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ABSTRACT

This study examined the effectiveness of active shooter preparedness training on students for the purpose of assessing whether or not undergoing such training helps ease students’ level of anxiety, sense of preparedness in the event of a mass shooting attack at their California State University campus, or an attack occurring at their place of internship. This data was collected by offering an active shooter training to student participants, facilitated by the Risk Management department, at a large University in Southern California. Following the training, first-year Bachelors and Masters students within the School of Social Work were given a self-administered questionnaire. The questionnaire pertained to student perceptions of anxiety connected to fear of a shooting on campus and/or at their internship placement as well as students' perceptions of the effectiveness of the active shooter preparedness training.

The research found that participants, on average, are moderately anxious about the possibility of an active shooter situation at school and their internships. Participants also indicated finding Risk Management’s active shooter preparedness training to be important and useful. Therefore, this study recommends that the California State University provide an active shooter preparedness training to all incoming first-year BASW and MSW students during school orientation.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Problem Statement

Most people do not consider the possibility of ever experiencing a tragedy such as an active shooter situation. Unfortunately, the sad truth is that this type of incident is on the rise in the United States. In fact, active shooter incidents have become more pronounced within the last decade. The Inland Empire alone has had three active shooter incidents less than a year and a half apart. The first notable mass shooting took place on December 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2015 at the Inland Regional Center in San Bernardino, CA, and the second active shooter incident occurred at North Park Elementary School in San Bernardino, CA on April 10th, 2017. The most recent shooting occurred on January 10, 2018 at California State University, San Bernardino and it had a significant impact on students, faculty and staff. It is gravely significant for Universities in Southern California to become better equipped with knowledge of appropriate active shooter situation emergency procedures.

The threat of an active shooter incident occurring at any time is a concern for all individuals. The thought alone can stir up the feeling of extreme fearfulness for some. Between 2000 and 2008, the United States has endured an average of approximately five active shooter episodes every year; this number has tripled annually since 2009 (The United States Department of Justice, 2014). Research
conducted by Texas State University, found that 84 Active Shooter Events (ASEs) occurred between 2000 and 2010 (Blair, & Martaindale, 2013). The FBI conducted a research over 14 years which concluded in 2013 and discovered that the active shooter attacks have increased from 17 attacks per year to 20 active shooter events per year (Blair & Schweit, 2014). An examination of 2014 and 2015 active shooter incidents concurred with the FBI’s 20 cases per year finding (Schweit, 2016). Furthermore, the research findings of Blair and Martaindale (2013), depict the likelihood of an active shooter event occurring at a school setting to be at a high rate of 34%; only 3% less in occurrence than business locations which are at a 37% frequency of occurrence.

As such, it is vital for Universities in Southern California community to become well versed in active shooter emergency protocol. School-wide active shooter training should be readily available and heavily endorsed by the administration of Universities in Southern California to best prepare students, staff, and faculty for such an event. Simply put, not knowing what to do or how to react in the midst of an active shooter situation misuses valued time, more importantly, not being prepared in an active shooter event puts individuals at higher risk of losing their life (CSUSB Emergency Management and Business Continuity, 2015). This California State University has a full-scale active shooter exercise that should be implemented annually. The policy proposal being suggested is that the School of Social Work allow the implementation of an active shooter training to be conducted for incoming first-year Bachelors, Masters, and
Pathways Distance Education students within the department. The application of such a training is significant due to the essential lifesaving nature of preparedness. This can be done through the teaching of awareness of potentially safety measures that should be taken in the event of an active shooter situation to increase one’s likelihood of survival. The method of quantitative survey design will be used to gather data to examine student’s reaction to such a training. A self-administered questionnaire made up of differing levels of measurement will be employed to assess independent and dependent variables.

Purpose of the Study

The primary goal of this research project is to evaluate students’ knowledge of basic safety procedures in the event of an active shooter incident transpiring on a California State University campus. Understanding this information will allow for existing student safety and preparedness gaps to be filled, therefore, increase the likelihood of student survival rates in the face of an active shooter event. Furthermore, a trained student can prevent an attack by learning to trust their instincts and becoming aware of basic characteristics of a suspicious individual. This would then allow for the individual to immediately alert authorities of unusual activity on campus and possibly stop an attack before it begins. With the active shooter training, students will learn to identify gunshots quicker, learn how to remain calm in a crisis, learn the importance of the survival
mode mentality, and how to reduce the opportunity for the shooter(s) to get into a room full of people.

Significance of the Project for Social Work Practice

The target audience of School of Social Work students is particularly significant to this research study due to the fact that these students will most likely enter the field of social work upon graduating. Moreover, their preparation level and knowledge of appropriate active shooter procedures may better prepare them in the unfortunate event of an active shooter incident occurring at their place of work. Furthermore, social workers encounter a plethora of individuals who are experiencing varying levels of stressors and chaotic life situations. This reality increases the likely occurrence of dangerous incidents, an active shooter attack being merely one of the possibilities. An active shooter event at Virginia Tech was carried out by senior Seung-Hui Cho, who shot and killed 32 people and wounded 17 while in attendance. In general, a vast number of social workers interact with clients who have IEPs (Davies, 2008). Cho held an Individual Education Plan (IEP) and was receiving social services assistance during his high school years. Social workers also interact with individuals in various environments; including schools, hospitals, and even people’s homes.

The findings of this study could help this particular California State University's social work department identify students’ level of anxiety, fear, and preparedness regarding the possibility of an active shooter situation taking place.
on campus. This information can then help the department, and the university, create and implement strategic active shooter preparedness trainings and workshops that are effective and address students' concerns. This proposed study is also significant because it will increase knowledge pertaining to this subject, especially considering that empirical data on this topic is currently limited. The findings of this research could, therefore, contribute to the changing of policy. One such change could include something as drastic as the California State University mandating the completion of an active shooter preparedness training for all incoming first-year students.

Research Question

With this said, the research question posed by this research project is “What is social work students' perception of the need for active shooter emergency procedure and preparedness training?”
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Chapter two contains information on relevant literature pertaining to the proposed study. This chapter specifically highlights material on active shooter incident in the United States, issues related to active shooter situations, prominent evidence-based active shooter trainings, and a section on theories that guide the conceptualization of this particular subject matter.

