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1. Summary

1.1 Introduction

Radicalization is a complex process. Former research pointed to the importance of multiple factors covering the social-, demographic- and psychological spheres. Furthermore, triggers like the deceasing of a family member or drastic events that circulate on (social) media, play an important part in the development of radical ideas. Especially youngsters and adolescents who are in the process of developing a social identity, are vulnerable to influences from charismatic role models or peers.

In this report the results of the research on the process of violent radicalization are presented. During this research, our focus evolved from paying attention to deradicalization interventions and risk factors to prevent radicalization, to a mind set in which we became conscious that the focus should be on positive experiences, instead of fighting against situations we do not want to happen. An overview is given of risk factors as well as protective factors on several levels and related to different spheres in the process of violent radicalization. In the consulted literature, little has been written about protective factors, therefore our aim was to uncover these during the qualitative interviews. Instead of only focussing on aspects which should be banished, attention should be paid to hopes, wishes and dreams. Further, in this report an overview of promising practices concerning trainings for the enlargement of resilience among youths is presented. This research aims to prevent certain (radical) attitudes to develop. Although the process of involvement in radical movements or developing radical attitudes is difficult to grasp, some preventive strategies could be identified. Also, indicators to take into account for the design and evaluation of trainings are discussed, in order to hand out guidelines for the development of tools. There is no univocal answer to the question: which measure or intervention is the most effective and efficient. Yet, we state that a comprehensive, integrated approach is useful if combined with a focus on positive factors, in order to increase youngsters’ resilience to prevent involvement in violent radicalization.

1.2 Defining violent radicalization

The concept of violent radicalization appears to be difficult to grasp. Therefore we have designed an extended definition for this report, to focus on aspects of violent radicalization. The completion of the Vice-Prime Minister (2013) has been put in brackets. Allen (in Vidino, 2011) described the concept of violent radicalization first as follows:
The process of [an individual or a group] adopting an extremist belief system [inspired by philosophical, religious, political or ideological notions], including the willingness to use, support, or facilitate violence [or undemocratic means], as a method to effect [drastic] societal change. (Allen, in Vidino, 2011, completed with the definition in the report of the Vice-Prime Minister, 2013).

We believe that the development of radical notions are not per se problematic, since having a certain passion about a topic can increase involvement within civil society. Radicalism becomes problematic when the willingness to use or support undemocratic means develops. This development should be prevented. But the process of involvement into violent radicalization is dynamic; a person can fluctuate in the degree of involvement. Further, the process is not linear. Young people can ‘dip in and out’ of the process (Bonnell et al., 2011, Noppe et al., 2012). Not only the process of radicalization might evolve from mild to extreme, the different forms of radical notions may also vary. Besides, radicalism is a process that develops through a combination of divers risk factors on several levels. To become aware of the risk factors for possible involvement in radical ideologies, the most striking ones have been outlined in this report.

1.3 Risk factors

To answer the question ‘which factors influence youngsters in the process of radicalization?’, we explored several risk factors. In the literature, distinctions are made between root causes, push and pull factors. Pull factors can be described as elements that tend to influence the individual and ‘pull’ him/her towards a more attractive alternative. Push factors are circumstances that make an individual more open for radical messages. There is no univocal explanation concerning the exact influences of these factors. Furthermore, authors use different divisions. Still, they all seem to agree on the multifactorial character of the development of (violent) radicalization, with a combination of risk factors on different levels.

1.3.1 Root causes

Among others, Van den Bos, Loseman & Doosje (2009) describe root causes that might form the breeding ground for the process of radicalization. Important markers in the root causes are age, education, economic status, (religious) worldview and / or personal markers. Combined with certain push- and pull factors, they might result in openness for violent radicalization. Yet, there is no objective demographic model of certain youngsters who become radical, and it is not possible to speak of ‘the’ radical (Bjørgo, 2011; de Graaff, de Poot & Kleemans, 2009; Horgan, 2008;
Van den Bos et al., 2009; Veldhuis & Bakker, 2007). Pels & de Ruyter point out that the level of education of radical youngsters does not have a strong influence on (the prevention of) radicalization (2012). Radical ideas may change, and most persons who seem to meet the markers for radicalization, do not radicalize at all.

### 1.3.2 Age

As noted before, the root cause age plays an important role in literature about radicalization. Young people in their puberty or adolescence seek connections and supportive relationships in their development of an own personality (Newman & Newman, 2001). Social bonds play a crucial part in this development of youngsters’ personality. Youngsters with few or no bonds to society might be at a higher risk of criminal behaviour (Hauspie et al., 2010; Vettenburg et al., 2013). The less social relations a youngster has (with institutions, family or peers), the more susceptible he or she is to involvement in radicalization (Gielen & Grin, 2010). Several authors state that puberty and adolescence are the periods in which youngsters are more vulnerable and receptive for radicalization, since they are in the middle of a process of developing their identity (Gielen & Grin, 2010; Pels & de Ruyter, 2012; Van San et al., 2010). Furthermore, youngsters who have a stronger sense of justice; a stronger urge for bonding; and who are more easily influenced, they are more susceptible to radicalization (Buijs et al., in Gielen & Grin, 2010).

### 1.3.3 Relative deprivation

Relative deprivation is a form of (perceived) discrimination, which results from comparing oneself (or one’s group) with others. The three factors described above (demographic e.g. age; social e.g. bonds; and psychological e.g. being easily influenced and having a strong sense of justice), can lead to the feeling of ‘deprivation’. The perception that oneself has no access to commodities others do have access to, is by some authors marked as the underlying root cause to become radicalized (Ponsaers et al., 2010; Van den Bos, et al., 2009). According to Gielen & Grin (2010) the result of relative deprivation is that feelings of injustice tend to overrule. This could lead to anger against society as a whole. This anger might be a trigger to increasingly radical ideas, which might translate into undemocratic behaviour, or the intention to use, or the actual use of violence (Van den Bos et al., 2009). Media, and especially Internet can increase these feelings of deprivation and injustice by restricted or biased reports about certain events or developments (Benschop, 2006).

### 1.3.4 Internet
The internet functions not only as a source of information, it functions as a virtual community in which youngsters meet (Van San, et al. 2010). According to Thompson: “the social media connects the world, welcoming those who feel disillusioned and persecuted, or who want to connect with […] the world for new opportunities” (2011, p. 168). Internet offers a meeting place for individuals who identify themselves with the ideals of the movement (Benschop, 2006). Terrorists use the Internet to recruit and radicalize members, and, according to Van San, et al (2010) the Internet played a crucial role in the radicalization of the youngsters they interviewed. For individuals in search of answers [and bonding], the Internet can be a comfortable place to connect with like-minded persons. Internet creates opportunities to access online radical movements. Participation virtually and in real life increases (Simi & Futrell, 2006). Terrorist websites are used to create mutual solidarity between groups. The intern cohesion is all about the feeling of belonging and being with people who support you (Benschop, 2006). Youngsters in search of membership, support and social bonds, can find this on the Internet (Simi & Futrel, 2006). Members state that the virtual community makes them feel ‘connected’ to other people over the world who share their views on society (2006). The virtual community, thus, brings solidarity between members who feel isolated in society and alone, referring to their radical believes.

1.4 Protective factors

1.4.1 Resilience

To prevent vulnerable youngsters from involvement in the spiral of violent radicalization, a key factor is the increase of their resilience. Resilience can be defined as the ability to ‘bounce back’ from adversity (Bonnell et al., 2011; Masten & Reed, 2005; Rutter, 2012). This concept can be of use for the future development of training tools or intervention methods. To increase the resilience of youngsters, one should emphasize positive aspects in youngsters’ lives and empower youngsters on several levels, to turn around risk factors.

A belief in individuals’ possibilities and strengths is the starting point. By inquiring the positive roots (core) of radicalization, the problem can be reframed to grasp what we actually want.

1.4.2 Reframe ‘radicalization’

Although radicalization is often related to violence and terror, radical notions do not per definition have to result in the act of using violence. Radicalism can also be described as an ideology; an expression of being politically involved, not necessarily meaning that this involvement implies using violence (Ponsaers et al., 2010). A radical person can be characterized as someone who has extreme
ideologies, that might divert from the common opinion. Therefore, Van San, et al (2010) note that the focus should be on ‘reframing’ the terminology of the political discourse about radicalization: developing an extreme opinion about certain issues and having ideals about the future, are in itself not problematic.

But labelling youths as ‘radicals’, sends the message that certain notions are inappropriate in a democratic system, even though some of the critics, or parts of the ideologies, might be relevant or legitimate (Van San, et al. 2010). The authors conclude that the passion youths have for ideologies or thoughts, can be used to support youngsters in developing into critical politically aware participants in society. Benschop (2006) states that governments should focus on empowering the so called radical youngsters (who actually want to bring attention to complaints), instead of defeating them.

We therefore suggest to reframe not only the discourse on radicalization into a positive one; youngsters being rooted (geworteld zijn), but also the meaning of ‘resilience’. Since (translated into Dutch), this too often is associated with resisting, fighting what we do not want (weerbaarheid), instead of focussing on what we do want to achieve or enlarge (veerkracht).

Thus, by positively appreciating the young [to become] ‘radical’ as a person who is in search of an active citizenship, the youngster is enabled to develop his or her ideals in a positive way (Van San, et al. 2010). Protective factors can be increased to enlarge the resilience of youths. By inquiring which social aspects positively influence youths, new skills or attitudes can be developed to help youngsters become resilient for involvement in radicalization. An ‘appreciative inquiry’ (AI) might function as a good tool, the underlying mechanism for prevention. Here, problems are not denied, yet they are approached as a wish for something else. The emphasis is put on creating possibilities instead of solving problems (Bouwen & Meeus, 2011).

1.4.3 Appreciate youngsters’ passion

AI can be described as a set of principles to affect groups and organizations. AI is based on the assumption that every organization and human system has something that works well (Cooperrider, Whitney & Stavros, 2005). The ‘art’ of appreciation is discovering and valuing those factors that give life to a group or a human system. The AI process involves interviewing and storytelling, to draw out the best of the past and set the stage for effective visualization in the future (2005). Simons & Havert describe appreciative inquiry as: “a discovery system which focuses on identifying the best an individual (...) has to offer, finding ways to leverage those talents and attributes, and planning and implementing ways to move forward to meet goals” (2012, p.210). AI thus, seeks to highlight and illuminate what are the ‘life giving’ forces or the ‘positive core’ (2005). An intervention should therefore not be focussing on what we do not want, or what we think must be tackled. Rather, the focus should be on what youths want to achieve in their life, focusing on their goals and wishes. By including everyone in an AI process, and not focusing only on vulnerable
youngsters, we can accomplish that everyone is involved. Because: that which you pay attention to, grows.

1.5 Promising practices

In recent years, several projects have been developed in the field of radicalization, that pursue to empower youngsters. They aim to develop skills and competences that affect changes in attitudes and behaviour and make youths more resilient to radical messages and ideas. During this research, some promising practices in this field were selected, bearing in mind the previous gained insights concerning the advantage of a positive approach. The selected projects deliver information on the skills and competences that are relevant to build resilience, on factors concerning good interventions, and on indicators to measure change in the direction of counter-radicalization. But apart from that, they are also helpful to determine if and to what extent a positive approach is already used. Some projects incorporate strengths, goals and wishes of youngsters into their interventions, and adjust their trainings to the target group, e.g. by using youth cultures or peer methods. However, there is still a lot of room for improvement to design fully positive, appreciative interventions.

1.5.1 Projects on resilience for radicalization

Several European countries developed projects that implement early-stage measures to counter radicalization and build resilience against extremism among young people. They aim to strengthen the capacities of youngsters to be resilient to radical ideas, and try to create adequate methods and environments to achieve this.

Some of the projects were evaluated to assess their impact on the radicalization process (e.g. Cultures Interactive, Identity and Resilience), others were evaluated to assess their impact on resilience in general (e.g. UK Resilience Programme), some were evaluated on policy level (e.g. STREET, Deradicalization – targeted intervention), others were part of a large-scale in-depth research into teaching methods that help to build resilience to extremism (e.g. Philosophy for Children, Digital Disruption) (Bonnell et al., 2011). Since most projects were not evaluated on their impact over time, we are not able to draw general conclusions on their effectiveness to counter radicalization.

1.5.2 Overview of projects

A project was considered to be a ‘promising practice’ when it met certain criteria. First of all, interventions had to be preventive in nature, intervening in early stages of the radicalization process.
Secondly, projects were selected that focus on building resilience and empowering young people vulnerable for (violent) radicalization. Thirdly, they aim at building resilience by influencing young people’s knowledge, attitudes and behavior and developing relevant competences and skills. Fourthly, we aimed to bring together projects that use trainings or educational settings as a tool for intervention. Furthermore, the projects focus on vulnerable youngsters themselves. And finally, the interventions had to be evaluated in some way. An overview of the covered projects is shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Aim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training ‘Identity and Resilience’ (NL)</td>
<td>strengthen competences and skills of young Muslim women, enhance their participation in Dutch society, and enhance their resilience to radical persons and thoughts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The UK Resilience Programme (UK)</td>
<td>improve pupils’ psychological well-being by building resilience and promoting accurate thinking, give skills to manage their emotions, deal with conflict and negative influences, and think critically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy for Children (UK)</td>
<td>develop skills of inquiry, listening and communication, engage young people to integrate different viewpoints into their personal thinking, and to develop critical thinking skills and the ability to reflect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET (UK)</td>
<td>reach and engage young Muslims who are outside mainstream institutions, including mosques, in order to provide alternative and safe environments and, where necessary, targeted interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewind (UK)</td>
<td>provide anti-racism awareness sessions for young people and staff, support those vulnerable to recruitment to far right groups, and help those in influencing positions, such as teachers; provide peer education training courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model United Nations (USA)</td>
<td>teaches young people to understand and appreciate others’ experiences and views, encourages participants to work together to resolve conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Disruption (UK)</td>
<td>build young people’s resilience to online extremist propaganda by making them more aware of the techniques that are used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deradicalization – Targeted Intervention (DK)</td>
<td>development of tools and methods to deal with radicalization of young people, work against young people’s engagement in extremist environments that resort to violence or justify the use of violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultures Interactive (DE)</td>
<td>uses youth cultures to work with at-risk adolescents from disadvantaged communities who are likely to get entangled into extremism, youth delinquency and violence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 European promising practices

The presented practices delivered insights into the skills and competences that were developed and strengthened within the different projects to build resilience against extremist and radical ideas. The interventions aimed to effect change with participants regarding their knowledge (e.g. concerning propaganda techniques, religious and historical knowledge), attitudes (e.g. tolerance towards people with dissenting opinions, self-reflection, and emotional well-being) and behaviour (e.g. debating capacities, assertiveness, conflict resolution, team working and critical thinking). Besides that, the projects also delivered relevant information concerning the training context (e.g. teaching methods and facilitation styles).
1.5.3 Five factors concerning good interventions

Five important factors were identified concerning good interventions (see table below). Trust is the main factor to consider when designing a training. To build trust, the attitude, background and skills of the facilitator play an important role, as well as the facilitating style and teaching methods (s)he uses. Apart from that, the social environment should be involved. Furthermore, an integrated or holistic approach embracing different aspects of participants’ lives is advisable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors concerning good interventions</th>
<th>Through</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Trust</td>
<td>facilitating a safe space for dialogue and positive interaction, agreeing on some ground rules, narrative interaction style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Facilitator</td>
<td>facilitator should be independent from the everyday contexts and should have credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Involve social environment</td>
<td>making sure that the acquired knowledge and skills are embedded on different levels: 1) within the communities participants are part of 2) within the lives of the participants: new competences should be applicable in their daily life 3) within the organizations facilitators/professionals work for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Facilitation styles</td>
<td>paying attention to processes of group dynamics, the development of the participants in the group and their relationships towards each other, sense of ownership, adjustment to target group, involving mentors or role models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Integrated or holistic approach</td>
<td>Tackling a wide range of responses tailored to the individual’s needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1.5.4 Indicators for an effective training

When assessing the impact of a designed training, Weilnböck determined some changes in attitudes and behaviour that were indicative of de-radicalization. Mental change was assessed when a person showed appreciation for personal memories, when (s)he had built personal confidence and trust with the facilitator and the group, when (s)he was able to apply narrative interaction, when (s)he was capable of emotional learning by reflecting upon one’s own affects, and had the capacity to deal with ambivalence and to argue in non-destructive ways.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of mental change in the process of de-radicalization</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Appreciation for personal memories</td>
<td>the person shows a new attitude about, and appreciation for personal memories and for the emotional experience of remembering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Personal confidence and trust</td>
<td>the individual shows signs that he/she has built personal confidence and trust with the facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Narrative interaction the individual has increased his/her capacity to partake in narrative interaction and tells/listens to stories [narrations]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Emotional learning the individual shows signs that he/she begins to realize and reflect upon one’s own affects and upon situations in which (s)he was mostly guided by emotions. Observing emotions and thoughts about what consequences these emotions had, and how the situation could have had a different outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Dealing with ambivalence the individual recognizes others and/or oneself as being contentious in nature, meaning that the person leaves behind the ‘black and white’ world, entering a world of different shades of color.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Capacity of argue the person shows signs of newly built appreciation for and capacity to argue or struggle with others in non-destructive ways, be it on political, religious or personal issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3 Indicators of mental change

According to Weilnböck (2012), mental change was assessed when:

1) The offender or vulnerable person shows a new attitude about, and *appreciation for personal memories* and for the emotional experience of remembering. The person thus has increased his/her capacity to uncover, bring to mind, emotionally re-experience and also verbalize memories of lived-through events.

