediscussio *OUTREACHPERIPAT*MULTIAGENCY *communityconsul+	0.226709
3. community*capacitybuildin*CHALLENGINGIDEO*FOCUSONTHEOLOGY *debate discussio*EDUCATIONTRAINI*OUTREACHPERIPAT *communityconsul+	0.066773
4. community*capacitybuildin*challengingideo*FOCUSONTHEOLOGY *DEBATEDISCUSSIO*educationtraini*OUTREACHPERIPAT*multiagency *communityconsul+	0.026789
5. community*capacitybuildin*CHALLENGINGIDEO*focusontheology *DEBATEDISCUSSIO*educationtraini*outreachperipat*MULTIAGENCY *communityconsul+	0.026789
6. community*CAPACITYBUILDIN*CHALLENGINGIDEO*FOCUSONTHEOLOGY *DEBATEDISCUSSIO*educationtraini*OUTREACHPERIPAT *MULTIAGENCY*communityconsul	0.053179
solution coverage**:	0.520592
solution consistency***:	0.813750

Outcome Model: PVE in the name of religion = f(LEADERS, CAPACITYBUILDIN, CHALLENGINGIDEO, FOCUSONTHEOLOGY, DEBATEDISCUSSIO, EDUCATIONTRAINI, OUTREACHPERIPAT, MULTIAGENCY, COMMUNITYCONSUL)

PATHWAYS TO SUCCESS – Influencing factors:	Raw coverage*

1. leaders*capacitybuildin*CHALLENGINGIDEO*FOCUSONTHEOLOGY
*debatediscussio*OUTREACHPERIPAT*multiagency*communityconsul+   0.079968

2. leaders*capacitybuildin*challengingideo*FOCUSONTHEOLOGY
*DEBATEDISCUSSIO*educationtraini*OUTREACHPERIPAT*multiagency
*communityconsul+   0.039984

3. leaders*CAPACITYBUILDIN*challengingideo*focusontheology
*debatediscussio *educationtraini*OUTREACHPERIPAT*MULTIAGENCY
*communityconsul   0.227109

solution coverage**:   0.320672

solution consistency***:   0.828512

NOTE: In Boolean analysis the upper case labelling refers to those factors that are present for the successful outcome to occur, while those in lower case refers to those that are absent for the successful outcome to occur

Key:

*Raw coverage measures the proportion of success explained by each term in the solution.

**Solution coverage measures the proportion of memberships in the outcome that is explained by the complete solution.

***Solution consistency measures the degree to which membership in the solution (the set of solution terms) is a subset of membership in the outcome.

Appendix G
Bibliography of Final Sources for Analysis

Ali, Aisha (2008) Capacity building of staff in Madressahs (Islamic Schools) *PVE Pathfinder Evaluation 2007-8*. For Kirklees Council (received via CLG).

Change Institute (2008) *Study on Best Practices in Cooperation between authorities and civil society with a view to the prevention and response to violent radicalisation:* A study commissioned by DG JLS of the European Commission.

Faith Associates (unpublished) 'The Muslimah make a difference' High Wycombe *2007-8 PVE pathfinder evaluation* (received via CLG).

Haddad and Balz (2008) Taming the Imams: European Governments and Islamic Preachers Since 9/11. *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations*, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 215-235.

Hughes, J. (1998) Community Relations from Northern Ireland: Lessons from Drumcree. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies,* Vol. 24: 3, pp. 433-450.

Hughes, J. (2009) Peace Reconcilation and a Shared Future: a policy shift or slightly more of the same? *Community Development Journal,* Vol. 44, No. 1, pp. 22-37.

Khuri, L. M. (2004) Facilitating Arab-Jewish Intergroup Dialogue in the College Setting. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, Vol. 7: 3, pp. 229-50.

Knox and Hughes (1996) Crossing the Divide: Community Relations in Northern Ireland. *Journal of Peace Research*. Vol. 33, No. 1, pp. 83-98.

Lowndes and Thorp (unpublished) East Midlands *PVE Pathfinder Evaluation 2007-8*.

