ALL THE MISSED WARNING SIGNS:

What the Research Tells Us About Prevention, Recognition, and Response in School Violence

Prepared in consultation with:

Dr. Scott A. Palmer, PhD

Clinical Psychologist | St. Cloud, Minnesota

Dr. Kay Pasley, PhD

Professor Emerita, Family & Child Sciences | Florida State University

Executive Summary

School violence in the United States is not random. It is not sudden. And it is not, in most cases, unannounced.

The research is unambiguous: in the overwhelming majority of targeted school violence incidents studied by the United States Secret Service, the perpetrator communicated intent to at least one other person before acting. Warning signs were present. Someone knew, or something was said.

The question this paper addresses is not why these tragedies happen. The question is why, knowing what we know, they continue to happen at the rate they do.

The answer lies not in the absence of information but in the failure to assemble it — across teachers, counselors, administrators, parents, and peers who each held one piece of a picture that none of them saw whole.

This revised edition incorporates an emerging body of research that significantly updates our understanding of how the pathway to violence operates in the current online environment. Researchers James Densley and Jillian Peterson of The Violence Project have identified a disturbing evolution in the motivational structure of mass violence: what was once driven primarily by grievance is increasingly driven by something more difficult to address — nihilism, and the desire for performance. Understanding this evolution is essential to understanding what prevention requires today.

This paper synthesizes the current state of research on school violence prevention, with particular attention to five areas:

- The behavioral and communicative warning signs that precede targeted school violence
- The new online dimension — how digital communities transform private despair into public performance
- The structural and institutional barriers that prevent warning signs from being recognized and reported
- The evidence-based interventions — behavioral threat assessment, means restriction, and trusted adult relationships — that are most effective at interrupting the pathway toward violence
- The gap between what the research shows works and what schools and communities actually do

The goal is not to alarm. The goal is to close the gap between knowledge and practice — and to give ordinary people the language, the permission, and the confidence to act on what they already know.

1. The Problem We Keep Misunderstanding

The Notoriety Effect and Its Consequences

When a school shooting occurs, public attention turns almost immediately toward the perpetrator. Who was he? What was his history? What drove him to this? The search for a psychological profile — a recognizable type, a face for the threat — is understandable. It is also, the research consistently shows, counterproductive.

The Secret Service's National Threat Assessment Center, which has conducted the most comprehensive analyses of targeted school violence in the United States, explicitly warns against the assumption that perpetrators fit a predictable profile. They do not. They are overwhelmingly male, yes. But they come from every racial background, every family structure, every socioeconomic condition, every academic performance level.

What they share is not a profile. What they share is a process.

> **KEY FINDING**
>
> *The search for 'the type of person who does this' is not only ineffective — it actively distracts from the behavioral indicators and situational factors that research has identified as genuinely predictive. Profile-based thinking causes us to look for the wrong thing in the wrong place.*

The notoriety effect compounds this problem. Extensive media coverage of perpetrators — their names, their manifestos, their grievances — has been linked in the research literature to contagion effects: measurable increases in copycat incidents in the weeks following high-profile attacks. This is not a marginal finding. It is consistent across multiple studies and has led major journalism organizations to develop specific protocols for covering mass violence.

For schools and communities, the practical implication is significant: the public conversation that follows a school shooting — focused on the perpetrator, his psychology, his stated motives — is precisely the conversation least likely to prevent the next one.

The Columbine Effect and What Came After

The phenomenon of copycat violence following high-profile school attacks — what researchers sometimes call the Columbine effect — has been documented for decades. Subsequent attackers have studied prior incidents, modeled their planning on them, and in some cases explicitly referenced them as inspiration.

But researchers at The Violence Project, who maintain the most comprehensive database of mass shootings in the United States, have identified something beyond simple imitation. The Columbine effect describes the mechanics of copying. What is emerging in current research is something more disturbing: the transformation of prior attackers into figures of veneration within specific online communities — what Densley and Peterson have described as saint worship — and the hardening of that veneration into a script that subsequent individuals internalize as their own.