2) A second essential indicator bearing witness of mental change in the process of (de)radicalization, is when the person has built *personal confidence and trust* in the facilitator and the group. And when the person thus has increased the capacity to build trust in a relationship and stay trustful even over quite challenging, conflicting and exhausting experiences of (group) interaction.

3) The person shows a new sense and appreciation for storytelling: being able to narrate personal experiences and actively listening to such narrations. The person thus increased his/her *capacity to partake in narrative interaction*.

4) The person shows signs which indicate experiences of *emotional learning* by realizing, and reflecting upon one’s own affects, and upon situations in which (s)he was mostly guided by emotions.

5) The person shows that (s)he is able to deal with *ambivalence*, whereby the person recognizes others and/or oneself as being contentious in nature, having to make decisions and negotiate compromise. This indicator is about leaving behind the ‘black and white’ image of the world, entering a world of different shades of color.

6) The person shows signs of a newly built appreciation for and *capacity to argue* or struggle with others in non-destructive ways, be it on political, religious, or personal issues.
When assessing the impact of the training, it is also important to take into account the effects outside the training context. Measuring the effects of anti-radicalization trainings should focus on three levels: change in attitudes and change in behaviour of the participants, and the degree of influence the training has on the social context (Gielen & Grin, 2010).

1.6 Conclusion: to an integrated approach

Preventive or proactive approaches to reduce involvement in violent radicalization, should not only focus on increasing youngsters’ resilience, by focusing on positive experiences. But also by diminishing the breeding ground involving radicalization (e.g. strengthen social cohesion and handle perceived deprivation). As a summary, a comprehensive scheme is created (see below). The demand side covers push factors, involving circumstances that are so unattractive, that the individual is metaphorically speaking, ‘pushed’ into radical ideas. The emotional and social resilience should therefore be increased (e.g. by empowering the individual or parental support). Furthermore, the supply side should not be underestimated. Pull factors can be tackled by increasing the awareness about ideological topics or recruitment. In the scheme below, several interesting practices and trainings have been combined to present a comprehensive overview to prevent or tackle violent radicalization. This scheme is based on an earlier figure designed by Meah & Melis (n.d).
Figure 4 Comprehensive scheme of prevention of violent radicalization
This research brought forward the importance of, and need for a positive discourse, starting from youngsters’ strengths and possibilities, and focusing on what they want to achieve in their lives. Some projects already incorporate some elements of this positive approach. They try to make the training relevant to participants’ lives by involving youth cultures or peer educators. The Cultures Interactive project demonstrated that the technique of narrative interaction is a central indicator to effect mental change. This is in line with the process of storytelling central to AI. However, it will need some more efforts to develop interventions that fully integrate this positive discourse. Therefore it is important to acquire further knowledge on the motivations and desires that drive young people. This information will be gathered during the next phase of the interviews. Recommendations then will be formulated to be able to incorporate a more thorough positive approach to the topic of radicalization.
2. Report Structure

The report consists of the following chapters: in chapter three the project STRESAVIORA is presented. In chapter four the research methods for the literature study are outlined and research questions are described. Chapter five provides the outcomes of the literature analysis regarding definitions of (violent) radicalization and related phenomena. The root causes and risk factors for involvement in the process of radicalization are the topics of chapter six. Also a brief description of the influence of the Internet on youngsters is given. Further, the principles of appreciative inquiry and its usefulness for future trainings are outlined in detail in chapter seven. In chapter eight, an examination of the (inter) national interventions aiming at tackling radicalization, primarily in the field of prevention is provided. Different strategies, approaches and an overview of interesting practices are presented. Finally, an overview of indicators, that might be useful to evaluate training tools on their effectiveness to increase resilience against radicalization, is given in the last chapter.
3. STRESAVIORA

In the government report of the Vice-Prime Minister, Minister of Home Affairs and Equal Opportunities (called: ‘Preventieprogramma van geweldadige radicalisering’), it was noted that the global phenomenon of violent radicalization must be banished. Individuals [or groups] must be prevented from violently expressing their beliefs (2013). Radicalization as an ideology of political involvement, is in itself not problematic. Nor does it always result in violence. But, as will be outlined in this report, “in those exceptional cases where violence does occur, it can inflict extensive damage on society as a whole […]” (Noppe, Verhagen, & Easton, 2012). Unfortunately, it is nearly impossible to determine if, or when exactly an individual with harmless radical ideologies, moves towards violent notions. Therefore, the third pillar (out of the listed six) in the ministers’ prevention report, focuses specifically on increasing the resilience of vulnerable individuals, groups and communities in our society against violent radicalization (Vice-Prime Minister, Minister of Home Affairs and Equal Opportunities, 2013). To work on this, the project STRESAVIORA (STrengthening RESilience Against VIOlent RAdicalization) has been created. The STRESAVIORA project runs for a period of 24 months, and is supported by the Prevention of and Fight against Crime Programme (2007-2013) of the European Union European Commission – Directorate-General Home Affairs.

The Federal Public Services, Home Affairs and General Direction Security and Prevention, are coordinating the project with ARKTOS vzw [non-profit association] as the project Co-Beneficiary. The general aims of the STRESAVIORA project include: prevention of violent radicalization; empowerment of the society; early prevention through youth resilience enhancement; engagement of the youths’ social environment (Federal Public Services & Arktos vzw, 2013b).

1 ‘Prevention program on violent radicalization’ (2013)
4. Methodology

4.1 Aim of the research

In 2010, during Belgium’s EU Presidency, the need for early preventive and social instruments, to support vulnerable youngsters and their social environment as approach against violent radicalization was expressed. In the strengthening of resilience of vulnerable juveniles, the cooperation with local actors became more and more important. Therefore, the need for, and investment in more research and knowledge gathering concerning this topic, became a crucial issue (IBZ & Arktos vzw, 2013b). The STRESAVIORA project consists of conducting scientific research, developing new training tools to strengthen the resilience of youths, and a testing phase of the training tool in different settings in Belgium, and Denmark (IBZ & Arktos vzw, 2013b). The scientific research was conducted by researchers of Thomas More. It covers a literature study and qualitative interviews.

The purpose of the literature research is twofold: first, gain insight into the process of (violent) (de) radicalization among youths, covering risk factors and protective factors in the process of violent radicalization. Second, provide an overview of effective trainings concerning the enlargement of resilience among youths, and a testing phase of the training tool in different settings in Belgium, and Denmark (IBZ & Arktos vzw, 2013b). The scientific research was conducted by researchers of Thomas More. It covers a literature study and qualitative interviews.

In a later stage of the research interviews among Belgian youngsters are conducted. In order to design a useful interview guide which focuses on specific topics concerning (de-)radicalization, the protective- and risk factors described in this report were used. Herewith, the process of (violent) radicalization in all its facets, forms and causes could be studied. Since literature shows that there is no single uniform profile of people who radicalize and little is known about resilient factors for radicalization, it is useful to focus on prevention by increasing resilience. By targeting a broad scope of youngsters in Brussels, the research is explorative in finding protective aspects in youngsters’ life, which might highlight some new topics for the prevention of the development of radical ideas. The interviews depart from an appreciative starting point and hereby we aim at uncovering positive aspects in youngsters’ life’s, which enables us to draw (preliminary) conclusions about preventive actions for violent radicalization. During the research phase, the goals were refined and the questions specified, in order to meet the commission’s need for practice-based research and outcomes which can be used in the field of prevention.
This research endeavours to answer the following questions:

1) Which characteristics and underlying factors/mechanisms foster and protect from radicalization?
   a. What are the characteristics and underlying factors/mechanisms that make youths vulnerable to (violent) radicalization?
   b. Which characteristics and underlying factors/mechanisms can be identified as protective factors to (violent) radicalization?

2) Which interventions are effective in the framework of de-radicalization?
   a. Which (international) interventions can be described as ‘good practices’ for the enlargement of resilience among youths?
   b. Which indicators are relevant to measure the effects of a resilience training?

3) How can youngsters’ resilience towards radicalization be enhanced?
   a. Which protective factors need to be reinforced to prevent youth from radicalizing?
   b. Which approaches can contribute to increase youngster’s resilience to prevent (violent) radicalization?

4.2 Literature analysis

Bernard (2006) assigns three stages in literature search: asking experts, search online databases and review articles. He notes that by asking experts about the topic of interest, the recommended articles or books can form a good guideline for useful literature. For this research, the first two stages were used. The researchers obtained useful insights about the concepts of interest, through the research team’s own expertise, consulting expertise in the research team’s network and through the Management Board’s expertise. Furthermore, websites of relevant national and international organizations were searched. Literature concerning good practices in the field of resilience building to radicalization, and evaluation of interventions aiming at building resilience to radicalization, was also identified through national and European policy documents on counter-radicalization strategies. Some of these delivered an inventory of useful European practices in the field of (de-)radicalization. A project was considered to be a ‘promising practice’ when it provided relevant information on building resilience against extremism and radical ideas among young people; when it delivered insights into the knowledge, attitudes and behaviour that contributed to increase resilience; and when it presented useful teaching methods and facilitation styles to support the acquirement of this knowledge, attitudes and behaviour.

Several criteria were used to include projects in this report: the interventions had to be preventive in nature; focus on building resilience and empowering young people vulnerable for (violent) radicalization; aim at building resilience by influencing young people’s knowledge, attitudes and behavior and develop relevant competences and skills.
Fourthly, projects had to use *trainings or educational settings* as a tool for intervention. Furthermore, the projects focused on *vulnerable youngsters* themselves. Finally, the interventions had to be *evaluated* in some way.

Literature was sought concerning strategies to build resilience specifically to radicalization, but also some useful insights concerning resilience building in general were gathered. Academic databases were searched (Web of Science; JSTOR; Sociological Abstracts; SAGE Journals; EBSCO Host; ProQuest; Taylor & Francis, and Limo), using following search terms and combinations and variations of terms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>prevention</th>
<th>preventing</th>
<th>countering</th>
<th>(de) radicalization</th>
<th>contra-terrorism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>training</td>
<td>empowerment</td>
<td>strengthening</td>
<td>empowerment</td>
<td>resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>youngsters</td>
<td>young people</td>
<td>youth</td>
<td>children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communities</td>
<td>communitas</td>
<td>solidarity</td>
<td>group dynamics</td>
<td>identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Societal vulnerability</td>
<td></td>
<td>appreciative inquiry</td>
<td>social media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extremism</td>
<td>terrorism</td>
<td>violence</td>
<td>radicalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact assessment</td>
<td>(research) evaluation</td>
<td>effectiveness</td>
<td>resilience building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1 Search terms*

Titles, keywords, abstracts and references were screened for relevance for our research and read in full. Recurring references, or references of particular interest were also included in the literature list. Unfortunately, in our literature search on radicalism, we found that there was a bias, concerning religious extremism. Therefore we must note that the used literature displays less diversity than we intended to, keeping in mind the broad approach to violent radicalization pursued in this project. The multidisciplinary character of this research increased, because of the consultation of criminological, judicial, psychological and anthropological literature. The search was limited to a period of ten years, with exception of some references, written before 2004. The key concepts defined specifically for this research, can be found in the attachment.
5. Radicalism as precursor of terrorism?

5.1 Radicalism and related phenomena

Some phenomena surround the process of radicalization, such as extremism, terrorism and polarization. Ponsaers et al. (2010) describe extremism as the willingness to accept the use of violence without actually carrying it out. Extremism can therefore be described as a mental attitude in which the use of violence by others is accepted and justified (Ponsaers et al., 2010). The second related phenomenon is polarization. This concerns a negative image of other groups in society (Moors et al., in Pels & de Ruyter, 2012). Polarization intensifies differences between groups and enlarges these contrasts which can enhance the process of radicalization (de Graaff, de Poot & Kleemans, 2009). Furthermore, terrorism has been defined as ‘violence leaning on an ideology that is shared by a group’ (Ponsaers et al., 2010). Terrorism is therefore the ultimate type. Summarized it can be stated that radicalism is a process that develops through a combination of divers risk factors and protective factors on several levels. Not only may the process of radicalization evolve from mild to extreme, the different forms of radical notions may also vary. Despite the ideological discrepancies of movements, these forms of radicalization run parallel (Van San, Sieckelinck & De Winter, 2010). The majority of the consulted literature about radicalization, tends to focus on one or two forms of radicalization, such as religious- and/or right-wing radicalization. In general, we can distinguish four forms of ideological movements: influenced by a religious discourse; right-wing extremist ideologies; left-wing ideologies an animal rights extremism. These are described in more detail below.

5.1.1 Radicalism influenced by a religious discourse

Different unrelated movements, marked by distinguished features and different ideologies, correspond in their radical interpretation. Causes of involvement are often frustrations about political-, economical- and/or cultural dominance of Western countries, and/or injustice against [religious] groups. These groups and/or individuals […] can be found in all layers of our society (Vice-Prime Minister, 2013).

5.1.2 Radicalism through right-wing extremist ideologies

This may occur when an individual is frustrated within our multicultural society. The frustrations are often rooted in unemployment or result from ethinical problems in certain neighbourhoods, often combined with xenophobia and a pro-militant attitude.
In Belgium, there are right-wing movements in which the members are opposed to democracy; social and political equality and cultural diversity. Criminal behaviour is mostly directed towards minorities (Vice-Prime Minister, 2013).

5.1.3 Radicalism influenced by left-wing ideologies

According to the Vice-Prime Minister (2013), left-wing ideologies derive from a resistance to the way our society is organized and functions. Anarchists [e.g.] resist every form of authority and believe in a society based on voluntariness, and cooperatives. Citizens are not a target, instead the focus is on public and financial institutions. The violent radical practices are directed towards symbols of authority and capitalism.

5.1.4 Radicalism influenced by animal rights ideologies

Ponsaers et al. (2010) divided this movement into animal rights extremism and animal rights activism. Although these two forms are often interwoven with each other, Ponsaers et al., note that in general, animal rights extremists use violence or intimidation to enforce animal rights. Animal rights activists on the other hand stand up for animal rights within the framework of the law.

5.2 Definitions of radicalism

In recent news, the term radicalization has mostly been linked to extreme violent events. The connection with dangerous behaviour is often made within public debate (Pels & de Ruyter, 2012). A single, univocal definition on the complex concept of radicalization appears to be difficult to grasp. Therefore it is important to underline that radicalization is a process and no end in itself. Close to social evolutions, several personal and political factors play a part in the process. Researchers, as well as policymakers, tend to use different definitions. These definitions match on certain aspects: they are based on several ideologies. But some also tend to leave important aspects out of sight: whether or not violence is used. Below, we provide an overview of the frequently used definitions for describing radicalization, after which we will elaborate the working definition for this research.