Lowry, C. and Littlejohn, S. (2006) Dialogue and the discourse of peacebuilding in Malaku, Indonesia. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly,* Vol. 23: 4, pp. 409-426.

Marcouch, Ahmed (2008). *Slotervaart Action Plan – Countering Radicalisation* Council of Amsterdam Borough of Slotervaart.

McEvoy, McEvoy and McConnaichie (2006) Reconciliation as a dirty word: Conflict, community relations and education in Northern Ireland. *Journal of International Affairs,* Vol. 60: 1, pp. 81-108.

OPM (unpublished) 'Preventing Violent Extremism Pathfinder Evaluation – Draft Final Report for West London Alliance'. April 2008. *PVE Pathfinder Evaluation 2007-8* (received via CLG).

Renaisi – Pearce and Barnett (2008) Evaluation: Young Muslim Leaders London Borough of Waltham Forest. *PVE Pathfinder Evaluation 2007-8* (received via CLG).

Rieker, P. Glaser, M. and Schuster, S. (Eds) (2006) *Prevention of Right-wing Extremism, Xenophobia and Racism in European Perspective*. Deutsches Jugendinstitut, Aussenstelle Halle.

Ross, M. H. (2000) Creating the conditions for peacemaking: theories of practice in ethnic conflict resolution. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 23, No. 6, pp. 1002-1034.

Slough Local Authority (Unpublished) Slough against Violent Extremism – Final Report – Draft Only *2007-8 PVE Pathfinder* (received via CLG).

Waterhouse Consultancy Group, (2008) PVE – An independent evaluation of the Birmingham Pathfinder. For Birmingham City Council *PVE Pathfinder Evaluation 2007-8* (received via CLG).

Bibliography of additional sources cited in this report:

Hundeide, Karsten (2003) *Becoming a Committed Insider*, Culture and Psychology, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp.107-127.

Lowndes, V. and Thorp, L (forthcoming 2009) 'Preventing Violent Extremism' – Why Local Context Matters. A chapter in: Eatwell and Goodwin (Eds) *Extremism in 21st Century Britain*. Routledge.

Ragin, C. (1987) *The Comparative Method,* Berkeley: The University of California http://www.u.arizona.edu/~cragin/fsQCA/

Ragin, C. (2000) *Fuzzy-Set Social Science,* Chicago/ London: The University of Chicago Press.

Ragin, C. and Davey, S. (2008) *User's Guide to Fuzzy-set/Qualitative Comparative Analysis*, Arizona: University of Arizona.

Slootman, M. and Tillie, J. (2006) *Processes of Radicalisation: Why Some Amsterdam Muslims Become Radicals*, Institute for Migration and Ethnic Studies, Amsterdam University.

Appendix H
Checklist for Relevance of Literature

Name of RA	
Title of Reference	
Author of reference	
Number of pages	
Time spent reviewing reference	

Whilst reviewing at a glance…

1   Check for relevance to Boolean analysis variables:

List of variables	Tick box (√) if variable is present
Whether the intervention/treatment resulted in a reduction in community support for violent extremism	
Whether the intervention/treatment resulted in a reduction in community support for violent extremism *in the name of religion*	
Targeted at young people	
Targeted at Muslim women	
Targeted at Muslim communities	
Includes capacity building/empowerment	
Includes challenging ideology	
Includes focus on theology	
Includes debate/discussion forums	
Includes education/training	
Delivered by outreach/peripatetic work	
Involves multi-agency working	
Includes community consultation	

NB – 'Violent extremism' is defined by CLG as: taking actions to cause injury or death to people in order to make a political protest.

2   Check for quality of research on the intervention:

Quality of research on the intervention	1	2	3	4
Detail on the content of the intervention				
Information on intervention implementation processes				
Clear basis of evaluation appraisal				
The evaluation addresses its original aims and purpose				
Credibility of findings (strong links between data, interpretation and conclusions)				
Description of context of data				
Source of research (see levels as set out in Stage one report)				
Description of how data collection was carried out				

Tick one of the boxes above to signify:

1   Excellent

2   Good

3   Mediocre

4   Poor.

3   Any other general observations:

Additional comments