# Assessing the risk of radicalisation and extremism in the community

Margarida Damas
Sara Afonso
Pedro Liberado
Catarina Santos

Date: 28/08/2023

# Change Control
## Document Properties

| Outcome No. | | FBOG Desk Review: Establishment of dimensions/indicators | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Project Result No.** | PR4 | **Project Result Title** | Frontline Behavioural Observation Guidelines (FBOG) adaptation and ideological differential screening |
| **Author/s** | | DAMAS, Margarida (IPS); | |
| **Contributor/s** | | AFONSO, Sara (IPS); LIBERADO, Pedro (IPS); SANTOS, Catarina (IPS) | |
| **Name** | | Assessing the risk of radicalisation and extremism in the community:  Desk research | |
| **Date** | | 28th August 2023 | |

# Table of Content

# The vulnerabilities of the prison-community transition
## Reentry challenges

It is widely accepted that prison offers only a temporarily limited solution for criminal problems, considering that, except for a small percentage, all imprisoned individuals will eventually return to their communities (Cherney, 2021). Therefore, when considering the impact and intervention of the criminal justice system, the prison-community transition must be accounted for (Decker & Pyrooz, 2020).

This transition is often challenging for the former imprisoned individual, who has to navigate several obstacles to manage and re-adapt to the new reality and resettlement difficulties (Damas, 2021). This transition, to be successful, should reflect an integrated and comprehensive reintroduction in the community, allowing the individual to choose to live a law-abiding life and productively function in society (Morton & Silber, 2018). Therefore, it encompasses a reentry process followed by, ideally, steady resettlement, which should lead to a stable reintegration (Walkenhorst, Baaken, Ruf, Leaman and Korn, 2018). However, this process is arduous, as it is defined by the readaptation to a social world, which was most likely, placed on hold and to a new identity shaped by the prison institution (Morton & Silber, 2018).

The prison institution tends to provide a disheartening experience, posing several difficulties at different levels. Consequently, prisons are often described as places of vulnerability, where one's grievances and frustrations can be aggravated. Accordingly, prisons can act as 'schools' of crime and breeding grounds for radicalisation since their forced social isolation, combined with a consequential sense of personal crisis and contact with criminal histories and know-how, can increase the responsiveness to extremist views and messages (Neumann, 2010).

Therefore, when back in the community, the reentry path tends to display a difficult transition, as formerly imprisoned individuals face multiple challenges, from personal to institutional, shaped by the prison experience, their resources, and their receiving environment, hardening everyday life (Damas, 2021). Research highlights six common challenges, namely: *i)* social exclusion and stigmatisation, primarily due to the weight of the criminal record; *ii)* monetary shortages; *iii)* family estrangement; *iv)* employment barriers; *v)* lack of social support; and *vi)* lack of personal skills (Damas, 2021; Decker & Pyrooz, 2020; Kubrin, 2012).

Hence, volatility, vulnerabilities and challenges describe the prison-community transition, straining transitioning individuals, their families and the overall community, requiring adequate and grounded support, which drawing a continuum, should begin between walls. Nevertheless, once out, support must be provided assistance and support "at the gate, literally and metaphorically" (Walkenhorst et al., 2018, p.63). Formerly imprisoned individuals must be accompanied during the first stages of transition, highlighting the first months post-release, but also in later stages, in which reintegration and stabilisation are expected to occur. Non-governmental and civil society organisations are critical in overseeing and guiding this process, providing access to essential services, social and symbolic capital whilst involving different parties to respond to short, medium and long-term needs, tackling potential critical events  (Walkenhorst et al., 2018).

Nevertheless, the reality faced when transitioning out of prison tends to be even more complex for individuals sentenced for violent extremism/terrorism-related crimes, as their paths are influenced by the broader political and societal configuration, leading to greater scrutiny of their resettlement processes (Cherney, 2021). Consequently, the complexity hidden in the prison-community transition for these individuals entails several stages for the individuals themselves, their community and their service providers (Walkenhorst et al., 2018). Consequently, the work to be developed to support them gathers even more significant momentum since its success implies the consolidation of a positive integrated life, away from extremism, discrimination and stigma. As the opposite entails substantial consequences for public safety, their reintegration is highly controversial, raising several questions, mostly related to their potential for re-engagement and its implications for society's well-being and safety (Horgan & Braddock, 2010).