After sifting through literature, it became clear that active shooter incidents are not a new phenomenon but have definitely increased in occurrence throughout the years. During the last seven years, the number of active shooter incidents that occur annually increased from 6.5 to 10. This trend reinforces the need for students and faculty to remain vigilant and well-prepared. Between 2000-2013, there have been 12 active shooter incidents in higher education settings leaving 60 dead and 60 wounded. The shooters ranged from current students, former students, employees, and non-attendees (U.S. Department of Justice & Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2013). A study done by Ellifritz (2012), shows that students that react quickly and with minimal hesitation have higher chances of surviving an active shooter attack. Research done on the Sandy Hook Elementary school shooting in 2012, shows that there has never been a breach of a locked door in one of these active shooter situations in the United States over the last 20 years (Green, 2016). Therefore, training faculty, staff, and students on
something as simple as securing a door shut can mitigate the risk of a violent attacker gaining access to people in a classroom on school grounds.

Issues Related to Active Shooter Incidents

This proposed study will differ from prior studies by not minimizing the seriousness of the likelihood of an active shooter event taking place on a school campus. Due to the fact that active shooter incidents are not as frequent as other national issues, it can be easy for media to broadcast an incident as merely a random act of violence. One such study done in the 90s explained school shootings as media-initiated “moral panic” (Burns & Crawford, 1999). Goode and Ben-Yehuda (1994) coined the “moral panic” term and were adamant about their view that media and society propagandize school shootings and consequently incite moral panic. In addition, Goode and Ben-Yehuda (1994), suggest that moral panic emerges when an extensive percentage of society feels that certain evildoers pose a threat to the moral order of society. As a result, the overall consensus among the group is to “do something” about the issue. A major focus of their reaction “typically involves strengthening the social control apparatus of the society, including tougher or renewed rules, increased public hostility and condemnation, more laws, longer sentences, more police, more arrests, and more prison cells” (Johnson, Goode, & Ben-Yehuda, 1997, p.26). A reaction which is understandable, yet it may not effectively solve the root of the issue.

A key finding presented in “moral panic” study was the concept that interaction between the media, politicians, and the general public, in regard to school shootings,
can be clearly illustrated with the use of a triangle. These systems operate in a constant motion that results in punitive action (Burns & Crawford, 1999). This simplistic cycle of interactions between the media, the community, and officials could be applied to other social problems. Furthermore, this course of interaction has been shown to deliver a better perception of how social problems may begin and multiply; school shootings included. One major criticism of this study is a concern over the reliability of the original empirical research.

Active Shooter Preparedness Trainings

In contrast to the moral panic approach, review of other literature produced a study which expounds upon the need for implementing active shooter procedures for the purpose of mitigating the vulnerabilities that exist within institutions of higher learning. A study by Doss and Shepherd (2015) suggests that creating a system to alleviate the risks of an active shooter can decrease significant vulnerability rates for schools. As such, institutions should strive to better equip their grounds with mitigating resources; active shooter safety trainings are one viable option.

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) designed a noncomplex training due to the rise in active shooter events throughout the country. Their active shooter training model supports the natural human fight or flight instincts; therefore, the simple three-step strategy urges people in an active shooter predicament. The three steps are to run, hide, or fight. This practical response guide is backed by DHS and other law enforcement entities. In fact, the “run, hide, fight” preparation module is often applied by
many first responders. Additionally, this “run, hide, fight” training module is correspondingly implemented by county, and state agencies for personnel active shooter awareness training. This three-step strategy is one that works and the training of which should continue to be utilized in various crisis incidents. These steps may be done in an order that most safely corresponds with the event. One should run as far as they can from the area and contact authorities as soon as they are safe enough to call 911. If evacuating the vicinity is not an option, one should hide, especially in a place they can either barricade or lock and prepare to fight in case the assailant gains entrance. Finally, when previous safety measures are exhausted, one should be ready to use power; the way the force is projected can be through the use of items or their body (Rorie, 2015, p.1-2). The findings of this article suggest that one should instill open dialogue between the institution’s personnel and community responders to accommodate the active shooter event in a realistic fashion (Rorie, 2015). Moreover, following the training, it was evident that personnel experienced a shift in mindset. They progressed from a state of ignoring the likelihood of such an event occurring to that of proactively preparing for an active shooter event.

Lastly, it is vital to present a review of the literature on one of this country’s most noteworthy pioneers of active shooter preparation training. This training is known as the Alert Lockdown Inform Counter Evacuate (ALICE) training. This was the first program to question the sensibility of “lockdown-only” policies for crisis situations. Due to the fact that this training has been in existence for so long, it is a great testimonial tool. Additionally, this tool has been reinforced by over twenty years of training experience
and has demonstrated to be a credible source of information ("Alice training facts and questions," 2013). ALICE utilizes the support of local law enforcement in active shooter program training, as they are a community’s experts in this area. ALICE Training Institute has provided training for an immeasurable amount of people and various organizations. Their training throughout the years has included 3,280 Police departments trained, 3,700 K-12 School districts, 1,300 Healthcare Facilities organizations, 900 Higher Education Institutions, 1,700 Businesses, 600 Different Government Agencies, 310 Houses of Worship, and 90 Individuals or Families ("Alice training facts and questions," 2013). The level in which they have been able to provide preventative training for a potential active shooter event is astounding.

The ALICE training purposes are to help people conceptually formulate to recognize, evaluate and react to instantaneous threats. It equips individuals to evaluate their preeminent decisions in given circumstances. ALICE implores the techniques of Alert (listen), which allows individuals to recognize that something is wrong. Lockdown, which suggests that individuals stay indoors and barricade themselves inside a room. Inform, which is calling 9-1-1 and present the following details if possible: 1) name, location, and situation 2) description and location of shooter(s) and any victims; location and description of any suspicious devices; and description of what the caller is hearing and/or seeing (Allen & Lengfellner, 2016). Next, counter or fight, when faced with an armed attacker and there are no options out. For example, one can throw a chair or other object(s) to distract the perpetrator and provide an opportunity to gain control or to escape. Lastly, Evacuate, if the opportunity arises and it is safe to do so. There are
several government agencies, law enforcement organizations, and associations offer recommendations that mirror the ALICE concepts (Allen & Lengfellner, 2016). The ultimate vision of ALICE is to equip all citizens with useful options and skills to be able to respond to any shots fired. School settings will be better prepared if police encounter unforeseen obstacles en route to apprehending the active shooter; therefore, the next best option is to prepare people to help themselves until public safety measures arrive.