The European Commission (in Veldhuis & Bakker, 2007) describes radicalization as: “the phenomenon of people embracing opinions, views and ideas which could lead to acts of terrorism”. According to Veldhuis & Bakker, an important detail here is that radicals adhere an ideology that promotes political and physical distance towards other groups, but they do not necessarily shift towards using violence (2007).
In addition to this definition, the AIVD (Algemene Inlichtingen- en Veiligheidsdienst) (in Verhagen, Reitsma & Spee, 2010) describes radicalization as: “[..] the growing process of increasing acceptance to aspire, support or provoke drastic, major societal changes” (2010). The authors note that radicalization is a psychological development in which an individual tends to identify itself more and more with extremist ideas. The individual alienates from persons who have different perceptions (Verhagen et al., 2010). In this definition, the importance of the willingness to provoke societal changes must be underlined, but it is not mentioned whether or not these changes are illegal. Therefore, we refer to the definition of radicalization used in the article of de Graaff, de Poot, & Kleemans (2009). Here, radicalization has been defined as: “a process of increasing willingness to make use of undemocratic means, to impose political or religious believes on others” (2009). It is made clear that radicalization is a process in which the acceptance of using undemocratic means to achieve certain goals, grows. If these undemocratic means include the use of violence, ideologies become a threat to society.

Since this research concentrates on the prevention of, and the strengthening of resilience of youths against violent radicalization, and taking into account that there is an inexhaustible number of definitions on radicalization (all of which describe the same kind of process but some of them tend to leave the aspect of using violence out of sight) we have designed an extended definition for this report. This definition was first formulated by Allen (in Vidino, 2011) and we have completed this with the definition from the report of the Vice-Prime Minister (2013). Violent radicalization is then defined as:

The process of [an individual or a group] adopting an extremist belief system [inspired by philosophical, religious, political or ideological notions], including the willingness to use, support, or facilitate violence [or undemocratic means], as a method to effect [drastic] societal change. (Allen, in Vidino, 2011, completed with the definition in the report of the Vice-Prime Minister, 2013).
6. Risk and resilient factors

Little has been written about protective factors for radicalization, although the concept has a long tradition in general research about violence. In research about domestic violence and child abuse for example, risk- and protective factors regarding violence have been studied. Protective factors are factors that form a buffer for certain risks. On behalf of these insights, risk taxation-instruments and intervention strategies are developed (Groenen et al., 2011). Protective factors can be environmental or personal factors which protect the individual against the effects of various stressors and prevent him or her therefore from deviant behavior (Born, Chevalier & Humblet, 1997). Focusing on radicalization, resilience can be underlined as a protective factor. Research on resilience is centrally concerned with individual variations in response to risk factors and aims to identify the factors that give protection (Garmezy, and Cohler, in Born, Chevalier & Humblet, 1997).

6.1 Resilience

To prevent vulnerable youngsters from involvement in the downward spiral of violent radicalization, the aim should be to develop their resilience. Resilience can be defined as the ability to ‘bounce back’ from adversity. It is a reduced vulnerability to risk experiences. Furthermore, it concerns ‘good adaptations under extreme extenuating circumstances’ and is used to describe a process in which people can overcome or resist negative influences that block (for instance) emotional well-being and/or achievement. It can be described as the ‘overcoming of stress or adversity’, or, as ‘a good outcome despite risk experiences’ (Bonnell et al., 2011; Masten & Reed, 2005; Rutter, 2012). The concept of ‘resilience’ has as its starting point the recognition that there is a huge heterogeneity in people’s response to all kinds of adversities. It is found that some individuals have better outcomes than others who experienced a comparable sort of adversity (Rutter, 2012). According to Jackson, Born & Jacob, some people react in an unexpectedly competent way to particularly adverse types of experiences (1997). By the 1960s, psychologists and psychiatrists had begun to study children over time who were believed to be at risk for problems due to their biological heritage. Some researchers observed that some children that were purportedly at high risk for problems, were developing quite well (Masten & Reed, 2005). Studies of children at-risk led to the recognition that certain children did not succumb in the same way as others to maladaptive behaviour. This recognition led to the notion that they might be protected because they were more resilient than their peers, and could respond more effectively in difficult circumstances (1997). These observations became a call to action for research on the phenomenon of doing well in the context of risk. ‘Resilient’ became the most prominent term for describing such individuals (Masten & Reed, 2005).
The idea that certain factors in development may offer protection against future problems and that resilience may be an important element in this situation encouraged a range of studies aiming to identify possible protective factors and examining differences between resilient and non-resilient children (Jackson, Born & Jacob, 1997). According to Born, Chevalier & Humblet there is a need to be precise about the sort of variables which define resilience, to prevent placing people in an inappropriate category. They defined five criteria of risk and a set of criteria for resilience which makes comparison between the results possible without the risk of defining the groups quite different (Jackson, Borns & Jacob, 1997). The authors note that within this research the difficulty arose that the socio-economic status of a family can be considered as a risk, as well as a resilient factor and that categorizing the resilient versus the non-resilient group was difficult to define. Yet, they operationalized the notion of risk and listed five criteria.

A person was at risk when 1) the individual had lived in an unstable family setting. 2) the subject’s family had experienced persisting financial trouble. 3) the adolescent came from a low socio-cultural background. 4) the young person lived in an environment which favoured delinquency and deviant behaviour. 5) other family members of the adolescent appeared to be deviant (any form was taken into account, as well as all members of the family). The authors determined the following criteria to consider a person resilient: 1) the individual had not committed acts in more than three categories of low gravity crimes. 2) the individual had not committed more than three acts per low gravity category. 3) the individual had not committed more than one act of average gravity. 4) the individual had never committed one single high gravity act.

The following protective factors could therefore be identified: social support. It was found that young resilient people are more satisfied with the support of their social environment, and resilient adolescents seem to have a larger social network. A second category refers to the educational and the residential climate. Resilient adolescents live in a positive emotional climate, autonomy and open-mindedness are enhanced and their educational climate advocates the value of success and stable religious values. Concerning hobbies, their environment has a structuring influence. A third protective factor is the category of having relationships with reference persons. Born, Chevalier & Humblet refer to the difference between resilient and non-resilient individuals. Resilient youngsters tend to have a meaningful relationship with an adult. Research of Losel & Bliesener (in Born, Chevalier & Humblet) showed that resilient adolescents have a stable relationship with a person from outside their nuclear family (in 50% of the cases this person was a teacher and in 1/3 of the cases this person was a member of the extended family). Finally, personal resources can act as protective factors as resilient adolescents seem to have more cognitive abilities than their non-resilient counterparts. They also seem to cope with problems in a more active manner, rather than being passive or unrealistic. Besides, they showed a greater faith in their own efficacy and had greater self-esteem (1997).

A small dose of hazards serves, according to Rutter, to build up resistance to a major dose. This because the body had the opportunity to acquire effective defences.
Rutter concludes that “positive experiences in adult life can contribute extensively to counter the effects of early adversities provided that they serve both to ‘cut off’ the past and provide new opportunities” These positive ‘turning points’ can foster resilience (Rutter, 2012). Here, the emphasis is on positive aspects, instead of risks.

In Frederickson’s theoretic model ‘broaden and build’(2009), further evidence for the power emotions have, is given. First, the author notes that being in a state of positive affects makes people more accessible. People’s range of vision broadens. This broadened range of vision makes people also more flexible, more in harmony with others, more creative, wise and resilient (Frederickson & Barbara, 2013). Second, positivity can trigger upward spirals, paths that help building a better version of oneself. According to Frederickson (2013) people become more resilient if they learn how to create more moments of positive resonance with others. Positivity resonance comprises micro-moments of three interwoven dynamics. First there is a connection with some other person on one or more positive emotions (pride, gratitude, joy,…). Secondly there is a synchronicity in the biochemistry and behaviour of these persons, and thirdly there is an inner thrive to invest in each other’s well-being. People, who encounter stress, tension or misfortune, have different kinds of mechanisms or strategies to deal with it. They can wallow in negativity or they can use past experiences to harden themselves against emotional discomfort and disasters by building up a defensive and protective shield. Some even try to become bullet proof (Frederickson, 2013). These findings can be of use for the future development of training tools or intervention methods.

6.1.1 Coping and agency

Noticing delinquent behavior amongst youngsters and adolescents, the question arises why delinquents resign from their criminal behaviour. To explain this, we refer to the concepts of coping and agency. According to Maruna (2004), little research has examined the relationship between the explanatory style of (former) delinquents and the process of rehabilitation. The explanatory style refers to the person’s tendency to offer similar sorts of explanations for different events in their life narrative. Individuals seem to spontaneously construct explanations for significant and unexpected life events. These interpretations are thought to be responsible for the following life actions of a person over time (Maruna, 2004). Maruna distinguishes three cognitive dimension styles in this research field: internal (‘I am solely responsible for this event’) versus external (‘this event is someone else’s responsibility’); stable (‘this cause will last forever’) versus unstable (‘this cause will be short-lived’) and global (‘it is going to affect everything I do’) versus specific (‘it is only going to influence one thing’). These styles are thought to correlate with specific behavior patterns. Individuals who have an explanatory style that invokes internal; stable and global attributes for negative life events (and vice versa for positive events), will be most at risk for becoming depressed when faced with unfortunate circumstances.
These persons are thought to increase their risk for depression because of the threat this poses to their self-esteem. Mentally healthy individuals do tend to use highly internal stable and global attributions when accounting for good things that happen in their life (Maruna (2004). It is found that individuals can choose the way they think, and thus, by changing the thought, an individual’s act may change too. Yet, it remains unclear if the pessimistic thoughts increases depression, or if depression increases pessimistic thoughts (Maruna, 2004). Regarding criminal behavior, it is found that depression and criminal behavior share common risk factors. Maruna therefore hypothesized that the process of desistance from crime, like recovering from depression, might involve adapting these thinking patterns. Therefore, ex-offenders should view positive events as the product of more internal, stable and global causes and negative ones as a product of external, unstable and specific causes. Maruna speculates that the more individuals are able to attribute positive life events to broad, long-lasting personal qualities, the greater the odds may be that they will be able to stay crime free (Maruna, 2004). An optimistic explanatory style offers so called ‘agency’ and gives attributions for positive life events, which will develop a more positive self-image and maybe even a gate for taking initiative to resign from criminal behavior. An optimistic view on the future is also described by Winsor & Skovdal (2011) in their article about vulnerable orphans in Kenya. They researched the positive effects of goat ownership on the psychological well-being of the orphans. According to Winsor & Skovdal, an important component of resilience is hope and agency. Children’s ability to cope with adversity depends on their on-going negotiation with the community in which they live. This influences their identity and their access to local support networks and resources. Individuals and the community seem to have the potential to promote positive identities that the children foster. Skovdal (in Winsor & Skovdal, 2011) found that orphaned children in Kenya coped with caring for family members by engaging in income generating activities, building positive identities since they mobilized financial support and resources. They gained respect, and were recognized by their family and community. Generating an income increases the children’s self-worth (Winsor & Skovdal, 2011).

6.2 Root causes

Violent radicalization develops through a combination of several factors on different levels, during a fluctuating process. There is no objective demographic model of certain youngsters who become radical, and it is not possible to speak of ‘the’ radical (Bjørgo, 2011; de Graaff, de Poot & Kleemans, 2009; Horgan, 2008; Van den Bos et al., 2009; Veldhuis & Bakker, 2007). Amongst others (like Ponsaers et al., 2010; Van San et al. 2010; Veldhuis & Bakker, 2007; Verhagen, Reitsma & Spee 2010), Van den Bos, Loseman & Doosje (2009) describe root causes that might form the breeding ground for the process of radicalization. Important elements in the root causes are age, education, economic status, (religious) worldview and / or personal markers.
Combined with push- and pull factors, they might result in violent radicalization. In the consulted literature, these categories are often mixed and some factors occur in different categories.

Yet, it remains of importance to pay attention to the combination of for example socio-demographic factors on the one side and contextual and external elements on the other. It is not clear which impact these factors can have on the development of violent radical notions, but it might be noted that especially young people in their puberty and adolescence are most vulnerable to radicalize.

### 6.2.1 Puberty/adolescence as a vulnerable period

The formation of a group identity is a critical experience during early adolescence, since it is a precursor and explanatory variable in the formation of an individual identity (Newman & Newman, 2001). Young people seek connections, supportive relationships and understanding of groups and communities. This helps them to develop their personality. Newman & Newman indicate that the group identity is a more basic need than the individual identity, referring to early allegiances to tribes and clans.

According to the authors, the individual’s desire to be part of a group emerges with salience during early adolescence and is, in part, a product of ancient social bonds (2001). The individual develops an identity because he or she internalizes the norms and values of a group. Of course the importance of the individual and its own moral, must not be underestimated, but young people feel the urge to connect with peers and be part of a group because they then experience a sense of belonging and connection. The positive sense of a certain group identity makes the adolescent confident that he/she is connected to society (2001). Newman & Newman state that: ‘perceiving oneself as a […] member of a group or groups is fundamental to one’s self-concept as well as to one’s willingness to participate in, and contribute to society’ (2001, p. 521).

Youth between 16 and 25 years find themselves in a phase in which crucial, life changing, choices have to be made (Hauspie, Vettenburg & Roose, 2010). Because of this ‘transition process’, the early adolescence is a very vulnerable period. Van San et al. (2010) describe puberty as a difficult period in a youngster life, in which it is extremely difficult to grasp the youngsters’ thoughts. According to Gielen & Grin (2010), puberty and adolescence are periods in which youngsters are more vulnerable for radicalization, since they are in the middle of a process in which their identity is still developing. This developing phase makes them more receptive for radical notions. Van San et al. (2010) too note that receptiveness for radicalization during puberty is obviously larger. A certain event, confrontation or impressive text can leave such a great impression on the youngster that this can fan the flame for a certain ideology (2010, p. 91). When this transition process, described earlier by Hauspie et al., is headed by an accumulation of negative experiences with, for example, social institutions, this phase might develop into a negative socialization process (Hauspie et al., 2013).
An accumulation of negative experiences or contacts with official societal institutions (ranging from school to juvenile courts), may lead to an unfavourable societal perspective (Vettenburg, Brondeel, Gavray & Pauwels, 2013). Both societal groups and individuals in society are defined as ‘societally vulnerable’ when they derive little benefit from their contacts with societal institutions, and additionally, are mainly and recurrently confronted with the negative effects of these institutions (Vettenburg et al., 2013). Societal vulnerability is, according to Hauspie, et al. (2010), an interactive, and cumulative process.

The combination of an unfavourable starting position, negative experiences with social and/or societal institutions and problematic behaviour can make a person societally vulnerable (Hauspie et al., 2010). According to Vettenburg, et al. (2013) and Hauspie, et al. (2010), social bonds play a crucial role in the process of becoming societally vulnerable. Youngsters with few or no bonds to society, are at a higher risk of criminal behaviour and of developing a street-oriented life style. By not being able to call on social institutions to reduce their [societal] inequality, societally vulnerable persons start to develop their own coping strategies to solve their problems. These strategies, according to Vettenburg, et al. (2013) may include delinquent behaviour. The key factor hereby is, that youngsters without ties to society, no longer have any stake in conformity, and thus, have ‘nothing to lose’. By losing ties to society, youngsters often look for support with peers. Adolescence is therefore a period in which the importance of a network amongst peers plays a major part (Hauspie et al., 2010).

According to Boutellier et al.(2007), individuals who still have to develop their identity and autonomy, and who do not have the skills for self-development, will be confronted with negative aspects of the [contemporary] individualized society. These youngsters cannot rely on close family ties or social institutions. Therefore, they are more sensitive to the ‘imagined community’ of a nation or race, and tend to be more open to radical ideas. Since, for example, right-wing radical ideas handle well-set norms and values, and are more focused on the collective, it might be an attractive movement for youngsters in search of group bonds. A confirmation of the identity through interaction with like-minded individuals, becomes then a crucial factor which prompts young people to seek out a radical group (Young, Zwenk & Rooze, 2013).