In this sense, different possibilities emerge when individuals previously sentenced for violent extremism/terrorism-related activities transition back into the community, as their adherence to extremist ideologies and groups may either remain the same, increase – especially building on previous socio-political grievances which were aggravated by those specific to the prison setting–, or decrease – often when met with tailored rehabilitative efforts. Therefore, understanding this continuity and change can have important implications for their resettlement process, thus requiring a broader understanding of the individual transitioning and its social contexts (Decker & Pyrooz, 2020).

Accordingly, the combination of the imprisonment background with the subsequent personal, social, and institutional anomies faced when returning to the community place transitioning individuals, whether previously engaged or not in extremist or terrorist activities, in highly vulnerable situations. As grievances and frustrations can be enhanced due to a sense of relative deprivation, building on a newfound marginalisation, an overall sense of alienation is cemented, creating a greater propensity for engagement in radicalisation and extremist behaviours (Angus, 2016).

In fact, as recent events have shown, the greater vulnerability of the prison-community transition cannot be neglected, requiring special attention. To assist the work to be carried out, adequate tools to determine potential radicalisation and extremist engagement, as well as to manage and adapt after-care support (Clemmow, Schumann, Slaman & Gill, 2020), which should be attentive to the reintegration stage and its needs, must be mobilised. Despite the vulnerabilities described, the prison-community transition, when met with adequate support and following a holistic and multi-level framework, can be paramount to ensure successful and healthy resettlement and reintegration processes, mitigating the risks of radicalisation and propensity to engage in extremist activities.

# How to assess the potential for radicalisation and extremism?

Similar to other deviant and criminal phenomena, the risk of radicalisation and violent extremism can and should be comprehensively assessed, being integrated into a broader preventive approach, allowing to adapt interventive, punitive, and supportive efforts (Sarma, 2017). For such, information about the individuals and their environments should be collected to later assist in understanding the likelihood of an outcome or behaviour (RTI, 2018), allowing its use in pre-emptive or interventive settings. Therefore, risk assessment

processes, or better, vulnerabilities and needs assessments, should be used throughout the different stages of the involvement with the criminal justice system. Thus, various agencies, including non-security and non-governmental ones, should be given suitable assessment instruments and procedures in the post-release setting. In the last decade, several tools have been designed in the P/CVE field, building on the most updated research. Nevertheless, and considering that radicalisation is a complex, non-linear process, the research on its risks and protective factors is dynamic and ever-evolving (Reiter, Dooseje & Feddes, 2021).

## Factors and conditions that have been associated with radicalisation and violent extremism:

Research on radicalisation and violent extremism agrees that certain emotional predispositional states, namely *i)* emotional uncertainty; *ii)* desire for existential meaning; *iii)* need for status; and *iv)* desire for justice, tend to motivate radicalisation processes and push towards extremist engagement (Reiter et al., 2021). When individuals search for a life meaning, purpose and identity, radical groups become especially alluring, as these offer clear and straightforward answers. Moreover, it is also agreed that individuals become more vulnerable following *v)* domestic and societal problems.

When considering the challenging moment of prison-community transition, emotional uncertainty, a need for status, meaning, and justice, and domestic and societal problems are often found, as previously imprisoned individuals tend to struggle with identity, family, social, and institutional issues.

In addition to these emotional states, several putative risk factors have been signalled (Lara-Cabrera, Pardo, Benouaret, Faci, Benslimane & Camanho, 2017; Veen, Feddes, Nickolson & Doosje, 2018; Hart, 2020;), being agreed that, at a personal level:

- Age: Individuals between 20-29 are more vulnerable to radicalisation;

- Lack ok kinship and marital relationships: The lack of solid and normative social bonds increases vulnerability to radical narratives. Such is especially pressing when exiting prison, as often family ties get damaged during imprisonment. However, in some instances, these existing bonds, especially when promoting a radical milieu, can increase the risk of radicalisation;

- Emotional vulnerability: When individuals face stages of uncertainty and emotional strain, they become more vulnerable to radicalisation;

- Prior criminal history: It has been argued that often radicalised and extremist individuals have a criminal past, however mainly on non-terrorism-related offences. Such highlights the need to consider radicalisation not as an inherent predisposition, but as a process driven by vulnerabilities and grievances;

- Justification of violence: When violence is seen as an answer to grievances and frustrations, individuals are more prone to adhere to radical causes.