While higher learning institutions may benefit from past and current research done on active shooter safety procedures, limitations to the generalizability of some research do exist. The "one size fits all" notion cannot be applied to all active shooter events. Although, modules such as the evidence-based curricula, the ALICE training, can be adapted and applied to the needs of certain organizations and institutions.

Another limitation highlighted in the literature review was subjective views on how preferences for whom, when, how, and where active shooter training should occur. For example, ALICE requires you to "alert, lockdown, inform, counter, and evacuate" and Act Fast suggests you "run, hide, fight." Some ideological perspectives also tend to differ when it comes to notions such as whom training resources should focus on; specialized training for school faculty and staff, preparedness training for first responders, or training for students on appropriate active shooter preparedness procedures. There are also differences of opinion with the administration of specific training curricula. Some agencies prefer the more basic video presentation followed by an interactive conversation about the information presented. Others, including Denver Health’s active shooter program, favor the more realistic approach of a simulated full-
scale active shooter drill. Denver Health’s training presented an active shooter event with the use of police, a SWAT team, health care providers, and volunteer actors for the purpose of strengthening the response of all of the departments involved in case such a crisis ever took place (Rorie, 2015). It is reasonable to assume that both forms of training options are viable and seek to accomplish the goal of increasing preparedness and establishing safety measures in the event of an active shooter emergency.

Theories Guiding Conceptualization

After reviewing several literature pieces, one theory stood out more than any other, the Organizational Theory framework. Although several theoretical concepts can and have been applied to the active shooter training research, the Organizational Theory framework developed by Bowman and Deal (Kelly, 2015) seems to be most suited to this precise research project goals. In fact, it is stated that Organizational Theory is used to “guide the study of how climate, personnel, politics, power brokers, and other factors influence how campus personnel prepares for a campus shooter or similar incidents” (Kelly, 2015). This theory works well with the proposed active shooter training study because the target audience of this research is students from a University in Southern California. Therefore, there is great significance in researchers finding a way to effectively collaborate with school administration and community partners to successfully implement the safety training. If the research findings substantiate the need for such a training, the university can subsequently utilize the training on a broader
scale and provide the training for more, if not all students at this California State University.

The organizational theory is made up of four frameworks including structural, political, human relations, and symbolic (Kelly, 2015). These sections examine the success or unsuccessful functioning of organizations such as companies and schools. The structural frame looks at the distribution of responsibilities within an organization. Such as, designating specific tasks to individuals so everyone is aware of who is in charge of which specific duties. The political frame addresses the influence of policy on the allocation of resources. For example, whether an institution will provide financial means to support an active shooter training program if the likelihood of such an incident is low. The human relations aspect of this theory stresses the importance of working with strong, like-minded individuals who are in support of a particular goal. Lastly, the symbolic frame looks at the symbolic meaning ascribed to an issue that gives it some kind of power (Kelly, 2015, p. 22). In regard to this research, using the organizational theory would allow for a clearer understanding of the views of university administration and community partners, as well as, what ways each of these groups can be utilized in the development and successful implementation of the active shooter training at this University in Southern California.

General Systems Theory (GST) can be applied when conceptualizing an active shooter event. This theory originated in the natural sciences with the mission to understand sets of objects, the correlations between those objects. Additionally, GST wanted to understand the correlation amongst sets of objects and their environments
(Corlett, 1971). This disciplinary framework was conceptualized by the biologist Von Beralanffy in the early 1920s. Ludwig Von Bertalanffy presumed that the general systems theory would be applicable to “biological”, “psychological”, and “social systems” (Guanaratne, 2008). Research by Broedling (1999), supports that when systems approach is used a change in one part of the system will affect the other parts, intentionally or not. The impetus for GST came from Bertalanffy’s sense that this concept was also relevant in the global ecosphere and social institutions General System’s theory would be feasible when trying to implement a standard for active shooter training because it will incorporate all the systems that may be affected by an event such as an active shooter event (Hammond, 2010).

General Systems Theory presents the notion that many entities must work in unison to resolve complex issues. Many factors influence how students, staff, and faculty interact with one another when encountering an active shooter situation. If all systems have similar training, then they can positively influence one another in order to achieve the best outcome possible to address such an attack. When applying systems theory, the professional coming up with the plan should examine and evaluate all the systems that influence an individual’s behavior, environment, well-being, and work to strengthen those systems. All systems can obtain qualitatively new properties through emergence, resulting in persistent evolution.
Summary

As depicted in the literature presented in this chapter, mass shooting incidents are on the rise and can take place anywhere at any time. The best way for one to safeguard themselves is by being as prepared as possible for this type of situation. Knowledge of appropriate response to an active shooter attack is potentially lifesaving practice. As demonstrated through research, the natural bodily response to run, hide, or fight are deemed to be best practice; the implementation of which is agreed upon across the board.
CHAPTER THREE:

METHODS

Introduction

This section is comprised of research methods and procedures that will be utilized in gathering data for this study. The specific topics that will be covered in this section include study design, sampling, data collection and instruments, procedures, protection of human subjects, and data analysis.

Study Design

In response to the general lack of research pertaining to individuals’ level of preparedness to respond effectively to an active shooter attack, this proposed study will attempt to assess students’ knowledge of appropriate response to the occurrence of an active shooter attack and perceptions of the effectiveness of the Act Fast active shooter training for the School of Social Work participants at a University in Southern California. This research is being done in hopes of addressing the need for operational active shooter training for students. The results of the study will determine if there is a need for the commissioning of preparatory active shooter training for students attending a California State University. Furthermore, training would increase students’ knowledge of apposite response and elevate the likelihood of students surviving this type of incident.