### 6.3 Risk factors

Although radicalization has been characterised as a collective phenomenon, by which external factors create the environment [breeding ground] where individual actions are further developed, to study radicalization, one must examine a combination of explanations. Elements of specific characteristics, and the social context, should also be measured. The interaction of these factors should be explored (Gielen & Grin, 2010; Ponsaers et al., 2010; Veldhuis & Bakker, 2007). For this, it is not possible to study radicalization without taking individual action and the social context into account.
6.3.1 *Perceived deprivation increases openness for radical notions*

As youngsters have a stronger sense of justice, urge for bonds, and are more easily influenced, they are more susceptible for radicalization (Buijs et al., in Gielen & Grin, 2010). The quality of the social bond plays an important part in this; the fewer social relations a youngster has (with institutions, family or peers), the more susceptible he or she is for involvement in radicalization. These three factors (demographic e.g. age; social e.g. bonds and psychological e.g. being easily influenced and having a strong sense of justice) can lead to the feeling of ‘deprivation’. Relative deprivation is a form of (perceived) discrimination resulting from social comparison. This could be a realistic or real type of discrimination, for instance in politics or economic circumstances, and a symbolic type of discrimination through stigmatization or negative stereotyping. (Perceived) deprivation is possible at both an individual and a collective level (Pels & de Ruyter 2012). The perception that oneself has no access to commodities, others do have access to, is by some named as the underlying foundation to become radicalized (Ponsaers et al., 2010). According to Gielen & Grin (2010) the result of relative deprivation is that feelings of injustice tend to overrule. This could lead to anger against ‘society’ as a whole. This anger might be a trigger to increasingly radical notions, which might translate into the intention to use- or actual use of violence or undemocratic behaviour (Van den Bos et al., 2009). Media and Internet can increase these feelings of deprivation and injustice by restricted or biased reports.

6.3.2 *Internet*

Not only can the Internet picture biased reports of events or groups. The use of social media by individuals and organizations to radicalize others for political and social change, has become increasingly popular: “the social media connects the world, welcoming those who feel disillusioned and persecuted, or who want to connect with […] the world for new opportunities” (Thompson 2011, p. 168). The internet penetrates a major part of the world, distributes information quickly and is easily accessible and cheap, and offers anonymity to terrorists (Thompson, 2011; Benschop, 2006). Social media connect people with a wide audience, and this synergy creates a movement *en masse* of like-minded persons [for example, the revolution in Egypt]. There is no leader needed, ideas are exchanged and people choose to act on them. According to Thompson, ‘group-think’ is a very powerful force (2011).

Terrorists use the Internet to recruit and radicalize members for home-grown terrorism operations, spreading their influence, and communicating with their supporters, luring users with a promise of friendship, acceptance and a sense of purpose. For individuals in search of answers [and bonding], the Internet can be a comfortable place to connect with like-minded persons.
Furthermore, cyberspace can function as a bridge between already involved members of a movement, who otherwise would be geographically separated, and not able to interact on a regular basis (Thompson, 2011). Internet offers a meeting place for individuals who identify themselves with the ideals of the movement (Benschop, 2006). Simi & Futrell (2006) note that white power members: “use the Web as a tool to overcome obstacles [like marginalization or geographical distance between members], by bridging members and groups on a consistent basis”. By these websites, the opportunities to access the movement and participate virtually and in real life, increase. According to the authors: “real and virtual spaces are not completely separate spheres but rather closely intertwined” (2006, p. 122). Both forms of participation [virtual and face to face] are crucial, since they tie the members to the movement. For this reason, virtual spaces are very effective, since they increase identity building when they are supported by social linkages in physical settings (2006). Terrorist websites are used to create mutual solidarity between groups. The internal cohesion is all about the feeling of belonging and being with people who support you (Benschop, 2006).

Youngsters in search of membership and social bonds, can find this on Social Media. Simi & Futrell note that [for example] white power movements on the internet offer a social space for members that offers support, companionship and a sense of belonging to a community. Because of the extreme racial and [often] anti-Semitic means, the members of [for example] white power movements (WPM) are highly marginalized and membership is risky. For this, the websites and forums offer members ‘free spaces’² where they can meet, articulate and support their shared views. According to Simi and Futrell, the primary function of these spaces is to create an environment where discussion about the movement’s ideologies [which are taboo in other contexts] is freed. Members state the virtual community makes them feel ‘connected’ to other people over the world who share their views on society (2006). The virtual community, thus, brings solidarity between members who feel isolated in society and alone, referring to their racial believes.

6.3.3 Pull factors

Other risk factors for involvement in radicalization are the so called ‘pull factors’, which are elements that tend to influence the individual towards a more attractive alternative and might draw youngsters into extremist messages [for example charismatic leaders] (Bonnell et al., 2011; Bjørø, 2009). Not all authors agree on the position of risk factors within the root, push / or pull factor subdivision. But they do agree that the factors are interrelated. The examples given are not exhaustive, neither do we intend to label certain aspects of youngsters as definitely radical. Note that the process of involvement into radicalization is dynamic, meaning a person can fluctuate in the degree of involvement.

² “Small-scale settings that provide activists the autonomy from dominant groups where they can nurture oppositional cultures and organize collective action” (Simi & Futrell 2006)
Besides, the process is not linear, thus young people can ‘dip in and out’ of the process (Bonnell et al., 2011, Noppe et al., 2012). Furthermore, these factors often involve perceptions, they thus not always reflect objective measurable facts.

We divided the pull and push factors into internal, contextual and external elements. Below, we present a simplified overview of the influencing pull factors. The schema below is based on the literature of Horgan (2008); Bonnell et al. (2011); Ponsaers et al.(2010); Vidino (2011) and Veldhuis & Bakker (2000).

![Figure 5 Overview of pull factors for radicalization](image)

The current influencing reports about political events, e.g. the increasing attention that is paid to the topic ‘radicalization’, seems to be a delicate item in this overview. Media reports or political discourse on the item, might increase the willingness of some youngsters to approach radical movements, and move away from society in which they do not feel valued.

Yet, it must be noticed that for some individuals, it is a wake-up call to act and make a change within society. This evolution, of becoming aware that one can make a change can, if guided and positively approached, have a positive outcome.

6.3.4 Push factors

Push factors are external forces or certain circumstances that make an individual vulnerable to extremist messages [for example lack of excitement] and make it unattractive to stay in a certain social environment (Bonnell et al., 2011; Bjørgo, 2009). We divided the push factors into internal, contextual and external risk factors. An overview of the push factors that possibly create more openness for involvement in violent radicalization is pictured in the schema below (based on the findings of Gielen & Grin, 2010; Veldhuis & Bakker, 2007; Vidino, 2011; Ponsaers et al., 2010; Bonell et al., 2010; Boutellier et al. , 2007; de Graaff et al., 2009; Van San et al., 2010; Veldhuis & Bakker, 2007; Verhagen, Reitsma & Spee, 2010 and Van den Bos et al., 2009 ).
A good example of the combination of several factors for involvement in radicalization comes from Vidino (2011). He describes a case study in which Italian authorities received insights from two former members of an al Qaeda-affiliated Tunisian network. The voluntary informants described in detail the process and factors which led to their radicalization and their motivations for abandoning the network.

The informants were economic migrants, living in isolation, far away from their family and friends, in a country of which they did not speak the local language, having few prospects for the future. Their social network therefore was limited. The notion of peer pressure here played a crucial role: long-time friends spurred one another on the path of radicalization and because of this, increased isolation from more moderate opinions, which in account, triggered further radicalization. The fear of losing their friendship, the only network the informants had in Italy, made them become militant (Vidino, 2011). Furthermore, the role of the radical imams were probably of equal importance: their charisma, presumed religious knowledge and being ‘a good father’ increased the fascination of the informants. The loss of a loved one, ‘a dramatic event that shatters previously held beliefs, and renders the individual receptive to alternative perspectives’ increased the ‘cognitive opening’ for further radicalization (Vidino, 2011). These men came into a cumulative process in which risk factors for radicalization increase one another and further develop the downwards spiral.
7. Reframe the discourse of radicalization

As outlined before, radicalization does not per definition have to result in the act of using violence: radicalism can be described as an ideology; an expression of being politically involved, not necessarily meaning that this involvement implies using violence (Ponsaers et al., 2010). Radicalization is a process, which moves on a continuum of which violence and / or terrorism is only one ultimate end. Pels & de Ruyter (2012) do not equate radicalization with terrorism, although in current academic literature the difference between radicalism and terrorism has become a very thin line. They note that: “radical does not necessarily have a negative meaning […]. It [first of all] means arising from, or going to, a root or basis” (2012, p. 313). Thus, a radical person is someone who has extreme ideologies, which might divert from the common opinion. After all, not every criticism or idealism about society results in some sort of political radicalization. And political radicalization definitely does not always result in terrorism (Van San et al., 2010). Benschop (in Harchaoui, 2006) underlines this with the remark that [for example] jihadism, is not per definition the termination of the process of radicalization. Jihadism is a reaction to a suppressed radical ideology. Therefore, according to Benschop, jihadism can be considered as an incapacity to find a democratic way of responding to- and having criticism on the exclusion and discrimination of [former] immigrants in the Netherlands. Governments should thus be focusing on empowering the so called radical youngsters, who actually want to bring attention to the complaints of their fellows, instead of defeating them.

Van San et al. (2010), agree on this and state that the focus should be on ‘reframing’ the terminology of the political discourse about radicalization: developing an extreme opinion about certain issues and having ideals about the future, are in itself not problematic. But by labelling youths as ‘radicals’, one brings the message that certain notions are inappropriate in a democratic system, even though some of the criticisms, or parts of the ideologies, might be relevant or legitimate. According to Van San et al., these opposites are no longer defined by political categories, but in moral terms: “the struggle is between good and evil” (Van San et al., 2010). By presenting these youths as [future] radicals, one risks to lose the opportunity that these youths (with passion for certain topics or ideologies) can develop into critical, aware civilians who can participate in and contribute to our democracy. Van San et al. (2010) observed that by reframing the topic ‘radicalization’ into a positive one, openness for dialogue and communication arose.

Today, with the expansion of internet and information technology, globalization of economic markets, the intermingling of cultures and the reconfiguration of national and international boundaries, individuals and societies are under pressure to find innovative approaches to address their own needs. The traditional scientific problem-based approach and as a result the deficit discourse have reached their boundary (Ludema, 2001). Ludema therefore suggests that vocabularies of hope serve as a powerful catalyst for positive social and organizational transformation.
Positive transformation and hopeful constructs are strongly interwoven. The process ignites when members of a community nurture cooperative relationships, exercise a sense of optimism about their capacity to influence the future, and inquire together into their most deeply held values and highest aspiration. Ludema provides guidance on how to create powerful vocabularies of hope. First, hopeful research agendas that focus on the life-producing, life-sustaining, and life-enhancing aspects of human systems need to be established. Second, constructive methodologies that facilitate the creation of hopeful vocabularies and that themselves become a source of hope by promoting normative dialogue and supporting positive social innovation need to be developed.

Appreciative Inquiry fulfils these purposes. Based on the premises that there is a direct and simultaneous link between the way we speak about our reality and the way we construct our reality, and that our vocabularies are products of the questions we ask, appreciative inquiry distinguishes itself by posing positive questions that direct our focus to the vital life-giving forces that nourish our best and most valued models of organizing micro and macro human systems. It can be recommended to reframe not only the discourse on radicalization into a positive one (geworteld zijn), but also the meaning of ‘resilience’, since (translated into Dutch), this too often is associated with fighting against what we do not want (weerbaarheid), instead of focussing on what we do want to achieve or enlarge (veerkracht). Yet, the question arises how to address the problem. We can either choose to study the problem, focussing on root causes and risk factors, herewith developing interventions based on what we do not want to happen (youngsters getting involved with violent radicalization). Or we choose to inquire into the positive roots (core) of radicalization. We hereby can try to reframe the problem in a way to grasp what we actually want to happen or what should be increased.

7.1 Appreciative Inquiry

By positively appreciating the young [future] ‘radical’ as a person who is in search of an active citizenship, the youngster is enabled to develop his or her ideals in a positive way (Van San, et al. 2010). By inquiring which social aspects positively influence youths in Belgian society, new skills or attitudes can be developed to help youngsters become resilient for involvement in radicalization.

Therefore, an ‘appreciative inquiry’ (AI) might function as a good tool. AI first emerged through the research of David Cooperrider and Suresh Srivastava at Case Western Reserve University (Simons & Havert, 2012). AI can be described as a set of principles to affect groups and organizations. It is an approach to organizational analysis and learning, and intends to discover, understand and foster innovations in social organizational processes (2005). AI is based on the assumption that every organization and human system has something that works well. These strengths can be the starting point for creating positive change (Cooperrider, Whitney & Stavros, 2005). By inviting people to participate in dialogues and share their positive stories about past and present achievements, a positive foundation can be the core for positive future development.
According to Cooperrider, et al. (2005) the ‘art’ of appreciation is the art of discovering and valuing those factors that give life to a group or an organization. The process involves interviewing and storytelling, to draw out the best of the past and set the stage for effective visualization in the future. AI thus, seeks to highlight and illuminate what are the ‘life giving’ forces of the organization’s existence, or the positive core (2005).

AI differs from conventional managerial and societal problem solving, since there, the basic assumption is that a problem needs to be solved. Therefore, key problems must be identified, causes and solutions analysed, and an action plan needs to be developed. In contrast, the underlying assumption of AI is that human systems are a solution to be embraced, rather than a problem to be solved (2005). A comparison between the two approaches can be found in

Figure 7 Paradigms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradigm 1: Problem solving</th>
<th>Paradigm 2: Appreciative Inquiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Felt need”</td>
<td>Appreciating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of Problem</td>
<td>“Valuing the Best of What is”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Positive Core”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root-cause Analysis</td>
<td>Envisioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“What could be”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Possible Solutions</td>
<td>Dialoguing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“What Should be”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Planning</td>
<td>Innovating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(treatment)</td>
<td>“What will Be”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


7.1.1 The DNA of AI

AI is based on five principles, often described as the DNA of AI (Cooperrider, et al., 2005). The principles are originally adopted from theoretical and experimental insights of the social sciences, and further explored by AI practitioners, inspiring the foundation of AI from theory to practice (Cooperrider, et al., 2005):

The (social) constructionist principle states that social knowledge and organizational / societal destiny are interwoven. The underlying assumption is that there is no such thing as an objective reality. Human systems must be seen as the result of human interaction, constructed by people’s convictions, experiences and images. The way people talk about reality, construct reality: words
become worlds (Srivasta & Cooperrider, 1990). A constructionist would argue that the seeds of change in social systems are implicit in the first questions asked. The questions asked become the collective material out of which the future is conceived and constructed. This principle is based on the belief that people are able to (re)create reality through cooperation between the imagination and the reasoning function of the mind (the capacity to unleash the imagination and minds of groups). Reality is ‘makeable’ instead of determined. Human imagination makes it possible to change, create and reconstruct the ways we look at our world and at our future. When people start to imagine their most desired future, in strong relationship with one another, hope arises and reality will be constructed. Relations of high quality are therefore a premise for successful change in an AI process (Cooperrider, et al., 2005).

The principle of simultaneity recognizes that inquiry and change are not truly separate moments. They can and should be simultaneous. The process of inquiry (asking questions, seeking knowledge), is in fact an intervention of change. Change simultaneously starts when people start thinking and talking about the questions asked, whilst discovering and learning the answers. What people discover and inspires is in fact already contained in the questions asked by the inquirer. And the ‘data’ discovered by inquiring is the source for constructing the future (Cooperrider, et al., 2005).

The poetic principle states that human systems and organizations are an open book. An organization’s or human system’s story is constantly co-authored. The past, the present and the future are endless sources of learning, inspiration or interpretation. A metaphor often used is that of a strong and rich poem: it can be interpreted in a million different ways. For processes of change this implicates that one can study any topic related to human systems. The stories that will arise from the inquiry, will not only influence the way one sees the world, but will also change the world which is constantly constructed with others. Whatever one focuses on, grows. An AI-practitioner will choose an appreciative focus inquiring on what we want more of, instead of less (Cooperrider, et al., 2005).

The anticipatory principle is one of the strongest mobilizing agents of the AI process. The basic assumption is that positive images and discourses of the future lead to positive actions. Our behaviour and actions are strongly inspired by the projected future. What we see or want to see in the future has a direct influence on the way we behave in the present. Opposite to the determinist point of view (the present originates from the past), the anticipatory principle states that our present behaviour and actions originate from the (collective) projections about the future (how it will be, what will likely become). Positive images are a key factor in successful processes of behavioural change (Bouwen & Meeus, 2011; Cooperrider, et al., 2005):.