Moreover, some factors have been pinpointed at a more situational level:

- Perceived illegitimacy of authorities: When formal authorities aren't granted legitimacy, vulnerable individuals might feel compelled to rebel against these, especially in cases of harsh prison experiences;

- Social alienation and disconnection: Social isolation from mainstream society has often been associated with a greater propensity towards engaging with radical and extremist groups.

- Perceived in-group superiority: As it raises a 'us vs. them' logic, increasing exclusionary feelings, it has been associated with a greater propensity towards engaging in discriminatory and extremist actions;

- Perceived individual/collective relative deprivation and discrimination: Feelings of relative deprivation are well-established risk factors for crime, radicalisation, and engagement in extremist activities, aggravating a sense of isolation and victimisation, cementing grievances and frustrations. This is particularly relevant for individuals transitioning from prison to community, who are often faced with socio-structural exclusion.

When discussing situational factors, those accounting for the environmental dimension must be considered. Certain communitarian characteristics can promote crime and greater adherence to radicalisation and violent extremism. Namely:

- Presence of charismatic entrepreneurs of extremism: When present, these have a tipping-point effect on radicalisation and readiness to engage in extremist activities,

as they mobilise local knowledge to tailor radical narratives, maximising recruiting efforts (RAN, 2020). This effect has been demonstrated to be especially relevant for previously imprisoned individuals, who, due to their greater transitional vulnerability, are seen as preferable targets (Soufan & Schoenfeld, 2016).

- Shared narratives of injustice and victimhood: When these are openly shared at the local level, radical informal support structures are enhanced (Hafez & Mullins, 2015), creating a supportive social milieu. Thus, when radicalisation and extremist violence are collectively normalised, formerly imprisoned individuals might adopt these to assist their perceived sense of belonging (Hafez & Mullins);

- Presence of radical and extremist organisations: In economically vulnerable communities, which are the most common return locations for formerly imprisoned individuals, radical organisations often take the provider role, supporting the most vulnerable members of the community;

- Communitarian disorganisation and marginalised status: Social disorganisation is associated with higher crime levels, leaving the community's most vulnerable members (*e.g.,* formerly imprisoned individuals) with a greater propensity to adhere to extremist causes. Disorganised communities pose significant challenges to those transitioning from prison to community, as combining a personal marginalised status (*e.g.*, 'ex-con') with communitarian marginalisation might push them to radical viewpoints and extremist behaviours (Vermeulen, 2014).

When looking for situational-level risk factors, it must be considered how transitioning individuals mobilise different environments, including the online one. In fact, in the current digitalised world, the online setting is an important milieu to signal, identity and understand radicalisation paths (Lara-Cabrera et al., 2017). Hence, considering one's online habits, encompassing encounters, communications and consumptions provide a broader picture of potential vulnerabilities and ways of solving them (Clemmow et al., 2020).

As it becomes apparent, despite the complexities and specificities entailed in radicalisation processes, the risk factors for engagement in extremist activities in a post-release setting are, to some extent, similar to those found for 'mainstream' criminal recidivism (Cherney, 2018). Amongst these, the following appear to be the most critical:

- Social isolation: As the individual alienates himself from the mainstream society, a sense of separation, discrimination, and marginalisation is enhanced, pushing the individual further to anti-social and potentially radical milieus;

- Anti-social peers and network: Inside anti-social networks, violence is often seen as an acceptable answer to grievances, thus facilitating the adherence to extremist ways of action;