This proposed research project will be done using a quantitative design which will utilize a post-test only survey method that will be given in the form of a
self-administered questionnaire. The questionnaire will be developed with several scaling questions that will provide participants with measures ranging from 0-10. This is done to rate their emotional response to certain questions, multiple choice questions that will allow participants a variety of answers to choose from, as well as, fill-in the blank questions to allow participants the opportunity to give elaborated information or simply generate their own specific responses.

The rationale behind choosing a quantitative design approach is its practicality. A quantitative design allows for the collection of data from a large group of individuals at one point in time while ensuring participant's confidentiality and anonymity. Additionally, a quantitative design is low to no cost study. Furthermore, data can be gathered within the limited timeframe allowed to conduct this study. Furthermore, the collection from a quantitative design can be safeguarded which minimizes the likelihood of being tampered with by other individuals who are not the researchers. Last, quantitative design's data can be inputted in a statistical package such as Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to be as accurate as possible.

While a quantitative research design offers many strengths, it also poses some methodological limitations. The first of which is the possibility of low participant response rates during the survey questionnaire data collection process. This limitation will be mitigated by the administration of the survey questionnaire in-person, directly after the conclusion of the Act Fast active shooter training presentation. This is the best approach to collecting as many
surveys as possible due to the fact that participants are already engaged in the Act Fast active shooter training research study. Another conceivable limitation to this particular study is technological malfunctioning since an active shooter preparedness training video, presented by Risk Management, is one of the significant proponents of the study. Researchers would be unable to administer survey questionnaires if participants are unable to view the video training. This limitation will be addressed by researchers making sure that two versions of the active shooter preparedness training video are present during all research trainings for the study. One version of the videos will be located on a USB drive and the other training video can be easily accessed through the YouTube website. Lastly, unlike the qualitative design, a quantitative design does not allow researchers to ask follow up questions or elicit more detailed and thorough responses for every question presented in the study. In order to minimize this limitation, the researchers designed the survey tool with open ended questions which allows the participants to fill-in the answer and give more detailed responses to specific questions.

Once again, the purpose of this proposed research is to measure California State University social work students' level of knowledge of active shooter emergency procedure and preparedness to execute proper response in the event of an active shooter situation. The independent variable (active shooter preparedness training) and the dependent variable (students' level of
preparedness) will hence be measured with an in-person, self-administered questionnaire.

Sampling

The sampling criteria for this proposed study is that participants must be incoming first-year Bachelors or Masters student enrolled in the School of Social Work at a California State University. The participants will be a mix of full-time and part-time students who either attend classes online or on campus. The sample also consists of both male and female students with diverse ethnicity, age, and level of schooling. This cohort would make up an estimated 150 possible research participants. Furthermore, this availability and purposive sampling method allows researchers access to a vital portion of students at a University in Southern California.

Each student will receive access to the survey questionnaire during their designated orientation time. Before the 20 minutes Act Fast active shooter training video and presentation are conducted by Risk Management, research participants will be debriefed on the purpose of this research and given an informed consent document to read and sign; acknowledging that the individual participant is aware of the risks and benefits associated with participating in this research. After the presentation, participants will be given the opportunity and choice to complete the post-test only survey questionnaire. Once the surveys are collected, the data will be processed and analyzed through the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.
Data Collection and Instruments

The data for this study will be collected using a self-administered questionnaire. The questionnaire is made up of several sections pertaining to the independent variable. The independent variable of this study is active shooter preparedness training. As such, the effectiveness of the training is measured by asking participants about previous training on active shooter preparedness. The dependent variable is the student's' level of preparedness for the occurrence of this type of attack. The students’ level of preparedness is measured by asking scaling questions such as, how prepared do you feel you are if there were an active shooter/attacker situation on campus? Also, demographic information is asked for and measured based on students' response to the multiple-choice question; the listed options include a.) African American/Black, b.) Caucasian/white, c.) Native American/ Alaska Native, d. Latino/a, e. Asian/Pacific Islander, and f. Other. The demographics section also includes questions on gender, age, ethnicity, and level of education. All of the questions included in the questionnaire were adapted from previously conducted research on Likert reliability and validity. For example, research by Matell and Jacoby (1971), suggests that the lower the point scale is, the more one is able to obtain higher optimal reliability. Additionally, participants will answer the questionnaire by filling-in the blanks, elaborate on open-ended questions and answer questions based on a Likert-type scale. Following the collection of information, the research data will be analyzed by using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS).
The reliability of this instrument is determined by analyzing the Cronbach Alpha using SPSS. This instrument’s focus is specifically on the training and feelings of the participants. The data collection method’s strength is that it yields large participation rates. The limitation of the method is that some of the data was collected days after the training, which can result in watered-down and skewed responses. Another strength demonstrated by the use of this instrument is its simplicity, which minimizes participant confusion when attempting to answer the questions. However, the scaling questions may take a few moments for some to decipher.

Procedures

The initial step in conducting this research study was to seek approval to conduct the study from California State University, San Bernardino, School of Social Work Director Dr. Smith. A research proposal to seek permission to use human subjects was submitted to the Institutional Review Board Social (Appendix D) work sub-committee was presented in August 2017. Participants were selected by convenience during the mandatory orientations held for incoming first-year master’s and bachelor’s program students. The participants were presented with background information on the nature of the study, the purpose of the study, and instructions on completing the informed consent sheet. Instructions guiding the completion of the survey questionnaire was presented to
all participants. Lastly, after the completion of filling out the questionnaire, participants were provided with a debriefing statement.