This is not ideology in the conventional sense. There is no political program, no manifesto with demands, no coherent belief system to be refuted or addressed. It is something the research is only beginning to fully characterize — and understanding it is essential to prevention in the current environment.

2. The New Dimension: Performance, Nihilism, and the Online Script

This section incorporates research that has emerged most fully in the past several years and represents a significant update to the traditional grievance-and-pathway framework. It draws on the work of James Densley and Jillian Peterson, co-founders of The Violence Project, whose longitudinal research on mass shooters and whose ongoing engagement with platform safety teams, clinicians, and researchers represents the current frontier of this field.

From Grievance to Nihilism

The traditional research framework — and the one that remains most clinically useful for early intervention — describes a pathway that begins with grievance: a perceived injustice, a humiliation, a sustained experience of being treated as less than. That framework remains valid and important.

What current researchers are identifying, however, is an evolution in the motivational structure of the most recent generation of mass violence events. The grievance is still present. But it is increasingly accompanied by something that is harder to address through conventional intervention: nihilism.

Nihilism, in this context, means something specific: the conviction that nothing matters, that no connection is real, that no future is available. And from that conviction follows a particular logic: if nothing means anything, then the only act that can mean something is one that nobody can look away from.

> **THE NEW MOTIVATIONAL STRUCTURE**
> *The violence is not a means to an end. It is the end. The performance is the point. This represents a significant departure from the grievance-resolution model and requires a correspondingly different prevention response.*

This shift matters for prevention because it changes the nature of the warning signs and the intervention opportunities. A student on the traditional grievance pathway is, in some sense, still oriented toward the world — still capable of having the grievance addressed, still susceptible to connection as a competing force. A student who has moved into genuine nihilism presents a different and more urgent challenge.

How Online Communities Narrate Despair

The research identifies a specific mechanism through which private despair becomes public performance — and it runs almost entirely through online communities that most educators, parents, and community members never see.

The process works roughly as follows: a young person experiencing isolation, rejection, or a sustained sense of being unseen finds their way — through algorithmic recommendation or active search — into online spaces where that despair is recognized, validated, and given language. These spaces do not resolve the despair. They amplify it. They provide a community of shared grievance, an identity built around that grievance, and — critically — a set of prior

actors who are presented not as cautionary examples but as figures who finally, through their act, made the world notice them.

Platform safety teams that monitor these spaces have described the content as involving the repackaging of alienation as memes, inside jokes, and saint worship of past killers — material that normalizes violent ideation, provides tactical information, and constructs a social identity around admiration for prior attackers. The young person who enters these spaces isolated and in pain exits them with a community, an identity, and increasingly, a script.

> **WHAT PLATFORM SAFETY TEAMS SEE**
>
> *The communities where this content circulates are not fringe spaces visible only to researchers. They operate on mainstream platforms and migrate rapidly when moderated. The tools to identify and disrupt them exist. What has been lacking, in too many documented cases, is the institutional will to deploy them consistently.*

The Platform Responsibility Gap

One of the most significant findings to emerge from recent research concerns the role of technology platforms in either disrupting or enabling the pathway to violence — and the gap between what those platforms are capable of doing and what they have, in documented cases, chosen to do.

Researchers working with platform safety teams have documented cases in which automated systems flagged user behavior consistent with escalating violent ideation — and in which that information was not acted upon in ways that might have prevented subsequent violence. The structural parallel to the school system fragmentation problem described later in this paper is direct: information existed, systems detected concerning signals, and the mechanisms for translating those signals into meaningful intervention were either absent or overridden.

This is not primarily a technical problem. The detection tools exist. It is a governance problem — about who has the authority to act on what the systems find, what thresholds trigger intervention, and what the institutional consequences are for inaction versus for false positives.

For the purposes of this paper — which is addressed primarily to schools, families, and community members — the practical implication is this: the online environment in which young people now spend significant portions of their lives contains communities that actively work to move vulnerable individuals further along the pathway to violence. Schools, counselors, and parents cannot monitor or moderate those communities directly. What they can do is maintain the human connections and trusted adult relationships that give young people a reason to step off the pathway when they encounter it.