- Poor family support and family estrangement: Often following a prison sentence, the formerly imprisoned individual returns to the community with minimal resources (*i.e.,* personal, social, symbolic, monetary). It is agreed that the family is crucial to overcome these, as it can provide acceptance, safety, integration, social connections, and opportunities (Damas, 2021). However, this is not always the case, as family relationships are often damaged with prison time, or, in some cases, weren't positive to start it. Moreover, this potential is aggravated for individuals convicted for terrorism-related crimes or in radicalisation processes, as the family might be reluctant to support them post-release;

- Unemployment and lack of preparation for future employment: These have been identified as triggers for pushing an adherent back into contact with old networks, as these provide comfort and income opportunities;

- Perceived disenfranchisement, discrimination, and inability to cope with it: Stigma is often pointed as one of the biggest challenges that previously imprisoned individuals face when transitioning back to the community. However, for those convicted of violent extremism/terrorism-related offences, its consequences tend to be more significant, as the label of 'terrorist' is catchy, with debilitating outcomes (Morton & Silber, 2018).

Lastly, it has been noted how some factors hamper disengagement and deradicalisation efforts, thus contributing to a greater propensity to (re)engage in extremist activities, namely (OSCE, 2014; Marsden, 2015; Haffez & Mullins, 2016):

- Lack of critical thinking;

- Lack of a comprehensive religious understanding;

- Rigid binary thinking;

- Un-balanced identity;

- Anti-social and hostile social networks and known associates in extremist groups;

- Lack of positive and healthy family relationships;

- Perceived legitimacy of violence to respond to grievances;

Considering this complex array of factors, it is essential to remember that different dimensions must be accounted for when assessing the risks and vulnerabilities to radicalisation and the subsequent propensity towards extremist activities. Thus, the individual must be understood holistically as a social being with complex personal, social, symbolic, institutional, and environmental realities. Therefore, individual, societal, and environmental/communitarian factors must be considered when assessing the risk of radicalisation and extremism in the post-release setting, which should be comprehended in the broader framework of reintegration challenges (Reiter et al., 2021).

Moreover, it's important to remember that risk is not a static and linear expression, meaning that, on the one hand, static and dynamic risk factors must be accounted for, and, on the other, protective factors and strengths must also be considered (Marsden, 2015; Hanby, 2013). Protective factors are often the key to understanding how different individuals with similar risk factors have different outcomes.

In fact, when adopting a heavily risk-focused approach to risk assessment, the risk is seen as a prediction to be rendered. However, a more comprehensive view of the individual is provided when including protective factors, portraying its risk as a manageable problem (Borum, 2015). As protective factors aren't just the inverse of risk factors, being considered as "positive attributes that shield or amour the individual from risky situations" (Hanby, 2013, p. 17), as well as dynamic and context-specific, these allow for better case management. By doing so, better-tailored interventive plans can be devised for individuals with a greater propensity to engage in extremist activities.

Despite this recognition, scientific research on protective factors for radicalisation and violent extremism is still scarce, which reflects on risk assessment instruments. However, the most cited factors are:

- Political satisfaction and participation;

- Marital status;

- School bonding and performance;

- General and institutional trust;

- Out-group connections and friendships;

- Parental involvement.

(Wolfowicz, Litmanovitz, Weisburd & Hasisi, 2019).

However, these are used in more generic terms, not accounting for the specificities of the post-release setting.

In sum, when considering the post-release setting and its cruciality for ensuring a sustained, grounded, and comprehensive follow-up of the formerly imprisoned individual, risks, needs, and strengths must be assessed, allowing for better planninAvg of the different moments encompassed in the reintegration process. However, these specificities are still mostly lacking in the current landscape of risk instruments.

# Radicalisation risk assessment in the community: Potentialities and limitations

Despite the evident importance of assessing the propensity to radicalisation and engagement in extremist activities in the post-release setting, especially considering the incremented grievances and vulnerabilities expected, some ethical concerns must be considered.