The participants were presented with a training done by the Police Department’s Risk Management unit at a California State University. The survey questionnaires were distributed the first day of class to all of the incoming master student participants; however, the first-year bachelor students were given their survey questionnaire the same day. Data were gathered by Dr. McAllister and second-year social work master students Nyemal Chuol and Berenice Dougherty on September 2017. The informed consent form (Appendix B) was used to inform participants of the study and to ensure the participant there will not be any safety concerns if they participate. Participants were instructed to make an “X” on a designated line to indicate their willingness to voluntarily participate in the study. Additionally, participants were specifically asked not to place any identifying information such as name, address, or telephone number anywhere on the questionnaire; therefore, ensuring that the research remains confidential. The survey questionnaire was designed to be self-administered (Appendix A) and designed to take participants approximately five to seven minutes to complete. Once the survey questionnaire was complete, participants were given information in the form of the debriefing statement (Appendix C) to assure that participants had access to counseling after filling out the questionnaire if need be. The data was collected in collaboration with CSUSB faculty, Professor Corral who allowed the second-year students, Nyemal Chuol and Berenice Dougherty,
to engage the incoming first-year master students in participating in this research. One MSW cohort had the survey distributed to them by Dr. McAllister. The second-year students followed up the next day to collect the data from Dr. McAllister.

Protection of Human Subjects

The protection of rights and welfare of all participants will be safeguarded by the research design chosen for the study and by the process and procedures in carrying out the study. The questions in the questionnaire have been proven by other research studies to be appropriate for participants. This survey questionnaire is not numbered; therefore, the participants cannot be identified. The participants also receive a presentation on the explanation of the research project and confidentiality measures. An informed consent will also be given to participants, which stresses voluntary participation, the right to withdraw participation at any time without penalty, the right to leave a question blank if participants feel the questions may reveal their identity. The consent should be granted by signing with an “X” mark and not their name. Furthermore, a debriefing statement will be included at the end of the survey questionnaire outlining a contact number to reach the faculty advisor supervising this project, a statement of where and when the findings of the study will be available. Participants will also be presented with the appropriate number for a mental health referral in case the study presented distress. The surveys and informed
consent forms were collected after the appropriate training presentation. The data will be collected and kept safeguarded in a password protected computer. The only individuals that will have access to the data will be Dr. McAllister, Nyemal Chuol, and Berenice Dougherty. The finding of the study will be presented anonymously in aggregated data only and the surveys with any additional files were destroyed after completion of the study.

Data Analysis

In this study, data will be analyzed through a quantitative data analysis method. This is done to assess the relationships among variables measured in the study. Descriptive statistics will be used to summarize and recapitulate the characteristics of the collected data; the level of preparedness and previous active shooter training related data. This information was analyzed by using frequency distributions, measures of central tendency (e.g. mean), and measures of variability (e.g. standard deviation).

Additionally, inferential statistics including t-test, ANOVA, and Pearson’s correlation coefficient were used to assess the relationship between perceptions of preparedness for a mass shooting and an individual having undergone some kind of active shooter preparedness training previously. The independent variable being measured is the presence of (previous experiences) training and the dependent variable is students’ level of preparedness. The data gathered from this sample of students can then be ascribed to the rest of the student body.
at this California State University. Also, the use of univariate analysis will be employed in determining if students feel adequately prepared to respond effectively in the event of an active shooter situation or if more training in this area is necessary.

Summary

The proposed research method used in this study is a quantitative survey design, which provides participants with a self-administered survey questionnaire. The participants of the study consist of incoming first-year Bachelor and Master students in the School of Social Work at a University in Southern California. The projected sample consisted of 133 male and female students with differing demographic features; including gender, ethnicity, age, and education level. The survey questionnaire is composed of varying levels of measurement created to assess a number of independent and dependent variables. Once data was collected, descriptive and inferential statistics were used in the analysis process of research data.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter discusses the general results and key findings from the survey tool. There were a total of 133 of first-year Bachelor and Master Social Work students from this University in Southern California. Participants were provided a brief training and then given a survey in September 2017. The research discussed in this study includes descriptive demographics of the participants. The chapter concludes with an overview of the key findings in the study and the inferential statistics.

Presentation of the Findings

Demographics

This study comprised of a combined total of 133 first year BASW and MSW students. Specific demographic characteristics of all the research participants are shown in Table 1. Of the 133 participants, 114 participants identified as female (85.7%) and 19 identified as males (14.3%). There were 49 BASW (36.8%) students, and 84 MSW (63.2%) students. The MSW students were broken down further to depict their different cohorts. Of the 84 MSW students, 32 attended classes on Monday/Wednesday, 29 attend classes on Tuesday/Thursday during the day, and 23 attend classes Tuesday/Thursday
evening. The minimum age of respondents was 20 years old and the maximum age was 59 years old. Approximately 85% of participants are under the age of 25 years old. The participants of this study predominantly reported identifying as Latino/a (60.2%), followed by White/ Caucasian (15%), African American/ Black (6.8%), and Asian /Pacific Islander (3%). There were 19 participants (14.3%) who reported belonging to more than one ethnic identity. One of the 133 participants declined to report their ethnicity.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Variable Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>MSW Monday/ Wednesday</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSW Tuesday/Thursday Daytime</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSW Tuesday/ Wednesday Evening</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BASW Student</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>African American/ Black</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White/ Caucasian</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latino/ a</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/ Pacific Islander</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Findings

To gain further information about research participants, they were asked five questions specifically tied to their level of anxiety related to the likelihood of an active shooter event transpiring on their University campus or at their internship placement. As such, scaling questions were presented to participants and they were instructed to rate these questions on a scale ranging from 0 to 10; where zero equates "no anxiety," "not prepared," or "not likely," and 10 signifies "very anxious," "very prepared," or "very likely." Questions were scored using this 0-10 scale.