What This Means for Warning Signs

The nihilism-and-performance framework does not replace the leakage research — it updates it. Warning signs still appear. Intent is still communicated, often to peers. The pathway is still interruptible.

What changes is the nature of some of the warning signs and the communities in which they appear:

- Expressions of hopelessness that go beyond situational despair — statements that suggest a young person has concluded that nothing in the world is worth engaging with
- Consumption of or engagement with content that venerates prior mass attackers — not merely dark or violent content generally, but specifically material oriented around admiration for specific individuals who committed mass violence
- Withdrawal from all real-world social connection combined with increased online activity — particularly when the online activity is conducted with unusual secrecy
- Language that frames a prospective violent act in terms of being remembered, being noticed, or making an impact — the performance orientation rather than the grievance-resolution orientation
- Sudden calm or apparent resolution following a period of distress — which in suicidal crisis research is associated with the decision to act having been made

None of these signs, in isolation, is diagnostic. Many young people express hopelessness, consume dark content, and withdraw socially without being on any pathway toward violence. The research framework is not about individual signs but about patterns — and about the trusted adult relationships that create the conditions in which those patterns can be noticed, named, and addressed.

3. What the Research Actually Shows

Leakage: The Communication of Intent

One of the most consistent findings in the research on targeted school violence is the phenomenon researchers call leakage: the communication — intentional or not — of an intent to do harm before the act occurs.

In the Secret Service's Safe School Initiative study, which examined 37 school shootings involving 41 attackers between 1974 and 2000, leakage was identified in the overwhelming majority of cases. Attackers communicated their intent to peers through direct statements, writings, drawings, online posts, or behavioral changes. In many cases, multiple people had information that, assembled together, would have presented a clear picture of danger.

93%	of school attackers studied by the Secret Service's NTAC exhibited warning signs before the attack that were observed by at least one other person.

81%	of school attackers had communicated their intent to harm others before the attack — most often to peers.

59%	of cases involved at least one other person who had prior knowledge of the attacker's plan before it was carried out.

The implications of these findings are profound. School violence is not, in the main, a problem of hidden monsters acting without warning. It is a problem of warnings that were not recognized, not reported, or not assembled into a picture that triggered intervention.

> **CLINICAL NOTE — DR. SCOTT A. PALMER, PHD**
>
> *In my direct involvement in the aftermath of school shootings in Minnesota, the pattern described in the research was consistent with what I observed: warning signs had been present and, in retrospect, recognizable. The gap was not in the signs themselves but in the systems and relationships that should have received and acted on them.*

The Pathway to Violence

The concept of a pathway — as opposed to a profile — is central to the current understanding of targeted school violence. Researchers describe a process that typically unfolds over weeks, months, or years, moving through identifiable stages that represent intervention opportunities at each point.

The pathway generally begins with a grievance: something perceived as a profound injustice — a humiliation, a rejection, a sustained experience of being treated as less than. For the overwhelming majority of young people who experience such grievances, the injury fades, finds another outlet, or is addressed by a trusted adult or peer relationship. The grievance resolves.

What the research identifies as the critical variable is whether the grievance finds a community that does not resolve it but amplifies it — and, increasingly, whether that community provides a script that transforms private despair into a plan for public performance.

The pathway model has two critical implications for prevention:

- Intervention is possible at multiple points along the pathway — the earlier the better, but never too late until the act itself occurs
- The single most effective interruption of the pathway is connection: a trusted adult relationship, a peer bond that feels real, any human connection that competes with the online community's narrative

The Role of Peers

The research is particularly striking on the role of peers in both the warning sign pattern and the intervention opportunity. Young people are far more likely to be the recipients of leakage than adults. Peers are told. Peers observe changes in behavior. Peers see the drawings, read the posts, hear the statements that adults do not.

And yet, peers almost never report what they know.