It is essential to clarify that risk assessment procedures in non-custodial communitarian settings are being conducted with free, thus non-convicted individuals who have already completed their sentences and formal involvement with the criminal justice system. Therefore, these aren't subjected to institutional control or surveillance (Sarma, 2017). Accordingly, and keeping in mind that formerly imprisoned individuals face challenging (re) integration paths, mainly characterised by socio-institutional exclusion, it is paramount to ensure that follow-up and after-care efforts stemming from non-governmental institutions don't extend the effect of the criminal justice system. In this sense, the resettlement process requires closely guided and trusted support, avoiding potential discrimination and stigma, which risk assessment, when poorly conducted, greatly contributes to (Sarma). Hence, when non-governmental organisations assess the risk of radicalisation and extremism in a post-release setting, they must avoid positivist and profiling attitudes, as these can hamper

reintegration by damaging the communitarian and self-perception of the assessed individual (Sian, 2017).

Moreover, the effective follow-up of newly-released individuals depends on establishing trustful relationships between service/support providers and the transitioning individual. For these relationships to be built, a sense of belonging, acceptance, transparency and legitimacy must be present. However, if risk assessment procedures are conducted with a heavily-focused risk perspective, it can be questioned whether or not trust will be elicited, as non-governmental organisations can be perceived as a continuum of the criminal justice system control.

Following up on the need to avoid discriminatory outcomes, an extra layer of care is needed to interpret "radicalisation red flags" (*e.g.* tattoos, physical appearance, religious practices). Often observational red flags of radicalisation might not be significant of a radicalisation vulnerability. Such considerations gain paramount importance in the communitarian setting, especially as the formerly imprisoned individual tries to escape the "ex-con" label. Accordingly, caution must be taken, as scoring someone as high risk can add to the individualised stigma. However, the risk is also felt at the communitarian level, especially when signalling cultural factors, since suspect communities can be created (Vermeulen, 2014). When assessing cultural and communitarian level factors at large, institutions risk producing an erroneous assumption, thus fuelling prejudice, discrimination, stigma, and, consequently, exclusion, which can be counter-productive to prevent radicalisation. Therefore, when assessing and scoring the propensity towards radicalisation and engagement in extremism, a comprehensive understanding of the assessed individual is required, going beyond simply checking for the red flags and risk factors, as these need to be interpreted in a thorough and individualised way (Weert & Eijkman, 2019). By doing so, non-governmental organisations can avoid profiling appearances, cultural traits and profiles, avoiding overly positivist approaches (Sian, 2017).

Lastly, considering the potentially harmful prison experiences, in which individuals lose their sense of autonomy, liberty and power, it is essential to avoid assessment schemes in which the individuals feel powerless and discouraged. Consequently, the individual must be included in their own assessment process, to the extent possible. This is especially relevant considering that the individual's involvement with non-governmental organisations in the post-release setting is most likely built voluntarily, in which individuals are free to choose their engagement, requiring them to feel listened to and validated (Cherney, 2021).

With these in consideration, it becomes clear how radicalisation and extremism risk assessment is necessary, yet for it to be effective, several concerns and issues must be ensured. On the one hand, to respond to the complexity entailed in radicalisation and resettlement processes, recognising that risk factors can only provide a fragmented picture of reality is necessary. Thus, not all individuals who experience, or are exposed to certain factors, will adhere to radicalisation and engage in extremist behaviours. And on the other hand, risk assessment needs to follow an individualised approach, in which the individual needs to be holistically framed and, most importantly, respected as a free and deserving community member. Altogether, when analysing the propensity to adhere to radical causes in communitarian settings, vulnerabilities and potentialities must replace risk and protective factors.

# How to assess the risk of radicalisation in the community:

When assessing the potential manifestations of the process of adhesion to radical ideologies and extremist behaviours in community settings, an intricate picture appears, as in the communitarian settings, continuous access and monitorisation of the individual aren't possible.

Consequently, a broader work is in order, striving to go beyond observable traits to an effort of understanding the individual and how the re-settlement path is individually perceived and dealt with. To do so, the goal must be placed on the assessment of propensity. By propensity, no rigid or inborn predisposition is presupposed. In fact, for this purpose, propensity is used to signal a fluid process in which the individual can move and interact with the environment, but without any certain outcome. Therefore, propensity towards engagement encompasses the process of adhesion to radical attitudes, and viewpoints as well as the adoption of externalised signs and behaviours of extremism.  From this, two main points can be drawn, on the one hand, the need to account for the environmental level, and on the other, the need to consider propensity as a dynamic complex process.