Questions about the importance and usefulness of active shooter preparedness training were asked, along with a question pertaining to participants' experience with previous active shooter preparedness training, and one question on the similarity of the information they learned from the research study training versus what they knew beforehand about how to deal with an active attacker situation. The lowest average among the questions (in table 2.) was Q5, which had a mean of 3.3 and the highest average among these questions was Q6, which had a mean of 9.3. Provided below (in table 2.) is the list of the questions asked in the survey tool.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>How anxious are you about the possibility of an active shooter/attacker being on campus?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>How prepared do you feel you are if there were an active shooter/attacker situation on campus?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>How likely do you feel there would be an active shooter/attacker situation on campus?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>How anxious are you about the possibility of an active shooter/attacker being at your internship?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>How likely do you feel there would be an active shooter/attacker situation at your internship?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>How important do you think it is to receive active shooter attack or trainings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>How useful did you find this training to be?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>How similar with the information in this training to what you previously knew about how to deal with an active shooter/attacker situation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9a</td>
<td>Do you have previous training on active shooter preparedness?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When evaluating question 6, which asks “How important do you think it is to receive active shooter attack trainings?” participants scored an overall mean of 9.3 out of 10. This indicates that an overwhelming majority of research respondents believe that being provided with the active attacker preparedness training was important; When broken down further, it is shown that 92 of the participants (69.2%) rated the importance of the training at a 10 on the scale, meaning "very important." Accordingly, 17 participants ranked importance at a 9 on the scale and 11 participants scored importance at an 8.

Question 7, which asks “How useful did you find this training to be?” produced similar results as question 6 (which was on importance of training).
Overall, research participants found the active shooter preparedness training to be useful, with a calculated overall mean of 8.4 on a scale out of 10.

When asked “How similar was the information in this training to what you previously knew about how to deal with an active shooter/attacker situation?” in question 8, respondents most frequently scored on a range between 5 to 10 regarding similarity between the training provided during this study and information they knew beforehand. Participant scores resulted in a mean average of 6.7 out of 10 pertaining to similarity of information. Additionally, respondents were asked if they had undergone an active shooter preparedness training in the past. Of the participants, 94 responded with a "yes" and 34 responded with a "no."
Table 3 Anxiety Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anxiety 1</th>
<th>Anxiety 2</th>
<th>Anxiety 3</th>
<th>Anxiety 4</th>
<th>Anxiety 5</th>
<th>Anxiety 6</th>
<th>Anxiety 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlations between Anxiety Questions

After studying the data, several interesting relationships between variables became evident. There is a strong relationship between anxiety and the possibility of an active shooter attacker being on campus ($r=.67, p<.0005$). Additionally, there is a strong relationship between participants' perception of the importance of receiving active shooter preparedness training and their perception of the usefulness of the training ($r=-.51, p<.0005$). Also, participants who found
the training useful tended to report feeling more prepared \((r=.22, \ p=.01)\). Lastly, students who score higher on feeling anxious about an attack occurring on campus also reported feelings of anxiety associated with an attack also taking place at their internship site \((r=.66, \ p<.0005)\). Similarly, people who were not anxious in one setting reported feeling less anxious in the other setting.

Inferential Statistics

Inferential statistics were completed to identify if there were any factors that might relate to participant's responses to the survey questions asked. Tests were then run to examine differences based on gender, program type (BASW vs. MSW), ethnicity, and age. Findings will be presented by demographic characteristic.

Gender

Many of the questions asked about male and females (no other genders were reported in this study) generated similar results. There was one significant difference, however, shown by the t-test; \((t(131)=-3.70, \ p<.0005)\). Males reported feeling more prepared \((\text{mean}=7.6)\) than females \((\text{mean}=5.7)\). The results indicate that gender may predict whether a person reports higher levels of anxiety due to the possibility of an active shooting situation and show that male respondents feel significantly more prepared to face an active shooter event than female respondents. Aside from this finding, there were no other pertinent differences between males and females in the study.
Program Type (BASW vs. MSW)

There were two significant questions that differentiated MSW versus BASW students. For question 1, "How anxious are you about the possibility of an active shooter/attacker being on campus?" participant responses showed \( t(130)=2.12, p=.035 \). Where MSW participants reported a mean of 5 out of a range of 10 and BASW participants reported a mean of 3.9. For question 7, "How useful did you find this training to be?" Responses showed \( t(124)=-2.6, p=.01 \) where BASW respondents found the training to be useful with a mean score of 8.9, while MSW participants found the training to be useful with a slightly lower mean score of 8.1.

Ethnicity

The majority of participants reported comparable scores on anxiety related to active shooter attacks. The mean and median scores of question 1, "How anxious are you about the possibility of an active shooter/attacker being on campus?" were both 5 which is moderate with an ANOVA of \( F(4,126)=2.65, p=.036 \). For question 3 “How likely do you feel there would be an active shooter/attacker situation on campus?” the ANOVA of students responses was \( F(4,126)=2.69, p=.034 \). Also, the mean score for question 4, “How anxious are you about the possibility of an active shooter/attacker being at your internship?” was 4 and the ANOVA is \( F(4,126)=2.74, p=.032 \).

Post-hoc analysis of significant ANOVA tests were completed. In all of the questions, African-American participants scored the highest on almost all anxiety
related questions. Also, African-American participants were more likely, than any other ethnic in the study, to believe in the likelihood of the occurrence of an active shooter attack at their internship placement. Furthermore, African-American participants reported higher scores related to the questions on anxiety and likelihood of an active shooter attack taking place both on school campus and at internship placement settings.

**Age**

Regarding age, 85% of participants were found to be under the age of 25 years old with the youngest participant being 20 years old and the eldest was 59 years old. The study found a negative correlation between and response to anxiety questions. In particular, the difference in age and response was shown in question 5 which asked, “How likely do you feel there would be an active shooter/attacker situation at your internship?” The older a participant, the less likely they believed an incident would occur at their internship site. Whereas, the younger the participant, the more likely they were to believe that an incident could transpire at their internship. For question 6 "How important do you think it is to receive active shooter attack or trainings?” the older the participant, the less they found the training to be and the younger the participant, the more likely they were to find the training important; \((r=-.196, p=.024)\). For question 7 "How useful did you find this training to be?” The older the participant, the less useful they found the training and the younger the participant, the more useful they found the training; \((r=-.178, p=.042)\).
Summary

This chapter elaborated on the data collected from the survey tool. It also presented demographic information gathered from the participants. Additionally, the survey tool yielded results and key findings of the research. Lastly, inferential statistics were reported.
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION

Introduction

This chapter will explore the key finding that were distinguished throughout the research. Additionally, the strengths and limitations of this study will be examined. The researchers will also elaborate on the significance of this study to the social work profession, practice, and policy. This chapter concludes with a synopsis of the study and closing remarks by the researchers.