The research identifies two primary reasons. First, young people do not recognize what they are seeing as serious — the cultural normalization of dark humor, violent imagery, and angry expression makes it difficult to distinguish concerning communication from ordinary adolescent venting. Second, and more significantly: young people are afraid that reporting will constitute betrayal, will get their friend in trouble, will be wrong and result in social consequences they cannot predict.

This second barrier is particularly important because it is addressable. Young people who understand that reporting a concern is an act of care rather than betrayal — and who have a relationship with an adult they trust to handle that information with discretion and judgment — are significantly more likely to come forward.

> **FOR SCHOOLS AND PARENTS**
> *The language we give young people matters. Teaching students that 'saying something' is an act of help rather than harm — and giving them a specific trusted adult to say it to — addresses the most significant barrier to peer reporting.*

4. Where the System Breaks Down

The Fragmentation Problem

One of the most consistent findings in post-incident analyses of school shootings is that information existed before the attack — but it was distributed across people and systems that did not speak to each other.

A teacher noticed something in an assignment. A parent observed a change in sleep and behavior. A coach saw a withdrawal from the team. A peer heard something and didn't know what to do with it. An administrator received an email expressing concern and hadn't yet acted on it. A platform's automated system flagged concerning content and the flag was not acted upon.

Each of these people and systems, working alone with the fragment they held, made a reasonable judgment. The drawing was probably just dark artistic expression. The behavioral change was probably stress. The withdrawal was probably a rough patch. The platform violation was probably not serious enough to escalate. Probably.

What the research shows is that assembled together, these fragments would have told a different story. The tragedy lived not in the absence of information but in the space between the people and systems who each held a piece of it.

Structural Barriers to Information Assembly

The fragmentation is not simply a matter of people failing to communicate. It is partly structural — built into the legal and institutional frameworks that govern schools and platforms alike.

- FERPA (the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act) places significant restrictions on what schools can share with parents and what teachers can share with administrators about individual students. These restrictions exist for important reasons — student privacy is a genuine value. But they can create conditions in which a school counselor, a classroom teacher, and a parent are each working with partial information about the same student, prohibited or deterred from sharing what they know.

- Counselor-to-student ratios at most American schools are dramatically below recommended levels. The American School Counselor Association recommends a ratio of one counselor per 250 students. The national average is closer to one per 450. In many districts it exceeds one per 700. A counselor with 480 students on her caseload does not have the capacity to proactively identify and build relationships with the students most at risk — who are, by definition, the students least likely to self-refer.

- Technology platforms that detect concerning user behavior face their own fragmentation problem: automated systems may flag content while human review processes, escalation protocols, and institutional accountability structures fail to translate those flags into meaningful intervention.

- The students most likely to benefit from intervention are the least likely to seek it. Withdrawn, isolated students do not raise their hands. The system is built for students who already know how to ask for help.

1:450	Average counselor-to-student ratio in U.S. schools. The recommended ratio is 1:250. In many districts the ratio exceeds 1:700.

The Reporting Gap

Even when warning signs are recognized, they are often not reported. The research identifies a consistent pattern: teachers, parents, and peers who notice concerning behavior frequently do not act on what they notice — not because they don't care, but because they lack three things:

- A clear sense of what crosses the threshold from 'concerning' to 'reportable'
- A specific person or process to report to
- Confidence that reporting will help rather than harm the student they're worried about

This is the gap that is most amenable to training and system design. None of these three barriers is fixed. All of them can be addressed through education, clear protocols, and the establishment of trusted relationships between community members and the professionals equipped to act on their concerns.

5. What Works

Behavioral Threat Assessment

Behavioral threat assessment (BTA) is currently the most evidence-supported framework for preventing targeted school violence. Developed in significant part through collaboration between the Secret Service's National Threat Assessment Center and school safety researchers, BTA provides a structured, multidisciplinary process for evaluating whether a student is on a pathway toward violence — and for intervening before that pathway becomes irreversible.