Regarding environmental considerations, it is critical to recognise that the macro landscape of the formerly detained person offers opportunities and limitations for the resettlement path. In specific, when looking at the vulnerabilities to engage in radical and extremist viewpoints and behaviours, the political and religious national and local frameworks must be accounted for, as these provide the infrastructure for collective and personal action. As for the processual nature of the outcome under analysis, its manifestations are expected to change over time. As a result, accounting for these temporal variations is paramount to guide and support interventions.  For such, it is crucial to establish a baseline level evaluation, serving as a reference point for assessing changes and impact, grasping the effectiveness of the accompaniment provided. For such, baseline assessments must be conducted before any actual interventive and after-care work, being of utmost importance to plan, adjust and monitor the support and potential interventive plan (UN Women, 2012).

## What to assess:

When looking at the most quoted factors for explaining radicalisation in general and in the post-release setting, it becomes apparent that in non-custodial settings a broader approach is required, avoiding a rigid risk approach, in which factors are perceived dually, failing to encompass the individual and situational complexity and how these are influenced by the macro landscape. Therefore, to understand the potential vulnerabilities to radicalisation, broader dimensions must be used, highlighting the following:

- Community engagement: When re-entering society following a prison sentence, re-engaging with the community is often challenging, as formerly imprisoned persons need to reconnect at a social and institutional level with their original community, thus requiring a dual adjustment- to a new reality and identity (Damas, 2021). This re-adaptation is an important conformity driver when successful, however, it can also aggravate discontent, potentially contributing to catalysing radicalisation processes (Cherney, 2021; Decker & Pyrooz, 2020)
- Civic engagement: A willingness to actively increase individual and communitarian conditions is essential to deal with communitarian challenges posed by the reintegration process. To do so, a sense of political and communal responsibility is paramount. However, when such an engagement fails to take place, already vulnerable individuals might further develop a sense of victimisation, discrimination, lack of power and isolation (Wolfwicz, Limanovitz, Weisburd & Hasisi, 2019; Angus, 2016).
- Interpersonal relations: Following a prison sentence, the individual returns to the community with minimal resources, and to overcome this, interpersonal relations, namely with the family, peers and broader networks, are critical, as they provide social, personal, material, and symbolic capital, giving opportunities for the individual to choose to live a crime-free life. However, when the individual struggles to feel accepted and connected, a sense of alienation and isolation is enhanced, which in turn can catalyse a sense of personal crisis. In turn, such can increase individual responsiveness to extremist views (Wolfwicz et al., 2019; Newman, 2010).

- Narratives and Speech: Narratives are the externalisation of thoughts and viewpoints, reflecting how individuals perceive themselves, individually and in relation to their social world. Therefore, when analysing the vulnerabilities encompassed within the reintegration moment, listening to the individuals and to what they experiences is paramount to understand their needs. Hence, when transitioning and re-settling, formerly imprisoned individuals verbalise their frustrations and struggles, which in turn can assist in understanding how they feel about themselves and the world (van Krieken & Sanders,2021; Haffez & Mullins, 2015; van Djick, 1995).
- Situational context: Difficulties encompassed within the prison-community transition are felt at different levels, as the individual is in constant interaction with the environment. In fact, environmental factors have been often presented as potentially increasing the chances of resuming criminal activities and influencing the propensity to adhere to radical causes, encompassing different various realms (Clemmow et al., 2020).
- Medium-to-long-term stability: The complexities encompassed within the prison-community transition, reflect a dynamic and multi-level process, with different stages, whose outcomes require a medium-to-long-term accompaniment, as different needs and challenges gain varying weights and repercussions (Walkenhorst et al., 2018).

Within these broader dimensions, research has been pinpointing several important features that help to explain how and why the resettlement process can either be a vulnerable moment for radicalisation or how it can be mobilised for positive change.