Since having conducted this research and having deciphered the collected data, several other active shooter incidents have taken place nationally. In fact, a minor incident took place recently at a California State University campus on January of 2018. A report of shots fired was made to law enforcement stating that a bullet had been fired and hit a window at the visual arts building (Irick, 2018). Luckily, no one was hurt, but the incident was a rude awakening to many about the reality of the likelihood of an active shooter attack occurring on their University campus at any given time. In lieu of these developments, the researchers propose that follow-up research on this topic be done. Additionally, future research can expand upon certain elements of the current study.

One of the finding of this current study showed that African-American participants scored the highest on almost all anxiety related questions. Not only
did African-American participants reported higher levels of anxiety than their counterparts, but they also reported higher frequencies of belief in the likelihood of an attack at school and at their internship setting. Therefore, the researchers recommend that further evaluation and research be done on African American/black students’ feelings of anxiety related to the likelihood of an active shooter event transpiring both on their college campus and at their internship placement. The researchers are curious as to the reason African-American students scored so high on the anxiety questions. The researchers speculate on whether high anxiety in African American participants is correlated to current events of police brutality towards the black community, adverse experiences of racism, or merely due to the fact that the sample size of African-American participants was made up of only nine individuals? The researchers also wonder if anxiety levels for African-American participants would resemble those of other ethnic groups if the sample size of African-American participants was larger. If subsequent studies are performed in the future, researchers should seek to understand what the underlying fear behind the anxiety is tied to.

The data examined also revealed that while males and females scored equally on feelings of anxiety connected to the active shooter questions, male participants scored higher than female participants on question 2, related to feeling prepared to respond if an active shooter situation transpired on campus. One potential reason that male participants scored higher than female participants on preparedness could be due to the high male veteran population in
the social work department. However, that has not been confirmed and would require more thorough evaluation.

Furthermore, researchers found that MSW students scored two points higher than BASW students on anxiety questions related to the possibility of an active attacker event occurring either on campus or at internship placement. The researchers speculate that the two-point difference might be due to MSW students either having already experienced being placed at an internship site during the previous year or that MSW participants were preparing to begin internships during the school year the study was done.

Lastly, research findings indicate a negative correlation between age and belief in the likelihood of an incident taking place. In short, the older a participant in age, the lower they scored on anxiety questions tied to the likelihood of a mass shooting taking place at their internship placement. On the other hand, the younger a participant, the higher they scored on anxiety about the likelihood of an incident transpiring at their internship site. The same negative correlations exist regarding finding the active shooter preparedness training important and or useful. Therefore, the older the participant, the lower their anxiety level. The younger the participant, the higher their anxiety level. This might be contributed to the fact that older individuals have been alive longer and have more years of experience than their younger counterparts. In addition, the number of veterans within the older age range is unknown but could be a potential factor in these results.
Limitations

Although this study produced useful findings and displays the need for active shooter preparedness training for California State University students, there were limitations to the research. The first limitation was that research was only conducted in the Social and Behavioral Sciences Department with only social work students. Therefore, it is hard to determine if research outcomes would resemble those generated by the current study or if results would differ with the added beliefs of students from other departments and professions.

Since surveys were given to several different cohorts of BASW and MSW students, some of the survey tools were provided to participants at different times. The survey tool was administered to some of the research participants directly following the Risk Management active shooter preparedness training, however, the survey tool was provided to other cohort group’s days following the training. Therefore, the results of the survey tools given days after the training could have been skewed.

In addition, the survey tool was only given on a one-time basis. It might have been more beneficial to have administered a pretest posttest for this study; where one survey is given at the beginning of the school year and a second survey is given at the end of the school year.

Lastly, there was a disproportionate ratio of male to female participants in the study. This reality makes it hard to determine if any other significant gender
difference exist with regards to the survey tool responses provided by participants.

Recommendations for Social Work Practice, Policy, and Research

This study will contribute to the social work profession by shedding light on the active shooter safety concerns held by students entering the field of social work shortly. The high levels of anxiety related to perceptions of the likelihood of such an attack are clear and span across specializations. This research can also help stimulate new school policy geared towards training efforts in an attempt to prepare students for active shooter response and, in turn, lower the anxiety levels of future California State University students.

Furthermore, the utilization of a Strength-Based Perspective and General Systems Theory can guide collaborative efforts between social workers, schools, and researchers to advocate for policy change. This study can contribute to the developing literature on the importance of professional development in social work practice; especially pertaining to growing trends of active shooter attacks.

Supplementary research is necessary to measure the anxiety levels and sense of preparedness of future social work cohorts in Universities in Southern California. Additionally, future research should incorporate various departments and majors throughout the University. The diversity of majors will help capture an array of participants in hopes of obtaining data that is more comprehensive and
integrates varied sampling of the student body of any given California State University. Also, a future study could benefit from performing pretest and posttests surveys. And, the survey tool itself should be remodified to incorporate questions specifically geared towards professors and their feelings of anxiety related to an active shooter attack taking place on the University campus they teach at.

Conclusion

The data collected in this research has provided a baseline from which to scale the average level of preparedness of first-year social work department participants. Themes that were measured include anxiety levels connected to active shooter incidents, the likelihood of a mass shooting occurring on a University campus in Southern California or at students' internship placements, levels of preparedness for such an event, importance, and usefulness of preparedness training. The need for further active shooter preparedness trainings was identified as an important element for the reduction of feelings of anxiety and has great potential for the active shooter readiness education of future social work students.
APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE
ACT FAST Training Evaluation

Please answer these questions to the best of your ability after completing the ACT FAST Training. You are welcome to skip any question you would like, however your feedback is important to helping us learn how to improve active shooter/attacker training. Please circle your answers. Thank you for your participation.