The key distinction between threat assessment and threat identification is critical and frequently misunderstood:

> **THE CRITICAL DISTINCTION**
>
> *Threat assessment is not about identifying dangerous students. It is about identifying students in distress. One leads to punishment. The other leads to support. The research is clear that punitive responses — suspension, expulsion, law enforcement involvement — without accompanying support frequently accelerate rather than interrupt the pathway to violence.*

A functioning threat assessment team typically includes a school counselor, an administrator, and a law enforcement liaison. Its purpose is to create a coordinated channel for the fragmented information described in Section 4 — a legitimate space in which a teacher's observation, a parent's concern, and a peer's report can be assembled into a coherent picture and responded to with appropriate support.

The research on BTA outcomes is consistent: schools with functioning threat assessment teams identify more students in distress earlier, connect them to support more effectively, and experience lower rates of violence. The Virginia Student Threat Assessment Guidelines (VSTAG), developed by Dr. Dewey Cornell at the University of Virginia, have been implemented in hundreds of schools and evaluated in multiple studies with positive outcomes.

The Trusted Adult Relationship

If behavioral threat assessment is the systemic intervention most supported by research, the trusted adult relationship is the individual-level intervention with the strongest evidence base — and the one that is most directly responsive to the nihilism-and-performance dynamic described in Section 2.

Across case after case, in school after school, the research identifies a consistent pattern: when a student in distress had a trusted adult relationship — someone they believed would listen without immediately punishing, someone whose response they could predict — that relationship was the thing most likely to interrupt the pathway toward violence.

And when it was absent, nothing else compensated for it.

The #1 Factor	The presence of a trusted adult relationship is the single most consistently identified protective factor against targeted school violence in the research literature.

This finding takes on additional significance in the context of the nihilism research. A young person who has concluded that nothing is real and that no connection matters has, by definition, lost or never had the trusted adult relationships that the research identifies as protective. The pathway to nihilism and the absence of trusted adult relationships are not independent phenomena — they are mutually reinforcing. Prevention, therefore, requires building those relationships before they are needed, in ordinary moments, as a structural feature of how schools and communities engage with young people.

> **FOR EDUCATORS AND COMMUNITY MEMBERS**
>
> *You may already be a trusted adult for a young person in your life. The research suggests that acting intentionally on that relationship — being predictably present, making it safe to say something small before something big needs to be said — is among the most protective things any adult can do.*

Means Restriction and Safe Storage

The third evidence-based intervention addressed in this paper is also the most politically charged — and for that reason, the most important to present accurately.

Means restriction refers to reducing access to lethal means during periods of acute crisis. In the context of school violence, this primarily means secure storage of firearms in the home.

The research basis for means restriction is straightforward and does not depend on contested claims about gun ownership or policy. It rests on two well-established findings:

- In the overwhelming majority of school shootings, the weapon was obtained from the home — most often from an unsecured location accessible to the student
- The acute phase of suicidal and violent crisis — the interval during which the decision to act is most likely to be executed — is typically brief. Research on suicidal crisis consistently shows that the acute phase lasts minutes to hours, rarely longer. A barrier that requires even a few minutes to overcome can be sufficient to allow the crisis to pass.

Secure storage of firearms does not prevent someone from being in crisis. It creates time — time for the crisis to pass, time for an intervention, time for someone to ask a question. It is a structural protection that requires no particular courage to implement, only the decision to act.

6. The Gap Between Knowledge and Practice

What We Know and What We Do

The research summarized in this paper is not new. The Secret Service's Safe School Initiative was published in 2002. The Virginia Student Threat Assessment Guidelines have been in development since the early 2000s. The research on trusted adult relationships, peer reporting barriers, counselor ratios, and means restriction has been accumulating for two decades.

What is new is the online dimension — the emergence of communities that actively recruit vulnerable young people, provide them with a script, and narrate their despair back to them in ways that escalate rather than resolve it. The research on this dimension is more recent, more rapidly evolving, and more difficult to address through the existing institutional frameworks.

And yet:

- Fewer than half of U.S. school districts have implemented formal behavioral threat assessment programs
- The national counselor-to-student ratio has improved only marginally in the past decade
- Surveys consistently show that the majority of students would not know who to report a concern to, or what would happen if they did
- Safe storage of firearms remains voluntary in most states, with limited public education campaigns and minimal enforcement
- Most schools have no systematic approach to identifying students who are being drawn into online communities that amplify violent ideation

This is the gap this paper is most concerned with. Not the absence of knowledge — the failure to translate knowledge into practice at the scale the problem demands.