## Conclusion: A comprehensive approach to risk

Considering the limitations and concerns previously mentioned, it is important to deconstruct the risk dominant approach to the assessment of formerly detained individuals. In this sense, when assessing the propensity of engagement in radical attitudes and extremist behaviours, it is important to consider how various factors and conditions have different weights and implications for different persons in distinct situational settings. Hence, instead of mobilising risk or protective factors, neutral indicators must be used, catalysing potential vulnerabilities, but also opening the possibilities of understanding how these can enhance the individual well-being and potentialities for reintegration. Therefore, dimensions, categories, indicators, and items are considered as unbiased features, which are complex and case-dependent. Consequently, in each specific case, each indicator can either decrease or increase vulnerability to the propensity towards engagement and, thus, enhancing possibilities for intervention. Such is not due to the nature of the indicator itself, but, instead, to its specific impact and relevance for the individual under assessment.

As a result, a different scoring system is to be put in place, as the assessor must consider the impact of each item on the specific individual, hence accounting for their specific micro, meso, and macro frameworks and not whether the factor is present or absent. By following such a comprehensive approach, further stigma and socio-structural categorisation are avoided, which, on the one, hand leaves greater room for the assessor to mobilise professional discretion and, on the other, acknowledges how formerly detained individuals are complex social beings who cannot be reduced to linear assessments and scorings (EPEX, n.d.).

Moreover, it is important to consider how the reporting result should be organised, especially as the language used to communicate the likelihood of adhering to radical ideologies or engaging in extremist behaviours is important (Hanson, 2009). In fact, "it is not uncommon that risk is presented as low, moderate or high. The problem with such descriptors is that they have no inherent scientific meaning, and are prone to divergent interpretations" (Hanson, 2009, p. 172). As a result, to effectively and usefully report vulnerabilities to radicalisation in the post-release setting, an interventive approach must be followed, as case managers require practical information on how to tailor intervention. Hence, when working with vulnerable newly-released individuals, instead of looking at an overall score and a risk-centred result, it is important to signal the dimensions which require intervention by assessing their level of relevancy for the case management plan.

# References:

Angus, C. (2016). *Radicalisation and violent extremism: Causes and responses.* NSW Parliamenty research service. https://www.parliament.nsw.gov.au/researchpapers/Documents/radicalisation-and-violent-extremism-causes-and-/Radicalisation%20eBrief.pdf

Borum, R. (2015). Assessing the risk for terrorism involvement. *Journal of Threath Assessment and Management*, 2(2), 63-87;

Cherney, A. (2018). Supporting disegangement and reintegration: qualitative outcomes from a custody-based counter radicalisation intervention. *Journal for Deradicalization*, 17, 1-27;

Cherney, A. (2021). The release and community supervision of radicalised offender: Issues and challenges that can influence reintegration. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 33(1), 119-137;

Damas, M. (2021). *Desafios da vida pós prisão: O estigma prisional e a readaptação à vida extra muros.* [Master Dissertation] ISCTE-IUL, Lisbon.

Decker, S. & Pyrooz, D. (2020). The imprisonment-extremism nexus: Continuity and change in activism and radicalism intervention in a longitudinal study of prisoner reentry. *PloS ONE*, 15 (11), 1-21;

EPEX (European Practice Exchange). (n.d.). The art of seeing promise over risk. The RecoRa Institute, Violence Prevention Network;

Hafez, M. & Mullins, C. (2015). The radicalisation puzzle: A theoretical synthesis of empirical approaches to homegrown extremism. *Studies in Conflicts & Terrorism*, 38(11), 958-975;

Hanson, R. (2009). The psychological assessment of risk for crime and violence. *Canadian Psychology*, 50(3), 172-182;

Hart, A. (2020). Risks, radicalisation and rehabilitation of incarcerated terrorists. *Journal of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism*, 15(3), 189-209;

Horgan, J. & Braddock, K. (2010). Rehabilitating the terrorists? Challenges in assessing the effectiveness of de-radicalization programs. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 22(2), 267-291;

Lara-Cabrera, R., Pardo, A., Benouaret, K., Faci, N., Benslimane, D., Camanho, D. (2017). Measuring the radicalisation risk in social networks. *IEEE Access*, 10892-10900;

Kubrin, C. (2013). Challenges of prisoner reentry. *Contexts,* 12(3);