1. How anxious are you about the possibility of an active shooter/attacker being on campus?
   No anxiety  Very anxious
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

2. How prepared do you feel you are if there were an active shooter/attacker situation on campus?
   Not prepared  Very prepared
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

3. How likely do you feel there would be an active shooter/attacker situation on campus?
   Not likely  Very likely
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

4. How anxious are you about the possibility of an active shooter/attacker being at your internship?
   No anxiety  Very anxious
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

5. How likely do you feel there would be an active shooter/attacker situation at your internship?
   Not likely  Very likely
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

6. How important do you think it is to receive active shooter/attacker trainings?
   Not important  Very important
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

7. How useful did you find this training to be?
   Not useful  Very useful
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

8. How similar was the information in this training to what you previously knew about how to deal with an active shooter/attacker situation?
   Very different  Very similar
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

9. Do you have previous training on active shooter preparedness?
   a. Yes
      If Yes, where/when did you receive training?

   b. No

10. Do you have any additional feedback or other topics related to active shooter/attackers you would like to see covered in future/additional trainings?

11. Which cohort are you in?
   a. MSW Monday/Wednesday
   b. MSW Tuesday/Thursday Daytime
   c. MSW Tuesday/Thursday Evening
   d. BASW Student

12. What is your age?
   a. 20-24  f. 45-49
   b. 25-29  g. 50-54
   c. 30-34  h. 55-59
   d. 35-39  i. 60 and older
   e. 40-44

13. What gender do you identify with?
   a. Female
   b. Male
   c. Male to female transgender
   d. Female to male transgender
   e. Other___________________

14. What best describes your ethnicity (circle all that apply)?
   a. African American/Black
   b. White/Caucasian
   c. Native American/Alaska Native
   d. Latino/a
   e. Asian/Pacific Islander
   f. Other___________________

Survey Questionnaire developed by Nyemal Thuok Chuol, Berenice Dougherty, and Carolyn McAllister
APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT
The study in which you are being asked to participate is designed to examine students’ knowledge before and after watching an active shooter training video. This study is being conducted by Berenice Daugherty and Nyemal Chuol, MSW students, under the supervision of Carolyn McAllister, MSW, PhD, Associate Professor of Social Work, California State University, San Bernardino. This study has been approved by the School of Social Work Sub-Committee, Institutional Review Board, California State University, San Bernardino.

PURPOSE: The purpose of this study is to measure students’ knowledge of safety procedures in the event of an active shooter situation occurring on the CSUSB campus.

DESCRIPTION: You have been chosen to participate in this study because you are a current student within the School of Social Work. You will be shown a training video on how to respond to an active shooter situation on campus. Following the video, you will be asked to complete a brief questionnaire.

PARTICIPATION: Your participation is completely voluntary and you do not have to answer any questions you do not wish to answer. You may skip or choose to answer parts of the survey, and can freely withdraw from participation in this study at any time without any consequences.

ANONYMOUS: Your responses will remain anonymous and your responses will be coded in numerical format using aggregate form. No identifying information will be asked.

DURATION: The survey will take approximately 8-10 minutes to complete.

RISKS: Some of the material shown in the video may elicit an emotional reaction. Counseling service providers are available for students during orientation and while enrolled in the program.

BENEFITS: You will gain knowledge and awareness of what to do in the case of an active shooter situation.

CONTACT: If you have any questions regarding this study or your rights, you may contact Carolyn McAllister, Associate Professor of Social Work at cmcallis@csusb.edu.

RESULTS: The results of this study will be available after June, 2018 at the John M. Pfau Library ScholarWorks database at California State University, San Bernardino.

This is to certify that I read the above and am 18 years of age or older.

Please place an “X” here

[ ]

Today’s Date
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APPENDIX C

DEBRIEFING STATEMENT
Debriefing Form

This study was designed to understand students' knowledge of and feelings of preparation for an unlikely but possible active shooter event on a university campus. There was no deception involved in this study.

If you feel you need counseling after this training, please contact the following numbers:

CSUSB Counseling and Psychological Services
(909) 537-5040

County of San Bernardino Department of Behavioral Health
http://sanbernardino.networkofcare.org/mh/emergency.cfm
For Emergency Walk-In Mental Health Services After Hours, visit the:
Extended Hours Triage (for Adults 18 and older only)
Behavioral Health Resources Center (BHRC)
850 E. Foothill Boulevard
Rialto, CA 92376
Phone: (909) 421-9342
Walk-In Hours of Operation: Monday through Friday 5:00 p.m. – 10:00 p.m. Open Holidays
2:00 pm – 10:00 p.m.
APPENDIX D

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO  
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK  
Institutional Review Board Sub-Committee

Researcher(s)  

Proposal Title  

Your proposal has been reviewed by the School of Social Work Sub-Committee of the Institutional Review Board. The decisions and advice of those faculty are given below.

Proposal is:

- [ ] approved
- [ ] to be resubmitted with revisions listed below
- [ ] to be forwarded to the campus IRB for review

Revisions that must be made before proposal can be approved:

- [ ] faculty signature missing
- [ ] missing informed consent [ ] debriefing statement
- [ ] revisions needed in informed consent [ ] debriefing
- [ ] data collection instruments missing
- [ ] agency approval letter missing
- [ ] CITI missing
- [ ] revisions in design needed (specified below)

Committee Chair Signature:  

Date: 9/21/2017

Distribution: White-Coordinator; Yellow-Supervisor; Pink-Student


http://riskmanagement.csusb.edu/emergencymanagement/activeShooter.html


ASSIGNED RESPONSIBILITIES

This was a two-person project where authors collaborated throughout. These responsibilities were assigned in the manner below.

1. Data collection:
   a. Team Effort: Nyemal Thuok Chuol and Berenice Dougherty

2. Data Entry and Analysis:
   a. Data Entry
      Team Effort: Nyemal Thuok Chuol and Berenice Dougherty
   b. Data Analysis
      Team Effort: Nyemal Thuok Chuol and Berenice Dougherty

3. Writing Report and Presentation of Findings:
   a. Introduction and Literature
      Team Effort: Nyemal Thuok Chuol and Berenice Dougherty
   b. Methods
      Team Effort: Nyemal Thuok Chuol and Berenice Dougherty
   c. Results
      Team Effort: Nyemal Thuok Chuol and Berenice Dougherty
   d. Discussion
      Team Effort: Nyemal Thuok Chuol and Berenice Dougherty