Why the Gap Persists

The gap between research and practice in school violence prevention persists for several identifiable reasons:

Political polarization

School safety has become entangled in broader political debates about gun control, mental health, and school discipline. This polarization makes it difficult to implement evidence-based interventions that have been incorrectly associated with political positions. Safe storage, for example, is not a gun control measure — it is a time-delay intervention with strong research support. Behavioral threat assessment is not a surveillance program — it is a structured support process.

Resource constraints

Behavioral threat assessment programs require trained personnel, administrative coordination, and ongoing professional development. Many districts, particularly in under-resourced communities, do not have the staffing capacity to implement these programs even when their effectiveness is recognized.

The training gap

Most teachers, parents, and community members have never received formal guidance on recognizing warning signs, understanding what constitutes a reportable concern, or knowing who to tell and what to expect when they do. Discomfort is data. Pattern recognition is a skill. Both can be taught.

The normalization of inaction

Perhaps the most significant barrier is cultural: a widespread, implicit assumption that warning signs are ambiguous enough to justify inaction, and that acting on a concern that turns out to be unfounded is worse than not acting at all. The research directly challenges this assumption. The cost of a false positive — a student who receives support they didn't need — is dramatically lower than the cost of a false negative. The threshold for action should be concern, not certainty.

The online visibility gap

A new and growing barrier is the simple fact that most adults — educators, parents, community members — do not see the online spaces where escalation happens. Platform safety teams see it. Researchers see it. The young people who inhabit these spaces see it. But the trusted adults who might interrupt the pathway typically do not — and current institutional structures provide few mechanisms for closing that gap.

7. What Can Be Done

The research points clearly to a set of actions available to schools, districts, parents, and community members that do not require legislative change, significant new funding, or political consensus:

For School Districts and Administrators

- Implement behavioral threat assessment teams using established frameworks such as the Virginia Student Threat Assessment Guidelines (VSTAG) or the NTAC's Enhancing School Safety guide
- Establish clear, school-wide protocols for reporting concerns — who to tell, what happens next, and how confidentiality is protected
- Train all staff annually on warning sign recognition, leakage behavior, and referral pathways — including the updated warning signs associated with online radicalization and nihilistic ideation
- Communicate those protocols explicitly to students and parents
- Work toward counselor ratios that approach the recommended 1:250
- Consider partnerships with platform safety researchers and organizations equipped to provide guidance on online warning signs

For Educators

- Recognize that discomfort is data — an instinct that something is wrong about a student is not paranoia, it is pattern recognition, and it deserves to be acted on
- Build relationships before they are needed — trusted adult status is established in ordinary moments, not crisis ones
- Know your school's reporting protocol and use it — you do not need to be certain to report a concern
- Give students the language: telling a trusted adult about a friend's concerning behavior is an act of care, not betrayal
- Be alert to expressions of hopelessness that go beyond situational stress — particularly statements suggesting a young person has concluded that nothing is worth engaging with

For Parents

- Store firearms securely — a locked safe is not a political statement, it is a time-delay that has been shown to save lives
- Know the warning signs: social withdrawal, changes in sleep or eating, increased secrecy about online activity, expressions of hopelessness or nihilism, drawing or writing that concerns you

- Have direct conversations with your children about the online communities that glorify mass violence — not as surveillance, but as the kind of ongoing conversation that builds the trusted adult relationship
- Know who to call — your school's counselor, the school's threat assessment team if one exists, or the 988 Suicide and Crisis Lifeline
- Talk to your children about trusted adults — make sure they know that saying something about a friend's concerning behavior is the right thing to do

For Community Members

- Trust your instincts — you do not need certainty to express concern about a young person
- Say something to someone equipped to help — a school counselor, a parent, a trusted adult in the young person's life
- Support school district efforts to implement threat assessment programs and improve counselor ratios
- Understand that the online environment is now part of the pathway — and that human connection remains the most effective competing force

Conclusion

School violence in America is a problem we understand better than we act on. The research has given us a clear picture: warning signs are present before most attacks, they are communicated to other people, and they are frequently missed not because they are invisible but because we have not built the systems, relationships, and cultural norms required to receive them.