The last principle, the positive principle, is more concrete and closely connected to the anticipatory principle. Change requires a large amount of positive affect, attitudes, and social bonding. Organizations are affirmative systems and thus responsive to positive thought and positive knowledge. The more positive the question is used to guide a group, the more long-lasting and effective is the change (Cooperrider et al. 2005).
7.1.2 The 4D Cycle

Simons & Havert describe appreciative inquiry as: “a discovery system which focuses on identifying the best an individual […] has to offer, finding ways to leverage those talents and attributes, and planning and implementing ways to move forward to meet goals” (2012, p.210). Simons & Havert share the view that, in a world where the main focus is on what is broken and needs to be fixed, a positive or ‘appreciative’ approach can provide an environment for transformative change. To discover the best each person [or group] has, an intervention model has been developed. This model is called the ‘4-D cycle’ (shown in Figure 8). Herewith, positive change can be achieved.

![Figure 8 The 4D cycle](Source: www.denieuweorganisatie.be/hoe, November 20th 2013)

This cycle is used to elaborate the principles for the practice of AI. The cycle can be explained as follows: First, an affirmative topic must be chosen. This is done by gathering narrations of the organization’s ‘life-giving’ stories. In the initial stages, topics represent what people want to discover or learn more about. The topics will evoke conversations about the desired future. After these stories, affirmative topics will be selected, and they will become the focus of the intervention. The cycle starts with discovery (appreciating what is best). As part of the discovery process, individuals engage in dialogue and meaning-making. They share possibilities. Through this dialogue, a consensus begins to emerge in which individual appreciation becomes collective appreciation and an individual vision becomes a shared vision for the organization [or group] (Bushe & Kassam 2012, p. 210; Cooperrider et al. 2005). The next step is dreaming (imagining what could be). When the best of what is, has been identified, the mind naturally begins to search further and to envision new possibilities.
By envisioning what might be, a positive image of a desired and preferred future is created (Bushe & Kassam 2012; Cooperrider et al. 2005). Step three is the design stage (determining what should be). The bridge between the future and the present is being built. The most essential elements of the dream are being translated in provocative propositions. A provocative proposition is a statement that bridges the best of "what is" with people’s own speculation or intuition of "what might be". It is provocative to the extent to which it stretches the realm of the status quo, challenges common assumptions or routines, and helps suggest real possibilities that represent desired possibilities for the organization and its people. (Cooperrider, 2005).

Constructing provocative propositions is like architecture. It’s the task of the facilitator to help create a set of propositions about the ideal context for life: what would our world look like if it was designed in every way, to maximize and preserve the topics we’ve chosen to study. A provocative proposition has the following characteristics: First, it is provocative, it stretches, challenges or interrupts the status quo. Furthermore, it is grounded in the collective history of a group, community, organization. Third, it is desired: it is wanted as a preferred future. Fourth, it is stated in affirmative and bold terms. Five, it follows a social architecture approach. Six, it expands the “zone of proximal development”, using a third party and complemented with benchmarking data. Seven, it is a participative process, eight it is used to stimulate intergenerational learning, and finally, there is a balanced management of continuity, novelty and transition.

The process of writing provocative propositions is hard work. But when done successfully, they provide a clear vision of the future and destiny (Cooperrider, 2005). Participants of an AI process co-construct the future by designing a provocative and inspiring statement of the intention that is grounded in the realities of what has worked in the past (Bushe & Kassam 2012; Cooperrider et al. 2005). The last phase in the process is the destiny stage (creating what will be). The design leads the organization to its destiny through innovation and action. Once guided by a shared image of what might be, members of the organization find innovative ways to help move the organization closer to the ideal. Since these ideals are grounded in realities, the group is empowered to make it happen (Bushe & Kassam 2012; Cooperrider et al. 2005). Thus, the process of inquiry may be described as collecting positive stories about the best experiences (Cooperrider et al., 2005).

A quality of an appreciative inquiry is its focus on changing how people think instead of what people do (Bushe & Kassam, 2005). By using a generative metaphor people are allowed to develop new ways of thinking and discussing their issues. “Generative metaphors are sayings or phrases that are in themselves provocative and can create new possibilities for action that people had not previously considered” (Bushe & Kassam, 2005, p.164). By approaching people in a positive way, they are more willing to participate, since they do not feel stigmatized or negatively labelled. An example of a generative metaphor is found in the work of Bouwen & Meeus (2011). They developed a practical guidebook for coaches, based on AI. People’s talents and passions are used as sources of inspiration to design and deliver the future.
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Bouwen & Meeus herewith offer an inspiring way to look at reality and to focus on what can be achieved. This appreciative method for coaching can be of value for developing an intervention to increase youngsters’ resilience against violent radicalization.

7.1.3 Appreciative intervention

Research has demonstrated that positive affect influences performance on many cognitive tasks, like the consolidation of long-term memories, working memory and creative problem-solving (Ashby, 1999). According to Bonnell et al. (2011), well-designed interventions feel enjoyable to the participants. If young people have enjoyed being involved in an intervention, they are more likely to share their learning experiences with their peers and families. This can extend the impact of the intervention. They will also be more likely to participate in future interventions (Bonnell et al., 2011). Apart from the integration of a fun factor in particular interventions, an overall positive approach to the issue of radicalization is deemed important. One should move away from a focus on risk factors to building knowledge on protective factors (Meah & Mellis n.d.). This shift from thinking in terms of ‘problems’ to opening possibilities and identifying hopeful ‘solutions’ corresponds to the perspective of reframing the discourse and appreciative inquiry.

AI can be used for a wide range of initiatives. Clarity of the purpose is essential though, to successfully go through the process. Organizations, groups or individuals feel the need for change and development, but often the starting point is focused on the problems that have been determined. By this, resistance instead of enthusiasm arises (Bouwen & Meeus, 2011). According to Bouwen & Meeus, enthusiasm develops when people can talk about their success stories, what they accomplished and what they are proud of. As Cooperrider, et al. (2005) state: “it is the positive image that results in the positive action” (Cooperrider et al. 2005, p. 9). An Appreciative Inquiry anticipates on this, and asks the right questions to change the direction of the thoughts of the participant from problem solving to increasing abilities. As described in “the appreciative inquiry handbook”:

The momentum for change requires large amounts of positive affect and social bonding, attitudes of hope, inspiration, and the sheer joy of creating with one another. Human constructs are largely affirmative systems and thus are responsive to positive thought and positive knowledge. (Cooperrider, et al. 2005):

Launching an AI initiative requires an understanding of the AI theory and internalizing the basis of the DNA of AI and the 4-D Cycle (Cooperrider et al. 2005). This is a process without hierarchies, and youngsters should discuss topics among each other. The ‘trainer’ is not considered as a teacher, but more as an intermediary who facilitates the save and trustful ‘haven’ where participants are able to formulate guidelines for future steps, together.
Inquiring intensively with others about the most vibrant stories of the power of relationship will have a completely different long-term impact than the study into the cause of antisocial behaviour in society. In the light of the research of radicalization, AI calls upon a new way to address the problem by reframing it in a positive, connecting, and hopeful topic, that inspires everyone to inquire and appreciate ones deepest values and wishes. Questions such as “what is the wish behind radicalization?, what are the key factors of being strongly grounded and connected with others as a youngster?”, might help reversing the problem to an inspiring topic. The inquiry in itself should be designed by asking positive, hopeful questions that lay the generative fundaments for developing discourse, methodologies and interventions on the topic of radicalization.

The application of AI can focus on different levels and a variety of scenarios. We hereby give a possible scenario that can further be adjusted to the organizational context of the training developers and stakeholders. This means that some preliminary inquiries and decisions have to be made to guarantee available resources and funds. The scenario consists of three stages:

1. First, assemble a steering committee composed of all stakeholders regarding the topic, and share stories about “the best ever” working with youngsters to further discover the positive core of radicalization and define some affirmative topics for further interventions.

Throughout the process of telling and sharing successful stories about past actions and experiences in the context of the training development network (and their partners), the steering group can discover positive key factors and things they value most about working and being with youngsters. This will help them to further focus on what already exists and what already works well, and to choose one or more affirmative topics to use for further inquiry and appreciation in the developing of an appropriate intervention. This discovery could then lead to the definition of an affirmative topic to be further explored with youngsters. The affirmative topic expresses what we want to study and learn more about because it already embodies what we value most and want more of to happen in our actions. Therefore, the outcomes of the literature study and interview analysis can be of use. To make it more concrete, consider that a large number of stories of this steering group show that youngsters flourish when they are in a context that allows them to get in the act of doing things they like and they are good at. This would lead to key factors such as ‘discovering and exploring talents and enthusiasm’, ‘being appreciated for ones best’, ‘promoting autonomy’, ‘creating a positive learning space’, etc. to be further discovered in dialogue with youngsters. In this example the affirmative topic can then be formulated like this:
Young people feel strong and alive when they are in the act of doing what they like to do and what they are good at. They even come in a state of flow, time seems to stand still, being completely drown into the action. This not only has a strong effect on feeling strong and self-confident, but triggers genuine appreciation of others. It works like a magnet and motivates to have more of those moments with positive effect for all.

Thus, the process of the steering group should result in (1) discovering key factors when working with youngsters is at its best and most alive, (2) defining some affirmative topics to be further explored with youngsters, (3) appreciative interview scripts to use during a summit as is described in the second step (asking for stories about the best of youngsters in general and peak moments of the selected affirmative topics and their images of the future), and (4) organize a scenario for the summit.

2. Second, organize a summit with youngsters to further explore and appreciate their own stories and experiences on both “the best of themselves” and the selected affirmative topics.

Organizing a summit calls upon a thorough preparation. Besides practical considerations, it is important to fully understand and apply the five principles of AI: according to the constructionist principle, the world is the result of the way we see and want to see the world by sharing thoughts and images with others. Social connection therefore is an important condition for change. During a summit strong connection should be made possible. This is done by facilitating story telling in face-to-face settings, sharing in small groups and generative dialogue in plenum. The simultaneity principle emphasises the importance of asking questions, because the process of inquiry is in itself an intervention.

Questions direct our thoughts and simultaneously have an effect on our present behaviour and choice of actions. Consider someone being asked to identify all situations and factors that undermine self-confidence. That person immediately is put in a state to recall negative experiences, triggering behavioural patterns to avoid what (s)he does not want to happen again. (S)he’s put in a mind-set, deliberately or unconsciously, to generate actions focused on prevention, not wanting it to happen again, shifting bad to not bad. On the other hand, suppose someone is asked to re-live strong moments of being confident, this person will (re-)discover key factors of being confident. (S)he is put in a state of positivity triggering mental and behavioural patterns to achieve more of what’s already proven to be successful and what is appreciated, thus should be increased. For this principle, the inquiry focussing on radicalization therefore may not be limited to asking questions about what’s wrong, studying risk factors, and developing measures and actions to avoid the problem. AI doesn’t ignore sentiments about what is wrong or bad or problematic. But, with a new set of questions, AI tries to reverse the dialogue into a discourse that changes the perspective on what works and what’s possible. AI therefore opens new opportunities for the human condition.
According to the positive principle, a momentum for change requires large amounts of positive affect and social bonding, attitudes such as hope, inspiration, and the sheer joy of creating with one another. If well applied to the process of organizing and having a summit, the problem of radicalization is not just reframed into a more inspiring and positive topic, but arouses more enthusiasm to reach a larger group of youngsters and stakeholders. The actions will not only envision the problematic ones, who are (or might be) in a process of radicalization. Instead, basically every youngster who is searching to become a strong person, with his own identity, and a collaborative member of society, is approached and appreciated. This is strongly related to the poetic principle.

We have the choice to narrow down all things happening in our worlds regarding radicalism to the extremes of aggressive, antisocial, violent behaviour and put all energy into repression. Or we can try to “read” radicalism in another way, as a continuum in the process of searching and struggling for answers about identity, personal development, commitment, and having strong values. If we look at radicalism in this new perspective, we see it perhaps as a part of natural human development, thriving to stand up and share values in a reciprocal relation with others and society. This new way of interpreting our reality, more focused on wishes, ideals and inspiring images of the future will make us anticipate and have a generative effect on our present behaviour and initiatives. As for people, they move in the direction of their desired future. This is the anticipatory principle at work.

The summit should be focusing on youngsters’ active involvement in the process of designing and developing (using the 4D cycle process) an intervention for themselves. For example, organize one day with youngsters (who have already participated in the training development network’s activities) and the members of the steering group. Some participants should act during the summit as facilitator, others can fully participate in the brainstorm. During the introduction, the proceeding of the day and the focus should be explained. Furthermore, everyone participating should contribute in the process of designing an inspiring intervention. This will be done by (1) first sharing stories about moments when they are most alive and connected and by collecting and sharing stories regarding some preselected affirmative topics. (2) Second, they will be invited to dream about the desired future, more concrete, how an intervention should look like when we use all key factors (discovered in the previous stage) that contribute to peak moments. (3) Third, there will be time to start designing this future intervention by prototyping elements of the intervention and making provocative propositions (expressing how it will be). (4) The last part of the summit will be reserved to start organizing follow-up, such as post-summit communication, installing and supporting small workgroups, etc.

3. Follow-up

After the summit, the steering group’s most important challenge is to make an overview of the outcome. The leading questions are:
What are the collective images of an intervention/training?
What are the key-factors and building blocks for an intervention?
What can we do to support actions and initiatives that come from youngsters and other stakeholders?
How does the outcome of the summit match with other sources of information about youngsters and the process of radicalization? How can they be combined to create new opportunities?
How do we communicate with our stakeholders regarding progress in the development of the intervention/training? How do we present the final result?
How do we make the community part of the story we’re writing? How do we communicate with society and governmental institutions, how do we involve public opinion, how do we use written and visual media, ...?

The three stages must be seen as strongly interwoven and co-creative. Not linear but iterative. Openness and flexibility will be needed to adjust, enrich, reframe, change, and even re-begin this process of co-creation.

7.2 Intercultural Competence

Trainings aim to develop different kinds of competences. A competence can be defined as an integrated whole of knowledge, skills and attitudes which enables a person to deliver effective and qualitative results in a given situation (Danckaert, 2008). One of the competences we see as a core competence in order to stimulate critical debate about (extreme) ideas is intercultural competence. The development of intercultural competence needs to be seen as an irreversible process of growing ‘awareness+’. This ‘awareness+’ is seen as the motor for more comprehensive intercultural learning in terms of knowledge, skills, attitudes, awareness of the personality, the development of a critical regard towards oneself in social situations, the transformation of the self in relation with others and creative ways to cope with reality (Krols, et al., 2011). In reference with radicalization, one can also state that an intercultural competent person is able to shift mentally between different forms of radicalization, without violent or illegal means to defend one form against the other. It is also related to the daily life of youngsters. Young people are part of very diverse groups, each with its own cultural characteristics. This can be either about their daily live, but also about their leisure time. Intercultural competence should best focus on all spheres of youngsters’ lifes. According to Krols, et al. Intercultural Competence is seen as a singular competence but with different aspects that make up the whole. The aspects read as follows:

Cultural self-knowledge:
The development of this component refers to reflecting and expressing answers to questions: ‘what is culture’, ‘what is my culture’ and ‘which influence does culture have in my life?’.
Cultural flexibility:
This component refers to the openness needed towards so-called (cultural) not familiar situations or practices, patterns, etc. which lead to recognizing the own limits of willingness to adjust. This search for limits is grounded in the awareness of the dynamic nature of culture and the permanent search for the added-value for intercultural encounter and collaboration.

Cultural resilience:
The cultural resilience refers metaphorically to the resilience of a suspension. To what extent will it lose its elasticity and will it even break? When will people retreat and stop collaboration and encounter? When encountering ‘shocking’ experiences or critical incidences, one can recognize the critical point where one realizes his/her sensitive zones or taboos, which is essential to explore your own frame of reference and that of others.

Cultural openness (receptiveness):
Cultural openness implies being open for the story and uniquely of the (cultural) other. It shows that authentic receptiveness can be blocked by several aspects, such as prejudices, stereotypes and an ethnocentric attitude towards the own view and that of others. Developing a strong receptiveness starts from a raised awareness of the importance of the added-value of the story, solutions and the others’ perspectives.

Cultural knowledge acquirement:
The fifth component refers in essence to a search for a balance between knowledge about culture (such as different models for culture, lists of cultural do’s and don’ts, cultural studies, etc.) and at the same time being attentive to the uniquely of every person in a specific situation or context.

Cultural relational competence:
Cultural relational competence puts forward the relation, and takes it as a starting point. In meeting others this component emphasizes the importance of a wide angle lens on identity. It aims at diminishing the tendency to reduce others to one of his or her perceived characteristics. However, every person’s identity is a unique combination of different aspects of identity.