Marsden, SV. (2015). Conceptualising 'success' with those convicted of terrorism offences: Aims, methods and barriers to reintegration. *Behavioral Sciences of Terrorism and Political Aggression,* 7(2), 143-165;

Maxdougall, A., der Veen, J., Feddes, A., Nickolson, L. & Doosje, B. (2018). Different strokes for different folks: The role of psychological needs and other risk factors in early radicalisation. *International Journal of developmental science* 12, 37-50;

Morton, J. & Silber, M. (2018). *When terrorists come home: The need for rehabilitating and reintegrating America's convicted jihadists.* Counter Extremism Project. https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/2022-04/EMW-2020-GR-APP-00067%20-%20Counter%20Extremism%20Project.pdf

Neumann, P.(2010). *Prisons and terrorism: Radicalisation and de-radicalisation in 15 countries. The International Centre for the Study of Radicalisation and Political Violence.*

OSCE. (2014). *Preventing terrorism and countering violent extremism and radicalization that lead to terrorism: A community-policing approach.* OSCE. https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/1/d/111438.pdf

Radicalisation Awareness Network. (2020). *The role of hotbeds of radicalisation.* [Conclusion Paper]. RAN. https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/system/files/2021-01/ran_small_scale_meeting_hotbeds_conclusion_en.pdf

Reiter, J., Dooseje, B & Feddes, A. (2021). Radicalization and deradicalization: a qualitative analysis of parallels in relevant risk factors and trigger factors. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, *27*(2), 268–283;

RTI International (2018). *Countering violent extremism: the application of risk assessment tools in the criminal justice and rehabilitation processes.* RTI International. https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/OPSR_TP_CVE-Application-Risk-Assessment-Tools-Criminal-Rehab-Process_2018Feb-508.pdf

Sarma, K. (2017). Risk assessment and the prevention of radicalization from non-violence into terrorism. *American Psychologist, 72*(3), 278–288.

Sian, K. (2017). Born radicals? Prevent, positivism, and race-thinking. *Palgrave Common*, 3(6), 1-8;

Soufan, A. & Schoenfeld, D. (2016). Regional hotbeds as drivers of radicalization. In A. Varvelli, *Jihadist hotbeds: Understanding local radicalization processes*, 15-38, ISPI: Milano

UN Women (2012, January 3). *What is a baseline assessment?* UN Women Virtual Knowledge Centre to End Violence Against women and girls. https://www.endvawnow.org/en/articles/1323-what-is-a-baseline-assessment.html

Van Djik, T. (1995). Discourse, opinions and ideology. *Current Issues in Language and Society*, 2, 115-145;

Van Krieken, K. & Sanders, J. (2021). Storytelling on Oral Grounds: Viewpoint Alignment and Perspective Taking in Narrative Discourse. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12;

Vermeulen, F. (2014). Suspect communities, targetting violent extremism at the local level: Policies of engagement in Amsterdam, Berlin and London. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 26(2), 286-306

Walkenhortst, D., Baaken, D., Ruf, T., Leaman, M. & Korn, J. (2018). *Rehabilitation Manual: Rehabilitation of radicalised and terrorist offenders for first-line practitioners.* Radicalisation Awareness Network.

Weert, A. & Eijkman, Q. (2019). Subjectivity in detection of radicalisation and violent extremism: A youth worker's perspective*. Behavioural Sciences of Terrorism and Political Agression,* 11(3), 191-214;

Wolfowicz, M., Litmanovitz, Y., Weisburd, D & Hasisi, B. (2020).  A Field-Wide Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Putative Risk and Protective Factors for Radicalization Outcomes. J Quant Criminol 36, 407–447;

# R2COM
Radicalisation and Violent Extremism
Prevention in the Community

**PARTNERS** KOSOVA
CENTER FOR CONFLICT MANAGEMENT

TRANSFORM

ALBANIAN HELSINKI COMMITTEE
KOMITETI SHQIPTAR I HELSINKIT

INNOVATIVE
PRISON SYSTEMS

ASSOCIAZIONE
CARCERE E TERRITORIO
DI BRESCIA

savoirs

UNITED
racism
nationalism