The emerging research on nihilism, performance, and the online script adds urgency and complexity to this picture. It is no longer sufficient to understand the traditional grievance pathway. We must also understand how that pathway is being accelerated and amplified by online communities that none of our existing institutional frameworks are equipped to monitor or interrupt — and how the human relationships that research identifies as protective become, in this context, not just beneficial but essential.

The pathway toward violence is interruptible. It is interrupted by trusted adult relationships, by peers who feel safe enough to say something, by threat assessment teams that can assemble the fragmented picture that no single person holds whole, and by structural protections that create time when time is what the crisis requires.

None of these interventions requires waiting for the next tragedy to prompt action. All of them are available now, in every school and every community, to anyone willing to close the gap between what the research shows and what we actually do.

The signs are there. We have always been capable of seeing them. What we have lacked, too often, is the knowledge that seeing is enough — that staying is enough — that the most important thing any of us can do is to pull up a chair.

Companion Resource

This white paper was developed in conjunction with All the Missed Warning Signs, a documentary short film designed for professional development use in schools and community organizations. The film translates the research described here into a visual and emotional narrative suitable for training conversations with educators, parents, and community members.

The film is available for screening at atmws.com. A facilitator guide for structured post-screening discussion is available at the same address. For licensing inquiries for educational use, contact allthemissedwarningsigns@gmail.com.

Selected References and Resources

The following sources informed the research presented in this paper:

1. Vossekuil, B., Fein, R., Reddy, M., Borum, R., & Modzeleski, W. (2002). The Final Report and Findings of the Safe School Initiative: Implications for the Prevention of School Attacks in the United States. U.S. Secret Service and U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C.

2. Alathari, L., et al. (2021). Averting Targeted School Violence: A U.S. Secret Service Analysis of Plots Against Schools. National Threat Assessment Center, United States Secret Service.

3. Cornell, D., & Sheras, P. (2006). Guidelines for Responding to Student Threats of Violence. Sopris West Educational Services.

4. Cornell, D. (2020). Threat Assessment in Schools: Research and Practice. In Handbook of Violence Risk Assessment (2nd ed.). Routledge.

5. Densley, J., & Peterson, J. (2021). The Violence Project: How to Stop a Mass Shooting Epidemic. Abrams Press.

6. Peterson, J., & Densley, J. (2026). We Study Mass Shooters. Something Terrifying Is Happening Online. The New York Times Opinion.

7. The Violence Project. (2026). Mass Shooter Database. theviolenceproject.org

8. American School Counselor Association. (2022). ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs (4th ed.).

9. Klassen, T.P., et al. (2022). Means Restriction for Suicide Prevention: Systematic Review. JAMA Psychiatry.

10. Everytown for Gun Safety. (2023). Guns and School Safety: Evidence on Youth Firearm Access. Everytown Research & Policy.

11. Riedman, D. (2022). K-12 School Shooting Database. Center for Homeland Defense and Security, Naval Postgraduate School.

12. Langman, P. (2009). Why Kids Kill: Inside the Minds of School Shooters. Palgrave Macmillan.

13. National Threat Assessment Center. (2019). Enhancing School Safety Using a Threat Assessment Model: An Operational Guide for Preventing Targeted School Violence. U.S. Secret Service.

Key Organizations

- The Violence Project — theviolenceproject.org — Comprehensive mass shooter database and prevention research by Densley and Peterson

- National Threat Assessment Center (NTAC) — secretservice.gov/ntac

- Sandy Hook Promise — sandyhookpromise.org

- Student Threat Assessment Guidelines (STAG) — University of Virginia

- Everytown for Gun Safety — Safe Storage — everytownresearch.org

- 988 Suicide & Crisis Lifeline — call or text 988