Cultural communicative competence:
At the heart of this component is the concept of ‘active listening’, which refers to more than listening only. Every partners needs to be aware of the risk of causing and interpreting misunderstandings and
the reality that ‘a harmonious’ course or a desired result of the encounter is guaranteed. A basic attitude in communication is to reframe tensions or conflict also as a learning opportunity.

**Cultural conflict competence:**
Encounter or collaboration doesn’t always run smoothly. It requires efforts and might inevitably lead to tensions and even conflicts. These conflicts don’t have to mean the end of an encounter or collaboration, but might also be a renewed start, which leads to stronger bonds and refreshed views or solutions. From that point of view conflicts aren’t destructive but give opportunities for synergy.

**Cultural multi perspective view:**
Focusing on ‘equality’ holds the risk of denying ‘being different’ (acknowledged diversity). At the same time one may not overlook ‘sameness’ (acknowledged equality). We are able to find this balance when we look for strategies that are focused on ‘equivalence’ instead of ‘equality’, which means recognizing someone in his/her ‘being different’ (we are all pupils) and at the same time ‘being the same’ (among the pupils there are also Christians).
8. Prevention

Several projects across Europe have been developed, implementing early-stage measures to counter radicalization. Some European and national policy documents and literature reviews contain promising examples of interventions and case studies to build resilience in the field of radicalization (ISD, n.d.; Vice-Minister, 2013; Bonnell et al., 2011). The main focus is on preventive interventions. This means proactive methods are used to increase nonviolent resistance (Omer, 2007). The Belgian national prevention program for violent radicalization identifies resilience building for vulnerable individuals, groups and communities as one of its priorities. It offers a useful inventory of (mainly local) European practices to control radicalization (Vice-Minister, 2013). To increase the resilience of youngsters, one should emphasize positive aspects in youngsters’ lives and empower youngsters on several levels, to turn around risk factors. A belief in individuals’ possibilities and strengths is the starting point.

8.1 Varieties of prevention

A preventive approach to radicalization can focus on preventing that the radicalization process starts or intervening to prevent that the process further develops. Depending on the stage the intervention targets, measures can be preventive, proactive, curative, reactive or repressive. In the figure below, the measures are presented.

![Figure 10 Overview of preventive measure for radicalization](Source: Zannoni, 2007, p 29)
Zannoni (2007) describes how the Municipality of Amsterdam in the Netherlands succeeded in developing a conceptual model that matches the different stages in the radicalization process with corresponding points of action for policy. In its municipal approach, the city of Amsterdam identifies four points of action for policy to intervene, in which the first three points (preventive and curative measures) are the responsibility of the municipality, while the last point (repressive measures) is the responsibility of the police and judiciary:

1) **Diminishing breeding ground (preventive).** This can be achieved by diminishing discrimination and intolerance; perception in the media and image building; strengthening intercultural contacts; and enlarging social capital and political (self) confidence.

2) **Enlarging resilience (preventive).** Measures in this area aim at empowering and countering social isolation; preventing radicalization on the internet; providing youth work for groups not reached by regular services and aimed at diminishing polarization.

3) **De-radicalization of radicalized individuals (curative).** Interventions aim at delivering support regarding work, school, health, housing, financial issues and ideological aspects; points of contact for signalling and support; handling right-wing extremism; and training of professionals in signalling and approaching radicalization.

4) **Handling violent extremism (repressive).** Violent extremists and radicals are handled by police and judiciary.

It seems that to tackle radicalization, different approaches can be used during the successive stages of the radicalization process. This research focuses on measures that resort an impact on the early stages of the radicalization process, namely preventive and proactive interventions. These measures try to strengthen resilience among youngsters vulnerable for radicalization and their social environment (parents, communities, frontline professionals).

### 8.2 Promising practices

For the purpose of this research, we examined some of these European practices that were developed to tackle radicalization. Few projects could be identified that were subjected to a full-scale scientific impact assessment. Some of the projects were evaluated to assess their impact on the radicalization process (Identity and Resilience; Cultures Interactive), others were evaluated to assess their impact on resilience in general (UK Resilience Programme; Philosophy for Children), some were evaluated on policy level (STREET, Deradicalization – Targeted intervention), others were part of a large-scale in-depth research into teaching methods that help to build resilience to extremism (Rewind, Model United Nations, STREET, Philosophy for Children, UK Resilience Programme, Digital Disruption) (Bonnell et al., 2011). We will present some projects that can provide some useful insights when designing a training to build resilience to extremism. Consequently, we will consider them as ‘interesting’ or ‘promising’ practices rather than ‘effective’ practices.
A project was considered to be an ‘interesting practice’ when it provided relevant information on building resilience against extremism and radical ideas among young people; when it delivered insights into the knowledge, attitudes and behavior that contribute to increase resilience; and when it presented useful teaching methods and facilitation styles to support the acquisition of this knowledge, attitudes and behavior. Several criteria were used to include projects in this report. First of all, to be included interventions had to be *preventive in nature*, intervening in early stages of the radicalization process. Secondly, projects were selected that focus on *building resilience and empowering* young people vulnerable for (violent) radicalization. Thirdly, they aim at building resilience by influencing young people’s *knowledge, attitudes and behavior* and developing relevant competences and skills. Fourthly, we aimed to bring together projects that use *trainings or educational settings* as a tool for intervention. Furthermore, the projects focus on *vulnerable youngsters* themselves. And finally, the interventions had to be *evaluated* in some way. An overview of the covered projects is shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Aim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training ‘Identity and Resilience’ (NL)</td>
<td>The training ‘Identity and Resilience’ aims to strengthen competences and skills of young Muslim women, to enhance their participation in Dutch society, and to enhance their resilience to radical persons and thoughts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The UK Resilience Programme (UK)</td>
<td>The UK Resilience Programme aims to improve children’s psychological well-being by building resilience and promoting accurate thinking. This project draws on cognitive behavioural therapy to give pupils skills to manage their emotions, deal with conflict and negative influences, and think critically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy for Children (UK)</td>
<td>Philosophy for Children aims to develop skills of inquiry, listening and communication. It engages young people to integrate different viewpoints into their personal thinking, and to develop critical thinking skills and the ability to reflect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET (UK)</td>
<td>The Strategy to Reach, Empower, and Educate Teenagers (STREET) aims to reach and engage young Muslims who are outside mainstream institutions, including mosques, in order to provide alternative and safe environments and, where necessary, targeted interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewind (UK)</td>
<td>Rewind aims to provide generic anti-racism awareness sessions for young people and staff, to provide support to those vulnerable to recruitment to far right groups, and help to those in influencing positions, such as teachers. They work with young people and adults at risk of becoming involved, or already involved in far right activity and ideology. They organize sessions for small groups, and also offer peer education training courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model United Nations (USA)</td>
<td>This project teaches young people to understand and appreciate others’ experiences and views. It encourages participants to work together to resolve conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Disruption (UK)</td>
<td>The Digital Disruption project aims to build young people’s resilience to online extremist propaganda. By making them more aware of the techniques that are used in propaganda and in the media in general, the project builds resilience to techniques used by those who promote violent extremism.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deradicalization – Targeted Intervention (DK)

Deradicalization – targeted Intervention is a Danish pilot project aiming at the development of tools and methods to deal with radicalization of young people and work against young people’s engagement in extremist environments that resort to violence or justify the use of violence.

Cultures Interactive (DE)

Cultures Interactive (CI) uses youth cultures to work with at-risk adolescents from disadvantaged communities who are likely to get entangled into extremism, youth delinquency and violence.

Table 2 Overview of preventive interventions for building resilience against radicalization

8.2.1 Identity and Resilience training

The pilot training ‘Identity and Resilience’ was developed between September 2007 and May 2008, by the Foundation Intercultural Participation and Integration (SIPi) in the Netherlands, for 18 Muslim girls between 17 and 33 years old. The objective of this training was to develop a preventive methodology to diminish the sensitivity of Muslim girls for radical ideas and social isolation. The course existed of three parts. The first part, Turning Point, aimed at instigating a process of consciousness and reflection, building a positive self-image, improving the ability to express one’s own feelings and thoughts, acquiring insight into own actions in relation to others, and enhancing problem-solving skills. The main aim was the acquisition of three competences: personal development, participation and communication. This was pursued through 16 meetings and individual coaching. Secondly, the girls received a course on Moral Judgment, where they were taught to use a nine points action plan to support them in analyzing moral decisions. Questions concerning religious dilemmas were included in this part of the training. Finally, they received a training on Conflict Resolution, providing insight into competences related to moral and religious upbringing, conflict, violence and aggression, handling situations of conflict and stress, and emotions, power and interventions in conflict situations.

The training was evaluated by the research bureau A.G. Advies (Gielen 2009). Evaluation methods used were document analysis, life story interviews, participant observation and in-depth interviews with participants as well as facilitators. The author states that after the training, the girls showed more tolerance towards people with dissenting opinions. Their behavior showed improvements regarding critical thinking, reflection, self-consciousness and autonomy. These changes in attitudes and behavior also resorted effect outside the training, in their social environment (work, school, home, mosque, neighborhood) (Gielen 2009). However, the conclusions of this evaluation should be treated with caution since they were based on a small number of training participants. The training later evolved into a train-the-trainer ‘Diamond, Training Identity and Resilience’ and was rolled out in the municipalities of Culemborg, Gouda, Den Haag, and Ede in the Netherlands (KplusV, 2011b).
8.2.2  UK Resilience Programme

The UK Resilience Programme (UKRP) was developed by three local authorities in the UK in 2007 and implemented in twenty two schools. It was not developed specifically to build resilience to radicalization, but with the aim of building pupils’ resilience in general and promoting their well-being. It learns pupils skills to self-manage their emotions and deal appropriately with ‘activating events’ like conflicts with others, negative situations and emotionally testing situations. They are taught to think critically using evidence in order to avoid jumping to conclusions, being prejudiced, blindly following others and escalating conflict situations. This is achieved by teaching participants how to take ‘a step back’ and look for evidence when considering a problem. The three-step ABC approach (activating event, belief, consequence) helps them to reflect on their emotional responses to problems. They learn how to communicate assertively and avoid aggressive and passive behaviour, how to manage emotional reactions with relaxation skills, and how to dispel pessimistic thoughts with resilient thinking. The programme was evaluated in three phases between 2009 and 2011. Some impact was found on depression scores, absence rates and academic attainment. However, the impact was small and relatively short-lived. The impact varied by pupil characteristics. It was much stronger for more deprived and lower-attaining pupils and those who started school with worse psychological health, particularly girls with these characteristics. Participants reported using the learned skills in real life circumstances, like ‘not rising to provocation’, using the ABC model to modify their feelings and using skills like assertiveness and negotiation (Challen et al., 2011). Bonnell et al. (2011) considered the usefulness of the UKRP in the framework of extremism. They also found that participants reported that the acquired skills helped them to manage their anger, and that they applied the learnt techniques in ‘real life’ situations. The UKRP is used for youngsters between 11 and 14 years old. The impact on older youth was not assessed.

8.2.3  Philosophy for Children project

‘Philosophy for Children (P4C)’ started off as a project to develop children’s thinking skills, but it evolved to an intervention encouraging children to develop skills of inquiry, listening and communication, to be more critical and reflective in their thinking, and to learn to integrate different viewpoints into their personal thinking. A 10-step process (including ‘thinking time’ and ‘shared reflection through conversation’) is used to help children to question, hypothesize and explore. They are engaged in dialogue on a controversial issue, considered important to them and society in general. Characteristic for P4C is the use of peer educators and the creating of a safe environment by agreeing to a set of ground rules.

---

3 For research and evaluations concerning Philosophy for Children, see: www.monclair.edu/cehs/academics/centers-and-institutes/iapc/
Reported impacts of encouraging young people to question and interrogate ideas include: greater recognition that others are entitled to their point of view, that there exist a number of different perspectives and lines of inquiry; an increased appetite among pupils and teachers to have conversations about potentially controversial issues; more open-mindedness among pupils; improved academic performance among some pupils due to their application of interrogatory and analytical approaches. These impacts have the potential to increase young people’s resilience to extremism by equipping them with the ability to think critically and independently (Bonnell et al., 2011).

8.2.4 STREET project

The STREET project’s ‘Routes to Success (R2S)’ programme offers individual lessons on emotional well-being, personal effectiveness, communication and interpersonal skills, active citizenship and social responsibility, and sustainable and international development. Young people are encouraged to break out of their comfort zones, try new things, challenge self-limiting beliefs, thus stimulating personal discovery. Self-esteem and confidence is also strengthened by creating a non-threatening, non-judgmental learning environment. Skills such as team working, leadership, time management, problem solving and critical thinking, aim to enhance personal effectiveness in daily life. Participants are encouraged to think about the goals they want to reach in life, and how they can accomplish that. In this way, participant’s self-esteem is reinforced on an on-going basis. The project also has a ‘deconstruction program’ aimed at providing young people with tools to deconstruct myths and propaganda techniques, and to consider Al-Qaeda inspired messages within a global geo-political context. In a first stage, social policy issues are discussed, and the way Muslims worldwide respond to them. The vulnerability of knowledge on Islam is tackled. Secondly, they talk about international conflicts and the way they have been instigated by propaganda messages. And in a final stage, the basics of propaganda, skills for critiquing the media, and the role of bias are scrutinized (Bonnell et al., 2011).

In a policy brief, Barclay (2011) attempts to identify good-practice lessons from the STREET project. According to him, one of the success factors of the project is the fact that the organization combines a profound expertise in countering violent radicalization with a strongly embedded position within the community. The organization is rooted in the local community. Many staff members are themselves individuals of the local community. Since they come from similar backgrounds to the people they engage with, they understand the ‘lived reality’ many youngsters in South London are dealing with, and thus enjoy credibility among local youth. They possess ‘street skills’ as well as cultural awareness and religious knowledge (Barclay, 2011).
8.2.5  

Rewind was originally set up as an anti-racist project, but now challenges all kinds of extremism. Its aim is to educate people of all ages, on issues of race and identity. This is done by using peer educators and providing a safe, no-blame atmosphere in which participants are encouraged to debate on race, extremism and related issues. To create this safe space, some ground rules are agreed upon. Everything that’s been said remains in the class room, and participants can use language they would not be allowed to use elsewhere in school. This method of ‘honest realism’ allows pupils to use real life examples of racism and language that is common in the local context. In this way, pupils’ preconceptions are respected. To counterbalance the intensity of the emotions that can be provoked by the debates, humor is used. This also achieves that the training is enjoyable and different. Furthermore, in some cases, DNA samples of participants were analyzed, showing that each person has ancestors from different, and often many, parts of the world. The intervention helped students to make sense of different messages around race and religion, and helped them to make sense of their own lives and gain self-confidence. The project also gives peer educators courses for secondary school students to deliver anti-racist education, supported by their teachers (Bonnell et al., 2011).

8.2.6  Model United Nations

Model United Nations (MUN) originated in the USA, but is now practiced in many countries. During the project United Nations debates are simulated, and young people take the role of diplomats representing different countries. These events can vary from a small debate between school pupils, to mass events in the UN headquarters. MUN participants are encouraged to work together to resolve conflict, to learn about different political and global issues and understand different views and perspectives. This is achieved by creating a safe space where participants can reflect on their own emotions, and find solutions to a given problem. By researching complex issues relating to world politics and potentially presenting them at a large-scale mock international conference, participants develop confidence, self-worth and aspirations. These transferable, long-term skills are invaluable for life. They learn about sensitivity and diplomacy, and develop the ability to look ‘at both sides’ together with the confidence to stand up for what they believe in (Bonnell et al., 2011).

8.2.7  Digital Disruption

Digital Disruption is an intervention that focuses on awareness raising among young people concerning the techniques that are used in propaganda, and in (online digital) media in general. By increasing their understanding of these techniques, the facilitators aim to make them more resilient to approaches used by people promoting violent extremism.
Participants are made aware of the agenda behind nearly all media. They learn to critically review, deconstruct and challenge propaganda messages. Focus is not on extremist propaganda, but on the general ‘tricks’ of propaganda. Young people are enabled to recognize when and how a piece of communication is trying to manipulate them. This approach appears to be more valuable and sustainable than simply countering extremist messages. Participants were also involved in co-producing a propaganda film, thus experiencing how easy it can be to produce persuasive propaganda based on myth and misinformation⁴. After the project, participants showed increased capacity for critical thinking and critically engaging with messages they are presented with (Bonnell et al., 2011).

8.2.8 Deradicalization – Targeted intervention

Denmark developed the action plan ‘A common and safe future’ to prevent extremist views and radicalization among young people in 2009 (Government of Denmark, 2009). One of the focus areas was direct contact with young people, for example through mentoring schemes (Danish Ministry of Social Affairs and Integration, 2012).

The pilot project ‘Deradicalization – Targeted Intervention’ focused on three strategies: a mentoring strategy aimed at young people showing signs of radicalization, a counseling strategy aimed at professionals and an exit strategy aimed at individuals already engaged in extremist circles. The mentoring strategy was included because it consists of direct contact with youths and focuses on individual, longer-term processes of change for youths. It aims at working on all the different aspects of mentees’ lives.

This strategy differs from the other projects since it is not group-oriented, but consists of a one-to-one relationship. Nevertheless, it was included because it provides some relevant information concerning the competencies of the mentor and the nature of the mentoring relationship. A report describing the experiences of the pilot (Helle Thomsen, 2012) points out that mentors combine several functions, like practical teaching, counseling on basic skills and identifying underlying personal problems. They support the mentees to form a better understanding of their own needs and aspirations and take charge of their own lives. In this way, mentors function as role models (showing things by way of example), guide (making professional knowledge available), coaches (asking questions to support the mentee to reflect on his own emotions), and significant others (building an adult relationship based on trust). The pilot learned that mentoring demands a wide range of skills, including professional competences (in the radicalization, social and youth area) and social competences (personal, communicative and relationship formation competences) (Helle Thomsen, 2012).

⁴ See http://blogs.boldcreative.co.uk/digitaldisruption/
8.2.9 **Cultures Interactive**

Cultures Interactive (CI) targets adolescents from disadvantaged communities at risk of becoming involved in extremism and violence. CI team members are engaged in communities and schools, and use an approach that combines youth cultures like Hip-Hop, Techno and Gothic with particular pedagogic exercises. Their approach is characterized by three elements. First of all, they engage instructors that are authentic representatives from particular urban youth cultures. These give workshops in youth-culture activities like breakdance, skateboarding, slam poetry/rap or digital music production. Besides being motivating, the workshops also include historical and pedagogical aspects. They pay attention to the civil rights background and the social contexts the youth cultures originate from. In this way many opportunities are created to raise issues relevant to de-radicalization. Secondly, they use civic education. They provide information, instruction and discussion about issues of extremism through pedagogical exercises and role plays.

In this way they aim at teaching the participants social and emotional skills like self-control, non-aggressive conflict solution, and the capacity to debate and moderate different opinions. Instead of referring to ethical principles, they engage with participants’ personal stories, ‘narrative interaction’, to induce behavior change. Finally, they create a group setting where youngsters can talk freely, make a personal connection, and open up to each other and the facilitator.

The project was evaluated through a good-practice research with a qualitative-empirical design, using biographical-narrative and focused-narrative interviews with participants and facilitators, group discussions and participant observation. Six elements were identified that were essential to induce pro-social change: 1) Appreciation for personal memories and getting in touch with what one experienced through one’s life history; 2) Personal confidence and trust with facilitators and with the group; 3) Capacity to partake in narrative interaction, this means telling and listening to personally experienced occurrences; 4) Emotional learning by realizing and reflecting upon one’s own affects; 5) Dealing with ambivalence, and recognizing the need to make decisions and negotiate compromise; 6) Capacity to argue or struggle with others in a non-destructive manner. The over-all intervention was able to generate an interactive atmosphere in which a trusting and resilient relationship was established, towards the facilitators as well as within the group. To achieve this, some important factors regarding the context were identified. The facilitator has to come from outside the institutional environment to be able to create a protected space. However, the institutions and local environments of the participants have to be involved. The group setting also is important because many of the effects rely on the group dynamics. And finally, the personal attitude and (narrative) interaction style of the facilitator were identified as a direct influencing factor (Weilnböck, 2012).
Portrayed in the schedule below, several skills and competences were developed and strengthened considering the above projects, to build resilience against radical ideas, including critical thinking, self-reflection, self-consciousness, autonomy, assertiveness, negotiation, enhanced self-esteem, team working, emotional self-control, non-aggressive conflict resolution, debating capacities and tolerance towards people with dissenting opinions. Besides strengthening emotional resilience by enhancing self-esteem and emotional well-being (P4C, UKRP, Identity and Resilience, STREET), personal resilience can also be strengthened by tackling the root causes of low self-esteem. This is achieved by projects working on geopolitical resilience (MUN, STREET), or religious resilience (Identity and Resilience).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Developed and strengthened skills and competences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Training ‘Identity and Resilience’ (NL)</td>
<td>Consciousness, critical thinking, reflection, positive self-image, expressing one’s own feelings and thoughts, insight into one’s own actions, enhance problem solving skills regarding conflict and stress, tolerance towards people with dissenting opinions, self-consciousness, autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The UK Resilience Programme (UK)</td>
<td>Self-managing emotions, dealing with conflicts and negative or emotionally destabilising situations, critical thinking, self-reflection, negotiation, assertiveness, non-aggressive conflict resolutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Philosophy for Children (UK)</td>
<td>Critical thinking, tolerance towards people with dissenting opinions, self-reflection, debating capacities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. STREET (UK)</td>
<td>Emotional well-being, enhancing self-esteem, team working, critical thinking, debating capacities, deconstructing propaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Rewind (UK)</td>
<td>Debating capacities, self-confidence, tolerance towards people with dissenting opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Model United Nations (USA)</td>
<td>Debating capacities, team working, conflict resolution, tolerance towards people with different opinions, self-reflection, emotional well-being, confidence, assertiveness, negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Digital Disruption (UK)</td>
<td>Critical thinking, understanding propaganda techniques, being able to deconstruct propaganda messages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cultures Interactives (DE)</td>
<td>Emotional well-being, non-aggressive conflict resolution, debating capacities, self-control, tolerance towards people with dissenting opinions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 European interventions

Interventions for prevention of violent radicalization should therefore not only focus on increasing youngsters’ resilience by concentrating on positive experiences, but also by diminishing the breeding ground involving radicalization (e.g. strengthen social cohesion and handle perceived deprivation). The so called ‘wall of resilience’ (Meah & Melis, n.d) seems essential in preventing a cognitive opening, which might lead to openness for radical notions or even indoctrination. The model of demand and supply is explained in detail in the attachment. Preventive (or proactive) approaches for diminishing the risk for involvement in violent radicalization should pay attention to the demand side of our comprehensive scheme. The demand side covers push factors, involving circumstances that are so unattractive, that the individual is metaphorically speaking, ‘pushed’ into radical ideas.
Emotional and social resilience should therefore be increased (e.g. by empowering the individual, or offering parental support). Furthermore, the supply side should not be underestimated. Pull factors can be tackled by increasing the awareness about ideological topics or recruitment. In the schema shown below, several interesting practices and trainings have been combined in a comprehensive overview to prevent or tackle violent radicalization. This scheme is based on an earlier figure designed by Meah & Melis (n.d).
Figure 11 Comprehensive scheme of prevention of violent radicalization

Preventive Strategies (secondary) and Pro-active Strategies:
- Empowerment of youngsters
  - Personal resilience building (awareness raising, preventing low self-esteem, dialogue, role models, narrative interaction)
  - Empowerment on the internet
  - Empowerment of social environment (informing, capacity building)
- Parental support
- Training of teachers
- Training of frontline professionals

Root Causes:
- Demographic factors
- Personal issues

PUSH FACTORS
- Internal risks
- Contextual risks
- External risks

PULL FACTORS
- Internal risks
- Contextual risks
- External risks

Supply of radical ideas
- PULL

Demand of answers concerning identity, religion, etc.
- PUSH

Breeding ground
- Frustration, discrimination, humiliation, injustice, alienation

Cognitive opening

Resilience
- Emotional Resilience
- Social Resilience
- Theological Resilience
- Geo-political Resilience
- Persecution Resilience

Preventive strategies (primary):
- Acceptance of multiple identities
- Strengthening of social cohesion
- Perception in the media and image building
- Strengthening intercultural contacts
- Enlarging social capital and political confidence of (Muslim) minorities

Preventive strategies (tertiary):
- Tackling radical messages on the internet
- De-radicalization
- Internships
- Job opportunities

Curative strategies:
- Partnerships

Repressive strategies:
- Handling violent extremists by police and justice

Radicalization: when demand meets supply, the process begins
9. Indicators and impact factors for interventions

After analyzing the useful practices from (inter)national literature, we can formulate several factors concerning good interventions. Furthermore we will point out some indicators to realize effective future trainings. Weilnböck (2012) evaluated two federal projects working on de-radicalization, carried out by two NGO’s in Berlin. He formulated criteria for good practices and impact factors of - and guidelines for successful de-radicalization work. Although this research tends to focus on preventive strategies to avert radicalization, the listed factors and indicators can be of use for keeping focused and for evaluating interventions.

9.1 Factors concerning good interventions

Impact factors concerning good de-radicalization work has been outlined by several authors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors concerning good interventions</th>
<th>Through</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Trust</td>
<td>facilitating a safe space for dialogue and positive interaction, agreeing on some ground rules, narrative interaction style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Facilitator</td>
<td>facilitator should be independent from the everyday context and should have credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Involve social environment</td>
<td>making sure that the acquired knowledge and skills are embedded on different levels: 1) within the communities participants are part of 2) within the lives of the participants: new competences should be applicable in their daily life 3) within the organizations facilitators / professionals work for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Facilitation styles</td>
<td>paying attention to processes of group dynamics, the development of the participants in the group and their relationships towards each other, sense of ownership, adjustment to target group, involving mentors or role models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Integrated or holistic approach</td>
<td>Tackling a wide range of responses tailored to the individual’s needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Impact factors for interventions


First, Weilnböck notes that the two evaluated interventions were able to generate an interactive atmosphere in which trust and resilient relationships were established both towards the facilitators as well as within the group itself (Weilnböck, 2012). This factor of trust is essential and all other factors should increase this trust and resilience. Bonnell et al. (2011) also note that facilitating a safe space for dialogue and positive interaction is a crucial factor for resilience-building activities. The facilitator should be able to create a ‘safe space’ for all people to take part in discussion.
Agreeing on some ground rules, and using tools and techniques that enable young people to take ownership, are important in creating this safe space. Facilitators should respect young people’s pre-conceptions, and have sufficient knowledge to counter stereotypes or mistaken assumptions. A narrative interaction style and a non-judgmental learning environment helps participants to open up to each other and the facilitator (Barclay, 2011; Weilnböck, 2012).

Secondly, for generating trust and resilience, Weilnböck notes that facilitators should come from outside, meaning that the facilitator should not be involved with the participants in any other way, since gaining trust is an essential factor. Thus, the facilitator should be independent from the everyday context. Similarly, research concerning civil society involvement demonstrates that the personal credibility of the professionals involved is important to connect to project participants. This might mean being of a similar age, race or ethnic origin, being the same sex, coming from the same area, or having had similar life experiences. Apart from that, especially in working with young people, having ‘street credibility’, can bring respect and can encourage young people to remain involved (ISD, n.d.; Barclay, 2011). Staff or volunteers who have been radicalized themselves can be helpful because they have a good understanding of the client group, especially in de-radicalization projects. However, most agree that projects need a mixture of those with direct experience alongside professionals with other skills, such as psychologists, social workers, and health practitioners, for example (ISD, n.d.). According to Horgan (2008), the effectiveness of any counterpropaganda, regardless of context, will rely heavily on the credibility and relevant expertise of the communicator and in particular on the communicator’s intention. The perception of this communicator’s expertise can be based on factors such as similarity in social background (e.g. views, values, status), although difference in age might promote the communicator to “expert” status (Horgan, 2008).

Third, Weilnböck (2012) notes that the effectiveness of the two approaches was closely connected to the necessity of involving not only the youngsters themselves, but also the institutions and local environments to which they belong. Interventions should connect to and be embedded within communities youngsters are part of. This can be done by using local language and phrases, and by reflecting the local community and demography through the involvement of community members including parents (Bonnell et al., 2011). One of the success factors of the STREET project is the fact that the organization combines a profound expertise in countering violent radicalization with a strongly embedded position within the community. The organization is rooted in the local community. Many staff members are themselves individuals of the local community. Since they come from similar backgrounds to the people they engage with, they understand the ‘lived reality’ many youngsters in South London are dealing with, and thus enjoy credibility among local youth. They possess ‘street skills’ as well as cultural awareness and religious knowledge (Barclay, 2011).

Skills and techniques for building personal resilience should be relevant to participants lives. They should attempt to be transferable and applicable to many contexts, including relationships with peers and family members, as well as achievement in academic and/or other activities.
Bonnell et al. (2011) determined that interventions encouraging young people to develop critical thinking skills were effective, regarding topics considered relevant to extremist ideologies, as well as more generic topics. According to them, this supports the idea that these skills are transferable, sustainable ‘skills for life’. Participants who have learned to think for themselves, will apply these skills to any context, even when they’re subject to peer pressure or targeted by extremist ideologies. Also, through interaction and team-work, young people develop transferable skills for positive collaboration and ongoing engagement. Team work contributes to the acquisition of skills like collaborative working, responsibility taking and effective communication, that are transferable and can be drawn on in the future. The transferability of skills was demonstrated in the ‘Identity and Resilience’ training in Amsterdam. Evaluation of the training was done by assessing effects of the training on three levels: attitudes, behavior and context. The evaluation demonstrated that the training also had a societal effect, since changes in attitudes and behavior were also applied beyond the training context, in the social environment of school, work, home, mosque and neighborhood (Gielen, 2009).

Bonnell et al. (2011) found that successful interventions were not one-offes, but sustainable and ongoing. They determined it is important to link the interventions to the wider school curriculum or organizational ethos to embed the activities into the day-to-day lives of learners. Interventions that are integrated into curriculum structures and teachers’ working practices increase their potential to resort maximum impact for students. This also implies that interventions need to fit into the ethos of the school and should be supported by school leaders and staff (Bonnell et al., 2011).

Fourth, another factor for contributing to the generation of trust and resilience is that the work is done in the group and with the group. Weilnböck’s (2012) research interviews indicated that the basic trust of the participants and thus the degree of impact the effects have upon them, are dependent on group dynamics approaches. Weilnböck underlines that it is essential that attention is paid to the processes and the development of the participants in the group and their relationship towards each other. Interventions appear to resort good results when they are young person centred and young person led, so they create a sense of ownership. The Cultures Interactive project made use of youth cultures to make the intervention relevant and adjusted to the target group. Peer methods also appear to be very useful to achieve ownership. Young people are able to communicate messages in a more relevant and credible way. They have more knowledge on the problems and environment of the target group, and hence are believed to resort more impact. The P4C and Rewind projects made use of peers in their interventions (Bonnell et al., 2011; Lub, 2011). However, there are some risks associated with peer methods. Some topics may invoke emotions and potential tensions within groups. This makes it essential that peer educators are properly trained and supported (Bonnell et al., 2011). Lub (2011) also refers to the mixed effects of peer mediation. Peers can deliver a positive contribution in case of polarized relations or conflicts between youth. However, it is not unambiguously clear that positive effects in this field are entirely due to the use of peer mediators.
Positive effects have been recorded mainly in primary schools and in a lesser degree in secondary schools, while adolescents are precisely the target group of counter-radicalization projects. Besides that, mostly the behavioural skills of the peer mediators themselves are being affected in a positive way. Finally, it is not advisable to replace the involvement of adult professionals entirely by youngsters, for safety reasons. In case a conflict escalates, involving peers is not appropriate. Peer mediation resorts better results when the degree of conflict is low (Lub, 2011).

Besides peer methods, involving mentors or role models was also used to counter radicalization. Negative role models can push towards radicalization, or can be a pull factor through recruitment. To counter this, positive role models can play a significant role. Often role models, key figures or high potentials like singers, sportsmen or actors are involved to inspire young people to accomplish positive things.

Many interventions have used mentoring and coaching approaches as a way to tackle social exclusion and enhance social and cultural capital of vulnerable youngsters, like the STREET project (Barclay, 2011; Bonnell et al., 2011; Lub, 2008). A mentor can act as a positive role model, be a source of practical help, provide encouragement on educational and job-related issues, and challenge anti-social attitudes and behaviour (Bonnell et al., 2011). In this way, mentoring can enhance a youngster’s position on the societal ladder and broaden its social network. However, Lub points out that it is important that mentors are supported by a sound and professional organizational structure (Lub, 2008).

Finally, multi-model or holistic approaches that involve a range of institutions, delivering a variety of services within one program, resort positive effects and are deemed important seen the complex and wide-ranging reasons why young people engage with extremist ideologies. A project that explicitly uses this holistic perspective is the STREET project. They support youngsters that often come from tough backgrounds and experienced a broad range of problems like violence, physical or emotional abuse and neglect. These multidimensional problems are tackled by delivering a wide-ranging response tailored to the individual’s needs. This can include emotional support like counseling, social and welfare support, help with employment or education, personal development or faith-based work. Through this holistic approach STREET helps youngsters to reconnect to society (Barclay, 2011). Young people benefit from support concerning different aspects of their lives and involving different actors and institutions in their social environment, like schools, police, youth work, community centers and families. Collaboration between these different partners is indispensable (Lub, 2011; Bonnell et al., 2011). Most projects discussed were part of a broader strategy including interventions for parents, communities and professionals. For example, the Identity and Resilience Project was complemented by trainings in parental education and the Danish mentoring strategy was complemented by a counseling strategy for professionals working with youth.

All these measures should be integrated in a whole approach. An effective training is based on a wide combination of initiatives, actions and measures which together provide a (more) high
quality environment, like a school environment. Such an environment is characterized by the high
degree of policy effectiveness and by the high degree of well-being and involvement of the people out
there with each other. Another feature is that the policy makers attach great importance to the
involvement and participation of all members of the community (for example in a schoolproject:
school management, teachers/educators, students, parents). Not infrequently, the proper alignment and
cooperation with the neighborhood or the wider environment is included. (Rigby, Smith & Pepler,
2004).

9.2 Indicators for evaluating radicalization projects

Klima, Vanhauwaert & Wijckmans (2012) note that there is a lack of evaluation and monitoring of
inter-agency work in crime prevention. They listed some obstacles to evaluate local cooperation,
which may be useful for the evaluation of interventions in the framework of radicalization among
vulnerable youngsters. A first obstacle they identify is the complexity of the interventions
(horizontal/vertical) and of the conceptual variables (influence of political, economic, demographic
and geographic conditions). Secondly, they point to the dynamic, changing and evolving nature of the
intervention. Besides that, the diversity of the intervention process outcomes, as well as the lack of
optimal conditions for traditional experimental research (restricted comparison groups) form a barrier.
These conditions make it difficult to identify the active ingredients of a complex intervention program
with many elements, and hinder the improvement of intervention programs (Klima et al., 2012).

Different methods have been used to evaluate policy interventions. These can be divided into
several categories. The experimental evaluation is qualitatively oriented and measures the effect of an
intervention by measuring the difference between a target group that participated in the intervention,
and a control group that did not. When applying this to anti-radicalization projects, two main problems
arise. First of all, this method presupposes an isolated experimental environment, and does not take
into account the context. However, the social context resorrs an enormous impact on the radicalization
process. Secondly, the target group is hard to reach and recruiting participants for an experimental and
control group is not evident. Another category of evaluations is the pragmatic and descriptive
evaluation, where the features and aims of a program are mapped but where no insights can be
provided on the outcome of anti-radicalization programs. The constructivist evaluation maps the
different realities of different stakeholders and creates a common reconstruction of reality that is
endorsed by the majority of the actors. However, the results are only valid for a specific context. And
finally, the realistic approach tries to answer the question ‘what works in which context, for whom,
and under which circumstances?’. However, all of these methods struggle with the fact that the
outcome is very difficult to define in the framework of radicalization (Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Pawson
& Tilley, 1997; Gielen & Junne, 2008). Gielen & Junne state that, effect measures of anti-
radicalization are difficult to achieve, yet not impossible.
9.2.1 Outcome mapping

To overcome the problems generated by traditional evaluation methods, Gielen & Grin (2010) identified outcome mapping as a suitable evaluation method for smaller scale projects or subprojects in a broader program, like resilience training. Instead of attempting to measure the impact of certain interventions to ‘diminish radicalization’ in general, this method limits itself to assessing changes in attitudes, actions, activities of persons and organizations that were directly targeted by the intervention. Relevant questions when using this approach are ‘How did the target group react? Are they behaving differently? Has the behaviour of the environment (friends, peers, neighbours) changed? Do key persons (youth workers, police officers) notice any change?’. Answers to these questions enable trainers to assess the outcomes (changes) that have taken place in the direct environment and are linked to the intervention project itself (Gielen & Grin, 2010). Gielen & Junne (2008) identified several indicators to measure the effect of an anti-radicalization intervention. These indicators are examples, and based on characteristics of radicalization (see below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators for evaluating radicalization projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators at micro-level (individual)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increased contact with people that differ in opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Augmented interest for other aspects of life (family, work, school, sport, art, neighbourhood, cinema,..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Less stringent rules for clothing and behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Higher level of tolerance for people that differ in opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More frequent visits to parents/family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Informed by different media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Less absenteeism at school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators at meso-level (group)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Enhanced group openness (for visitors, friends, people with different opinion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inviting speakers that differ in opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Less hierarchy and more diversity in the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Less strict expectations towards the behaviour of group members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Broader program, new discussion topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Less tendency to oppose other groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Moving away from radical key persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- New role models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Invited by other groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators at macro-level (society)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Positive perception by youth workers, teachers, police, imams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Enhanced contact with neighbours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More active participation in society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Less outstanding at work, better contact with colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Less discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More positive coverage in the media</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 12 Indicators for effect evaluation*

Gielen & Junne divided the indicators in three levels. First, indicators that affect change on a *micro level (individual)*, like enhanced contact with family members, higher degree of tolerance for people that differ in opinion and interest in a broad range of aspects of life, are listed. The *meso-level* comprises indicators that are relevant within the group, e.g. enhanced group openness, more diversity and less hierarchy. And finally, indicators that measure effects at the level of the society (*macro-level*) are included: positive perception by key professionals and more active participation in society.

By using this model, Gielen & Grin (2010) note that the focus of policymakers to increase the effects of the policy, should be on several aspects. First of all, persons involved, should have a thorough knowledge of the issue. It is also important to aim the policy at the relevant target group and context. Therefore, several interventions should be used at the same time and parallel to each other. Instead of using abstract goals like ‘preventing from radicalization’, goals aiming for change in attitudes and behaviour are measurable (Gielen & Grin, 2010).

The importance of measuring effects on different levels, was demonstrated in the evaluation of the ‘Identity and Resilience’ training organized in the framework of the ‘Action Plan Slotervaart: Countering Radicalization’ (2007) in the Netherlands. Impact of the training was assessed at three levels: attitudes (changed viewpoints on an individual level), behaviour (changed behaviour inside and outside of the training on a meso-level), and context (societal change). These different levels of change are visualized in Figure 13:

![Figure 13 Three levels of change](source: Gielen, 2009b, p. 12)

According to Gielen & Junne (2008), to measure the usefulness of an activity, following questions remain important: first, is the target group reached by this intervention? Second, is the intervention effective to achieve the set goals? Third, can the intended effects be measured in the social environment? Fourth, is the intervention embedded in the context of the participants? Concerning *attitudes* in the above presented figure, participants showed changed perceptions on certain issues.
The participants developed more understanding for people that differ in opinion. Their role models, people they identified with, had changed. In terms of behaviour, the participants were able to apply all the acquired competences and skills during the training. They developed a critical attitude, showed improvements in the ability to reflect on themselves, and had a stronger feeling of self-consciousness. During the training they opened themselves up towards different people. Their autonomy increased and their social conformity diminished. The participants were also able to apply the learned competences and skills outside the training context. They could transfer these skills to the broader environment of work, school, home, mosque and neighbourhood. They appeared less isolated and demonstrated more profound contact with family and parents.

9.3 Indicators for pro-social change

When assessing the impact of a designed training, Weilnböck (2012) determined some changes in attitudes and behaviour that were indicative of de-radicalization. Weilnböck describes six indicators for enduring pro-social change (see below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of mental change in the process of de-radicalization</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Appreciation for personal memories</td>
<td>the person shows a new attitude about, and appreciation for personal memories and for the emotional experience of remembering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Personal confidence and trust</td>
<td>the individual shows signs that he/she has built personal confidence and trust with the facilitators and the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Narrative interaction</td>
<td>the individual has increased his/her capacity to partake in narrative interaction and tells/listens to stories [narrations]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Emotional learning</td>
<td>the individual shows signs that he/she begins to realize and reflect upon its own affects and upon situations in which he/she was mostly guided by emotions; The individual can observe emotions and thoughts about what consequences these emotions had, and how the situation could have had a different outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dealing with ambivalence</td>
<td>the individual recognizes others and/or oneself as being contentious in nature, meaning that the person leaves behind the ‘black and white’ world, entering a world of different shades of color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Capacity to argue</td>
<td>the person shows signs of newly built appreciation for and capacity to argue or struggle with others in non-destructive ways, be it on political, religious or personal issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Indicators for pro-social change

According to Weilnböck (2012), mental change was assessed when:

1. The offender or vulnerable person shows a new attitude about, and appreciation for personal memories and for the emotional experience of remembering. The person thus has increased his/her capacity to uncover, bring to mind, emotionally re-experience and also verbalize memories of lived-through events. According to Weilnböck, it has been assessed as particularly indicative if memories with a positive emotional charge are expressed and also if such memories pertain directly to what the person experiences during the intervention when working with the group.

2. A second essential indicator bearing witness of mental change in the process of (de-)radicalization, mentioned by Weilnböck, refers to the fact that the person has built personal confidence and trust with the facilitator and the group. And that the person thus has increased the capacity to build trust in a relationship and stay trustful even over quite challenging, conflicting and exhausting experiences of (group) interaction.

3. The person shows a new sense of and appreciation for storytelling: being able to narrate personal experiences and listen actively to such narrations. The person thus increased his/her capacity to partake in narrative interaction. Weilnböck underlines the importance of narrative listening and co-narrative interaction as well as the necessity that the method of intervention provides story-generating tools.

4. The person shows signs which indicate experiences of emotional learning by realizing, and reflecting upon one’s own affects, and upon situations in which (s)he was mostly guided by emotions. This might include observations about what consequences these emotions had and how the situation could have had a different outcome.

5. The person shows that (s)he is able to deal with ambivalence, whereby the person recognizes others and/or oneself as being contentious in nature, having to make decisions and negotiate compromise. This indicator is about leaving behind the ‘black and white’ image of the world, entering a world of different shades of color.

6. The person shows signs of a newly built appreciation for and capacity to argue or struggle with others in non-destructive ways, be it on political, religious, or personal issues.
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Attachments

Overview of Key concepts

The most important key concepts that are used in the report are described below. These are no general definitions, rather they are operationalized to use as working concepts for this specific research.

- Radicalism:
  Radicalism can exist in several forms. Some radicals keep to extreme thoughts or ideologies, which do not necessary form any threat to the environment or society as a whole. Other radicals aim to effect fundamental societal changes, whether or not by using undemocratic means. Radicalism is not exclusively an Islamic phenomenon, it occurs within diverse religious movements (Stad Antwerpen, Mechelen, Vilvoorde & Maaseik, 2013).

- Radicalization:
  Radicalization is described as a process in which people adopt an extreme position in terms of politics and religion […]. The radicalization process does not follow a single route or pathway and there are no specific stages or steps involved. Radicalization is often a social process involving interaction with others, however there are reported cases of individuals self-radicalizing (Bonnell et al., 2011).

- Violence:
  Violence cannot be understood solely in terms of physical force, it also includes assaults on the personhood, dignity and/or - sense of value. Violence can be legitimate or illegitimate, visible or invisible, meaningful or useless. Violence is in the eye of the beholder; depending on one’s geopolitical-economic position in the world. Particular acts of violence may be perceived as depraved or glorious. Violence wears a very human face, and sadly most violence is not ‘senseless’ at all. Violence may be seen as a human condition (like sickness, or suffering); it is present in each of us, as is its opposite - the rejection of violence (Schepers-Hughes, 2003).

- Violent radicalization:
  The process of [an individual or a group] adopting an extremist belief system [inspired by philosophical, religious, political or ideological notions], including the willingness to use, support, or facilitate violence [or undemocratic means], as a method to effect [drastic] societal change. (Allen, in Vidino, 2011), complemented with the definition in the report of the Vice-Prime Minister (2013).

- Vulnerability:
  Vulnerability can be described as the “predisposition, tendency, likelihood or strong contextual influencer, that may lead to an actual risk” (Barclay, 2011).
**Societal vulnerability:**
Societal vulnerability can be described as an accumulation of negative experiences or contacts with official societal institutions (ranging from school to juvenile courts), which may lead to an unfavourable societal perspective. Both societal groups and individuals in society are defined as ‘societally vulnerable’ when they derive little benefit from their contacts with societal institutions and additionally are mainly and recurrently confronted with the negative effects of these institutions (Vettenburg, Brondeel, Gavray & Pauwels, 2013).

**Resilience:**
Resilience can be defined as the ability to ‘bounce back’ from adversity. It is a reduced vulnerability to risk experiences. It concerns ‘good adaptations under extreme extenuating circumstances’ and is used to describe a process in which people can overcome or resist negative influences that block (for instance) emotional well-being and/or achievement. It can be described as the ‘overcoming of stress or adversity’, or, as ‘a good outcome despite risk experiences’ (Bonnell et al., 2011; Masten & Reed, 2005; Rutter, 2012).

**Prevention:**
Prevention is a strategy to stop people from becoming terrorists or supporting violent extremism. This can be achieved through challenging extremist ideologies; supporting vulnerable individuals; increasing the resilience of communities to violent extremism, and addressing the grievances that ideologues are exploiting (Bonnell et al., 2011).

**Empowerment:**
Empowerment is viewed as a process: the mechanism by which people, organizations, and communities gain mastery over their lives, by changing the way they look at social problems and the solutions for these. Empowerment can be regarded as a process (empowering), and an outcome (empowered) (Steenssens & Van Regenmortel, 2007).

**De-radicalization:**
De-radicalization is the social and psychological process whereby an individual’s commitment to, and involvement in, violent radicalization is reduced to the extent that they are no longer at risk of involvement and engagement in violent activity (Vidino, 2011).
Explaining radicalization by demand and supply

In this model, the tree circles are (relatively) independent phenomena, yet when supply meets demand, radicalization ensues (Meah & Melis, n.d.). Several authors specify that the breeding ground is the starting point from where people stray further into radicalism, covering frustrations and perceived injustice about the own group (Noppe et al., 2012; Ponsaers et al., 2010; Van den Bos et al., 2009; Van San et al., 2010; Veldhuis & Bakker, 2007; Verhagen, Reitsma & Spee, 2010). As pointed out in this model, the breeding ground nourishes the *cognitive opening*. But as Meah & Melis explain, the starting point is the *demand* circle. According to Meah & Melis, young Muslims [since their model is based on research about Islamic radicalization] have a growing demand for *answers* concerning their identity and religion, yet due to generation and migration issues, the answers are not found at home or in the traditional mosques.

The deterritorialization of the Islam, and the centrality of Islam in the public debate has pushed young Muslims to ask themselves what it means to be a Muslim, specifically in Western society (Meah & Melis). Parallel with the growing demand, there is an active *supply* of radical ideas, for example through the internet, media, or literature and travelling preachers. According to Meah & Melis, this supply refers to ideologies of violent jihad, not to non-radical answers.
The so called supplier is actively seeking the seekers, to convince them of the necessity and individual duty of violent global jihad, rejecting democracy as idolatry (Meah & Melis, n.d.). In order that the radical message gains ground, there must be a cognitive opening that admits views previously considered as extreme. This opening is created by experiencing some form of crisis that shakes previously held beliefs, and renders individuals receptive to alternative perspectives [dramatic events can occur on the personal or social level]. In other words; the crisis breaks through the wall of resilience and leaves a cognitive opening where the radical supply can penetrate (Meah & Melis, n.d.). In this part, the breeding ground plays an important role, since this breeding ground consists of frustrations, which represent a possible crisis that could initiate cognitive openings (Meah & Melis, n.d.).

\[\text{General Intelligence- and Security Service, the Netherlands}\]